

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

60-61 VICTORIA, 1897

VOL. XLV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF MAY TO THE  
TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JUNE INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S PRINTER

1897

1897

# House of Commons Debates

## SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

#### KINGSTON POSTMASTER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Elbert Tupper) asked :

1. Has Mr. James Shannon, postmaster at Kingston, been superannuated or retired ?
2. If so, upon what ground ?
3. If Mr. Shannon has been retired and a successor appointed, what is the name and age of his successor ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. James Shannon, the postmaster at Kingston, has been superannuated. He was superannuated for the purpose of improving the efficiency of the post office at Kingston ; Mr. Shannon being a gentleman of advanced age and feeble health. His successor is Mr. Gunn, formerly a member of this House. His age has not been made known to the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I be allowed to draw the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to the fact, that Mr. Gunn's age has to be made known to the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then I presume that if it has to be known it will be made known, but I have given the answer that at present his age is not known.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact, that Mr. Gunn is obliged to give his age.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given the information given me to-day by the secretary of the department.

#### JUBILEE POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. GIBSON asked :

1. Is it intended by the Post Office Department to issue a set of Jubilee postage stamps on the occasion of Her Majesty's approaching Jubilee ?
2. If so, will such stamps be put into public use, and what course will be adopted whereby the public may purchase such stamps ?
3. Will there be any limit to the quantity to be issued ?
4. Of what various denominations will such issue consist ?
5. What will be the amount of each denomination to be issued ?
6. What steps will be taken to limit the number to be issued ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). It is the intention of the Government to issue a set of jubilee postage stamps. Such stamps will be put into public use by being delivered to postmasters throughout Canada for sale to the public in the same manner as ordinary postage stamps are sold. There will be a limit to the quantity to be issued. The denominations of jubilee stamps, and the total number of such jubilee stamps to be issued are set forth in the following schedule :—

SCHEDULE showing the Denominations and Total Number of Jubilee Stamps to be issued.

Number to be issued.	Denomination.
150,000	½c. stamps.
8,000,000	1c. do
2,500,000	2c. do
20,000,000	3c. do
750,000	5c. do
75,000	6c. do
200,000	8c. do
150,000	10c. do
100,000	15c. do
100,000	20c. do
100,000	50c. do
25,000	\$1 do
25,000	\$2 do
25,000	\$3 do
25,000	\$4 do
25,000	\$5 do
7,000,000	1c. post cards.
Total value of one stamp of each kind, \$16.21½.	

As soon as the total number of stamps mentioned in said schedule is issued the plates from which they will have been engraved will be destroyed in the presence of the head and two officers of the department. On the 10th June, the Post Office Department will proceed to supply jubilee postage stamps to the principal post offices in Canada, and through them the minor post offices will obtain their supply until the issue is exhausted. If this jubilee issue were to wholly displace the ordinary postage stamps it would supply the ordinary wants of the country for between two and three months, but as the use of the ordinary postage stamp will proceed concurrently with that of the jubilee stamps it is expected that the jubilee stamp will last beyond the three months. Inasmuch as the department is already receiving applications for the purchase of jubilee stamps, it may be stated that the department will adhere to the established practice of supplying them only to postmasters and through them to the public, who may purchase them on and after the 19th June, 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend state where these stamps are being printed, if they are now being printed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not at present being printed. They will be printed in the city of Ottawa.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. In the "Daily Witness" of May 15, appears a letter from the correspondent at Ottawa, in which the correspondent writes as follows:—

Mr. Davin, prefacing his doctrine with the declaration that he was an authority on journalism, laid it down as a cardinal principle of newspaper management, that every communication sent to the paper must be published, a remark which showed Mr. Davin to be as ignorant of journalism as he is of parliamentary propriety.

I never made the declaration, and the statement of the correspondent that I did so has no foundation in fact. It would be an absurd statement from a person who knew nothing of journalism and from a person

Mr. MULOCK.

who knows something of journalism, it would be still more absurd. What I did say—I quote now from the unrevised "Hansard"—was this:—

Mr. Fairlie asked to have his letter published, and newspaper men know that it is the practice to publish a reply.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was also sent to the "Free Press."

Mr. DAVIN. I have had as long an experience of journalism as either my hon. friend or the editor of the "Free Press." I know what is the duty of a journalist: it is that if a man accused by a newspaper sends a reply it is the duty of a journalist to publish it. The Finance Minister is a journalist, and he knows what the practice is. Especially is this the case when the newspaper has criticised it. To criticise a letter he receives, and then put it into the waste paper basket or into a pigeon-hole is equivalent to slapping the man's face and then boxing his ears.

There is therefore not a tittle of foundation in the statement in the letter of the correspondent. Again, the same correspondent, in the last issue of the "Witness" to hand, that of May 19, referring to one of the debates here, says:—

Mr. Davin announced that he had not risen to discuss the tariff matter, but now he would do so.

Mr. Davin had three newspaper files on his desk, one in French and two Winnipeg newspapers, all bearing on the tariff and on a discussion which proceeded some time ago on a tariff motion of his own; so that, while professing no intention to speak on the subject, the evidence all pointed to the contrary.

My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is not here, but there are gentlemen around me who were here at the time, who know, and it is not necessary to have their evidence at all, because my word is sufficient, what occurred. While speaking, I bent down to my friend the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and asked him to send a page into the reading-room for the papers from which I wished to quote. Here are two letters, in an interval of two or three days, making two complete misstatements as to a matter of fact regarding the conduct of an hon. member of this House.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to raise a

question of privilege. There appears in the correspondence from Ottawa of the Montreal "Gazette" of to-day a heading in which I remark the following words: "An Important Question regarding the Préfontaine Clause." As I am not responsible for the preferential clause, which is the one evidently referred to, and do not understand how the typesetter on the "Gazette" happened to have my name on his brain, I wish to have my responsibility perfectly disengaged from the authorship of this clause.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the following announcement made in the Speech of His Excellency at the opening of this session:

I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal, and thus share in the large traffic centering in that city.

That speech was delivered to us on the 25th day of March, and I wish to ask the hon. Minister if he is prepared yet to take the House into his confidence and lay before us these arrangements which were declared to be concluded on the opening day of the session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think I will be prepared, at the first opportunity which will be convenient for the purpose, to make a complete statement of the proposed arrangement. I do not know just in what form the hon. member would desire that it should be presented.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I propose is that the promise made by the Governor General should be fulfilled and that this arrangement should be laid before this House for its approval.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question but that will be done in the ordinary course. I thought that the hon. gentleman desired to have some explanation prior to the submission of the resolution and the Bill, so that the House might be informed as to the details. I shall take occasion, if it will answer the convenience or suit the purpose of the hon. gentleman, when the Estimates are on having reference to the Railway Department, to make a full statement with regard to these details. I have no wish to conceal anything from the House, and only desire to take a convenient opportunity of putting the matter in the form in which it would be properly presented.

#### PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH, C. P. R.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to

draw the attention of the Government to the following article from the Prince Albert "Advocate":—

The management of the Prince Albert Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway seem to conduct their business on the penny wise and pound foolish plan. While they charge us the highest rates charged on any road in Canada, they give us the worst possible service. During the last two or three years they have done away with section men on this road, and, as a result, the train is delayed by the excessive growth of weeds on the roadbed in the summer time and by the drifting snow in the winter. This winter the snow-fall has been heavier than usual, and the train has been making about as good time as the ox teams of the freighters. Passengers have been kept four or five days on the trip from Prince Albert to Regina, which should not take more than ten hours, though the schedule time is fourteen hours, and have been subjected to great hardships through cold and the want of proper food. It is disgraceful that such a state of things exist on a railroad which is receiving a subsidy of \$80,000 a year from the Government, especially when at a very small expenditure a few fences could be erected along the road in the open prairie, where the wind fills the cuttings with snow, and by the employment of the usual section men, who could easily keep the remainder of the track clear. The attention of the Minister of Railways should be brought to this matter at once, to see if he cannot force the company to keep up to their contract by giving us at least two trains each week; and if he cannot afford us the relief we need, our member, Mr. Davis, should bring the matter to the attention of the Government, who would, no doubt, find a remedy for this grievance.

I might say that this state of things has been going on for the last two or three years, and it is a very serious matter indeed with us, because the rural districts are served with their mails from the town of Prince Albert. If the mail does not get in in time, say at nine or ten o'clock in the evening, the postmaster is unable to get it assorted in time for the mails that leave for the rural districts about ten o'clock the following morning, and as the result of this the people throughout the district of Saskatchewan have to wait a whole week for their mails. This country is paying \$80,000 a year as a subsidy to this company, and they should be compelled to fulfil their contract with proper expedition. This matter has not been brought to the attention of the Government before, and I press it upon their attention now at the request of the citizens of Saskatchewan, and I would urge on the hon. Minister of Railways to take such action as will compel this company to fulfil its contract.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know whether the committee in Prince Albert has approved of the hon. gentleman bringing this matter before the House.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—QUEEN'S JUBILEE CELEBRATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a Supplementary Estimate of a sum required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1897, to provide for the pay, allowances, transport and general expenses of the Militia Contingent to be sent to England to represent Canada in June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends this Estimate to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, 20th May, 1897.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that His Excellency's Message, together with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply. He said: This is a special Message relating to the sum necessary to pay the expenses of the Jubilee contingent. The amount required is \$26,000. I have had a conversation on the matter with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and have made the suggestion which, I think, he is willing to concur in, that we should go into Supply for the purpose of passing this exceptional item, and after it has been dealt with, proceed with the regular Orders of the Day.

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

(In Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the acting Minister of Militia will give us a full explanation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This is for the purpose of paying for the transport and the pay and allowances expected to be necessary for the 200 men and officers who are to proceed to England to take part in the Jubilee celebration. Our idea is that officers and men should receive the pay of their several ranks; and that, in the case of the men, some additional subsistence allowance will be necessary while they are in England. As nearly as we can calculate, the money will be divided into two parts of nearly equal size. Perhaps about \$11,000 or \$12,000 will be required to pay for the passages from this country to England and back again, and also for transport from the respective homes of the men in Canada to the port of embarkation and from the point of arrival in England to whatever place the military authorities there require the men to report at. The pay of the officers and men will, as I have said, be in proportion to their rank which, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), of course, is aware of. It will amount probably to something like \$13,000 or \$14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that you have here sufficient to cover all expenses?

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I hope so. But this is, of course, a matter in which it would not be to the interest of the country that there should be any stinginess; and, if this is not sufficient, I am sure the House will not object to grant us more.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is supposed to be sufficient?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, this is supposed to be sufficient. The contingent will be absent, I suppose, about forty days in all.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) made any arrangement for reduced fares?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contingent are to go by one of the Dominion steamers, the "Vancouver," about the 5th of June, and return about the 1st of July, by which time, I am informed the Jubilee celebration will be over. They will return by some other steamer of the same line, probably the "Scotsman." We got fairly favourable rates. Of course, there is a great rush to England this summer, and we had to pay, probably, a little more than we should have had to pay at another time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to make a suggestion to the committee and to the Government. As I understand it, a number of gentlemen prominent in military circles, some of whom have occupied seats in this House and other honourable positions in the country, have been invited to accompany this contingent on their visit to England. I feel—and I believe the great majority of the members of the House and the people of the country will agree with me—that some reasonable allowance should be made towards the payment of expenses of these gentlemen. I do not advocate anything in an extravagant way. But I think that the gentlemen who are to accompany this contingent, it may be with the Premier or in some supernumerary capacity, considering the important positions they occupy and the greatness of the occasion, will go as the representatives of Canada, and I think that the people will be perfectly satisfied that their representatives on this occasion—they will be only few in number—should be allowed some reasonable amount for expenses. It appears to me that without some such allowance, only men of great wealth can accept the invitation. I do not think that that would not meet the approval of this House or of the people of the country. This being a representative delegation, reasonable provision should be made for expenses for the men who have earned the right to an invitation. I simply bring this matter up that it may be taken into consideration by the department, by the Government, and by the House, in the hope that some arrangement can be made to provide as I suggest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better to deal with this resolution on its own merits, not raising the question which my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has raised. That question can be raised at any time and can be considered by the House. But I may just say that, so far as I am able to judge, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, representing the Militia Department, has already said that the Government may require to ask the House for more liberal consideration on this account than is proposed in this resolution; and I am quite certain that anything that the Government feel obliged to call upon the House for would be responded to in a very generous and liberal spirit. The question the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) has raised is one of considerable importance. I am inclined to think that the gentlemen who have the good fortune to be selected are only too happy to perform this service to their country, and are only too happy to have the invitation upon such terms as the Government may provide for them, and that, in fact, if there were any gentlemen included in that arrangement who were not prepared to accept the terms that are offered, they would find a great number of volunteers who would be delighted to take their places upon the terms offered by the Government.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps it is well that I should mention for the information of the House that the Imperial authorities intend to provide not only barrack accommodation and rations for the non-commissioned officers and men, but barrack accommodation for the officers who may accompany the contingent. While I entirely agree that this is not a case for cheese-paring or undue economy, and while I shall not hesitate to ask the House for more money if I find it necessary. I am, as at present advised, inclined to think that the gentlemen who are appointed, who are mostly men of considerable rank and who will receive the pay of their rank, will be fairly well provided during the short time they will remain in England, which, I suppose, will not much exceed three weeks. However, I am glad to hear the expressions of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and, as I say, I shall not hesitate, in case of need, to ask the House for a further sum.

Resolution reported, and read the second time.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is desirable, as the House has been kind enough to accept this item without debate, that we should proceed to carry it through as many stages as possible. Therefore I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year ending the 30th June, 1897, the sum of \$26,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution considered in committee, reported, and read the second time.

#### INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$26,000 required for defraying certain expenses of the militia contingent to be sent to England for the Jubilee of Her Majesty in June, 1897.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

#### SUPPLY—THE AMERICAN BANK NOTE PRINTING COMPANY'S CONTRACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to call the attention of the members present to some circumstances in connection with the granting of the contract for printing the bank notes, the inland revenue stamps, postal cards, stamps, &c., for the use of the Government. There are certain things in connection with this which I think merit the attention of all the members of this House, and it shall be my endeavour to put the facts of the case in as short and lucid a statement as I possibly can. It is a proper ambition, I think, for every country to be the maker of its own currency so far as that can possibly be done, and the mere accident or incident of more or less relative cheapness is not to be taken into account very largely in carrying out what is, on the whole and in principle, laudable and correct. On this assumption, at least, the Dominion of Canada has gone from the time that it was a Dominion; and at the time of confederation when, by the constitution, this power came to it, it took up the old line of policy of preparing the paper currency, stamps and the like for the service of the Government, in Canada itself. From 1866 this has been done, and been done, I believe, by one firm, and from 1868 when the Dominion came to take this matter in charge, it has been consecutively carried out on the same line and under the same management, but with certain changes and gradations, of course, which were incident to the changed conditions from one quinquennial period to another, for a period of five years has generally been the term of the contract. The notes—to confine myself to that—because where notes are made the other supplies are made, and by the same person—the notes at first were made in the city of

Montreal, and as well supervised as the Department of Finance could do, which was the responsible head in the matter. But it was early felt that as soon as possible the work of the preparation of these notes and stamps should be as close as possible to the supervising power; so that this contract, and the work under the contract, which went on in the city of Montreal in 1868 and from that time forward, gradually was brought into closer supervision by the Finance Department, and at the time of the granting of the contract in 1881, an option was introduced into the contract, by which the Minister of Finance could compel the contractors to do this work in the city of Ottawa. That option, however, was not put into force, it was put in as a principle into the contract, but the option was not exercised. At that time, in 1881, a step was taken in cheapening the cost of notes and such supplies to the Dominion, not so much in the actual rates which ruled before in the case of bank notes, as to the number of impressions which were to be taken from each plate, which, of course, operates in the way of cheapening the product. The number of impressions which were to be taken under that contract of 1881, was raised from 25,000 and 15,000 respectively, to 30,000 impressions from the first plate, and 25,000 from the plate retouched, that is, giving 55,000 impressions in all. That contract term ran out in 1886, and another contract was entered into. Under this contract there were absolute reductions in the rates to a very large extent, running, if we speak in the gross, up to about 15 per cent of the work so far as bank notes and inland revenue stamps were concerned, and a reduction of about 30 per cent in postal stamps and supplies. In that year, 1886, the option was exercised, and the condition was made absolute that the contractor should provide a suitable home for this work in the city of Ottawa, and that the work should thereafter be carried on in the city of Ottawa close to the supervising department. In 1892 came the period of another renewal of the contract. Tenders were asked for, the whole matter was gone into exhaustively in the department, and as a result, the work was given to the British American Bank Note Company, the same concern which had done the work for all these past years of which I have been speaking. In 1892 great reductions also were made in the rates which were paid for the work, and to establish the point which I have been making that these reductions went on from time to time as circumstances permitted, I desire to state from a report by the Deputy Minister of Finance, what were the principal reductions made in the contract of 1892:

In the case of the notes supplied to this department, the cost of the \$1 notes was reduced from \$104 a thousand to \$91.31; the cost of the \$2 notes, from \$126.50 to \$109.04, and of the \$4 notes, from \$113.75 to \$97.54. Similar large re-

Mr. FOSTER.

ductions were made in the cost of the postal and inland revenue supplies. Thus, postage stamps were reduced from 20 cents to 13 cents per thousand; registration stamps, from 40 cents to 28 cents; post cards, from \$1 to 80 cents or 90 cents, dependent upon whether Canadian or imported stock was used; reply cards, from \$3.25 to \$2.75 or \$1.50, dependent on the quality of the card.

In law stamps, in post bands, in gas and weights and measure stamps, in tobacco stamps, and all other stamps for the Inland Revenue Department, a large and substantial reduction was made. Improvements were made in the methods of manufacture, improvements in prices were made, and these improvements following in direct line with cheapening of manufacture meant that substantial reductions were effected. So much then for the history of the bank note work from the time of confederation up to the present with respect to those two lines: (1). The plan upon which the Government acted of having the work done in Canada and by Canadians, and of drawing it continually closer and closer under the supervision of the Department of Finance; and (2) the gradual and substantial reductions which took place in connection with the price for the work.

This work of printing the bank notes and other like kinds of work has been always carried on under very definite and plain conditions, and I wish to indicate some of the principal conditions of the contract which expired by notice given on 23rd April of this year, these conditions being found on page 3 of the blue-book brought down. In the first place, it was a condition of the tender, and of the specification assented to, for the contract is based upon the specification, that the contractor was to engrave, print, furnish and deliver all the Dominion notes, postage stamps and revenue stamps; the Government of Canada, on its part, agreeing to employ the company to perform all the work which the said Government may require during the period covered by the agreement; and that the work to be done—the engraving, printing and delivery—should be done at Ottawa, in such building as should be approved by the Government of Canada—fire-proof building, all safeguards considered necessary being applied. The conditions of the work are outlined with definiteness and clearness, and a general supervisory power is given to the Minister of Finance, to the Postmaster General and to the Controller of Inland Revenue in each case to see that the supplies are up to the requirements in quality and in every other respect, each of these Ministers having arbitrary power to reject supplies which did not come up to the standard of quality or in other respects as required. Those conditions have been very well understood: that the whole of the work should be done at Ottawa, that the Government should give all its work to that contractor, and that there should be this supervisory

power and general power to a certain extent on the part of the Ministers so that the grade and quality should be kept up to the specifications and terms of the contract.

That brings us to the consideration of the present case. The contract entered into in 1892 was made for five years, and the period expired on 23rd April, 1897. The contract was to expire at that time if six months' notice were given by the Minister of Finance. If six months' notice had not been given in advance, then the contract would expire on six months' notice having been given either by the Minister of Finance or by the contractor, each in his several interest. The notice was given on 26th September, 1896, by the Finance Minister, and the British American Bank Note Company received notification that on 23rd April next the contract would expire. Just about that time the British American Bank Note Company, through the president of the company, invited the Finance Minister, who, presumably, had the larger interest in this matter and who was the person who had under his charge the arrangement of the contract, to go down to the place of the manufacture of the bank notes and stamps and look at the establishment, as he might wish to see something of the method and manner in which this work was executed. This was almost a necessary condition, because no Finance Minister or any other Minister possesses the least knowledge of the technique of this branch of the business, and unless he makes himself acquainted with it in a practical way by actually visiting the establishment and seeing just how the work is carried on, it is impossible for any man, I do not care how intelligent he may be, to approach the subject from the point of sufficient information. So the president of the British American Bank Note Company courteously invited the Minister of Finance to visit and inspect the establishment. The invitation was acknowledged by the Finance Minister, as the papers show, but, so far as I know, he never put his head inside the doors of the establishment. This invitation was given by the British American Bank Note Company on 16th October. On 19th October the Finance Minister called for tenders, getting an Order in Council on his report authorizing him to give notice for the termination of the old contract and to call for tenders for a new contract. Tenders were called for on 19th October, and the specification will be found on page 15 of the blue-book, and it would be well that hon. members should pay attention to the specifications, because they are the basis of the whole business, they are the pledge of good faith between the power asking for the contract and the parties who are tendering for the contract; and when these specifications are definitely stated it is a rule, and I think a wholesome rule, that these specifications, which are the basis of the contract, are as

much a pledge between the parties as they would be between man and man, and which should be thoroughly, absolutely and definitely observed; or, if they are not definite, and at any stage of the progress of negotiations the contracting power finds it is in the interest of the Government to make a change in the specifications, then it is the absolute duty of the contracting power to give the same information to every one of the tenderers as he does to any one of the tenderers. What were the specifications? The specifications stated what was to be tendered for, as follows:—

Engraving, printing, furnishing and delivering to the Government of Canada, as and when required during the period and on the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth:

- A. Dominion notes;
- B. Postage stamps, stamped envelopes, post and letter cards and post bands;
- C. Inland revenue stamps.

That was the work to be done, and the House will see that it takes in all the work, exactly on the lines which have been followed up since confederation, exactly on the line of previous tenders, exactly on the line of previous contracts, and no person who had had any knowledge of the previous history of tendering for this branch of the Dominion's work, had the least doubt but that these words meant exactly what they stated, and what they included, namely, that the work, and all of the work, should be done in the city of Ottawa. That was an essential basis in the calling of the tenders. The usual five years' term was fixed as the period during which this contract was to continue. Section 7 goes on to state:

All work under the contract—

That is the engraving, and printing, and delivering, and so forth.

All work under the contract shall be done at the city of Ottawa in such building or buildings as are approved of by the Government of Canada. \* \* \* No contract shall be entered into with any tenderer until he has satisfied the said Government of Canada that he has, or will have by the time he begins the work under the contract, a proper building or buildings in Ottawa in which to carry on the work under the contract.

The usual precautionary clauses are put in the specifications, and they agree very nearly with the specifications of the preceding tender, and terms of the preceding contract. Section 22 declares: That there should be a deposit for bona fides of \$5,000, and a deposit of \$50,000 to remain in the hands of the Government at interest for the due execution of the work. There was also the usual clause 23: That the Government of Canada does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender; leaving itself entirely free at any stage of the negotiations to act as it considered in the best interests of the country.

So much then for the specifications upon which the present tenders were called.

Now, I do not know exactly for what purpose or with what aim, but the fact is, that when these tenders were asked for the area of the call was made very wide indeed, and these specifications were sent to Great Britain, to the United States, and to Canada. At pages 20 and 21 of the papers brought down will be found a list of the firms and companies to whom these specifications were sent, ostensibly with the view of giving them information so that they might tender for this work on the basis as set out in the specifications. Numbers of these were sent to London, and the letter of the Minister of Finance accompanying them is as follows:—

Finance Department,  
Ottawa, 22nd October, 1896.

J. G. Colmer, Esq.,  
Canadian Government Offices,  
17 Victoria Street, London.

Dear Mr. Colmer,—I send you a dozen copies of a circular in relation to our new contract for engraving and printing the Dominion notes, postage and inland revenue stamps. I think it is hardly probable that we shall have any tenders from parties in England, but I am desirous of having the contract made known as widely as possible to parties in the trade. I shall, therefore, be obliged if you will cause these circulars to be sent immediately to the leading houses in England in that line of business.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING,  
Minister of Finance.

Mr. Colmer followed out the instructions to the letter, and in a communication to Mr. Fielding he details the corporations, and firms, and parties to whom he sent the circulars. Immediately following upon that came inquiry from some of the firms, as to whether or not the stipulation in clause 7: that the work shall be done in Ottawa; was to be firmly adhered to, and, in furtherance of that inquiry, Mr. Colmer sent the following telegram to the Finance Department:

Tenders for engraving. Firms point restrictions clause seven manufacture Canada. Also state tenders impossible without specimens mentioned clause fourteen.

The specimens referred to were specimens of stamps and the like of that. To that the Minister of Finance replied:

Tenders for engraving. Cannot abandon condition requiring manufacture at Ottawa. If responsible parties wish to tender, we will send specimens.

The answer of the Finance Minister to the English inquirers is firm and decided, that this work must be done at Ottawa. That, as Mr. Colmer says a little later on, cut out all the English firms from attempting to tender. They had not their engravers and their machinery over here, and they had no buildings to carry on this work in the city of Ottawa. There was also a tender received from a firm in Toronto, Barber & Ellis, and that firm also made

Mr. FOSTER.

inquiry as to whether any of the conditions in the specifications would likely be relaxed. What they wished to have relaxed, was, not the condition that the work should be performed at Ottawa, but the condition as respects the \$50,000 deposit. Their argument was that it would require \$50,000 to put up an establishment, and then, if the firm had to deposit \$50,000 in hard cash with the Government, that that was an outlay of \$100,000 which was pretty nearly equivalent to a year's work. The Barber & Ellis Co. signified their intention of tendering, but they wanted the restrictions relaxed to the extent, that they would be allowed to give undoubted personal security of some kind, instead of depositing the \$50,000 cash. To that, the Minister of Finance was equally firm as he was in reference to the inquiries from London, and his letter in reply emphasizes it, and declaring that this is a very special and important work, he says:

The engraving contract is one which, from its nature, can only be undertaken by persons having a considerable amount of capital, and who are able to assure the Government of their thorough responsibility; therefore, it is necessary to impose conditions different from those which apply to ordinary contracts.

The Minister there declares that these restrictions and conditions of the specifications cannot be departed from. He is firm with the London inquirers; he is equally firm with the Toronto inquirers.

This brings the matter to another stage; that is the stage when the tenders were received. These tenders were advertised to be in on the 23rd of November, and on the 23rd of November, whether at 12 noon or at any other hour during the day I cannot glean from the papers, but presumably at the hour of 12 noon, three tenders were in. One was an irregular tender; why? For the reason that there was no deposit. That was from the Barber & Ellis Company. They were quite willing to make the deposit of \$5,000 for bona fides, and they were willing to put up any amount of satisfactory personal security for the due performance of the work; but they were not willing to deposit the \$50,000 with the Receiver General. That tender, then—number one, we will call it—was ruled out because it did not conform with the specifications. There was another one which did not conform with the specifications: that was the tender from the American Bank Note Company, which has its headquarters in the city of New York, with reference to the history of which, and the bona fides of which, and the large operations of which it is not necessary for me to say anything at this stage of the matter. Now, the Barber & Ellis tender was ruled out because it was informal, in that it did not comply with one of the specifications, the specifications being in their principal conditions such as I have read to the House. The American Bank Note

Company's tender was informal in a much more essential condition than the Barber & Ellis tender; why? The Barber & Ellis Company were willing to do all the work in Ottawa, willing to put up their building, willing to do everything except put up this deposit of \$50,000 in cash, instead of which they wished to give undoubted and sufficient personal security; but their tender was informal, and was ruled out. The American Bank Note Company's tender was informal in this condition, that it entirely overrode the basis of the whole specification, which was that the work should be done in the city of Ottawa, and they added a rider in these words:

The American Bank Note Company understands and makes it a part of this tender that it is not required by the specifications hereto attached to manufacture bank note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of the trade, inks, colours, &c., in the city of Ottawa, but that such supplies necessary to the faithful fulfilment of the contract may be obtained elsewhere.

Now, Sir, I make bold to state that there was not an employee in the Finance Department, or a gentleman in Canada who has had any knowledge of the history of the bank note work of this country from 1867, who did not know absolutely and positively, in reading these specifications, that they called for all the work, and that that was the essential condition insisted upon from confederation—insisted upon when in 1886 the old contractors were forced to come to Ottawa and place their capital and large plant in a new building here. But the American Bank Note Company simply said to themselves, as they said afterwards to the Minister: "No, we cannot comply with that condition; if you enforce it, we cannot take this contract, and therefore we put this rider in, that we shall not be obliged to conform with that basic specification, but that we shall be allowed to do this work in New York, and bring it in here." The American Bank Note Company, if they be not a firm of lawyers, have graduated somewhere very near to a lawyer's office. They are skilled casuists, altogether too skilled for my simple and unsuspecting friend the Minister of Finance. With extreme skillfulness and shrewdness they expressed their contentions, as mild-looking as though there were no harm in them; but they were accomplishing the deadly business they were after, of doing none of the essential work in the city of Ottawa. "It is not required," they say, "by the specifications hereto attached, to manufacture bank note and other papers." No one ever thought it was, no one ever said it was. "Steel rolls." No one ever thought it was, no one ever said it was, if they were plain rolls. "Steel plates." No one ever thought it was, no one ever said it was, if they were blank plates. And here is where the astuteness comes in. "The dies and other tools." They slide

right over the dies as if they were on a descent of glare ice, and they get to the tools as quickly as they can, as if they were no distinction between dies and tools. An engraver's chisel is a tool, but the design which he transfers by months of hard work and an accumulation of skill which can only be learned by years of practice, is the essential thing in the work. But that, say this company, is only a tool, like the engraver's tool. The dies and other tools are to be got in New York or wherever else they can be got most cheaply. When that casuist sentence came before the Finance Minister, he was a little troubled in his conscience. He took the precaution of having a report upon these tenders from the Deputy Minister, who, from the time he has been in office in this country, has been contemporaneous with this work, and has known everything in connection with it. Now, I want the House to attend to the report of the Deputy Minister of Finance, who with the officers of his department—good officers who are used to making that kind of calculations—moneyed out, as it were, the tender. On the face of it the report of these officers is this: that the old contract totalled up to \$123,000; that the present contractor's figures amount to \$128,843, about \$5,843 more, while the American Bank Note Company quoted prices equivalent to \$99,646, a difference of more than 20 per cent in favour of their offer. That struck the Deputy Minister as being peculiar. If the Deputy Minister had been as new a comer in that department as the Finance Minister, it would not have struck him as being peculiar. But it so happened that when the contract of 1892 was being made, the Deputy Minister had to make certain calculations and researches, and he made them. When he finds that \$99,646 is the tender of the American Bank Note Company, he feels moved in spirit to comment upon those figures, which he does as follows:—

This difference is so great that the undersigned deems it advisable to make some remarks thereon, and while he is unable fully to understand the reasons for it, he considers it might arise from various causes. In the first place, the new tenderers—the American Bank Note Company—may possibly think that they would be able to make up the difference by the increased rates at which they tender for supplies that are not generally in demand. If the contract is awarded to them, this feature should be kept in mind and carefully guarded against.

That is a very wise suggestion. It is what would immediately strike a professional man who was looking into this matter and trying to get at the bottom of it. He then goes on to say:

Further, a very great difference between theirs and the tender of the British American Bank Note Company arises in the prices given for printing notes.

Now, mind, not for engraving the plates but for printing the notes.

Seeing there is such a manifest difference between the two tenderers on this item, the undersigned thinks some inquiries should be made through some expert, and he would suggest that the matter be submitted to the Queen's Printer, in order to ascertain whether the tender of the American Bank Note Company is one that can be carried out successfully, seeing they may have tendered at the unremunerative price in order to secure a foothold in the country.

Now, that is a very pregnant remark, and why is it made. It is made from previous knowledge. The Deputy Minister goes on to say :

In connection with the foregoing the undersigned begs to point out that at the time the present contract was entered into, full and explicit inquiries were made as to the rates of the American Bank Note Company, and also as to the charges made by the British American Bank Note Company to the chief monetary institutions in Canada ; and in one case the department was allowed access to the bills rendered for printing notes for the institution in question by the British American Company. The result of the inquiries proved that the rates charged to the Government for this class of work were in no sense larger than for the institution in question, and were not then higher than the rates quoted by the American Bank Note Company. The account rendered to the institution in question is now in the possession of this department. It can hardly be possible that since the present contract was entered into prices for the work have fallen to such an extent as the rates offered by the American Bank Note Company would lead one to believe. Indeed, from the tender of the present contractors, it would appear that it was found necessary to raise the rates in some lines in the offer now submitted. Accordingly, it would appear that other reasons exist than those pointed out inducing the American Bank Note Company to tender at rates so much lower than now paid.

Before entering into a contract with this company, if it be intended to do so, the undersigned respectfully suggests that care should be taken, and a distinct understanding arrived at, that no safeguard observed by the present contractors in conducting the business should be omitted in executing the work under the new contract. In this regard the undersigned may state that very great care is taken by the British American Bank Note Company for the custody and safe-keeping of our notes when in course of preparation.

He goes on to state what preparations are taken, and then adds :

Should the Government decide to enter into an agreement with the American Bank Note Company, it would appear to be desirable to bear in mind also that the institution is an alien corporation, and the officers who would in all probability conduct the business with the Government and carry out the orders, would probably come here from New York. In this connection the undersigned has to call attention to the condition appended to their tender that they are not to be required to manufacture bank note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of their trade, inks, colours, &c., at Ottawa, but may obtain elsewhere such supplies necessary to a faithful fulfilment of their contract. This would appear to allow them to do a large portion of their work in New York, and is a fea-

ture of the offer which seems to require very careful consideration, and while nothing is stated definitely on the point, the undersigned presumes the company took into consideration that they would have to pay customs duties on all dutiable articles brought into Canada.

And lastly, and most important for the House to bear in mind, he says :

The undersigned would further add that a contract with a new company would necessarily entail an immediate outlay for designs, rolls and dies—

Not tools—the Deputy Minister did not think they were tools

—necessary in the preparation of the new plates required. It would, in fact, entail all the expense attaching to the preparation of new notes and stamps. This of course would be unnecessary if the work remained in the hands of the present contractors, and this extra expense has not been taken into consideration in comparing the tenders. Undoubtedly, it would seem that even with this taken into consideration the tender of the American Bank Note Company is much lower than that of the British American Bank Note Company.

That I consider to be a very fair, a very judicious and a very pregnant report. Well, the hon. Finance Minister read that report, and what did he do ? Here was a company—and I believe my statement will be acceded to by every unprejudiced gentleman who reads it or who hears it—here was a company, one of the tenderers, which wished to have its tender accepted, although it had specifically ignored the basic consideration of the tender, namely, that the work of engraving and the preparation of these plates should be done in the city of Ottawa. The hon. Minister could not accept the Barber & Ellis tender because the \$50,000 were not deposited, although personal security, undoubtedly satisfactory, would be given. On that ground he ruled it out. He could not allow the London men the tender because the work must be done in Ottawa ; but when he has got the tenders before him, and he finds that this American Bank Note Company had put in a tender ignoring the specific and most important clause in the specification, what does he do ? Does he call for new tenders ? Not at all. Does he call the three tenderers together and enter into communication with them and give them all an equal chance ? No, he studiously ignores the British American Bank Note Company, one of the tenderers, whose tender was perfect in every respect, whose tender complied in every respect with the specifications, who had deposited the \$5,000 and had agreed to put up the \$50,000 with the Receiver General. He passes over that, he ignores the other two tenderers entirely, and he enters into communication with the American Bank Note Company. The British American Bank Note Company were within the sound of his whistle ; the American Bank Note Company were in New York and an alien corporation. He will not have

a word to say to the Canadian organization when the essential basis of the contract is ignored entirely by the American company, but enters into communication with the latter. He goes on to state in a letter written immediately, the 14th of December, to Mr. Freeland, the secretary of the American Bank Note Company :

Dear Sir,—Referring to your company's tender for engraving and printing the Canadian Government notes and stamps, there are one or two points upon which we require some additional information.

1. In conversation with you, I understood you to say that your company would be as well pleased if the stamped envelopes were withdrawn from the proposed contract. I shall be glad to have from you a confirmation of this statement.

Now, Sir, the very moment that it was mooted that these tenders were called for, that very moment constant and continuous personal communication was had between the American Bank Note Company and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) here in Ottawa and in New York ; but not one word, not one item of interview or conversation could the British American Bank Note contractor have with the Minister of Finance. Will the House please note what this clause that I have just read means ? When all the other contractors from confederation up, when the other two tenderers in this case, gave in their tenders upon remunerative and unremunerative work equally and submitted the whole tender, why was it that the Minister of Finance was forward to intimate to the American Bank Note Company that the one unremunerative part of their tender might be dropped, and they not called upon to carry out ? Stamped envelopes have not gained great currency in this country on account, I suppose, of their lack of cheapness. The machine to make stamped envelopes will cost from \$5,000 to \$7,000. The profit in making stamped envelopes that are used from year to year in this country will not more than pay the interest on the cost of the plant, and so that is not a remunerative part of the contract. The Finance Minister suggests that this may be dropped out of the American Bank Note Company's contract, and that the Queen's Printer may do this work. If the Queen's Printer is to do it, the Government must supply the Queen's Printer with \$6,000 worth of machinery, which will be left for all time to come entirely unremunerative. It is a most singular thing that they should be dropped out, and that this intimation should come from the Minister of Finance. But it did.

2. In the case of a number of inland revenue stamps, the prices are abnormally high.

I should think they were abnormally high in the offer of the American Bank Note Company—sometimes ten times as large as the tender of the British American Bank Note Company. Chewing tobacco stamps are \$100 per thousand ; snuff, under 40

per cent, \$57.06 per thousand ; law stamps, \$72.34 per thousand. And the Minister says these prices are abnormally high. He said :

I find, however, that the quantities of these stamps hitherto used and consequently made the basis of our estimates as given in the specifications, have been quite small. I can understand that if only these quantities are required, the price on which you tender must be made high enough to include the cost of engraving. This price, while it might be reasonable as applied to a small quantity, would be excessive in the event of a large quantity being required.

But, by the Minister's own admission, a large quantity is not required.

It is possible that, owing to the changes in our revenue laws, some of these stamps may be used in larger quantities.

And he asks him to amend his tender with reference to these items for larger quantities if they should be necessary. But now follows the important point.

3. I desire to call your attention to the following paragraph in your tender :—

“ The American Bank Note Company understands and makes it a part of this tender that it is not required by the specifications hereto attached to manufacture bank note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of the trade, inks, colours, &c., in the city of Ottawa, but that such supplies necessary to a faithful fulfilment of the contract may be obtained elsewhere.”

I think it would be well—

How mildly the hon. Minister corresponds with this favoured company.

I think it would be well for you to offer some explanation of this clause. Our specifications were not intended to prevent the importation of paper, ink, colours, &c., &c., or the ordinary—

That is a good word.

—ordinary tools of the engraving trade. Nor were they intended to prevent the importation of steel rolls or steel plates where such rolls or plates are of a plain character, without any engraving, impression or other such work. The only point in which your condition seems to conflict—

He does not like to put it too rawly or too roughly by saying that they do conflict—

—with the terms of our specifications is in respect of the dies. If you attach importance to the making of these outside of the Dominion of Canada, I shall be obliged if you will furnish me with fuller information on the subject. Our chief purpose in requiring the work of this contract to be done in Ottawa is that it may be performed by workmen in an establishment coming immediately under the supervision of this department, with a view to the greatest possible security against loss or fraud. I shall be pleased to receive any information you may be able to furnish as to the circumstances which in your judgment require these dies to be made abroad.

Yours very truly,

W. S. FIELDING,

Minister of Finance.

Now, I take it that that letter is an invitation, couched in the most alluring terms, to Mr. Freeland to make good his case, and

an invitation that if done in a plausible way, it would be admitted. Mr. Freeland is ready for the occasion, and he does not allow many hours to pass until he indites a letter and sends it back saying :

First. That we confirm your understanding that the company would be as well pleased if the stamped envelopes were withdrawn from the proposed contract.

Why shouldn't they ? There is nothing in it for them. New machinery would have to be brought and kept, and the best they could get out of it would be the interest on the cost of it—nothing to be made. Yes, they say, we would be pleased if you would just withdraw that from the contract.

Second. In compliance with your request that we furnish a statement of the terms on which we will supply certain inland revenue stamps in larger quantities, if required, we would say that, over and above the quantities of same in the printed specifications, and multiplied by 5, on which, on November 23rd, 1896, is based, we will supply from the same plates at the following rates per 1,000 stamps for the term of the contract.

And they give a schedule of prices. I will not go into that.

Third.—

This is the important point.

Third. We are pleased to know that our understanding of the printed specifications is correct, as to obtaining elsewhere papers, inks, colours, or the ordinary tools of the engraving trade, steel rolls and steel plates ; as the language of the specifications is such that a different construction might have been intended ; and stating also that the only point in which our conditions seem to conflict with the terms of the specifications is in respect to the dies, and asking, if we attach any importance to the making of these outside of Canada, to give fuller information on the subject.

Then follows the information.

But, Sir, one of the aims of this present Government from 1878 up, and of the old Government preceding it, was to cultivate and establish here in the Dominion of Canada a force of men of sufficient skill and sufficient working power to make for us our currency in the engraving and in the mechanical execution as well. The mechanical execution, when you have the machine and the machine-like men, is nothing compared with that skilful and ingenious and unfrequent talent of doing the nice work of the engraver, of being able to design for yourself, transfer that design to the steel and make the dies. What follows after that is all mechanical. If the Minister of Finance does not know that, five minutes spent in the establishment will tell him that the work after the design is on the steel, is mechanical. The die is, if hon. gentlemen know it, and most of them do, I suppose—I am sorry that I have not one here—the die is the first product of the engraver's skill. He makes his design, be it a beautiful maiden, or a ship

Mr. FOSTER.

at sea, or some pregnant ideal. The engraver goes to work with his plates, his steel, and the tools of his trade, and he transfers that image or design, by patient work, taking from two to eight weeks to perform it properly, and at a cost which will run from \$150 to \$1,000 for the skilled work alone of transferring that to the steel, which is the die. After that all you have to do is to harden the die, transfer it to the soft steel roll, and transfer that again, by the same mechanical process to the plate, and then print off your stamps, bills or whatever they are. The essential work is done by the engraver, but this product of the engraver is simply a tool of the trade, according to the argument of Mr. Freeland, which has been admitted by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. But, Sir, from the moment that the New York concern got the Minister's consent to have that work done in New York, from that very moment there is no heart or soul in that business in Canada, there is simply the work of a machine which turns off from the die, which is the product of the engraver's skill, simply the mechanical product. Well, they go on to argue that out. I could follow their argument, but I will not. It is apparent to every member of this House that a die is not a tool of the trade, and does not belong to that category. What do they say ? Enough to make the Finance Minister's blood boil, or ought to have made it boil, at least :

It being this company's intention to prepare the work in the highest style of the art, the limitation of the use of such talent as is procurable within the Dominion, would be detrimental to our intention. Such talent is not resident in Canada, nor obtainable in the market, while the portrait, vignette and lathe work engravers of the parent establishment could be employed here with much greater efficiency, each in their several branches, in executing the original and preparatory work, immediately under the personal supervision of the officers of the company ; nor would it be wise to dismount and move to Ottawa the extremely delicate machinery which we propose to use, for the short term of five or six months required to produce all the original dies and matrices for the entire contract term of five years.

I ask the members of this House to examine the work of their Dominion bills, to examine the work of the bank bills of this country, to go down to that establishment and examine the dies and the prints from them, and to say whether there is talent in Canada, and resident to-day in Ottawa, which is able to do fine work. I say that the Finance Department had found no fault, I say that the style of the art is good, equally as good in quality, it is well executed, and there are native Canadians to-day doing that work in that establishment, and who can successfully compete with the men in the parent establishment in the city of New York. But, Sir, it is not for the Finance Minister of this country, when he is engaged in the important work of seeing

how the money currency of this country should be made and where, to be swift to depreciate the talent of his own country, and to make a contract which eats out all the ambition, all the heart, and the whole kernel of the work, so far as skill and artistic ability are concerned, and leave the mechanical shell for Canada and for Ottawa. Then he says :

It might be well to state the company's intention more in detail, with the paragraph in question made a part of the proposed contract.

I want you to note that, because when you come to the contract, you will find it is not in it.

It is our intention to submit a model, or models, of each instrument, note, stamp or card, exhibiting the same just as it will appear when printed from the engraved plate, for the approval of the Government, and, upon approval of the same, to engrave in the parent establishment—

That is in New York.

—the original dies of portraits, vignettes, lathe work, borders, &c., with which the matrix die of each note or stamp will be partially prepared, carrying same to Ottawa for finishing.

What finishing? Simply assembling or putting together, and then lettering in the name of the bank, or the name of the note, that is all. The whole of the important work has been done before they are assembled together.

All the transferring—

Simply the mechanical operation. Here is your round roll of soft steel, here is your die, and you put it in place, apply the pressure, roll it two or three times, and you have a transfer from the die to the roll. There is the work, but it is simply mechanical.

We might add, that no Canadian labour would be displaced by our so doing, as the labour employed heretofore in making such original engravings, in our opinion, has been largely that of non-residents.

Now, that is an imputation which is not true. In the early history of engraving, outside labour had to be obtained; but in the course of the work our own Canadian people have come to learn it, and to become adepts in it; and it is an imputation which I, for one, am not going to take from Mr. Freeland or any other alien who wants to get a contract. But he puts in another memorandum, and he goes into it still more closely, and he says now :

But, desirous of meeting your wishes, we modify the seemingly objectionable paragraph so that it may read, "partially engraved dies." And to prevent misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "partially," we will prepare here the different pieces composing the details of the different dies, transfer them to what we may term the matrix dies—those from which the rolls are taken that make the plates—put in such work as may interlace with the several pieces, but always leave some portion of these matrix dies unen-

graved, and transporting them to Ottawa, finish and harden them there, and do all the balance of the work in Ottawa.

Which means, when translated into English, that nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the work is done in New York, and that simply the assembling of the parts and some little lettering have to be done after they are put into the plate in Canada. He says here :

At our interview on Monday it was stated that the present contractor intended to purchase \$20,000 worth of machinery.

That sentence just opens the light upon—what? Upon the fact that not only was the Finance Minister willing to interview, and to talk, and converse with the American Bank Note Company, and be willing to use the correspondence of the British American Bank Note Company in his conversation, but he was not willing to ask Mr. Burland, who is president of the American Bank Note Company, if that Bank Note Company had any other proposition to make. Now, they say :

But, desirous to meet your wishes, we modify the seemingly objectionable paragraph so that it may read, "partially engraved dies."

Let us go to the contract; the contract reads this way :

That the original dies of portraits, vignettes, lathe work, borders and other patterns or designs, and the matrix dies used in connection with any work under this agreement, may be engraved at the establishment of the contractors in the city of New York, in the State of New York, one of the United States of America.

No partially engraved dies in the contract. Willing to meet their wishes in a letter, but when it comes to the contract, the contract is absolute and gives them the whole power, the word "partially" being left entirely out. Now, I think I have made it pretty plain as regards the conditions and specifications. What happened after that? Well, Sir, on the 5th of January, directly after this correspondence, the Minister is convinced by that letter and memorandum, and he telegraphs to the American Bank Note Company that he is willing to recommend the acceptance of their tender, provided the details can be arranged to his satisfaction. The hon. gentleman then goes to Council and reports, and on the 7th of the month he gets an Order in Council passed, on his report, authorizing him to do that, if the details are arranged to the satisfaction of the Finance Minister. Until he obtained that authority, he never opened his lips, nor had the department any communication with the British American Bank Note Company. After he had committed himself thoroughly to the American company, after this correspondence and after the hon. gentleman had received the power, then he wrote a letter to the British American Bank Company returning the \$5,000 deposit and stating, we have had a better offer and we

return your deposit. I say what should have been done by the hon. gentleman, as hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious that Canadian labour, enterprise and skill shall be assisted in this country, was when the essential conditions of the specifications were ignored by the American Company, to have asked the British American Bank Note Company and the Barber-Ellis Company whether they had any propositions to make. The hon. gentleman did not do it. He simply cavalierly ignored the establishment which has done work since 1868 to the satisfaction of the Dominion, and he never opened communication with that company until he had received and accepted an irregular tender and had committed himself to the American Company. When that occurred Mr. Burland, as president of the British Bank Note Company, wrote to the Minister and asked for an interview, at the same time asking whether a plan he was prepared to submit could not be admitted; and stating that rather than the work should go out of Canada, he would be prepared to do it in his own establishment at the same rates as those offered by the American Bank Note Company. This was on 15th January, and at that time there was no Order in Council passed, and there was no contract entered into, there was no purchase by the new company, there was nothing to prevent the Finance Minister at that period of the negotiations accepting the offer of the British American Bank Note Company at the reduced rates, thus allowing the work to be done here in Canada. My hon. friend the Finance Minister will argue: I could not honourably do that. Why not? If the Barber-Ellis tender was ruled out for informality, much more should he have ruled out the American Bank Note Company's tender for informality. The only formal tender was that of the British American Bank Note Company. The hon. gentleman ignored that, and entered into communications with the other company. The contract was not authorized to be executed by Council until April 5th, and the contract was not indentured until March 9th, whilst on January 15th Mr. Burland's offer on behalf of the British American Bank Note Company, was before the Minister, offering to do the work at the same rate as those offered by the American Bank Note Company. There is another phase of the question. What is that? What was mentioned by the Deputy Minister of Finance. It is true that on the fact of it the tender for the work was \$128,000 by the British American Bank Note Company, and \$99,900 odd by the American Bank Note Company, but that does not take into account the charge for engraving. What is meant by that? Simply this. If the British American Bank Note Company's tender had been accepted, every die which was necessary for

**Mr. FOSTER**

the printing of the bank notes of the revenue stamps and postage stamps, having been made and stored, and being to-day in store in that establishment, would not have cost the Government a single cent. When the old company is thrown aside and the new company comes in, the latter has to recoup itself for the engraving of every bank note and revenue and postage stamp, and so they have to be paid at high rates for engraving the dies and making plates. What does that amount to? It reaches a large sum. Let me point out this fact. The American Bank Note Company has obtained this contract on the ground of paying a less amount for workmanship. Let us see how the figures stand. Here is a statement showing the difference in cost of engraving between the American Company and British American Bank Note Company:

	American Prices.	Brit. Am. Prices.
\$1 Notes—		
Face plate.....	\$ 250 00	\$ 300 00
Back .....	125 00	100 00
Retouching, one-half price	187 50	200 00
Tint plates for patent green	687 50	412 50
	\$1,250 00	\$1,012 50

Difference in cost of engraving 9 sets of plates, per annum, \$2,137.50.

Difference in cost of engraving five and one-quarter years' supply, \$11,221.38.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Take the engraving and printing together.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I am dealing with the matter in my own way, and I leave it to the House to say whether I am treating it fairly or not. What does the hon. Minister of Finance consider unfair?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I do not complain; but the hon. gentleman is taking one part of the work, which happens to be at low prices and makes a comparison with higher prices for that particular class of work. He should take all branches of the work together, and give the House the total sum. That is what we have to deal with.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Does the hon. gentleman object to my taking a different course?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman does not take the total.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I ask my hon. friend if he will allow his hon. friend to finish his statement. I propose to do this in my own way, for the sake of conciseness. I am only afraid I will not be able to bring out everything.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am afraid you will not.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Then as regards \$2 and \$4 notes, the following are the figures—

	American Prices.	Brit. Am. Prices.
<b>\$2 and \$4 Notes—</b>		
Face plate.....	\$ 250 00	\$ 300 00
Back plate.....	125 00	75 00
B. Back, or seal.....	125 00	75 00
Retouching, half price.....	250 00	225 00
Tint plates for patent green	687 50	412 50
	<b>\$1,437 50</b>	<b>\$1,087 50</b>

Difference in cost of engraving 3 sets plates, per annum, \$1,050.

Difference in cost of engraving five and one-quarter years' supply, \$5,512.50.

	American Prices.	Brit. Am. Prices.
<b>Large Notes (2 notes to plate)—</b>		
Face plate.....	\$ 250 00	\$150 00
Back plate.....	125 00	55 00
Retouching, half price.....	187 50	102 50
Tint plates for patent green	687 50	220 00
	<b>\$1,250 00</b>	<b>\$527 50</b>

Difference in cost of engraving 1 set plates, \$722.50.

	American Prices.	Brit. Am. Prices.
<b>Single Notes (1 note to plate)—</b>		
Face plate.....	\$ 250 00	\$ 80 00
Back plate.....	125 00	40 00
Retouching, half price.....	187 50	60 00
Tint plates for patent green	687 50	110 00
	<b>\$1,250 00</b>	<b>\$290 00</b>

Difference in cost of engraving 1 set plates, \$960.

Total difference of engraving for five and one-quarter years, \$18,416.88.

Now, if you come to the Inland Revenue stamps, you will find that the same difference exists, only accentuated, because the prices of the American company for engraving are still higher in comparison. Let me give the difference in favour of the Canadian company for the five and one-quarter years' supplies of Inland Revenue stamps, in the matter of engraving alone. The saving is, as compared with the American company, \$5,397.97, so that there is altogether about \$24,000, in which, on the matter of the engraving alone, the tender of the British American Company is lower than the tender of the American company. Now, the point I wish to make, and the reason I take these separately, is this: I make a distinction between the skilled work and the mechanical work. I say that the skilled work is the heart and soul of this business, and on the skilled work or engraving, the British American company is \$24,000 less for the five and one-quarter years' term of the contract, than the American company. What did the Deputy Minister say in his report? He intimated that they got this contract by making a cut rate on the mechanical work. Now, you take the printing, and there is where the American company got in their work. They are lower on the printing, on the simple mechanical work, and lower by a great deal; but there are some things to be considered in that as well. There are the

qualities, and the costs of paper to be considered, and whether the American company will give and can be got to give the same quality and price of paper, that the Canadian company has given, upon which it tendered. There is this other consideration: The bank note printing of this country has always been done by hand. The bank note printing in Washington was done by hand, but machine work was afterwards substituted, and the machine work was all sent out, and it is now again done by hand work. Every man knows that hand work is much more costly than machine work. Are they going to do their bank note printing by machine or by hand? The British American Company tendered on the ground of doing it by hand work, as they had always done it, and the least that could have been done in the course of these negotiations, when the formal tenders were before the Minister would be, to take both into his confidence and find out in reference to those matters, and whether the cost would be reduced by the British American Company, in the line of printing, and of cost of paper and the like of that. What does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) find fault with? I read the totals for engraving and printing, and showed that the American company was cheaper by 20 per cent. But, I have made this point, and it is a point which should have been made: That on the life and soul and essence of the work, the engraving, the Canadian company, made up of Canadian citizens, Canadian stockholders and Canadian workmen, tendered \$24,000 lower for the five and one-quarter years than did the American company.

Now, Sir, I do not intend to go very much further with reference to this. My view has been to make a statement, what I think is a fair and adequate statement—maybe not adequate—but a fair and honest statement of the facts as they are here. Let them be faced. If this Parliament is willing to hand over this work to an alien corporation which has no entity in this country, and which has to get an entity by forcing a Bill through this Parliament in order to give it the same rights as it has in the city of New York, a company in which there is not a single Canadian, in which the capital is alien and the labour alien, if this Parliament is willing to face that condition of things and to close up one of our Canadian industries, which has done the work to the satisfaction of the department, and the country, let them face the whole facts of the case, and let them vote upon it with the facts before them. To my mind, Sir, certain things are patent in this whole matter. The Minister of Finance, from the very beginning ignored the Canadian company. He treated them with scant courtesy. He did not deign to visit the establishment and make himself acquainted with the technique of the work, which would have been of great advant-

age to him. He handed down his specifications, and proclaimed in London and in Toronto and in Ottawa that the conditions could not be departed from, and that the work had to be done in Ottawa. He received only one formal and complete tender; that of the British American Company. He received two informal tenders, one without the deposit of \$50,000, the other with a rider that all engraving that should have been done in Ottawa be cut out and sent to New York. He ignored the formal and perfect tender and he did not even communicate with that tenderer, but undertook to communicate with the American and alien company to the end, that he gives way to every one of their contentions and is to-day, or will be, the possessor of an establishment in this city where the simple mechanical work, and that only, is done; and the heart and soul and essence of the business is to be done in the city of New York and by an alien corporation. Well, Sir, why should we ignore a Canadian industry? Will any man take the history of that work in Canada, where art was small in the beginning, where skill gave place to brawn and naked strength, and where all this nicety and beauty of detail and of conception had to be a gradual process, a fruition worked out through the hard struggles and stages of successive years. Will the hon. gentleman remember that the Canadian Government has, to a certain extent, fostered that talent and brought it out until it has made an accretion of it which has done honour to Canada. Our present Finance Minister has the doubtful honour of entirely passing by, ignoring, setting back all of that, leaving it houseless and homeless, so far as the patronage of the Government is concerned, and of transferring it all to a large and alien corporation. It is a distinction which I do not covet; it is a distinction which I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) should not covet. And for what reason? There is no reason that he dare to give this House but one; that is, that he declares he has got it done a little cheaper. But how much cheaper? When he takes into consideration the matter of engraving, he has got to meet the whole bill for the engraving of every die that is necessary for the making of all the notes and stamps and which he would not have to meet if the old company had been given the contract. And if it comes to that, what is the saving, anyway? There is an actual loss, for the company which has, up to the present, been doing the work, offered, on the 15th day of January, to do it at the same price as the American company, and the Minister of Finance would have escaped all the extra cost of engraving, because these dies are in the possession of the present contractor. Dies never wear out when they are made. When your efficient skilful man put in his two months of labour, and the portrait or vignette is finished,

Mr. FOSTER.

that is hardened and remains there for ever. All that you have to do is to transfer it at any time to a new roll, and make from that a new plate, and you have everything. These are two simple mechanical processes. All of that accretion of skill is contained there in that building which we forced them to come to Ottawa to build, and to put their brains and money in, and he has only the petty excuse that his honour would not allow him, after he had committed himself to the other company, to accept the Burland Company's offer, and give the work at the same rate to the Canadian company. I think that is worthy of note; and if the hon. gentleman attempts to argue that the engraving was not the essential feature of the whole work, he will have a hard row to hoe. That is undoubtedly the essence of the whole thing, and it was that which the present contractors had to cope with, and for which they had to incur heavy expense in a small field, bring their men to a high condition of skill, and keep them employed, though for months of the year they were paid when there was not work to be done. They were kept there, and were a source of expense to the establishment, and added to the cost of the work in the establishment; yet even with all that, the company would have done the work in the end just as cheaply as the American company, and this would have saved money to the country. My hon. friend took the stamped envelopes out, and actually increased the expense of the Government in so doing. Did he do that for the sake of economy? Was he in for saving? If so, I could have given him a suggestion as to how he could have saved probably \$100,000, and saved it easily. He could have had the Queen's Printer print all the postal cards for the use of this Dominion. That is a simple process mechanically. All you have to do is to have one or two little dies engraved, which are very simple and very easy to be made. Once the engraving is done at a cost of probably not more than \$100, and the plate is fixed, the work resolves itself into the purchase of paper, and the mechanical work of passing it through the press, cutting and trimming it, and sending the cards to the Post Office Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did you do it?

Mr. FOSTER. These gentlemen seem not to have one positive quality. When you point out one single thing to them, their only defence is, "Why didn't you do it?" The Minister of Finance was going on this, his only plea, that he wanted to save. You have a printing establishment and a staff of men; you have the capital and maintenance already provided for; and in order to print the postal cards, all you would have to do would be to pay a hundred dollars or two for the engraving and get one or two inexpensive machines.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did you not do it ?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend has not any positive quality in himself, if he will always shirk behind what he thinks to be somebody else's failing, he will never go to heaven.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then why did you not do it ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not with that negative sort of virtue that people ever do any thing or ever come to anything in this country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If it was such a good thing for us to do, why did you not do it ?

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you not follow us in everything else ? Why make any changes ? Just as the hon. gentleman will take one part of the census which shows that the population has decreased, and will hold that to be as true as the New Testament and will take another part which shows that the industries of the country have increased and will hold that that is as false as any thing his Satanic majesty can invent ; so when he does one little thing that is positive, he boasts that he is doing better than we did, while when he is brought up with something he did not do, his only answer is : "You did not do that either." Now, what my hon. friend has done has been to destroy a native industry and introduce an alien company into this country. On the simple ground of saving, I ask him why he did not print the postal cards also ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him ? He has stated that at a trifling expense of about \$100, the necessary plates could be obtained for printing these postal cards, and that as we have all the machinery and appliances and staff of the Queen's Printer, the whole of that work could be very well done in our own printing department. The hon. gentleman was Finance Minister and had the giving out of this very work for a great many years ; and to test his sincerity, if that is the proper place in which to do that work, I would like him to say why he did not have the postal cards printed in the way he says it should be done.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will give me time, I will answer all that. It is the privilege of some people to answer a question by asking another, and I will put a question to my hon. friend. Mine was a negative fault ; I did not do a certain thing. My hon. friend, when in Opposition, was very positive on one thing ; he was positive that the Governor General's salary ought to be reduced. Why, may I ask my hon. friend, now that he has possession of the power and is autocratic, does

he not carry out his positive assertion of a few years ago ? Now, I will proceed to number two. In the first place, my hon. friend does not seem to be able to state fairly a position which I took two moments before. I did not state that the Queen's Printer's department had all the machinery that was necessary ; I did not state that at an expense of \$100 the printing could be gone on with. I said that the die which was necessary for the postal cards could be made for probably \$100. I am not positive whether it would cost that or not. I said that you had the whole establishment, its capital and maintenance, and all that would be necessary would be to put in a few inexpensive machines, and you could carry on the work for yourself. Why I did not do that, and why the Finance Minister did not do it, are very different questions, and I will tell you why I did not propose at any time to destroy the heart of the engraving business, and give it to an alien New York firm. So far as I was concerned, I was solicitous to see the establishment in its entirety, soul and body, engraving and mechanical work, put together and patronized as an institution worthy of this country, and both were continued. My hon. friend is not in that position. He is destroying the soul of the thing on the ground of economy, and yet he is not distributing the parts of the body in a way for the best interest of the country. Now, the Finance Minister showed all the way through a very accommodating spirit to the New York firm. In interviews, in correspondence, in every possible way, his whole communication with them seemed a sort of invitation for them to do what I suppose they wanted to do, and what they succeeded in the end in doing. Now, my hon. friend has destroyed a Canadian industry, which was built up here through twenty-five or thirty years of constant effort. He has introduced in its place an alien corporation, which not only takes from the Canadian corporation the work previously given to it, but on the basis of Government patronage, had established an enginery of rivalry to destroy what remains of the private work of that establishment which the Government had caused to be established at Ottawa at great expense. At a time when even the most common Canadian labourer cannot cross the Niagara River and do a day's work and get a dollar for it on the American side, without running the risk of deportation, at a time when a Canadian cannot hold a mining license in the United States or a contract from an American authority unless he abjures his allegiance, the hon. gentleman is so far imbued with that very Christian spirit that he turns both cheeks to be smited and brings an alien corporation to this country to take the employment from our own people and take the bread out of our children's mouths. I think that this year, more than all others, it

would have been well if the hon. Finance Minister had at least pursued an even course of absolute fairness to the Canadian company. Had he done that, he would have been on the right side of economy and of the common sense by giving to our own people the employment we have to give.

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

### After Recess.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I hope it will not be necessary for me to occupy the attention of the House very long in reply to the observations of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) on the subject of the engraving contract. It appears to me, Sir, that the question that the hon. gentleman put at the close of his speech this afternoon can be answered in a very simple way. This is not a case in which a man should multiply words, because the facts of the transaction are so simple that a long speech might only serve to divert attention from them. The hon. gentleman asked, as he concluded his speech to-day, and asked with an air of, shall I say, assumed warmth, what reason there was for passing over the tender of the British American Bank Note Company, or, as we commonly speak of it, the Burland Company. Sir, there were one hundred and fifty-three thousand reasons for doing so, and every one of these reasons represented one dollar of the money of the people of Canada that is being saved by the course pursued by the Government and that would have been squandered had we followed the course recommended by the hon. gentleman this afternoon. I venture to say that if, in the face of an offer from one of the most respectable establishments in the engraving business in America, of \$153,000 better than the offer of Mr. Burland, we had accepted Mr. Burland's offer, there would have been a grave public scandal, a gross waste of the public money, and the Government would have taken a step which would have deserved, and I am sure would have received, the emphatic condemnation of this House. Now what are the simple facts of the case?

The hon. gentleman seemed to assume, and his whole argument was based on the idea, that the Burland company were entitled to some monopoly of this business. Happily, Sir, the Government have not taken that view. The facts were these: Mr. Burland's contract was about to expire. The Government, in the exercise of their judgment, for what they believed to be the best interest of the country, invited public tenders for the work. They received tenders, and they awarded the contract to the party whose tender was the lowest. This is a course which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is not prepared to approve of. I am afraid he

Mr. FOSTER.

has not as much faith as I have in the policy of awarding contracts to the parties whose tenders are lowest; for I think that experience has shown that hon. gentlemen opposite were not ready to regard that principle as warmly as I am disposed to regard it to-day. My hon. friend, in his speech this afternoon, was disposed to encourage the idea that the Burland company was entitled to a monopoly. I am sorry he took that view, because otherwise I might be able, on the face of the papers, to give him credit for a different opinion. That Mr. Burland and his associates felt that they should have a monopoly is quite evident, and they felt it so strongly that a year before their contract expired, they applied to the hon. gentlemen to give a private renewal of the contract. If my hon. friend will turn to page 9 of the papers, he will find that on the 17th April, 1896, a year before the contract expired, the Burland company applied to the late Government for a renewal of the contract. They pleaded in the name of this Canadian industry in behalf of which we have had so much sympathy expended to-day. They stated that in consequence of the growing importance of the business it was necessary for them to have new machinery, and they did not feel that they were in a position to put in that new machinery and extend their works unless they had an assurance of the renewal of the contract. But I regret to say, assuming that the hon. gentleman was sincere in his apparent argument this afternoon, that the Burland company was entitled to a monopoly, his action was not consistent with that; for, in the most hard-hearted way, he refused to give the extension demanded. Mr. Burland not only urged this renewal in consideration of the growing importance of the establishment, but he urged it in the interests of the hard-working people whom he employed. He said in the petition that some of his employees were working in places in that building in Wellington street which were entirely unsuited to them, and in the name of the employees, and in order that their health might not suffer, he asked for a new contract. But the hon. gentleman was deaf to the entreaty of this native industry and of these suffering sick men. He allowed the matter to go and Mr. Burland did not get a renewal of the contract.

So the matter stood until the present Government came into power. In September last we gave notice, under the terms of the contract, that the contract would expire in April, 1897, and thereupon steps were taken to invite new tenders. The hon. gentleman asked us this afternoon why such a large area was covered in the invitation. Well, Sir, I think that if you want to get competition for public contracts, the best way is to extend the invitations over the largest possible area. But if you do not want competition, if you want a private deal, you

had better not issue invitations very widely, because others than those you expect may come in and tender. We thought that as this was a contract involving a considerable sum of money it was the sound policy to invite tenders over as large an area as possible. There are special reasons why, in a transaction of this kind, invitations should be widespread. The business of engraving is a difficult and delicate one. There are few people in Canada who are acquainted with the business, and few who are able to engage in it. I feel that if we had confined our invitation to the Dominion of Canada we might have had difficulty in obtaining proper competition. In fact, the result goes to show that we should have had difficulty. It was suggested this afternoon that it was wrong on the part of the Government to issue these circulars and allow foreigners—Americans—to come in and tender for this contract. I do not think we have adopted, either by statute or by any rule, the principle that we will not allow foreigners to tender for public contracts. Certainly my hon. friends opposite have not always been anxious to exclude foreigners from competition. But there seems to be a material difference between their action and that of the present Government. They not only allowed foreigners to tender for public works, but they were prepared to give contracts to foreigners who were not the lowest tenderers. Our policy is, having opened the matter to public competition, to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, regardless of whether he was a foreigner or a Canadian. I have already said that if we had not invited foreign competition we might have had no competition at all, and I think the result of our invitation shows that there is much ground for that view. We imposed—properly imposed—special conditions upon this contract. We required that the work should be done in a building to be specially constructed for the purpose in the city of Ottawa, and we required a deposit of \$5,000 to be made with the tender, this to be supplemented with the sum of \$45,000, making a total deposit of \$50,000. These were, I grant you, somewhat severe conditions; but, as I explained in the letter which my hon. friend read this afternoon, the peculiar character of the work, the necessity for security, the necessity for having the work in the hands of responsible people, was, I thought, such as to be ample justification for imposing these conditions. So severe were these conditions that they were objected to by some of the parties interested. My hon. friend tried to convey the impression this afternoon that I had been very unjust towards the British American Company. But, in reading this afternoon some of the correspondence on the subject he might have read this letter which certainly does not go to show any desire on the part of the Government to deal unfairly with the company.

On page 25 of the documents, the following letter will be found:—

Wm. Barber & Bros., Georgetown Paper Mills,  
Georgetown, Ont., 4th Nov., 1896.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,  
Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

My dear Sir,—Several of my friends who wish to tender for engraving, &c., of Dominion post office and other supplies, find themselves very much handicapped by the condition requiring a deposit of \$50,000. It was thought all along that this condition was inserted at the request of the present contractor, who is a very wealthy man, and would be eliminated from the new tenders. If this matter cannot be got over in some way, I fear the work will remain with Mr. Burland, and at his own price. A new contractor would have to provide a suitable fire-proof building, a plant costing at least \$50,000 and put up a deposit of \$50,000, all for a business of about \$100,000 per annum. This would be all right if we could be assured of a few years' business at current prices, but if the Government is to get fair business rates for their work, no contractor can afford to comply with the above conditions. For the safety of the Government the security may be required. On that point I am not able to express any opinion.

I have, &c.,

JOHN R. BARBER.

Here, you see, Mr. Speaker, was the impression existing in the mind of the gentleman who wrote that letter that the conditions we had imposed were designed to leave the business in the hands of Mr. Burland, and to give him the monopoly of it. Well, Mr. Barber's opinion that we were not likely to get any tender under these conditions, had unfortunately too much foundation. His opinion would have proved correct but for the fact that we received a tender from the American Bank Note Company of New York.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman say when the tender was received? Was it before the 23rd of November?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thank the hon. gentleman for putting that question because it contains—I am sure not offensively on his part—it contains a suggestion which is a repetition of a gross misrepresentation, and one of many which have been made in relation to this matter. It has not been stated here, my hon. friend from York did not state it this afternoon, but it has been stated by the public press, under the inspiration, evidently, of persons interested in the British American Bank Note Company, that the tender of the New York company was not received on the day named, but that they were allowed to put it in afterwards. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement; the tender was received at the same time as the other tenders, before 12 o'clock on the day named. I thank the hon. gentleman for affording me an opportunity of mentioning that here.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement was made in the public press.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman is quite correct. I am not finding fault with his question. I think he has done me a service in giving me an opportunity to make this statement. The statement was made, it is true, in the public press, but it was in the Tory press; and in the same press there was the further statement that the Government had permitted this American company to obtain a contract for ten years, while the specifications only allowed them to give a contract for five years; and that also was entirely unfounded. In the same Tory press the statement was made that the Government had permitted the New York company to bring in their materials free of duty, while the others would have to pay duty; and that statement was entirely unfounded. I would cordially advise my hon. friend opposite not to place too much credence in these statements of the Tory press.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Then you would place no reliance in the newspapers at all?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Well, I would not go so far as that. There are papers and papers. Now, Sir, as I said a moment ago, we would have been without competition, we would have had no tenders in competition with Mr. Burland's company but for the fact that the American Bank Note Company had put in a tender. We had the tender of Barber, Ellis & Co., Toronto, which we were not able to entertain, for the reason that there was no deposit with it. I think it will be admitted that when a deposit is exacted in connection with a contract, it is one of the essential elements of the transaction, and if that deposit is not produced, clearly the tender should not be entertained. I will venture to say that if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, were to put a condition in their advertisements for tenders that a certain amount had to be deposited with the tender, and if that amount was not deposited, the tender would not be entertained, and the whole House would say that the Minister did perfectly right in not entertaining it. Therefore, we dismissed the Barber-Ellis tender, and the gentlemen who were interested in that tender fully understood that there was ample justification for our refusing to entertain it. We had the tender of the Burland company and we had the tender of the American Bank Note Company. Now, what would have been the position of the Government in this matter if we had had no tender from the American Bank Note Company? It is quite evident that the Burland company—as I call it for convenience, that being the name of the gentleman who is president of the company—had the impression that they would secure a monopoly. They had the impression that there was no competition. Just how it came about that there

was no competition within Canada, I do not know; but I do know that while we had considerable inquiry about this matter, it ended in our having only one tender which complied with the conditions, one tender in the Dominion of Canada, and that tender was from the British American Bank Note Company; and so firmly convinced did that company seem to be that they had the game in their own hands, that they were not content even to do the work at the old price, but they added \$30,000 to the price of their contract. I think when the House understands that, they will see that it would have been a rather unfortunate thing for the Government, an unfortunate thing for the taxpayers of Canada if we had had no other tender than that of the British American Bank Note Company. Well, Sir, two tenders were received. If you will turn to page 40 you will find the figures summarized. In the first column you will find the figures for the old contract, that is a contract existing for some years with the British American Company. In the next column we have the tender of the same company for the new contract; and in the last column we have the tender of the American Bank Note Company for the new contract. These are the figures prepared by Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Treadwell of my department, and I am sure that the ex-Finance Minister will admit that the figures have been most accurately and most carefully prepared. The summing up of this statement is as follows: For the whole term of five and a quarter years which is involved in the contract, the existing rates of the British American Bank Note Company would amount to \$646,147.64; their rates for the new contract, when they added \$30,000, evidently thinking they had a monopoly in their hands, amounted to \$676,428.80; and the tender of the American Bank Note Company for the same work was \$523,146.17; showing a difference as between the old contract rates and the American company's tender of \$123,000, and between the British American Company's new tender and the American Company's tender the difference on the whole contract term was no less than \$153,242.63. That was the position in which the Government found themselves. We found that the old contractor was not even content to work on the old terms, but that he had added \$30,000 to his tender, and we found that as between that tender and the tender which we were offered from the American company there was the enormous difference of \$153,282. Now, I do not think that there are many members of this House, on either side of politics who, if they will give us their candid opinion, will say that the Government should have accepted the tender of Mr. Burland. But they say: Why didn't you send for Mr. Burland? Why didn't you talk to him? What was there to send to Mr. Burland about? There was no doubt about

**Mr. FIELDING.**

Mr. Burland's tender. He had put his tender in in a simple and straightforward way; but he thought he had the game in his hands, and he put up his price \$30,000 above the former price. There was nothing to explain, we had nothing to ask him about. We knew that his price was \$153,000 worse than the other tender. That is why we did not send for Mr. Burland, and that is why we did enter into negotiations with the parties who had offered us the lowest prices, the difference being the large sum which I have mentioned. Now, it is stated that we permitted the American company to depart from the specifications. I do not know that we ought to admit that. My hon. friend from York stated to-day that it was beyond all question a grave departure. Well, I must tell him that some hon. gentlemen no less intelligent than himself, and better informed in law than he is or I am, have taken the view that it was not a departure from the specifications, that the statement in their tender that they desired to make the original dies in their establishment in New York was not a departure from the specifications. I do not urge that view, because I am inclined to think that there was a slight departure from the specifications. But what we had to consider was this: Is the departure from the specifications a material one, having due regard to the amount of money involved for the people of Canada? Reference has been made to-day to a report made by the Deputy Minister, and the impression, I am inclined to think, was left upon the minds of some members that the course I have pursued in this matter was at variance with the recommendation of the Deputy Minister. If such an impression was left on the minds of any hon. member, I desire to remove it. The report of the Deputy Minister pointed out that the matter was one of great importance, and that there were certain questions which should be well and carefully considered before final action should be taken. The enormous difference between the tender of the American Bank Note Company and the tender of the British American Bank Note Company, or the Burland company, struck Mr. Courtney as so remarkable that he thought he might well stop and consider all the circumstances surrounding it. He very properly pointed out that, as respects a few items, there was a possibility that under certain conditions the prices given might prove unfavourable. There were certain stamps for which the price mentioned was quite high. The issue of the stamps specified was a small one. The tenders had to include the cost of engraving, and that made the tender somewhat high. It was pointed out that if by any change in our revenue laws it became necessary to have a larger quantity of those stamps, the price given would be exceedingly high, and while probably we would not want a large quantity, still it

was prudent to protect ourselves in that respect. So we called the attention of the American Bank Note Company to the fact that while their price might be all right for a small issue, it involving the necessity of including in the price the cost of engraving, we thought it possible that circumstances might arise which would require the issue of a larger number of those stamps, and therefore we wanted to know what rates would apply in such an event. The company made a statement, which was perfectly satisfactory, that they were compelled to tender on the quantity specified in the advertisement, but if a larger quantity were required they were prepared to make a lower rate. Thus the precaution Mr. Courtney advised was taken; every material precaution that was advised by Mr. Courtney was taken, and in the end every step was taken with his advice and full knowledge and concurrence. Of course the Minister is responsible, and the Government is responsible. I am not at all disposed to throw any responsibility on a Deputy Minister, and I only allude to this because the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) tended to leave the impression that the course of the Minister was at variance with the views of his deputy. I have pointed out that there was this very large difference. I think when there was so much difference it would have been a very foolish act of the Government if they had gone on dealing with the Burland company. The hon. gentleman had much to say respecting that item in the tender of the American Bank Note Company which referred to the making of the dies. The die, he said, is the soul, heart, everything of the whole business, and if we allowed the die to be made abroad that was practically throwing up the whole work. If the hon. gentleman's soul bears no greater proportion to his body than the die bears to the whole undertaking, I am afraid I shall have to regard him as a rather small souled gentleman, because he may be surprised to learn that the dies and all the preliminary work in connection with them amounts to only about \$6,000 out of the contract of \$523,000. I have asked the gentlemen interested, and I have received the information, which I believe to be correct, that all the preliminary work done on this contract, all the work done outside of the city of Ottawa, will involve a payment of not more than \$6,000 out of the total contract of about \$523,000. So it means this, that instead of crushing a native industry, instead of breaking down one of our Canadian workingmen's establishments, what we have done is to accept the offer of gentlemen who are giving us reasonable and fair prices and are going to do one per cent of the work in their establishment in New York, while 99 per cent of the work is to be done in Canada by Canadian work-

men, and the company have already erected a building in Ottawa by Canadian labour, and have expended a large sum of money among the workmen of this city during the past few months.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to set the hon. gentleman right in one respect. I did not want to interrupt his beautiful simile about the die and the soul; but I wish to say that I did not state, and never intended to state, that the die was the soul of the whole business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The soul won't die.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a witty remark, but I was making an explanation to the Finance Minister. What I said was, that there were two branches of this work, one mechanical and the other what might be called artistic, which was the engraving part, and I said the engraving part, the skill, the art necessary to do the engraving was the soul of the whole business; that the other was merely mechanical. I also made the statement that ninety-one-hundredths of that engraving under the present contract will be done in New York; and I adhere to that statement most thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The impression which the House received from what the hon. gentleman said, what all hon. members who heard him must have understood, and all who would read his remarks would have understood the hon. gentleman to mean, except for this explanatory passage, was that a very large part of this contract work was to be done by aliens and foreigners in a city elsewhere, and not in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will take a bank note and show what is the die portion, and what is the other large portion of the work, I shall feel obliged.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I am not capable of explaining to the hon. gentleman the details. I do not think that either he or I knows as much about engraving as we ought to know, and I suppose that neither of us could explain the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply asking for information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I frankly admit that I do not know all the details of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the work on a bank note is the die.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I still adhere to the first statement, which I think is the most important one. I understood my hon. friend was raising the question whether the work is going to be done in Ottawa by Canadian labour or done in New York by American labour. That is

Mr. FIELDING.

what the hon. gentleman attempted to convey. If the hon. gentleman thoroughly understands that only 1 per cent of the work will be done by foreigners, and he has made all this row about that 1 per cent, I will accept his explanation. The relation of the die to the work is such that there is some room for the view that the die is one of the tools of the trade. These plates are not engraved by hand, but by machinery, and the die is a part of the machinery through which the plates are produced. But I do not think the public are interested in these technical matters. The public are, however, interested in the question as to where the work will be done, what proportion of the work will be done here, and what proportion abroad, and above all whether the country will receive fair value and whether the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. I wish to say a word with respect to the English proposal to which the hon. gentleman referred. He thought it wrong that we should go abroad for tenders, but we thought it was the right thing to make the letting of this contract known abroad. True, there are but few people who could tender for it, but in order to reach that few it became necessary that we should widely distribute the notices, and so we sent them to the High Commissioner's office in London with a request that they might be placed in the hands of the trade. Now, what was the response? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has rather conveyed the impression that we dealt in a different manner with the parties who might have tendered in England, from that in which we dealt with the American parties. The English people simply asked whether we were going to insist upon having these notes manufactured at Ottawa, and we said, that we could not waive that condition. We did not waive that condition; they are going to be manufactured in Ottawa by the company which has taken the contract. There was no suggestion on the part of the English parties that they desired to do a part of the work in England. They simply ask us to abandon the condition that the work was to be done in Ottawa. We refused to abandon that for the English parties, and we refused to abandon it for any parties. The contract in that respect has followed the conditions of the specifications, and the work is to be done in the city of Ottawa. But, Sir, the difference between the tender prices of the American Bank Note Company, and the tender price of the British American Bank Note Company is the essence of the whole matter. One other point I may allude to. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) tried to make very much out of the fact, that we had allowed the American Bank Note Company to drop out of their contract the stamped envelopes. He said, that was unremunerative work, and that we were doing a great favour to this American company when we

allowed them to drop it out of their contract. Now, what are the facts? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said that the price the American company had offered to do the stamped envelopes for was an unremunerative price. I do not blame him for thinking that, because his idea of what is a fair price is the price that can be gathered from Mr. Burland's tender. He does not seem to have any other idea of what is a fair price, and when he finds that the tender of the Burland company was \$2.50 and \$3 a thousand for stamped envelopes, and that the tender of the American company was \$1.50 and \$1.75 per thousand, he sees there was a material difference, and possibly the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was justified in thinking that probably that was an unremunerative price.

Mr. FOSTER. That helps my argument.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Exactly, it helps it; but if my hon. friend would read the letter of Mr. Barber which he will find at page 35, he will get some interesting information in respect to the stamped envelopes. In the letter of the Barber & Ellis Company, dated 21st November, 1896, there is some interesting reading; there is for example this sentence, which I do not know anything about except that I find it in the letter:

We might say that we have employed an experienced steel engraver from New York to visit Ottawa to examine the samples, and on his recommendation have made up our prices. He found on examination that supplies had been delivered that were not steel plate work.

I do not know what foundation there is for that.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the least.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, the Barber & Ellis Company give it upon the authority of an expert engraver, who probably is a better judge than either my hon. friend or myself. However, I did not read it for the purpose of endorsing it; I frankly admit that on that point I have no knowledge, and I offer no opinion. But down at the conclusion of the letter you will find the following passage:—

We would ask your attention to the prices we are prepared to supply stamped envelopes. The prices that are at present paid are practically prohibitive, as no consumer will pay the difference between the stamped and the plain envelope. As the whole amount used annually only amounts to three or four hundred dollars, we would urge the Government to reserve the right to cancel that portion of the tender at any time, as we are prepared to lay before your department a plan very much in line with that adopted in the United States, and we are confident that the consumption of stamped envelopes would very soon amount to as much per week as they do now in the whole year, and they could be sold at such a price as to yield the Post Office Department a large annual revenue.

Now, Sir, in looking over the matter we

found that the stamped envelope provision in the contract was not a very important element, and it was left out of the contract simply because our attention had been called to the fact that it was hardly to be regarded as in the same line as the engraving. It was shown that it could be done under conditions different from those which necessarily surrounded the engraving, and we were led to believe that the work would probably be done as cheaply, and perhaps more cheaply elsewhere, than by insisting on having it done as part of the engraving contract. When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that we left it out of the contract in order that we might relieve the American Bank Note Company of a piece of work that was unremunerative, and which they were glad to get rid of, I would call his attention to the fact that while the prices of the American Company for stamped envelopes were \$1.50 and \$1.75 per thousand, the tender of the Barber & Ellis Company to do the same work was \$1.25 per thousand. Therefore, it could not have been dropped out of the American Bank Note Company contract because the price was remunerative, when the Barber & Ellis Company was prepared to do it at a lower price.

Mr. FOSTER. How many would they do?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would do as many as we wanted.

Mr. FOSTER. Two hundred thousand?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Their proposal was that they would do just as many as we wanted. I call attention to the fact that we left the stamped envelopes out of the contract, because we discovered that they could be conveniently done in the ordinary way of printing, and my hon. friend the Postmaster General is now free to make a new and special contract if he chooses with the Barber & Ellis Company, or with any one else, for these stamped envelopes; or, to have them done, as he probably will have them done, and as I believe is his intention, by the Government Printing Office in Ottawa.

I believe, Sir, that in this matter, we must always get back to the main question of the difference between the tender of the American Bank Note Company and the tender of the British American Bank Note Company. I wonder what risk there is involved in accepting the tender of the American company. One would suppose from the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that there was something very dangerous in it. Now, the method this company proposes to adopt in dealing with this business is set forth in their own letter which is to be found on page 47. They say:

It is our intention to submit a model, or models, of each instrument, note, stamp or card, exhibiting the same just as it will appear when printed from the engraved plate, for the approval

of the Government, and, upon approval of same, to engrave in the parent establishment the original dies of portraits, vignettes, lathe work, borders, &c., with which the matrix die of each note or stamp will be partially prepared, carrying same to Ottawa for finishing; all the transferring and finishing of the printing plates with their necessary retouchings to be done in Ottawa; and we might add that no Canadian labour would be displaced by our so doing, as the labour employed heretofore in making such original engravings, in our opinion, has been largely that of non-residents.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) disputed that to-day. I have no knowledge on the subject except to call attention to the tenderer's own statement. The company further state:

In regard to security against loss or fraud, we have to say that we shall take every precaution and care in the execution of the proposed contract, as is our invariable custom established by long experience. The company has been entrusted with the preparation of securities such as bonds, paper money, stamps, mint dies, &c., &c., from governments and banks of almost every nation, and without even the requirement of a bond or deposit, excepting a bond to the United States for postage stamps only; and no claim for loss or fraud has ever had to be made.

That, Sir, is the statement made by the tenderers, and though it may be said that we are not bound to accept their own estimate of themselves, I may say, that I made proper inquiry in quarters well informed, and I am in a position to add that the American Bank Note Company is one of the most respectable, reliable, and responsible concerns engaged in the engraving business on the continent of America, or for that matter, throughout the world. As a further proof of that, I quote the statement they make as to the banks for which they are doing business. They have been making notes, according to their statement, for the Dominion Bank, Bank of Toronto, Canadian Bank of Commerce, Ontario Bank, Standard Bank, Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia, Merchant's Bank of Halifax, People's Bank of Halifax, Bank of British Columbia and Bank of New Brunswick. I venture to say, that every one of these banking institutions is just as jealous of the bank's interests, and as anxious to guard against fraud, and as interested to have good work, as is the Government of Canada, and if these great banking institutions the managers of which are known to us all as gentlemen of very great sagacity and prudence, can deal with the American Bank Note Company without any risk of loss or fraud, I do not see why there need be the least alarm at the Government of Canada dealing with them. My hon. friend, before concluding, called attention to a letter written by Mr. Burland on the 15th of January, in which he proposed that we should allow him to do the work on the terms offered by the other company. That is to say, after we had invited public tenders, after we had received the tender

Mr. FIELDING.

of the other company, after we had negotiated with them, after we had accepted their tender and notified them of the fact, Mr. Burland asked to be allowed to substitute a new tender at their figures. That was a most extraordinary proposition. Mr. Burland declared in his correspondence that his business had been injured, and he thought it necessary to add \$30,000 to the price of his former contract. He thought it necessary to name a price which was \$150,000 more than the price of the American company, when he thought that he had a monopoly, and that we were at his mercy; but when he found that there was competition, he coolly proposed to drop off the whole \$153,000 and take the contract at the price of the American company, and he thought this Government were going to accept his proposition. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for York make the statement he did to-day that when that letter of Mr. Burland was written no action had been taken, there was no decision arrived at, there was no Order in Council, there was nothing done, but the whole matter was still open.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I have here exactly what I did state—the bones of it, at any rate. I said that at that time there was no Order in Council confirming the contract, that no contract had been granted, and that there was no purchase of property in Ottawa. That is exactly what I stated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that was exactly the bones, I suspect that the flesh had another colour.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend put the colour on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very often it is necessary. The hon. gentleman's statement was that on the 15th of January, when Mr. Burland wrote that letter, no action had been taken which was binding on the Government. Surely that was what the hon. gentleman meant to convey.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I meant to convey exactly what I stated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman did not mean to convey the idea that the Government at that time were free and open to make a contract with Mr. Burland, what point had his observation?

Mr. FOSTER. I did claim that they were free and open to do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will turn to page 49 of the blue-book, he will find that ten days before the date of Mr. Burland's letter a telegram had been sent to the New York company stating that I was prepared to recommend the acceptance of their tender provided the details could be arranged satisfactorily.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend has only to think for a moment to know perfectly well that his recommendation simply goes to the council of Ministers, and that the Ministers in Council decide whether his recommendation shall be carried out or not. That is not a contract under an Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman must not escape in that way. In the first place, he must know that no Minister of the Crown, with a proper sense of his responsibility would send a telegram of that character unless he had every reasonable assurance that his view was going to be concurred in by his colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must know that I have been a member of a Dominion Government as long as he has, and that I have looked into these matters a little; and I say that the statement that a Minister will recommend a thing is not to be considered as an actual carrying out of the thing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope not to make a statement in my official capacity that I will recommend a thing to Council, leaving another party to be led astray by my statement, unless I have the concurrence of my colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. But an intelligent party will not be led astray by that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But when a gentleman in a foreign country receives a telegram from a Minister of the Crown stating that he is prepared to accept his tender if the details can be agreed upon, he understands that he is dealing with a responsible Minister, and that the Government of Canada will not, and ought not, to repudiate that undertaking.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes the responsible Minister makes a rash promise.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On that point my hon. friend is speaking in the light of a very considerable experience which I have not had. But we need not discuss the question how far the Minister binds the Government, for my hon. friend will find that two days later there was an Order in Council, dated the 7th of January, whereby my action was confirmed, and that was eight days before Mr. Burland wrote this letter.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the order?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find it on page 51. The Minister having reported the transaction, the order concludes as follows:—

The Minister, therefore, recommends, in view of such saving, that he be authorized to accept the tender of the American Bank Note Company, provided that the details of the contract can be arranged with the company to his satisfaction.

The hon. gentleman will find, therefore, that not only had I agreed to recommend the acceptance of the tender, but I had agreed to do so with the knowledge and concurrence of my colleagues, and it was put in the proper form and confirmed by His Excellency in Council more than a week before Mr. Burland wrote his letter.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why on the 5th of April was it necessary to get an Order in Council to authorize the concluding of the contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because it was exceedingly proper, when the details of the contract came to be arranged, that it should be submitted for the approval of His Excellency in Council. But, nevertheless, there was in the first place the acceptance of the tender by the Minister of the Crown, which a gentleman dealing with the Government, and especially a gentleman in a foreign country, had a right to accept as a definite statement of the views, not merely of the Minister himself, but of the Government for which he was acting; and then we have the report to Council, and the confirmation by the Governor in Council, many days before Mr. Burland sent this letter. But even if there had been no acceptance of the tender of the American company, I believe it would have been a scandal and a great injustice to have permitted Mr. Burland, after he had had a fair chance in a free and open competition to tender for the work, to come in afterwards and make changes in his figures. Let it not be said that the other parties were allowed to make changes. They were not allowed to change a figure or a line. There were statements in their tender which required explanation; the warning note of my Deputy Minister suggested certain things which had better be cleared up, and I took steps to have them cleared up; but the American Bank Note Company were not allowed to change one line or figure of their tender. They were asked to explain their statement in regard to the dies, and their explanation resulted in this conclusion, that while it was desirable that the work should be done in Canada, it was not desirable, for the sake of preventing 1 per cent of that work being done abroad, that we should pay \$153,000 of the people's money above a fair price. That is the whole story. We put the work up to public tender; we opened it widely to all skilled men to come in and tender; we accepted the tender of a responsible party, a tender which we were satisfied was made in good faith, and which we are satisfied will be carried out in good faith. We believe the work will be done no less excellently than Mr. Burland's work—and I am finding no fault with his work; 99 per cent of the work will be done within sight of the Parliament building, in a handsome structure put up by the American company,

it will be done by Canadian labour; and we will have \$153,000 of the people's money in the treasury, which would have been thrown away if the Government had adopted the course which the hon. member opposite has advocated to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to know that I shall be obliged to detain the House for a very short time, because anybody who has listened to the clear, succinct and able indictment of the hon. Finance Minister by his predecessor (Mr. Foster) will admit that but very little need be said in reply to the extremely lame and impotent defence which the Finance Minister undertook to make. The hon. gentleman commenced by charging Mr. Burland, who represents the British American Bank Note Company with being a monopolist, and the late Government with having regarded Mr. Burland as entitled to a continued monopoly. But in his very next sentence the hon. gentleman refuted his own charge. In the very next sentence he said that Mr. Burland had applied for an extension of his contract, and that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had refused. My hon. friend would not permit Mr. Burland's contract to be extended, but insisted on the contract being submitted, when the proper time came, to tender in the usual way. The hon. gentleman thus himself conclusively proved that the late Government entertained no such idea as that a monopoly existed in favour of Mr. Burland, but that, on the contrary, they determined, when the proper time came, to have the contract submitted to open competition. So much for the charge, again and again reiterated by the hon. gentleman, that the late Government treated this contract as a monopoly to which the Burland Bank Note Company was entitled. The hon. gentleman says this Government gave wide and extended notices. He asks why did they go to England as well as to the United States. I think that I can furnish the reason. If the hon. gentleman had made up his mind to give the work to an American company in the city of New York, the best means he could possibly devise of covering such a design was to make the pretense—for it can be regarded as nothing else, considering the character of these specifications—of having tenders called for in England. But he knows that the moment he was asked the question whether these specifications were to be adhered to, the moment that Mr. Colmer, whom he had instructed to give notices of the specifications and call for tenders in England, asked whether these specifications were to be adhered to, the only answer he could give—unless the system of inviting tenders is to become a farce—was that there could be no variation, and that everyone who tendered would be held to the exact terms of the specifications. That was a proper position to take, but did

Mr. FIELDING.

the hon. gentleman adhere to it? I maintain that he had no tender from the American Bank Note Company at all. No one who knows anything of the character of the tenders can pretend for a moment that the hon. gentleman had an honest and legitimate tender from the American Bank Note Company. Why? Because their tender was not according to specifications; and if he had given them the answer he gave the English contractors who wished to tender, namely, that no change could be made in the specification, that it was a dishonest pretense to put forward specifications and then allow anyone to send in a tender entirely at variance with them and accept that tender, we would have heard no more about this contract with the American Bank Note Company. The only legitimate tender which the hon. gentleman had in his possession was that of Mr. Burland, representing the British American Bank Note Company. In every particular, as the hon. gentleman himself admits, the terms of the specifications were complied with exactly to the letter by Mr. Burland. Whereas, on the contrary, the tender sent in by the American Bank Note Company was one he was bound to reject entirely, because it contained a most material and substantial change by stipulating that the work, instead of being done in Ottawa, as the specifications required, should be done in New York. They would not undertake to do the work in Ottawa, but insisted on doing it in New York. Therefore, I say that the hon. gentleman stands here to-night without the shadow of foundation for the claim that he accepted the lowest tender. As a matter of fact, he had no lowest tender to accept. The hon. gentleman was unable to make any variation to suit the English tenderers, but to the American Bank Note Company he could give latitude to vary the specifications and conditions, according to their own pleasure. Yet he calls their offer a tender. Why was not the tender of the Barber-Ellis Company considered as a tender by the hon. gentleman? I agree that it was not a tender because it did not comply with the terms of his specifications, which required that \$50,000 should be put up with the Government as security for the carrying out of the work. They did not put up the money, but they offered to give to the hon. gentleman personal security, to his own complete satisfaction, for the \$50,000, in addition to the \$50,000 which they would have to invest in the city of Ottawa in order to carry out the contract. The hon. gentleman knows that that approached much more nearly to a legitimate tender—although I admit it was not one—than the tender he had in his hands from the American Bank Note Company, who told him, on the face of that tender, that they were not prepared to accept his specifications. I deny that he gave this contract to the lowest tenderer, simply be-

cause he had no lowest tenderer. But that is not all. The hon. gentleman wants to know why the Government should have sent for Mr. Burland. I will tell him why. Instead of such a course being a scandal, as he has described it, let me tell him that the records of his own department, the records of every department in the public service, under all governments, will prove that again and again the various departments of the Government have done precisely what the hon. gentleman would have done if he had sent for Mr. Burland and discussed this matter with him. Why did he not do so? The hon. gentleman had no other tender. Burland's was the only legitimate one, the only one in conformity with the specifications. Why, then, did he not send for Mr. Burland and say, we cannot accept your tender unless you make a large reduction. That has been done scores of times by the Government of the day, by the Liberal Government when it was in power just as well as by Conservative Governments. Again and again, when tenders were higher and there were objections to lower tenderers, the highest tenderer has been sent for, and the question put to him: Will you undertake to do this work for such a sum? And again and again it has been complied with, and the contracts have been entered into on conditions of that kind. Where, Sir, would be the scandal? He asks why he should send for Mr. Burland. I will tell him—not only because Mr. Burland was the lowest tenderer (for he was the only tenderer) but because he was a man of the highest character and standing and because he had for thirty-five years performed this service for the Government, first of old Canada and then of the Dominion in a manner which the hon. gentleman himself admits here to-night was in every way admirable, and gave the utmost satisfaction to the department. Was that not a reason, particularly when Mr. Burland was a representative of the British American Bank Note Company which had invested about half a million dollars in this enterprise, which capital would be swept away by the action of the hon. gentleman. These are reasons why he should have given Mr. Burland an opportunity of saving the capital which the hon. gentleman, by a stroke of the pen, by an unfair and unjust stroke of the pen, was willing to sweep away. Such an act strikes at the very foundation of the system of tender and contract. He says it was too late when Mr. Burland made the offer which he did make, that he would perform this work on the terms that the Government was prepared to give to the American Bank Note Company. Does the hon. gentleman deny what Mr. Burland alleges—that again and again Mr. Burland sought an interview with the hon. gentleman and was refused?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asks me a question, and I

desire to answer it. I have no recollection of Mr. Burland having been refused an interview with me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that my information is that he again and again begged an interview, and that he begged the hon. gentleman to go and see his establishment. But, not only that, but I think he went from colleague to colleague of the hon. gentleman and met with a great deal of sympathy and many expressions of regret for the position in which he was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? Mr. Burland came to me; I had an interview with him. He saw nearly all my colleagues. What I deny is that Mr. Burland was refused an interview with me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I have stated is on the authority of Mr. Burland, and everything goes to prove the accuracy of his statement. And, having a capital of half a million dollars which was going to be sunk and destroyed by the injustice the hon. gentleman was attempting to perpetrate, why did he not give Mr. Burland an opportunity—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood Mr. Burland. I did see Mr. Burland and discussed the matter with him. I did not refuse to have interviews with him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say—

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will accept—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course I accept the hon. gentleman's statement at once, and have no doubt that that is the impression that rests upon his mind. But I think he will find that Mr. Burland was not afforded the opportunities he desired. We have his own declaration of his inability to obtain the consideration of this question at the hands of the hon. Minister of Finance. Now, why was that? Why is it that a Canadian, a man of such high standing and a man who for so long had been a public contractor, and had given complete satisfaction, was not deemed worthy of the consideration of the hon. Minister of Finance? When that hon. gentleman found himself in a position where he might not only correctly and properly but where it was made his duty to give consideration to this man, why should he turn his back upon him and refuse consideration, while he could hide himself away to New York and put himself in personal communication with these American capitalists for whom he appears to have entertained such affection. Sir, nobody denies that people from the United States, coming into our country are allowed to compete for public work. But, if ever there was a time in the history of Canada when we should not treat that country with undue favour

it is at the present moment when the humblest workman in Canada is prevented from crossing the boundary to do a day's work in the United States. Is this a time when a prominent man in our country, a contractor who has done his work faithfully, should be treated with injustice and a member of our Government should cross our border and seek in the United States, parties, not to receive the tender by open, fair, public competition, but to be treated with a consideration that has invariably been denied to any Canadian contractor. Whenever any Canadian contractor, I care not in what part of Canada he is, sends in a tender that does not comply with the specifications, it is the invariable practice to treat that tender as waste paper. You may use it to say to another contractor, will you do the work on the same terms as this tenderer offers to do it on? That is the only legitimate way in which such an offer could be used. Why, Sir, the Order in Council that was passed is of a most extraordinary character. Here are tenders invited by the Minister of Finance for a most important and delicate public work. And what happened? Why, instead of the hon. gentleman being able to go down to his colleagues, the members of the Government of Canada and say: Here is the lowest tender, am I authorized to accept it? He could not say that, because it was not true. What he did get was contained in this sentence:

The Minister, therefore, recommends, in view of such saving, that he be authorized to accept the tender of the American Bank Note Company, provided that the details of the contract can be arranged with the company to his satisfaction.

Not, provided that the specifications that were offered alike for the consideration of the Burland Company and the English tenderers and everybody else were complied with, but that he might have permission to go and negotiate a new contract that was not provided for in the specifications. The hon. gentleman talks of the employment that has been given to the citizens of Ottawa in the erection of this new building. Does he plume himself upon that when he sees the capital destroyed in the building that has been erected by the citizens of Ottawa, standing alongside of it, half a million of money sunk by a Canadian contractor in faithfully discharging his duty to the Government? Why, Sir, on these very dies, the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Burland was in a position, if he had treated Mr. Burland with that justice to which every man in his position is entitled, to have saved to the Government of Canada a very large sum of money. Mr. Burland found that he was in a position where his property was likely to be destroyed, and he concluded to perform those services not only upon the same terms that are contained in the American Bank Note Company's tender, but to comply to the letter with the specifications.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and to save to the Government of Canada all this money that is to be paid for the manufacture of those dies and plates and other things that are now permitted to be manufactured in the city of New York. I do not believe that such a thing would be entertained by any Government anywhere, as to go to a foreign country to get work of that kind executed, when one of the citizens of their own country was able, and had shown himself qualified, to perform that work in a most efficient manner. I do not believe you can find any other Government that would go into a foreign country and entrust to foreigners their dies and plates. I do not mean to say that the work could not be so guarded as to protect the country from loss, but I say it opens a field for fraud upon Canada that will be appreciated by any person who knows the character of such work, and the means and the opportunities that will be opened for the contractor to be imposed upon by his own employees, with the result of setting on foot a fraudulent currency in Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman talks about stamped envelopes. Why, Sir, it strikes one as a most extraordinary thing after reading those papers. Where did the hon. gentleman get this hint about stamped envelopes? Why was it that the suggestion came from him? It is a curious thing that the hon. gentleman should go out of his way to suggest an alteration in the contract which was going to take \$5,000 or \$6,000 of public money out of the treasury of Canada, which would be required to obtain plant for the Queen's Printer to do that very work. The hon. gentleman has given us no explanation of that. Why is it that the suggestion coming from the hon. gentleman to his American friend, to this foreign contractor, was so quickly seized upon if that work was to be a profit to him? Why, Sir, it was known at once, and the eagerness with which this American contractor closed upon the Finance Minister's proposition to eliminate that part of the work, shows that importance was attached by the contractor to having that feature of his contract eliminated. Now, Sir, I am astounded when the hon. gentleman tells this House that the Deputy Minister approved of this transaction. Why, there is no man who can read English but will say that the Deputy Minister, a man of great ability, a man of great experience, as every member of this House knows, a man understanding this subject infinitely better than it was possible for the Finance Minister to understand it—I say it is impossible to read Mr. Courtney's letter without finding in it the most emphatic condemnation of the course pursued by the Minister of Finance that it is possible to put into the English language, especially when we look at the relative position of the Deputy Minister of Finance and his chief, of the letter that Mr. Courtney addressed to the

head of the department. Why, in every line of that he points out the danger, he points out the suspicious character of this tender, he does everything that a man can do to show that he disapproved profoundly of the change that was about to be made. I say that a graver act of injustice, not only to the British American Bank Note Company, but to the Canadian people, in my judgment, the hon. gentleman could not have perpetrated in connection with the mode, the illegal mode, in which he has dealt with this subject of tender and of contract, than is disclosed by the statements which have been placed before the House and by those papers which he himself has laid on the Table. I say that if the hon. gentleman had wished to destroy the whole system of tender and of contract, to destroy its sacredness, to prevent its being regarded as a safety to the people; if the hon. gentleman had wished to sweep away all the safeguards that surround that most important question of tender and of contract, he could not have adopted any means more thorough than those he has adopted in the treatment of this question. The hon. gentleman, instead of having accepted the lowest tender, had no lowest tender. If Mr. Burland could have obtained access to him, I say an offer would have been made long before in order to save his property from destruction and confiscation at the hands of the hon. gentleman, and to protect himself from the injustice which was about to be done him, and by this offer he would not only have saved a large amount of public money, but he would have preserved inviolate that system of tender and of contract which, for a country like Canada, with its enormous public works and its enormous transactions, is of the most vital importance to the people of Canada.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not flatter myself that I can say anything new on this question, as the ground has been covered so fully by the previous speakers, especially by the ex-Minister of Finance. But there are one or two points to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, and which seem to me of some little importance. I shall not go over the facts stated by the ex-Minister of Finance about the contract held so long by the British American Bank Note Company, and executed by them to the satisfaction of the Government, and I think to the satisfaction of the country. I find that previous to 1886 the work was done in the city of Montreal, but in that year a new contract was entered into, the provisions of which compelled the contractor to have the work done in Ottawa. Of necessity he had to erect here a building and bring machinery here, necessitating a large expenditure on his part. That is a point which I think we should bear in mind. The British American Bank Note Company had to go to a considerable expense in

1886, not so very long ago, in erecting this fine building in the city of Ottawa. We are told that there is a capital of \$400,000 invested in that business. I want to say that provision was made that all the work pertaining to that contract had to be done in the city of Ottawa; there was no exception, none of the work was allowed to be done in the city of Montreal at all. Previous to that the work had been done there, but now the contractor has to do all the work in the city of Ottawa. Now, this contractor, in order to do all this work in the city of Ottawa, had not only to erect a substantial building costing a large amount of money, had not only to purchase and put into that building fine machinery, but he had to get skilled workmen, he had to bring them to the city of Ottawa, and no doubt at great expense. He had not only to bring them here, but he had to train other men in this city to take their places and to do part of this work. Well, this contract lasted for five years, and in 1892 another contract was entered into. We find that this second contract was taken at a considerable reduction in price compared with the previous contract, that additional security was given for safety, and for taking care of and guarding the work that was done, for the safety of the plates, &c., and this contract was in force until April 23rd, 1897.

We are told that in April, 1896, the British American Bank Note Company applied to the late Government, and said they wished to add some more machinery and make improvements in their building, and before doing so they wanted to ascertain whether they would obtain a renewal of the contract for a further term of five years after the contract had expired. I was a little surprised at the Finance Minister speaking of this company as he did, and talking about them as if they thought they had a monopoly of this contract, and as if under the old Government they had such a monopoly. What do we find? Instead of the old Government entertaining that proposition for a renewal of the contract, they declared, after considering the matter, that they were not prepared to consider any renewal of the contract until its expiration in April, 1897. So the late Government is not open to the charge of favouring the British American Company. If they were open to such a charge and desired to favour that company, that was the time to have done it; but they absolutely refused to do so and allowed the contract to run to its expiration, and at that time the Government had changed. The Finance Minister gave six months' notice to the British American Company, which was necessary under the contract, and called for tenders. Particular attention should be given to the terms of the new tenders. It is all very well to argue that words do not mean what they apparently express; but in looking over the conditions of the tenders

it is distinctly stated that all the work must be done in Ottawa, and no exception whatever is made. I think even a lawyer, and members of that profession can twist the meaning of words pretty well, would hold the opinion that word "all" means all, that it means every particle of the work shall be done in Ottawa. There was good reason for inserting such a condition. It was that the Government wished to retain constant supervision over the work, that the Government should at any time send an officer to inspect the work, and they should safeguard the country from any possible loss through carelessness. This point should be fully considered in this discussion, and I repeat this as being the most important point in the contract, that the work was to be done in the city of Ottawa. Circulars were sent to the Canadian agent in London enclosing forms of tender, and these were sent to a great many English firms. Those firms refused to consider the matter at all. Why? Doubtless because all the work had to be done in Ottawa. That stipulation ruled them out, and they said, we cannot compete with that condition in the contract. But if those firms had known that a great part of the work could have been done in England, the making of the dies and the engraving work could be executed there by skilled workmen, they might have put in tenders for the work. They said, we do not tender because there is the stipulation that all the work has to be done at Ottawa. When they ask if that was considered an important condition, the reply they received was that no deviation could be made in that respect, and that all the work must be done in Ottawa. It appears that only two tenders were received. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said that only one was received; but I will admit, for the purpose of my argument, that the tender of the American Note Company was a proper one. I ask, and I wish the careful attention of the House to this point, why were only two tenders received? Why was only one tender received from the United States? It was because there is only one company there possessing the necessary facilities for doing the work. How did they acquire those facilities? Because the company gradually acquired capital from doing government and other work, purchased plant and built up a large establishment and secured skilled workmen, and now they have facilities which enable them to tender for work of this class. But there is only one company in the whole of the United States willing to tender for this work. We find also that only one company in Canada tendered for the work. It is said that the British American Bank Note Company thought they had a monopoly. It seems that they had practically a monopoly in Canada, because no other company was willing to tender. When other companies were asked to tender, they declined to do so. I will read

Mr. CRAIG.

an extract from a letter from a Canadian company, in which they gave as a reason for not tendering not only that they were unwilling to put \$50,000 as a cash deposit, but they gave other reasons as well. Mr. John R. Barber, writing on November 4, 1896 (at page 25 of the blue-book) says:

A new contractor would have to provide a suitable fire-proof building, a plant costing at least \$50,000 and put up a deposit of \$50,000, all for a business of about \$100,000 per annum. This would be all right if we could be assured of a few years' business at current prices, but if the Government is to get fair business rates for their work, no contractor can afford to comply with the above conditions.

That is a very strong statement, and it bears out the fact, which I shall show more clearly later on, that the British American Bank Note Company had not been paid more than fair prices for their work. The Barber & Ellis Company knew what the British American Company had been receiving, and yet they were afraid to tender. They stated that unless they were guaranteed the contract for a few years—evidently more than the five years for which the contract would run—there would not be money in it to induce them to make the investment. The British Bank Note Company had incurred this expense; they had erected a building here, put in machinery, trained workmen, and because they had this building, expensive plant and large capital invested they were able to make a tender at fair prices. So, as I have said, there were only two tenders received, and of those the tender of the British American Company was the only tender in strict accordance with the stipulated conditions. I mention this because the tender of the American Bank Note Company was not in strict accordance with the conditions set out; they made a special stipulation that they should not be required to manufacture the dies in Ottawa. I now wish to call attention to the memorandum of the Deputy Finance Minister respecting these tenders. It is a most important document. Mr. Courtney, in his memorandum, shows the difference in prices. No doubt those differences are large, amounting to \$30,000 a year; and Mr. Courtney points out some reasons which may account for this great difference in prices. What does he say? He says:

In the first place, the new tenderers—the American Bank Note Company—may possibly think that they would be able to make up the difference by the increased rates at which they tender for supplies that are not generally in demand.

To my mind that shows, and I shall prove it very soon, that Mr. Courtney did not think that the prices given by the British American Company were excessive. But he pointed out some reason why the prices in the tender of the American Bank Note Company were so small, and his idea is, that they thought they would be able to make

some of it up on account of other supplies that are not generally in demand. He suggests another reason in these words :

Whether the tender of the American Bank Note Company is one that could be carried out successfully, seeing that they may have tendered at unremunerative prices in order to secure a foothold in the country.

I have no doubt that they did tender at low prices in order to secure a foothold in the country, and that was a very natural thing for them to do. They have a large establishment in New York, they are doing a very large business there, and they have specified in their tender that they shall make all their dies and their tools in their factory at New York, and that they shall bring to Ottawa a great many of the supplies which they are using in their ordinary business. I repeat, that I have no doubt they tendered at a very low rate in order to get a foothold in this country, and I am very sorry to say they have succeeded. Now, it is a serious matter for us to notice, that the important part of this work is to be done at New York. I was very much impressed with the remark of the Finance Minister when he said, that only 1 per cent of this work was to be done in New York and 99 per cent was to be done in Ottawa with Canadian labour. If that is the case it is a very strong point, but I cannot reconcile that with the statement in the memorandum of the Deputy Finance Minister. Listen to what he says :

In this connection the undersigned has to call attention to the condition appended to their tender, that they are not to be required to manufacture bank note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of their trade, ink, colours, &c., at Ottawa, but may obtain elsewhere such supplies necessary to a faithful fulfilment of their contract.

Nothing could be more plain and emphatic than that, and if it is a fact as stated by the Minister of Finance that only 1 per cent of the work is to be done at New York, and that 99 per cent is to be done at Ottawa by Canadian labour, then I cannot understand the following statement by the Deputy Finance Minister :—

This would appear to allow them to do a large portion of their work at New York, and is a feature of the offer which seems to require very careful consideration.

Well, it ought to have our careful consideration, and I have no doubt in my mind that the Deputy Finance Minister is correct and that they will be allowed to do a large portion of their work in New York. That, Sir, is the objectionable part of this contract. Not only is a large portion of the work to be done in New York, but it is that very portion which we would like to have done in this country, namely, the skilled labour. An establishment like the British American Bank Note Company ; a Canadian institution, was a school for

young men who might learn to engrave and perfect themselves in this business. What are our young men going to say when they find that the skilled labour is carried from our country to the United States ; and that the fine work is to be done in New York and the ordinary work is to be done in Canada. That would seem to imply that we have not the skilled workmen here, and that we have not the young men who will learn this, even in the course of years. It is now proposed that we should go to the States to get men to do this work, instead of teaching our young Canadians to do it.

Another question that arises is this : Were the British American Bank Note Company charging too much ? That is a point also for our consideration. I shall read from page 39 of the blue-book, a statement which will answer that question completely. Mr. Courtney was unable to account for the low prices at which the American Bank Note Company tendered, and so he suggested reasons for it. It seemed to be a point which impressed him very much, because he tried to find out reasons why they tendered so low, and on that subject, he says :

In connection with the foregoing the undersigned begs to point out that at the time the present contract was entered into, full and explicit inquiries were made as to rates of the American Bank Note Company, and also as to the charges made by the British American Bank Note Company to the chief monetary institutions in Canada ; and in one case the department was allowed access to the bills rendered for printing notes for the institution in question by the British American Company. The result of the inquiry proved that the rates charged to the Government for this class of work were in no sense larger than for the institution in question, and were not then higher than the rates quoted by the American Bank Note Company. The account rendered to the institution in question is now in the possession of this department. It can hardly be possible that since the present contract was entered into prices for the work have fallen to such an extent as the rates offered by the American Bank Note Company would lead one to believe.

It would seem from this that in 1892, before the Government entered into the contract with the British American Bank Note Company, they wanted to find out whether the prices were fair, and they discovered on inquiry and from seeing actual invoices, that the prices of the British American Company were not higher than the prices at that time charged by the American Bank Note Company. That bears out the assertion I made, that the American Company has tendered low in this contract in order to get a foothold in this country. They knew the prices charged previously, and they were determined to come in, and as is done very often by business men, they made a very low offer. I venture to say for myself, that I regret very much that the Government has seen fit to go out of the country to get this work done. The

speech of the Minister of Finance was in great part, not an argument, but a mere statement of facts which nobody denies, and as his great reason for giving this contract to the American Company he said, there were 153 thousand reasons. If it is a fact that the prices tendered for and charged previously by the British American Company were fair prices, were not higher in 1892 than the prices charged to our banks by the American Bank Note Company; is it not a fair inference that the American Company's tender was a cut-rate tender, put in, in order to be sure of getting the contract and with a hope that on some extra work they might be able to make up for these low prices. I have very little doubt, Sir, that they will do it before their five years term is up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would you be in favour of giving the British American Company \$153,000 more than the other company?

Mr. CRAIG. I was going on to say, that I had no doubt that in the course of five years the American Bank Note Company will have an opportunity of making a good deal on extra work.

Mr. TALBOT. That is a supposition.

Mr. CRAIG. Certainly it is a supposition, and it is a supposition not of mine but of the Deputy Minister of Finance himself. He gave that as one of the reasons why the American tender was so low, and I think he is perfectly right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Deputy Minister of Finance has expressed no such opinion, and does not hold such an opinion, but fully recognizes the fact that there is a saving of \$153,000 on the transaction.

Mr. CRAIG. Perhaps I might read for the benefit of the Finance Minister, what I read a little while ago. The Deputy Finance Minister is writing about the difference in the two prices, and in trying to account for it, says this:

In the first place, the new tenderers, the American Bank Note Company, may possibly think that they would be able to make up the difference at the increased rates at which they tender for supplies that are not generally in demand.

I think that bears out entirely what I say. I did not wish to misrepresent the Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend said it was not clear that there was any saving, and that the Deputy Minister of Finance was the party who had suggested that. I said that was not fair to the Deputy Minister of Finance, who had not suggested anything of the sort. He made a report suggesting that certain figures required explanation, but he did not say that there would be no saving in the transaction.

Mr. CRAIG.

and he will not say so if called before the committee.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not say that the Deputy Minister suggested there would be no saving. I merely said that no doubt the American Company might be able to make up the difference, which is just what the Deputy Finance Minister said. I do not know whether they will or not, but it is very likely they will in the course of five years. They have taken this work at a low rate, and the Deputy Finance Minister thinks they may make up the difference. He says further:

Seeing there is such a manifest difference between the two tenderers on this item, the undersigned thinks some inquiries should be made through some expert, and he would suggest that the matter be submitted to the Queen's Printer in order to ascertain whether the tender of the American Bank Note Company is one that could be carried out successfully, seeing they may have tendered at unremunerative prices in order to secure a foothold in the country.

I mention this to show and I think it shows conclusively that the Deputy Minister, who has had a large experience, thought these prices were extremely low. He knew the prices of the British American Bank Note Company were fair prices, and he thought the matter should be referred to an expert like the Queen's Printer to see whether the work could be done at those rates. Now, I regret that the Government have gone out of the country to get this work done. In doing so I think they have made a mistake. I thought so at the time, before I had examined the matter at all, and I think so still. I think this business should be confined to Canadians. Canada is well able to print its own bank notes, postage stamps and inland revenue stamps. It seems to me it is rather humiliating to say that we have to go to the United States and get an American company to come here and do this work for us, because we are not able to do it for ourselves; and that is especially the case when we read the remark made in one of the letters of the American Bank Note Company. What do they say? They say that we have not skilled workmen in this country capable of doing this work. The ex-Finance Minister was perfectly right when he said that any Finance Minister should resent such an imputation on the people of this country. The work has been done well in the past. We have skilled workmen in Canada able to do this work as well as it can be done in New York, and therefore there was no reason on that account for going out of the country at all. But I repeat, a business of this kind should be confined to Canadians. The Finance Minister said that the previous Government had allowed foreigners to tender for public works. I suppose they have; but this is a special kind of work, a work which must be done in the city of Ottawa, according to the specifications of the Government. You

could not imagine the Government of the United States giving a contract for the printing of their bank notes, postage stamps and inland revenue stamps to a Canadian firm. They would scout and laugh at such an idea. They would say, "Do you mean to say that we have to go to Canada to find a firm to do work of this kind for the Government of the United States?" Any Congressman who proposed to do that would never be elected again. There is no question that would touch the pride of the American people so quickly. If any Congress voted to do such a thing as we are voting to do to-day the men composing it would not have a chance to sit in Congress again. The American people would think it an outrage on their sense of propriety and on their national pride to suggest that they should go to Canada and get Canadian corporations to go into the States to print their bank notes and postage stamps with pictures of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln on them; and I think they are right. I think sometimes that the American people have a little too much braggadocio; their children are taught in their histories and geographies that the United States is the only country in the world. But I think Canadians have too little of that sort of thing, and the present Government have even less than the people of Canada. I think the people of Canada would rather pay a little more for work of this kind in order to have it done by a Canadian company, which has done it well and at fair prices in the past, than to have it said that we have to go to the United States to get it done. We must always remember that this work has always been well done; no complaint had been heard about it, and it had been done by Canadian workmen. I must confess, notwithstanding the statement of the Finance Minister, that in reading over the blue-book it did appear to me that he had favoured the American Bank Note Company a little, because I find that after the tender of the British American Bank Note Company had been sent in, that was the end of it so far as they were concerned; but when the American Company wanted to make certain changes in their tender if they accepted the work, the Finance Minister was willing to talk to them about it. He discussed these changes. He did not say this condition throws you out and we must give the contract to your rivals. He did not tell the British American Bank Note Company anything about this, but discussed the matter with the American Bank Note Company just as if it was an ordinary matter of bargain and not of tender at all. The British American Company had complied with every condition of the specification. They made no stipulations, they did not ask to be exempted from any conditions, but these other parties did. The hon. Finance Minister, however, discussed the matter with the American Company, wrote them letters,

saw them personally, and after a while agreed to accept their conditions, and in this I think he favoured the American Company. I do not say that he did so intentionally, but none the less he did so. I am satisfied in my own mind that the Canadian people would rather pay a little more for work of this kind to a Canadian company and have the work done entirely in Canada, than give it to a foreign corporation and go to the United States to have it done. I am very much mistaken in my estimate of the temper of the Canadian people if that be not their opinion. While the price of the Canadian Company was rather higher, yet we have, at the same time, the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Finance that in 1892 these were fair prices. Does the Government want to have things done for less than their worth? The hon. Finance Minister boasted a great deal of having saved the people \$153,000. Well, apparently he has effected a saving, but we are not through with the contract yet. If the hon. gentleman should ask my opinion, I could have told him how he might have saved the Canadian people a great deal of money in other ways. He could, for instance, admit coal oil free. If he wished to save the Canadian people money, there are many other ways in which he could do it without giving important contracts to a foreign corporation. There is a principle at stake in this connection, and in my opinion Parliament should lay down the rule that, in matters of this kind, only Canadians should be allowed to tender. That would be an encouragement for Canadians to equip themselves to do work of this kind. What will be the result of this contract? It will throw us back for years. Our young men will have no encouragement to learn engraving, because the hon. Finance Minister has closed the principal field open to them in this country. The hon. gentleman has admitted the statement of the American Bank Note Company that we have no skilled workmen in Canada who could do this work as well as it can be done in New York. For my part, I dissent from that statement. It is not a true statement, but the hon. Finance Minister accepts it as if it were gospel. Under this contract there will be no encouragement for our young men to practice engraving, because only the ordinary mechanical work will be done in Ottawa, and the skilled work, the engraving, will be done in New York. I think it would have been better if this Government, before closing the contract with anybody, had asked the British American Company to make a reduction in their prices; and if they had done so, we might now have had the satisfaction of knowing that the work of printing our bank notes and postage stamps and inland revenue stamps and work of that kind was not being done by an American corporation.

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

(In the Committee.)

Boularderie—Wharf and approaches at Ross Ferry ..... \$500

Mr. BETHUNE. Is this in excess of the contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is to make the road which leads to the wharf. The right of way was given us free.

Margaretville—Reconstruction of pier.... \$12,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderers, Simon & Burpee, for \$10,554, and the balance is for clerk of the works and so on.

Judique—New wharf..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$2,000 in this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) sees, there is a re-vote of \$2,000. This amount is to be devoted to the construction of a breakwater 750 feet in length and 29 feet wide. After careful examination it has been found that \$2,000 more was necessary for this.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Judique a port ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I never heard of that port. What part of the globe is it in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the county of Inverness, and I understand that it is a very important port for fishermen.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before we pass from the province of Nova Scotia, I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to two very important works in the county of Cape Breton. One is the breakwater at Cow Bay, upon which a very large sum of public money has been expended. I am afraid that unless an appropriation is made in the Supplementary Estimates, the work will be actually carried away and a great deal of property destroyed. The other is the breakwater at Gabarous which is regarded as of great importance. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) will find further information in his department with reference to both these works. I trust they will be duly considered before the Supplementary Estimates come down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a full report as to the Cow Bay breakwater. It would require, I understand, about \$20,000 or \$25,000 to put it in a good state of repair. I quite realize the importance of every word the hon. gentleman has said.

Pugwash—New wharf..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is an additional vote of \$6,000.

Mr. CRAIG.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract, the contract having been awarded to Messrs. Simmons and Burpee for \$8,640.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there is a large amount outside of the contract which goes for expenses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is within the experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that it is just as well to keep a few dollars at our disposal. Of course, we are not obliged to spend every cent.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that if the hon. gentleman had a dollar he would have to spend it. How is this superintended ? Do you put a man on there locally and keep him there, or is this superintendence undertaken by provincial officials by periodical visits ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. gentleman knows, we have local engineers who have the general supervision of the works. But as they cannot be all the time on the spot for every work which is going on, we have local men under them who are paid by the day, and who may be called clerks of works.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do you pay a man a day in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The rule I have adopted is to pay \$2 or \$2.50 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. The man starts in when the contract is let and remains several days after it is finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He starts in when there is work to be done. Oh, yes ; my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) need not shake his head. It will be all right.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Is it the intention of the Minister to call for tenders for the Judique breakwater this season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not asked for tenders. I am now considering whether we should ask for tenders now or later on. I can assure my hon. friend that Judique wharf will receive our careful attention.

Wallace—New wharf..... \$1,600

Mr. BETHUNE. I am very much disappointed at not seeing a large sum here for the construction of a harbour of refuge at North Pond, Aspy Bay, in the county of Victoria. Money should be appropriated for a harbour there. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the necessity of having a harbour of refuge constructed at Aspy Bay. The county which I have the honour to represent is sparsely-settled, especially in the northern portion. Beginning at English Town and following the coast line, facing

the Atlantic round Cape North up the western side, facing the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the boundary line between Inverness and Victoria. There is only a fringe of the land, as it were, settled in all that distance, and between these settlements, facing the St. Lawrence on the west and the Atlantic on the east is a large tract of land of half a million acres of Crown lands, clothed in primeval verdure, in which roam at will moose, cariboo, deer, bears, foxes and other valuable fur-bearing animals. This territory is uninhabited by man, and no one knows what treasures may lie here undeveloped. Those places along the coast have been settled some of them for over a hundred years. The settlers there are as fine a class of people as we have in Canada. They are intelligent, frugal, industrious, and loyal to church and state. They are mostly engaged as farmers and fishermen, who to the present time, have endured and still endure many difficulties in prosecuting the calling of fishermen, for the reason that they have no place of shelter for their boats, except the beach. Commencing at Beach Cove, at the boundary line between Inverness and the county of Victoria, and passing by the settlements of Wreck Cove, Bay St. Lawrence, Cape North, Money Point, Aspy Bay, North, South and Middle Harbours, White Point, Cape Egmont, New Haven, Neil's Harbour, Black Brook, Green Cove and North Bay, Tignish—in all this distance of sea-coast there is not a single harbour, not a single place of refuge for the fishermen's boats. When they go out fishing and come in again, their boats must be hauled upon the beach. If there is a storm threatening they dare not launch their boats. There is no place of shelter but the beach, and their lives would be endangered while landing in the surf. Whenever they come in they must haul their boats upon the beach, if there is any sign of a storm. Of course they suffer great loss on account of this want of accommodation, as they can use only small open boats instead of large decked boats in which they could go out in any moderate weather, and engage in deep-sea fishing to a larger extent than is now done. Any hon. gentleman will realize what loss they suffer on this account, besides the hardships they undergo in hauling and launching their boats. If a storm threatens of course they cannot go out, because in coming to shore again their lives would be endangered on this rough coast. Again, when their fish is cured, they have trouble in getting it to market, because they have no harbour. They must wait until calm weather arrives so that a vessel may get near the shore, and then they carry their fish in boats to ship them. Of course a vessel cannot come near the shore unless the day is calm. If a storm arises, the vessel has to go off to find a harbour somewhere else. The farmers in this district suffer equally with the fishermen in

getting their products off to market. They also have to wait for a calm day until a vessel can come near, by which they can export what they have to sell. When they want to export cattle or horses the animals are made to swim out to the vessel and are then hauled on board by some kind of tackling. Hon. gentlemen will readily see the difficulties people there have to undergo. Now, in order to remedy this trouble, at least to the people of Cape North, all that is wanted is to give them a harbour at Aspy Bay. This can be easily done by opening a channel through the bar which lies in front of what is commonly called North Pond. This bar is nearly three miles long, through which a channel can be easily cut. The people round there say that there is only about three or four feet of sand, and underneath that is adhesive clay, which would form a good foundation for a pier. The water inside this point is about three miles long and about two miles wide, and the water is of sufficient depth to allow any large ship to ride safely. Then I call the hon. Minister's attention to this matter for another reason. A harbour of refuge is needed here, on account of the number of vessels which frequent those waters. Last year there passed by within a few miles of this place going to the port of North Sydney, 627 steamers, 158 coasting steamers, 5 ships, 90 brigs, 54 brigantines, and 1,237 schooners, with an aggregate tonnage of 762,000 tons. I would remind the Minister of Public Works that this coast is strewn with wrecks, which have been attended with great loss of property as well as of life. Not many years ago a ship was wrecked within a few yards of where I want this harbour constructed in which 14 lives were lost. There is no place in the coast I have already mentioned where a vessel can harbour, no matter in what distress seafaring men may be. Another reason why I want a harbour constructed there, is because it would afford communication between Newfoundland and Cape Breton every day in the year. In this connection I will call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the Cape Breton and Newfoundland route has attracted a great deal of attention for some years; and a conference concerning it was lately held in New York attended by the Deputy Minister of Railways of Canada and by Mr. R. G. Reid, contractor of the Newfoundland Railway. Referring to this route the Toronto "World" editorially says:

The Cape Breton-Newfoundland route will possess features that can be duplicated by no other route across the Atlantic. The trip from Montreal or New York to England via Newfoundland will offer a variety that ought to prove attractive to trans-Atlantic passengers. Instead of spending seven days continuously on the ocean, as is the case on the trip between New York and Liverpool, passengers going via Newfoundland will spend only four and one-half days on the water, and this will be divided into two periods of three

and one-half days and one day respectively. The trip will be made by steamship and rail alternately. On the whole, time will be saved by this route, as the distance is shorter than via New York or Montreal, and half the trip will be made by railway. Many people who are afraid to trust themselves for a week on the ocean on account of sea sickness, would not hesitate to venture on a voyage that could be covered in half that time. The Newfoundland route is certainly something new in trans-Atlantic travel, and we will not be surprised if a considerable volume of passenger traffic is attracted to it. It ought to be much more economical to maintain a fast service via Newfoundland than from New York or any other American port. Two vessels are all that are necessary to maintain a weekly service between Newfoundland and Great Britain. These vessels need not be one-half the size of the ordinary trans-Atlantic steamers, as they require only half the quantity of coal and provisions. A single steamship costing a quarter of a million dollars will maintain a tri-weekly service each way between the west coast of Newfoundland and North Sydney, C.B., where connection is made with the American railway system.

You will notice here that this route will only afford communication between Newfoundland and Cape Breton for about seven months in the year, because the harbour of North Sydney would be ice-bound for about five months in the year. But if we had a harbour of refuge at Aspy Bay I am informed by seafaring men that we can have daily communication during the winter as well as summer. Cape North extends northward, and Cape Ray extends southward from the coast of Newfoundland, leaving about fifty miles between the two points. It is said by those who are acquainted with the locality that when the tide changes, say from the west to the east a "jam" is formed between the two points, and of course the ice recedes leaving an open space of water. During this time a good steamer could run in comparatively open water from Cape Ray to Aspy Bay in about three hours.

Again, when the current changes from the east to the west there the same thing occurs, and a space of free water is left open. Of course the project I am now considering would necessitate the building of a few miles of railway from Aspy Bay to some point on the Intercolonial Railway. I am told on good authority that the Government is going to extend a line of railway to Margaree, and from that to Cape North would be only a few miles further on. This would benefit trans-Atlantic traffic. Mails and passengers could be landed there three hours after leaving Newfoundland; the ocean passage from Newfoundland to England would be made in three days and a half, and the passage between Newfoundland and Cape Breton would be made in three hours, and passengers would then commence their trip overland hours before they could by going to North Sydney. Seven hours would be occupied in the run between Cape Ray and Sydney, and this during the summer months only. Again, if we have this harbour con-

Mr. BETHUNE.

structed, it would not only benefit the people there, but would open up a large tract of country, no less than half a million acres, which is at present lying waste. There is no railway through it, the timber is uncut, minerals are lying hidden in the soil. By having this line of railway built and the harbour established the whole Dominion would reap the benefit. I ask the serious attention of the Minister of Public Works to the importance of this subject. Again, it would be a strong inducement to Newfoundland to enter the union if we had this communication established. There is nothing chimerical about this project, because it is a practical one. The Island of Cape Breton was the chief station placed within a short distance of Newfoundland for a purpose, and no doubt was to afford communication between Newfoundland and Canada during the whole year. Then, of course, besides the carrying out of this project around the coast of my county are much needed the construction of a great many breakwaters and wharfs. But we are modest in the east; if we get this appropriation this year we will hope for more next year, and by reason of those facilities being provided the people would be able to obtain a livelihood with some comfort to themselves, because at the present time, as I already stated, they endure many hardships in the pursuing of their calling. We have heard a great deal of the west and of its importance; but in my opinion, Cape Breton has never received that attention at the hands of the Government which its many and valued resources and its importance demand. There is not any place in Canada of its area which possesses equal wealth, and the Government should pay more attention to that island. My county especially has received no justice whatever for many years past. If I were desirous of proving that fact as regards Cape Breton, I need only call the attention of the Minister to expenditures in some other parts of the Dominion not nearly so important as Cape Breton, on which large sums of public money have been lavished. For the sake of making one comparison, let me take a portion of Canada, a small island in the Gulf of St. Lawrence known as Prince Edward Island. It is 130 miles long, four to thirty-four miles broad, and contains 2,133 square miles. Cape Breton is 100 miles by 85 miles, and its area is 3,220 square miles, or about 1,000 square miles more than Prince Edward Island. The population of Prince Edward Island is 109,078; the population of Cape Breton is 86,854. Let hon. members now look at the Estimates. What does Cape Breton get this year, and what did it get last year? This year it receives \$6,900, of which Inverness County receives \$6,400, while Prince Edward Island has lavished on it \$73,800. We have ten times the amount of coast water; there are no harbours in my county, I am now referring to the county north of Ingonish. Last year the

appropriations for Cape Breton amounted to \$8,300, of which Inverness County received \$5,500. Last year Prince Edward Island received \$53,850. Hon. members will at a glance see the great disparity, and Cape Breton is the most important portion of Canada, according to its size. Our waters teem with the finest of fish. The soil is as fertile as any in the maritime provinces, our rivers are full of the finest salmon and trout, we have an almost inexhaustible coal supply, also gold, silver, copper, iron, manganese, marble, limestone, gypsum, plumbago and other minerals, which are all awaiting development. If the island received greater attention from the Government these resources would be developed and become a source of wealth not only to Cape Breton but to the Dominion at large. I think I have said enough to convince the Minister of the necessity of establishing a harbour of refuge at North Pond, Aspy Bay in the county which I have the honour to represent, without delay. I am willing that it should be called after the hon. Minister if he likes—Harbour Tarte would sound well—and in that way his name would be perpetuated during the ages to come. If he carries out these works for the county of Victoria, I am satisfied the people there will call him blessed. This subject is one of importance to my county and I earnestly hope it will receive the Minister's attention; in fact I am satisfied it will, because I am convinced the hon. gentleman is inclined to do what is right and just.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Victoria, and it will be my pleasant duty to give his observations every attention when I consider my Supplementary Estimates.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** While on the subject of harbours, I desire to offer a remark or two with respect to the county I have the honour to represent. For some years we have been asking for repairs to be made at a place known as Sawpit Wharf, a work that should have received the attention of the Government some time ago. There has been no lack of appeals made by myself in regard to it, but it now needs the attention of the Government. It is a work that is much required, for the wharf is of great convenience to persons coming and going to the town of Lunenburg. It is only about three-quarters of a mile from the town, and they very often are compelled to go a distance of something like twenty miles around the arm of the bay, and to go into ruffled water in order to get into the harbour. It necessitates not only that distance of travel but also the dangers of the open ocean. It would not cost more than \$250 to repair that structure. I have been previously answered by the Govern-

ment, that the reason for not giving the grant, was, that there was no transfer of that property from the local Government to the Dominion. That is no fault of mine. I have made the request several times, and nothing has been done by way of obtaining that transfer. Another structure placed somewhat similarly, is known as Young's Landing, it is about two miles from the town and is of as much importance as the wharf previously referred to. It is in the Back Bay of Mahone, commonly known as Mastine Brook, and in the winter time the town can be reached from no other point conveniently, except by going out or around that immense peninsula, and into ruffled water which entails many risks. That is another convenience to the public that I am asking for and it is somewhat similar to Sawpit wharf. That structure is also claimed by the local Government, and a request has been made that a grant be given by the Federal Government for the necessary repairs which would cost like that of Sawpit wharf also about \$250. These amounts are very small, and there is no reason why these repairs should not receive attention and the necessary grant given. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to make immediate inquiry, and if it is possible for him to do so, I should be much pleased if he would make the grant. While I am on my feet, I might draw the attention of the Government to another matter in connection with our harbours. The harbour of Lunenburg is more frequented than any other harbour of Nova Scotia, except that of Halifax. We have no less than 130 or 150 sailing vessels independent of steamers belonging to this port. With the exception of Halifax, we have as large an export as is to be found in the province, the export of fish more particularly, and we also export very largely of agricultural products. We find the depth of water in that harbour a very great inconvenience for vessels at low tide. The tide is only six feet rise and fall, but still, the waters are so shallow that at certain seasons of the year—particularly in spring when the westerly winds blow stronger than at any other time, and drives the water from the coast—that it very frequently occurs, that steamers are unable to reach the piers and are compelled to remain in the mud until the tide permits them to come further. This has been a request of mine for some years, and a definite promise was given me three years ago that a dredge would be sent there. It has not been sent yet, and I would urgently appeal to the Minister that this work shall receive his very earliest attention. It is a matter of greater importance than the dredging of any other port in the province. The Minister will find on inquiry, that my statements are correct, and he need have no scruples in granting the request I make. I will therefore ask that these public works should receive his early attention.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLIES. I listened with considerable pleasure to the observations made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Bethune), and I rise to endorse every statement he made in connection with the necessity of a harbour of refuge being established at Aspy Bay. If the Minister will take the map of Cape Breton and study that coast for a few moments, I am quite sure that he will as readily as I do, endorse every word that has fallen from the lips of my hon. friend (Mr. Bethune). The Minister will remember, that on the whole of this iron-bound coast there is not for some 120 miles, a single place of refuge for a ship or boat of any kind. This is not only a matter of local importance to the fishermen, but it is really a work of national importance, because if a harbour of refuge were established there it would be frequented by very many of the vessels seeking the coast on the eastern seaboard in the early spring.

While on this subject, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a question which I brought to his notice last session, and to which he promised to give his attention at a very early period. I refer to the L'Ardoise breakwater. I am sorry to see that there is no provision whatever made in the main Estimates for that work. During the last summer session, I gave notice of motion inquiring from the Minister if it was the intention of the Government to have that work enlarged, both seawards and landwards, this being necessary as I pointed out and as was reported on by his own engineer last year. The Minister then told me, that he contemplated devoting some attention to this very important work at an early date. During this session I also had a motion in connection with this matter, and the Minister was good enough to give me the same—perhaps not very satisfactory answer—but still the somewhat hopeful though somewhat indefinite one: that it was under consideration. I hope that he has given it careful consideration, and although these main Estimates show no provision for that important work, I do trust the Supplementary Estimates will demonstrate that it has received the Minister's favourable consideration. I again impress upon the Minister the importance of that work. L'Ardoise is situated at a point on the Atlantic coast distant some 60 miles from the harbour of Louisbourg on the east, and there is no harbour on the west for some considerable distance; the nearest being St. Peter's, which is very inconvenient for that locality. The Minister will kindly remember that that is a very large and important section of the country. It is populated entirely by fishermen. The reports in the office of the Minister of Marine will show, that some 200 boats manned by five or six hundred people go out on the bosom of the waters that surround those coasts, day in

Mr. KAULBACH.

and day out, during the season, seeking a precarious livelihood from these great waters and not a single shelter have they, except the small shelter formed by that breakwater, which is only partially built, and to which I now draw attention. It was the intention of the late Government to complete this breakwater by extending it further towards the shore, thereby making it more commodious and safer, and also, extending it a little towards the sea, thereby affording a wider area for the boats to shelter in. I again press upon the Minister the absolute necessity of having that work completed at the earliest possible time. I would be sorry to insinuate that such a thing as favoritism prevails with the Minister in the distribution of public money, but I cannot help observing that I find, when I look at these Estimates, that counties which are represented here by Conservatives are in a marked degree absent from these Estimates. Not a single county in the Island of Cape Breton, nor one on the mainland, represented by a Conservative, has a vote in these Estimates that I can find. Surely politics have nothing to do with the construction of works which are absolutely necessary for the preservation of life on our sea-coasts. Such a course was not the policy of the late Government. My hon. friend will see, if he refers to the appropriations in his own department, that the county of Yarmouth was very well looked after by the late Government, although it was then represented in this House by a member very hostile to that Government. The same was the case with the county of Digby, which was represented in the last Parliament by a gentleman who never cast a vote in favour of the late Government. That county was very lavishly provided for by the late Minister of Public Works. Not one of us found fault with this, because these works were works of necessity, and as all the counties contribute to the public treasury, it would be almost criminal to distinguish one county and provide for it handsomely, because it was represented in this House, perhaps accidentally by a gentleman supporting the Administration of the day, and to discriminate against another county which, wisely or otherwise, thought proper to send a gentleman here to represent it who was not in harmony politically with the Government that held sway for the moment. I will ask my hon. friend now if it is his intention to make some provision in the Supplementary Estimates for the work to which I am calling his attention. If so, I personally will appreciate it, and the people who sent me here will appreciate it in no less degree.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend is quite fair to me. Since the last session of Parliament I have caused a survey to be made at that point, and when the Supplementary Estimates come down, I hope my hon. friend

will be pleased. It is not customary to place in the main Estimates votes for works which are not initiated. The main Estimates contain only votes for works which have been begun, and that is the reason why many works which will find a place in the Supplementary Estimates are not mentioned here. My hon. friend is not just when he says that counties represented by opponents of the Government do not receive a fair share of public expenditure. If he will kindly look at these Estimates, he will find that in one case \$500 is going to be voted, that \$17,500 is voted for the Souris breakwater, and that \$12,000 is to be voted for Margaretville pier. When I have to ask this Parliament for money I do not consider whether it is going to be voted for a Liberal county or a Conservative county; it would not be fair to do so. In that respect I quite agree with my hon. friend, and when the Supplementary Estimates come down he will find that the rule he advocates will have received application.

Mr. GILLIES. I am very much obliged to the hon. Minister of Public Works for the kind manner in which he is disposed to look upon the work to which I have drawn his attention; but this is a work that was long ago initiated, and that is why I draw his attention to it on these main Estimates. The plan was made by his own engineer nearly three years ago, and it is now in his department. I am also pleased to know that he is in line with me when I say that it would be a very improper way to distribute public money by signaling one county favourably when it had a representative here supporting the Government, and discriminating against one represented by an opponent of the Government, and that he is likely to be actuated by that view of the matter.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if anything has been done in connection with a work to which his attention was called last session by my colleague, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who urged the necessity of a wharf or some other protection for fishing boats at Cape John in that county. While on my feet, I will mention another matter. I was informed by residents of Merigomish, in the county of Pictou, that they had sent a petition to the Minister asking for some grant to extend and strengthen the wharf at that point. They did not use me as a medium, and it is possible that this may be provided for in the vote I see lower down for general repairs and improvements of harbours in maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will look into the facts, as I do not remember now whether we received a petition or not.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. member for Richmond has referred to me

as having been returned by accident. If he will look back to the record he will find that I was elected twelve times the majority which returned him.

Mr. GILLIES. I never mentioned the hon. member for Inverness. In fact I had not the hon. gentleman in my mind at all. I would be delighted to see every grant possible made to the county of Inverness. He is entirely mistaken in the impression that I referred to him as being here by accident, and I should be delighted to see any grant the hon. gentleman applied for, now or in any other session, for Inverness, put in the Estimates.

Prince Edward Island—Souris—Reconstruction of breakwaters at Knight's Point ..... \$17,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The expenditure up to date on that work has been very large. It has amounted to \$171,000. For this year we badly want the sum asked for. A part of the work is under contract and another part is being done by day's work. The amount of the contract is \$27,000.

Mr. FISHER. Last year the hon. gentleman got \$37,500. There is a re-vote of \$10,000 which leaves \$27,500, and this year he is asking for \$7,500. He is thus asking for \$35,000, and the contract is for \$27,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance will be employed in completing by day's work that part of the work which is not given under contract—the part inside the breakwater which could not be properly given by contract.

West Point wharf, Prince Edward Island.. \$6,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied to replace the wharf which was carried away during a gale in 1891. The total cost will be \$9,000.

Mr. PERRY. This was a wharf built by the local government of Prince Edward Island some years ago. In 1882 it was handed over to the Dominion Government. It had cost the local government \$5,000 or \$6,000, but the Dominion Government paid the local government \$7,000 for it. Since then the Dominion Government never saw fit to spend a dollar on it just because the county was represented by myself, and the result of this neglect was that the wharf was carried away. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) has thrown out the insinuation against the Minister of Public Works that he is partial and has not treated the county of Richmond properly because it is represented by a Conservative. Well, for the last fifteen years the late Government never spent a dollar on the wharf at West Point. How much money did they spend on the Tignish breakwater? Why, Sir, since 1878 they have not spent \$1,-

500 on that breakwater. I contend that Tignish breakwater is second to no port in Prince Edward Island. The \$12,500 that the present Government has been kind enough to grant will enable them to build a breakwater from the bar inward, so that the large vessels from Gloucester, N.B., drawing five feet of water, over one hundred of which come there, will be able to go up where there is plenty of water and leave the mouth of the harbour free for other vessels to go in and out. The hon. gentleman says that the present Government is partial, that the hon. Minister is not doing right. Look at this \$17,500 which is granted to Souris in King's county. That is not represented by a Liberal, but I hope it will be before long. I know very well that the game played for years by the late Government was to starve the public works of Prince county and to starve out old Perry as well. But old Perry is here, and he is here to stay. The Government deserves credit for doing justice to King's county, and I hope they will not act in any of these things from a party standpoint, but will do justice to every part of Canada. I am not going to back any Government that will do injustice.

Mr. FOSTER. We are glad to hear the familiar voice once more.

Summerside Harbour—Protection works.. \$30,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite admit that it is a pretty large amount. And I may immediately say, that if we are going to do this work a very much larger amount than this will be required. The estimated cost of the work is \$104,000. We ask only \$30,000 this year, because we find we cannot afford to spend more. Of course, we will not do this by day's work.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole plan that is to cost \$104,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A breakwater 3,000 feet long.

Mr. FOSTER. That would go nearly all around Prince Edward Island.

Mr. POWELL. What is this work wanted for there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To make a safe harbour. I have here a plan of the harbour and I would be very glad to show it to my hon. friend (Mr. Powell).

Mr. POWELL. This is already one of the safest harbours of the whole Gulf of St. Lawrence. I have gone in there a dozen times myself after dark.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineers of my department, the report of the local engineers who are not appointed by me, and the report of the chief engineer who was not appointed

Mr. PERRY.

by me, are to the effect that this work is a necessary work. The harbour is filling all the time, and the breakwater is to prevent the sand from drifting in. I will be glad to show the plan to my hon. friend; it is a very interesting piece of work.

Mr. FOSTER. We are such tyros in these matters that we should not understand it, but most of us have been in the harbour.

Mr. PERRY. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works—he has done very well, and I greatly approve of his course—to the fact that there is one item that is omitted—the harbour of Miminegash. This harbour is in want of repairs. A small sum will save it now, but, no doubt, the fall storms will carry off the south part of the work unless some repairs are made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Miminegash is a name I have heard before and when the Supplementary Estimates are considered, I will be glad to give my attention to the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Perry).

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I would like to ask if the amount here for Souris breakwater is sufficient to cover the expenditure undertaken there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We hope so.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the necessity of doing something for the breakwater at Belle River.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Belle River breakwater does not belong to this Government, and I do not see why I should spend public money there.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. Minister is well aware that the Dominion Government has spent money on works in the same position in every part of the Dominion. We are doing that every day. So far as the riding I represent is concerned, I fear there may be a little truth in what has been stated by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies). There is only a vote of \$500 for the whole of East Queen's, while large amounts are appropriated for other parts. There is a revote here of \$20,000, I think that amount should have been expended. Now I suppose they are making a show of spending a large amount in Prince Edward Island again, and next year I presume it will be found that very little of it has been actually spent, and that the money will be revoted again. I trust the hon. Minister will not steel his heart against the just claims of my constituents.

Public Works—New Brunswick—Port of St. John..... \$16,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have resolved to complete the survey of

the harbour at St. John first of all. We have no survey at all, and I have made up my mind not to do any more work until we have a survey.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a protection to the harbour which is absolutely necessary, whether there is a survey or not. That has either to be kept up, or the harbour will be destroyed. My hon. friend knows that a large amount of money has been spent there. A system has prevailed of putting in large blocks, and the storms which are very heavy there, will sweep them away. I think within the last two or three years there has been some solid work done there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our idea is to join Partridge Island with the works that are now made, so as to fully protect the harbour. But before we do that work, the engineer reports that it is necessary to have a full survey of the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to have been only \$5,000 spent last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In repairs, in making concrete blocks. They have been found to stand very well.

River St. John and tributaries..... \$16,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this to be expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The idea is to build a dredge for inland navigation work, costing about \$9,000, and repairs are to be made at the Oromocto dam and a weir is to be constructed at the Oromocto Island. The idea of this work is to give eleven feet of water between Fredericton and St. John, and four feet of water between Fredericton and Woodstock. Of course, it would require a larger sum of money to complete the work.

Mr. FOSTER. This is to be operated above the city?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Works—Maritime Provinces in general ..... \$10,000

Mr. POWELL. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a breakwater in the county of Westmoreland, the artificial harbour at Cape Tormentine. A large sum of money has been spent upon that, and the department is now brought face to face with a very serious problem indeed, either that work must be abandoned altogether or some immediate repairs must be made. I think \$8,000 or \$10,000 judiciously expended now, would save in the course of a few years \$40,000 or \$50,000. A mistake was made at the beginning owing to the fact that creosote wood was not used in the construction, and in consequence the borer or worm that destroys wood in the salt water on the shores of the Gulf,

has been very destructive indeed. It has undermined all the woodwork, and the stones in the cribs are now tumbling into the sea. It is not an uncommon thing for immense portions of this work to be case ashore by the tide. The work must be proceeded with at once, in order to save what remains. For years the trade has increased immensely in that harbour. The lumber from the eastern portion of the country is now all shipped there, trade is being drawn there and in a few years, if the harbour is maintained in a state of efficiency, the trade will have largely increased. Last year the Minister of Marine inaugurated a winter steamboat service there, and this winter service must be always maintained, unless my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) is successful in having the tunnel constructed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken as to the cost of the work. If it was only a matter of \$10,000 or \$15,000, perhaps I would have undertaken it; but reports have been laid before me showing that to put the Tormentine works in a good state of repair, would require \$100,000, and the magnitude of that sum frightens me. I quite agree with my hon. friend that this is a work of great importance, and a great mistake was committed when it was constructed with timber that had not been creosoted. In consequence, the work has been nearly destroyed by the worms. I quite agree with him that something must be done. I will bring the question before Council for very serious consideration.

Mr. POWELL. In my estimate of \$10,000, I was basing my view upon what would have been sufficient last spring when I called the Minister of Public Works attention to it. In the present state of the harbour, the estimate of the Minister of Public Works may be true, if the report of his engineers is to be relied upon. But this I will say, that if \$10,000 or \$15,000 had been expended last summer, it would have been sufficient to put the works in a fair state of repair, no matter what the hon. gentleman's engineers may say about it. It is a matter for the exercise of a little common sense. To go to work and rebuild it may take \$100,000. But if, when I called the Minister's attention to it last year, \$10,000 had been spent simply in dumping stones on the outside—because this borer will not work in the dark—that pier would have been preserved, and the action of the water would not have worn it away. It may be that at present the work of disintegration has proceeded so far that it is necessary to expend \$100,000; but \$15,000 judiciously expended last year would have saved the expenditure of that large amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend is once more mistaken, because if we had done as he proposed the work would have been destroyed all

the same. This borer is doing his work all the time. A great mistake was made at the inception of the work, and I do not see how we can remedy it without rebuilding anew.

Mr. POWELL. I acknowledge a mistake was made, and the engineers were either ignorant of what was before them or negligent of their duty. But in respect to dumping this stone on the outside, if the worm has done its destructive work, then it is the action of the tide that completes the work of destruction. The work could be renewed by just planking the inside. Any one who is familiar with engineering is aware that if the planking had been renewed on the inside of the work, the work could have been carried on with very little expense.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give my immediate attention to the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.). Has the Minister in contemplation the construction of a wharf opposite to Cape Traverse, and has the matter been brought before him in any way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My attention has been called to the proposed work referred to by the hon. gentleman, but I must remind him that the estimated cost is half a million dollars, and perhaps Parliament would hesitate before granting that sum this year.

Laprairie—Work in connection with ice piers, dredging steamboat channel, &c... \$9,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these ice piers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are opposite Montreal, and as the water is falling there, dredging is essential.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Government own the wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

River Richelieu—Belle Isle Channel guide piers ..... \$6,000

Mr. MONK. What are these guide piers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot very well explain what they are, but the hon. gentleman can see them outlined on a map which I have here.

Mr. MONK. The reason I make this inquiry is because I understand there are guide piers there at present.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The piers are rotten and are falling into the river. The hon. gentleman may be a very able lawyer, but I must depend on the opinions of my engineer, who has made a careful survey. The Richelieu boat can-

Mr. TARTE.

not now approach the pier, on account of its bad condition.

Mr. MONK. The piers are there still.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They must be reconstructed.

River St. Lawrence—Removal of rocks.... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these rocks?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are on the Gaspé coast, and are very dangerous to fishermen. Every year we vote a certain amount of money to remove rocks, so that the fishermen may land there without danger.

Rivière Ste. Anne de la Pérade—Repairs to protection works..... \$5,000

Mr. MONK. In regard to repairs for protection works, I would remind the Minister of Public Works of the promise he made to me last year respecting works of a similar nature at Ste. Geneviève. These are necessary, and the hon. gentleman promised that he would look into the matter. He began an investigation three or four days before the 11th of May last, which gave us great encouragement in that part of the county. I hope he will prosecute those investigations and find out whether the works are necessary, and if the inundation of that part of the county is caused by works done by the Dominion Government, he will see that a sufficient sum is placed in the Estimates next year to carry out the necessary works. Although this investigation was made a few days before the 11th of May, nothing has been done, and I desire to keep the matter fresh in the mind of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad that my hon. friend has again called my attention to the work at Ste. Geneviève. May is the best month to make these surveys, and they have been made all over the Dominion during that month. That is the reason why the month of May has been chosen.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the Minister to bestow some attention to the wharf which was projected by the late Government to be erected at Pointe Claire in Jacques Cartier county. The result of a survey which was made there was that a wharf would cost about \$2,000. Pointe Claire is a short distance from Montreal, on Lake St. Louis. There is a wharf at Lachine, a wharf at Ste. Annes, and on the opposite side of the lake, there is a wharf at Caughnawaga, another at Chateauguay and another at Beauharnois. Pointe Claire, one of the most important places on Lake St. Louis, is the only place without a wharf. That, I believe, the hon. Minister knows himself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I appeal to the hon. member for Maissonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) who is familiar with that portion of Montreal, to bear me out in the statement I now make. At Pointe Claire there is the remnant of an old wharf abandoned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the establishment of a new wharf would require but a small expenditure by the Government. I trust that the Minister will see his way to erect a wharf there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the cost of a wharf at Pointe Claire would be \$5,000 or \$6,000, but still I quite recognize the importance of Pointe Claire, and I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and myself will be able some of these days to rejoice over the building of a wharf there.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can bear out what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has stated. If any place on Lake St. Louis should have a wharf, it should be Pointe Claire. I can well understand why it was not properly treated by the former Conservative Government, because it is one of the most Liberal parishes in the county of Jacques Cartier.

Mr. MONK. That is perhaps an additional reason why the Minister of Public Works should build the wharf.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is asking for a larger vote this year, still, if we consider the damages suffered by the farmers along the river Ste. Anne, I think something more than mere repairs is required, but considerable protection works are needed. I thought my duty to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to that fact, and ask him to send out an engineer from the department to find out what repairs are required and to see to it that protection works be carried out along the river Ste. Anne. Those protection works are of high importance for that village, which is all the time liable to suffer serious damages from the water. Now, I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will do all within his power to protect the village from those dangers, both on the east side and on the west side. I wish also to ask the hon. gentleman whether the outlay has exceeded the amount of \$3,000 that was appropriated last year, or whether he is going to pay the arrears due in this connection out of this appropriation of \$5,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that not a cent over the appropriation was expended; so, at least I understand from the report of the officials of my department. As to the additional \$5,000 asked for, we shall try to apply that

sum in the best way we can. The hon. member should not forget that these are not purely Dominion works, therefore, I think the people of Ste. Anne are also bound to look after their own interests. However, the Government, in view of the considerable importance of those works, have thought it fit to ask Parliament for this appropriation. But still let the hon. gentleman not forget that these are not purely Dominion works.

Public Works—Ontario..... \$306,000

Mr. FOSTER. As a number of the Ontario members are not present to-night I would suggest that the vote for Collingwood Harbour and Rainy River, which are new votes, should be allowed to stand, and that we pass the others.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well.

Mr. REID. I understand that the Government have been making a survey at Prescott, and it is generally reported that they intend building a new breakwater there. Is that the case?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are now dredging at Prescott, but I may say it is not the intention to build a breakwater. We think that by careful dredging we can give all the accommodation that is required at present.

Mr. REID. That is my own opinion, and so far I agree with the Minister. At the same time it was reported that they were going to build a breakwater.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not intend to do so now.

Mr. REID. Did not the Minister receive a deputation about the breakwater?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID. I see that the Government tug is there now. Is it the intention to have the dredge to do some dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is going on now.

Mr. REID. It is a very important work, and I am glad he is doing some dredging there, because the large vessels which go to Port Arthur go into Prescott.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the promise made last session with regard to the improvement of the river Sydenham, between Wallaceburg and Dresden. The port of Wallaceburg stands fifth in the list of ports trading with American ports, and this traffic is very much impeded for the want of this necessary work. I see nothing in the Estimates so far, and I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if we may expect that something will be

done there during the present season. It is not a large work, but it is a very important one.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I am very sorry to have to inform the hon. gentleman that we have no dredges. There are hundreds of calls made upon us which we cannot comply with, for the want of sufficient equipment.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I understand that the dredge that has been engaged in that work is going to do some work at Port Stanley. I hope the hon. gentleman will see the importance of having this work done.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I will give my attention to the remarks of my hon. friend.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Has the hon. Minister any idea of what it will require to finish the dredging at Owen Sound harbour?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** About \$50,000.

Toronto Harbour—Works at eastern entrance ..... \$20,000

**Mr. CLARKE.** I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if any changes have been made in the plans for the works at the eastern end of the island? Has any appropriation been made for the protection of the western end of the island? I understand that deputations waited on the Minister and pointed out to him the necessity of taking some means by the construction of groynes or otherwise to protect that part of the island. Is it the intention that this sum shall be devoted entirely to the extension of the works at the eastern end, or will there be a further sum in the Supplementary Estimates to provide for the protection of the western end?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** As my hon. friend says, a deputation waited on me a few months ago and urged the construction of groynes. The plans submitted to us were not altogether accepted at the time. I do not know whether there will be groynes, as suggested; but we are bound to do something and my chief engineer is now giving his best attention to that question.

**Mr. CLARKE.** I may say that the work now being performed at the eastern end of the island unless supplemented by other works further west, will very seriously affect the western end. Heavy seas are being diverted to the south-western part of the island, which is not at all protected.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** A pretty large portion of this sum will be employed for dredging. My attention was called last year to the necessity of building groynes to protect the western end of the island, but we have not yet made up

**Mr. CLANCY.**

our minds as to the kind of work that is required. I understand that it is a pretty difficult matter.

**Mr. CLARKE.** Can the hon. Minister give us any idea of what further sum will be required to complete the works at the eastern end of the island?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** About \$80,000 in addition to this.

Goderich Harbour..... \$53,000

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is the whole cost of this harbour to be?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** This sum covers the whole cost of the work, which is now under contract.

Resolutions to be reported.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st May, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

**BILL WITHDRAWN.**

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.**

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the 25th instant, at three o'clock p.m.

**Mr. BRITTON.** Is it understood that Thursday of next week will be a holiday, and that there will be no session of the House on that day?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Thursday is Ascension Day, and is, therefore, I think, of necessity a holiday, and has always been observed as such.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Is Thursday a statutory holiday for this House?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It is a statutory holiday. This House has sometimes disregarded statutory holidays, as the hon. gentleman knows; but

I do not suppose that we shall trifle with tender consciences by sitting on Thursday.

**Mr. WALLACE.** If the House would sit on Thursday, and not sit on Wednesday, it would suit the convenience of members much better.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Call Wednesday Ascension Day.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I would suggest that the Government give Saturday of next week to private members, in place of Monday. There are a great many items in the Public Bills and Orders. It is within the knowledge of the House that the entire time of the last session of the last Parliament was taken up with the Remedial Bill, so that there was no legislation at all, and in the last session of this Parliament there was no time for legislation in the hands of private members. This year, owing to the Queen's Jubilee, the Government are trying to get through with the business of the session, and I do not for a moment wish to stand in their way; at the same time, there are no less than twenty-four Bills in Public Bills and Orders, some reached once, and some twice, and I would suggest that the Government take into their consideration whether they would not give us Saturday of next week for private members instead of Monday. We have to be here, and let us have that day as well as the following Monday, and we shall be able to get through the list pretty well.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** We will consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion between this and Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

#### ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** The Speaker of the House of Commons has received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor General's secretary:—

Governor General's Office,  
Ottawa, 21st May, 1897.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon, at 5 o'clock, for the purpose of giving assent to such Bills as have been passed by Parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,  
Your obedient servant,

DAVID ERSKINE,  
Governor General's Secretary.

#### FAST ATLANTIC SS. SERVICE.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to a statement which appears in this morning's "Citizen"

Within a day or two Sir Richard Cartwright may be able to make the announcement in the House, that the contract made with Messrs.

Peterson, Tate & Company, of Newcastle, for a fast Atlantic service, has been concluded. The terms of this offer, entailing a subsidy of \$500,000 a year from the Dominion Treasury for ten years, have already been embodied in a provisional contract with the Canadian Government, and has only awaited the sanction of the Imperial authorities. This, it is learned, has been obtained. The Government yesterday received a telegram from Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, stating that the contract, which had been under consideration for some time by the Admiralty, had been approved by the Imperial Government. And this is understood to mean that Her Majesty's Government has also consented to contribute the promised annual subsidy of \$350,000.

Is this information authentic?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** No notification, so far as I am advised, has been received from the Imperial authorities.

#### SUPPLY BILL—QUEEN'S JUBILEE CELEBRATION.

Bill (No. 112) for granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$26,000, required for defraying certain expenses of the militia contingent to be sent to England for the jubilee of Her Majesty in June, 1897, was considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies).** The only object is to enable the department to remove obstructions in navigable waters without incurring liability to the owners of wrecks, and the immediate object is to remove a wreck from a ledge lying off a harbour in British Columbia. It provides that if the proprietor of the wreck does not remove it, we can remove it at his expense. The Bill passed the Senate under the late Government, but was not in time to pass this House, and having received the approval of both Governments, it cannot be the subject of any controversy.

Bill reported.

#### SUPPLY—ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE** moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Before you leave the Chair, I would like to call the attention of the Government to the question of the Alaskan boundary. I see by the papers that an agreement has been entered

into between the Imperial Government and the Government of the United States, and that that measure is now before the Senate of the United States. This is a very important question, considering the character of the mineral discoveries immediately along the boundary, and I think it would be well for the Government to lay on the Table any information they have in regard to this matter and the terms of the treaty which has been entered into. I merely mention the matter now in order that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) may be prepared to lay upon the Table of the House any information on this subject in possession of the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The arrangement between the two governments was not an arrangement which involved any departure from what was already understood, but simply laying down of the boundary that had been agreed upon, a scientific determination of the 141st meridian. There is no objection to laying the papers on the Table if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) so desires.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should be very glad if the House were given whatever information is in possession of the Government, because there is in connection with that question a matter of very great importance looking to the value of that section of the country.

#### BICYCLES AS BAGGAGE.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the Railway Committee yesterday, a statement was made with regard to the Intercolonial Railway having for some time, carried bicycles as baggage. I would like to know how long it is since that arrangement was made and by whose instruction. It is generally understood that railways charge for carrying bicycles, but here is a railway owned by the Dominion and run by the Government at a loss of about half a million dollars a year to the people, carrying bicycles free, while, in other parts of the Dominion, wheelmen have to pay for the carriage of bicycles. I would like to know under what circumstances and under whose instructions a system of that kind was established on the Intercolonial, when it was not adopted by other railways throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I very gladly furnish the information asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen). The arrangement referred to has been in existence for some little time. I trust that it will not be assumed, because I do not particularly refer to it, that I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as to the balance against the Intercolonial Railway under the present administration or for this year. The amount, I think, has not run up to anything like what the hon. gentleman says

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of late years. Last year the gross deficit on the running of the Intercolonial was about one-tenth of the amount named by my hon. friend. When the hon. gentleman mentioned the matter to me. I wired the general manager at Moncton to give me a statement of the mode adopted by the management in respect of the carriage of bicycles, and how long the system had been in operation that is now in vogue. And he made this reply :

We have not charged, on the Intercolonial, for carrying bicycles. They are carried in the same way as baby-carriages are carried. Bicycles actually in use by passengers are carried free, but carried entirely at the risk of the owner as to injury or loss. If the bicycle and any other baggage of a passenger combined weigh more than 100 pounds, excess is charged for the over-weight. The passenger is required to sign a release freeing the railway from any claim for damages. The use of bicycles has gradually grown, and at first, I believe, all railways carried them without charge. About a year ago, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway began to charge for them, and the question arose whether we should do the same. But I thought it better to wait until arrangements concerning traffic were completed. Of course, we do not find the carrying of bicycles so onerous as railways do that run near large cities and in a thickly-settled country.

#### DUTY ON COAL OIL.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a notice of motion on the Orders, and I wish to explain to the House and to the country why I think it useless to move that motion. The motion is as to the duty on coal oil. I had, on the same Order paper, a notice respecting the duty on agricultural implements and other matters, and, when it came to the vote, those gentlemen in this House from whom I might have expected support did not support me.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it necessary to name them? Why, they are known to fame already. But I will name them, seeing my hon. friend asks me to do so. One of them is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). He certainly was bound to support me, because he had his constituency placarded with bills, "Vote for Richardson and free implements." And I suppose that when he goes back to his constituency, as go back he will within two or three months, he will have it placarded, "Vote for Richardson who voted for keeping the duty on agricultural implements."

Now, I am not going to impugn the motives of these hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and other gentlemen who came into this House professing Patronism. I have no right to do it. On the contrary, I assume that they have voted as they have done with the best of motives as they understand it and up to their lights. They seem

to be under the impression that no good could come from a vote for a motion if their voting were to be in a minority; and I find that some newspapers that used to take an interest in these questions and used to advocate free implements also take the view that a man should never bring forward a motion in this House if he is likely to be left in the minority. Because that is what it comes to. The size of the minority is nothing, for if you are beaten by a majority of two you are beaten just the same as if you had against you 90 per cent of the vote.

I will not refer to a past debate, but I believe it is proper to refer, when dealing with the tariff, to anything that has taken place on a previous occasion in this House when the same subject was under discussion. I may say, then, that some time ago I referred to what took place in England—how Mr. Villiers came forward in 1841, though in hopeless minority in the English Parliament, and moved that motion which, by being pressed again in 1842, in 1843, and 1844, so affected public opinion in England, that at last the greatest parliamentary England ever saw, Sir Robert Peel, adopted Mr. Villiers' policy. I also referred to the case of the ballot. I pointed out how Mr. Grote, the Greek historian, came forward with a motion in favour of vote by ballot. He was hopelessly voted down. After three terms, I think, he retired from the House of Commons, and then Mr. Henry Berkeley took up the cause of the ballot, and brought it forward yearly, and was, yearly, as hopelessly voted down. And yet the time came when the ballot was adopted by the House of Commons and became part of the law of England. But, Sir, to show that it is useful to divide the House, even if you should be in a minority, to show that it is useful to press a Government, even though that Government may have the sympathy of the Opposition and may be in a position to sit upon your motion, to show that that is the way, really, to affect opinion inside and outside of this House, I have a case in point, in the records of this House, and that case will kill two birds with one stone. In these debates, we have had a statement made that I was very valiant to bring forward motions for the farmers, but that, after proposing these motions and fighting for them, I, nevertheless, never divided the House. I remember my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries saying that he would be very glad indeed if I could point out a single case where I divided the House against my own Government. He thought it was impossible. I do not blame him for that, because he knows very well how rare it is in a Parliament where we have party so highly organized, for any man to divide the House against the Government of the party to which he belongs. Now, in 1887

I brought forward in this House a motion to do justice to those who, by the legislation of 1886, had been deprived of the right they got in 1883, a right for second homesteads. I did not contend for the principle of second homesteads, I was contending simply that persons to whom a certain right was given by the legislation of 1883 and who were unjustly deprived of that right by the legislation of 1886, should be placed in the position that justice demanded. I brought it forward in 1887. My friends in and out of this House smiled at me for doing it, for my temerity, for my folly. They thought it was impossible that I should succeed, there was no chance of doing anything, the opinion of the House was absolutely against me. I brought it forward in 1888, again in 1890, and again in 1891. Now, I call the attention of my hon. friends in this House who represent Patron constituencies, to what occurred, and I call the attention to it of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who, I am sure, mistakingly, not wilfully, misrepresented me in regard to this matter. I am carrying out and illustrating a principle, and a parliamentary method; I am carrying out a promise that I gave him and others that if these misstatements were repeated, however innocently, in this House, I would bring forward evidence that the statements made all over the west, in newspapers whose interest it is to malign and misrepresent me, and statements sometimes made in this House, had no foundation. Now, having brought forward that question again and again, on June 1st, 1891, I moved:

That, whereas in 1893 an Act was passed granting second homesteads to those settlers who had completed the conditions of the first homestead entry; and whereas in 1866 an Act was passed abolishing the policy of second homesteads; and whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between the 1st of June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead.

We had a debate, in which I find that the leader of the then Opposition, the present Prime Minister, took part, and the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Dewdney) took part, and opposed my motion; Sir John Thompson took part in the debate, my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) took part, as did also Mr. Watson, who then represented Marquette; Col. Tisdale, Mr. Macdowall, Mr. Daly, Mr. Mills of Bothwell, Mr. Trow, then whip of the Opposition; Mr. O'Brien and Mr. German. I want to point out to these gentlemen, and I want to point out to the west, that at the very time when I was on the comble of the wave to win, from the very men that I might have expected support, from the very men from the North-west Territories, from the representatives of Saskatchewan, Brandon and Marquette, I received opposition. Yet what did

I do? I determined to divide the House. In order to knock me off, Sir Hector Langevin said:

I spoke to the leader of the Opposition at the beginning of this sitting, and, though the news that we had then was not so serious as that we have now,—

He referred to a lamentable matter, namely, the impending demise of our great leader, Sir John A. Macdonald.

—I said we would probably ask for an adjournment at six o'clock, and the hon. gentleman agreed with me. I will now move the adjournment of the debate, and we will take care that the hon. member for West Assiniboia will not lose his place on the paper.

Now, Sir, I believe it is known with certainty that neither in this House at the time nor in the country, was there one man who felt more keenly what was taking place in a neighbouring mansion than I felt, nevertheless I had a duty to perform to my constituents, and I was determined to perform it, and you will find the following in "Hansard":—

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the leader of the Government to say that my question will stay at the head of the paper?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will give the hon. gentleman a chance of having his motion discussed.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the leader of the Government fix a place on the paper for it? I ask this question because I am pledged to divide the House on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Divide it now.

Mr. LAURIER. I must say to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that, according to the rules of the House, if a motion for the adjournment of the debate is carried, his motion goes to the bottom of the paper. I should myself object to the adjournment, because I think a vote ought to be taken, and I believe he has a grievance. It is true that the hon. gentleman opposite told me, at the beginning of the sitting, of the condition of Sir John Macdonald, and that I said that I would be ready at any time to adjourn the House; but I am not ready to agree to the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DAVIN. For the reasons I have stated, I cannot consent to the adjournment of the debate. I have carried my constituency with the whole weight of authority against me,—

And I carried it, mind you; I want hon. gentlemen to remember that I carried it with the weight of the House and with the weight of the Government against me.

—and I am pledged to my constituents to divide the House on this very question.

The House divided and the vote stood 87 to 73, the Government had a majority of only 14. What occurred after that? Sir John Thompson came and told me that he would put not only the Bill dealing with Dominion lands, but all my other Bills upon the Government Orders. I want to point this out to the Patrons, that if they want their principles carried out, it is not by silently and tamely lying down behind the

Mr. DAVIN.

Government, but by pressing them in this House and fighting for them like men. On the 3rd of August, when I had a Bill, No. 108, on the paper, as well as the motion which I have read:

Order being called for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davin,—

That is, on the adjournment. Mr. Davin said:

I may explain that the principle of this motion is embodied in my Bill (No. 108) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, and I think that the Government are likely to place that Bill on the Government Orders, so that I need not proceed with the discussion of this motion. I, therefore, move that the Order be discharged.

On September 18th Mr. Dewdney had his Bill, the Dominion Lands Act, before the House for the second reading, and on that occasion Mr. Davin, amongst other things, said:

I hope the Minister and the Government have considered the suggestion I ventured to make on the first reading of this Bill. I had a Bill on the paper and a resolution with regard to one of the clauses, and the House will remember that there was a very strong feeling in favour of a resolution embodying the principle of one of the clauses, and that feeling was expressed by a vote in this House, and there were other means taken to express the same sentiment. I withdrew that resolution, and I also refrained from moving the second reading of the Bill, because I was told by the Government that my Bill would be placed on the Government Orders. The reason it was not placed on the Government Orders was, that the Minister of the Interior brought down a Bill, and there would have been two Bills dealing with Dominion Lands on the Government Orders. The Minister of Justice is not here, but he told me that he would make a statement to the House at any convenient time, declaring that that was the position of the Government. Therefore, I assume that the principle of these clauses in Bill No. 108 is agreed to by the Government. One of the clauses deals with the prevention of the pollution of the waters, another deals with the sale of homesteads for taxes, and another deals with second homesteads. I assume that the principle of these clauses has been acceded to by the Government.

The Bill went into committee. I had had some conversation with Sir John Thompson, and it was agreed that while two of the clauses of my Bill were embodied in the then legislation, this one should be held over in order that they might learn certain facts that the Government thought it desirable to know before adopting that clause.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Bill is reported, I trust that the hon. Minister of Justice will say something about the second homestead clause, because we really had a kind of understanding, though not such as pledged the Minister or the Government, that the matter would be placed in a more satisfactory position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I certainly did promise that I would state our views upon the question of second homesteads before the Bill should be disposed of, at the time that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) presented his resolution to the House.

Now, mark this, Mr. Speaker, he took a hostile view of the principle of the resolution. Even so late as 1891 we had the then leader of this House taking the same hostile view that Sir John A. Macdonald had taken year after year, when I was fighting here for my life against a powerful Government, and against a feeling on this side of the House against myself.

At the time the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) presented his resolution to the House, I took a hostile view of the principle of the resolution; but I specially urged the House to adjourn the discussion of the matter for some time, in consideration of two views. One view, which was put forward not only in the argument of the hon. gentleman, but in petitions which had just then been placed upon the Table, was, that there were persons in the list of claimants who had peculiar claims in relation to second homesteads; and the other was, that the conceding of the principle involved a very large extent of the public domain.

He goes on to explain that the Government were desirous to know the exact extent of the public domain, which, he said, would be millions of acres, that would be alienated under the conditions of my contention, if my contention were adopted. We had the Dominion Lands Act amended in 1891, and I sat next to the Minister of the Interior with my Bill in my hand, and he asked me for the clauses. Clause 12 I handed to him just as it is; also clause 14, which provides in respect to the pollution of water, which has been a boon of the greatest value to the North-west. In 1892 my clause literally as I handed it to the Minister, will be found as 4:

The clause substituted by section five of chapter thirty-one of the Statutes of 1887 for clause forty-three of the said Act, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor.

And it embodies the 'ipsissima verba' of my own clause, as drafted by myself, and it was placed in that legislation. What does that show? It shows the same thing as occurred in the case of Mr. Villiers in regard to the Corn Laws, and in regard to Mr. Grote and Mr. Berkeley in regard to the ballot, that if any hon. member supporting a Government takes the course that is freely taken in England, in that Parliament which is the august mother of all the colonial parliaments where he is never looked upon as a worse party man if he shows himself independent he is bound in the end to succeed. Take the present leader of the Liberal party, Sir William Vernon Harcourt I have seen him attack the policy of Mr. Gladstone, Bills introduced by Mr. Gladstone and features of Mr. Gladstone's policy and yet subsequently he became the trusted Chancellor of the Exchequer of the Liberal Government, and is now the leader of the Liberal party. It would be of immeasurable advantage to hon. members of this House if we could only bring the methods of the English Parliament into this Parlia-

ment, if instead of having two machines here, a Government in power with a hundred and twenty or a hundred and fifty members supporting it, and every one of them here not to give the country the benefit of his judgment, knowledge and ability, but coming here to watch the leader stand up, and then like jacks-in-the-box up they are—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not say that against your party. This remark applies to every party in this country, because we have not the methods that obtain in the English Parliament. Those young members who have come into Parliament and who think that is the proper course for them to take, are doing great harm to the country, to themselves and to their cause. Look at what harm they are doing to themselves.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not carried just yet. I think my views will carry by-and-by, but it will take a much longer time to carry them—I do not expect such an easy job as that.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it as read.

Mr. DAVIN. If I do so, I will let down the hon. gentleman too easily, for I am going to point out the slough in which one of his colleagues in the Liberal party is wallowing now. I have here the Winnipeg "Tribune." I do not think much importance should be attached to the utterances of that paper, for if I can believe my eyes, it is now denouncing a railway project that it strongly advocated four or five days ago, declaring in unqualified terms that it would be a boon to Manitoba and the North-west. It would seem as regards the "Tribune" that something extraordinary has taken place. I do not know whether the "Tribune" was put in a corner and golden spectacles put on its nose or not, in order to enable it to see matters from a wholly different standpoint. The "Tribune" published an article on June 17th, seven days before the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was declared its representative here. It is headed, "The Manitoba Candidates"—that independent and precious batch of members who came here to show us what free western men are, to show us how those free and independent western men, who are supposed to have a streak of greater daring than other men in any part of Canada, would act. The "Tribune" discusses among others Mr. McCarthy, and his name appropriately precedes that of the hon. member for Lisgar. Here is what it says about Mr. McCarthy:

It is needless to enlarge upon the qualifications of Mr. Dalton McCarthy, whose reputation is Dominion-wide.

I may say in that connection what a favourite of the North-west Mr. McCarthy was; he took the North-west under his wing; the

dual language in the North-west Territories was a pang to his sensitive soul; the school system of the North-west Territories wounded him to the heart. We have at the present time the same state of things precisely as when the hon. gentleman talked violently from platforms in this city and from his place in this House to divide the people of this country in race and religion. But where has he taken himself now?

Mr. BENNETT. He is under the barn.

Mr. DAVIN. He is under the barn. I suppose; to use the classic phrase that has been given us by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). Now, this is what this paper says of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson):

Of Mr. Richardson, the anti-coercion candidate in Lisgar, whose connection with this journal is well known, nothing further need be said than that he will, as a member of Parliament, stand by every pledge and principle which he has given or advocated as a candidate.

And the pledges he gave were: to put binder twine, and barbed wire, and farm implements, and coal oil, and the cheaper cottons, all on the free list. Richardson and free implements! Where is Richardson and free implements to-day?

An hon. MEMBER. Under the barn again.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, he is not under the barn yet, for the rain has gone and the sun is shining out, and the fashionable Richardson is away forgetful of the farmers, and enjoying the otium cum dignitate that belongs to a favoured supporter of a successful government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no. I know you would like to have it carried and I would do anything to oblige the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), but I cannot stop just now for him. Then, Sir, on 19th June we have the startling head-line, and we know what an immense lot was made out of head-lines in this House some time ago. I have to travel in the wake of those superior persons whose independence I admire so much. It is impossible for me to give full vent to the heart deep admiration I have for the brilliant creatures that astonish the world on the opposite benches. Here we have the "Tribune" of 19th June, and here are the headings that stare me in the face:

Patrons will not be fooled.

Mr. McMILLAN. And you were not able to fool them.

Mr. DAVIN. I never tried. Does the hon. member mean, that the Government can do what I have failed in? I grant you that up to the present you have fooled them, but you cannot fool them all along.

Patrons will not be fooled.

Mr. DAVIN.

This was the assurance given in that heading. But, Sir, we have here what is of much more importance now than anything the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) could say; we have the utterances of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. He will remember having been a leading star at the Brydon rink in Winnipeg, and he had a paragraph in his speech which is headed: "The National Policy arraigned." Here is what he said:

He would just say this, that whatever arguments could be advanced for the National Policy in the east, none could be advanced here, where the National Policy bore heavily on and kept back the farming community. Here was a fact to consider. It had been stated by a gentleman conversant with the facts, that the Massey-Harris binder, which sold in Winnipeg for \$140, was sold in Glasgow for \$75. Here the Canadian farmer was unduly burdened, as against his competitors. The great competitors of the Canadian farmers were, among others, those in the Argentine Republic, and in that country they were buying their machines for about half what the Canadian farmer had to pay for them. Another competitor was Australia. Now, was it not time to think about these things and to see if something could not be done for the farmer, who had to fight against these competitors, who brought the price of wheat down to 40 cents a bushel? Is it not time to forget party and do something for the good of the country?

That is what my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior said. But, Sir, the duty to-day is the same on agricultural implements as when he made that speech; the duty is the same in protecting the Massey-Harris Company as when my hon. friend made that speech; and not only that, but Massey-Harris, and the hon. member of this House who is a manufacturer of farm implements; they have got their iron lower, they have been put in a better position, and the duty on the implements remains the same, and we have not heard one word from my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) who is the leader of these gentlemen, to explain how it is, that he has not succeeded in getting his colleague to give us agricultural implements free, as he said they would be given.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have shown that my hon. friends could do something if they had supported me the other day. I have shown that if these gentlemen will themselves take the lead and move in these matters—and I would be most happy to walk humbly behind them as their supporter—they could do something to make this Government keep its pledges with the farmers of Canada, and its pledges with the Patrons. My hon. friend from East Assinibola (Mr. Douglas) has declared authoritatively that the Patrons did not want anything on the free list. Why, Sir, I have the authoritative programme of the Patrons here, and this is it:

Tariff for revenue only. Farm implements, binding twine, fence wire, nails, lumber, coal oil, to be free of duty.

Mark that. Farm implements amongst the

things that should be free ; nails amongst the things that should be free ; lumber and coal oil amongst the things that should be free ; the very things that I am fighting for here, Sir. Why, I am a better Patron than any of them.

Mr. ROGERS. You are stating what is false now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. ROGERS. I take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) must withdraw the expression he has just used.

Mr. ROGERS. I will, Mr. Speaker. He is not quoting from the Patron platform now.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) to say that this is not authoritative ?

Mr. ROGERS. You are not reading from the Patron platform.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I have it published in the "Standard," which is one of the Patron papers in the west.

Mr. ROGERS. That is not the Patron platform.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman deny this :

First, the maintenance of British connection. Is that true ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not think it is right to catechise in that way.

Mr. DAVIN. What is it the Postmaster General is muttering ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was stating to Mr. Speaker, if you desire to know, that I do not think it is quite in order for a member of the House to proceed categorically to examine another member of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that if my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) speaks to the Speaker, it would be only courtesy for him to rise on his feet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is why I rose.

Mr. FOSTER. You spoke before you rose.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I will not mind my hon. friend the Postmaster General ; there is not very much in that. When my hon. friend the Postmaster General says something that is worth my while to deal with I will deal with it. Here we have the minutes of the fourth annual meeting of the Grand Association of Ontario, of Patrons of Industry, held in the Temperance Hall, Toronto, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and

Friday of March, 1895, with Mr. Mallory, Grand President, in the chair. I suppose that is authoritative. I suppose I shall have to say to my hon. friend what I said to the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that he is really not everybody, and that he does not apparently carry the Patrons in his pocket, any more than he carries out their pledges in this House. Here is what is in this pamphlet published in 1895 :

Luxuries shall be taxed to the fullest revenue-producing extent, and the following shall be admitted free into Canada, viz.:—cotton, tweeds, woollens, workmen's tools, farm implements, fence wire, binder twine, coal oil, iron and corn.

Well, Sir, is that not satisfactory ? I want to call the attention of the House and the country to this. As a great Italian writer said of Italy, if I may compare very great things with very small, "Would that I could have my hands in her hair, that I might wake her up." I know that in this case it would be hard for me to get my hands in the hair of the hon. member ; but certainly I wish I could do something to wake him up to the principles which he is pledged to follow. Here is a peculiar thing : When I am stating here the Patron platform and advocating it, a Patron stands up and actually says it is not the Patron platform at all. The blandishments and allurements of polite society have recently so bewildered and hypnotized him that he is ready to say with the Irishman, "I am not myself at all."

Mr. ROGERS. I ask the hon. gentleman to give me the privilege of reading two or three paragraphs of the Patron platform.

Mr. DAVIN. I have the floor, and the hon. gentleman can reply to me afterwards. Now, what I have said is also a reply to what was said by the "Patrons Sentinel" last year, when I moved a similar motion. That paper said :

Messrs. Davin and Boyd brought forward a resolution in the House of Commons last week to place farm machinery, binder twine and coal oil on the free list, when a revision of the tariff takes place ; but the motion was voted down, supporters of the Government taking the attitude that the matter should be left over till the whole question was under consideration. It would have done no harm, however, to have placed themselves on record as favourable to the change, as their vote against the resolution will not strengthen the confidence of the farmers in their professions of paternal solicitude for the interests of agriculturists.

This is what the "Patrons Sentinel" said last year when they had the excuse, that the tariff was not brought down ; but now, when the tariff is brought down, and is taken back, and we are within two or three days when it will be brought down again, as a revised tariff, I am taking one of the last opportunities we have of urging on the Government to give us free implements and free coal oil, or greatly reduced duties

on both. Now, it was said that we accomplished nothing. I have shown what I accomplished almost single-handed—yes, single-handed. By pressing the Government in regard to binder twine and implements in years past, I got my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance to put implements down to 20 per cent, and reduce the duty on binder twine and barbed wire 50 per cent, and I was confident had they remained in power to get implements, lumber—all those things free. A Tory Government, on protectionist principles, pressed by me, reduced implements from 35 per cent to 20 per cent at one stroke, while a Liberal Government does not take a cent of duty off, but gives some additional protection to the manufacturer. That is the difference between them. Look at this picture, and then on that, the counterfeit presentment of two Finance Ministers—one an honest protectionist and Conservative, who says he will do the best he can for the country, the other a blatant free trader, who went from one end of his own province to the other proclaiming himself a free trader and leading a party many members of which declared that there should be no duty on coal oil, as it was one of the necessities of life. I heard the Postmaster General make that declaration; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in and out of this House, declared that coal oil ought to be free. Yet, what do we find? We find two Finance Ministers—the one a Tory, if you will, who takes 15 per cent off; the other, after having promised, vicariously and directly to remove the duty, does nothing at all but strengthen the hands of the supposed enemy of the farmer. One is an honest statesman; the other is—well, you can describe him as you please. In 1894 the ex-Finance Minister brought down his revision of the tariff, and there was a general discussion in regard to coal oil, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) leading the way. The tax, he said, bore with special weight on the maritime provinces; and I am told that in Halifax the changes were rung on the duty on coal oil until coal oil seemed to be the great staple of discussion in that contest. The duty before the reduction of the late Government was a specific duty of seven and one-fifth cents per gallon. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asserted that the protection amounted to 123 per cent on the coal oil imported into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and he concluded with a touching appeal for sweeping away the enormous monopoly. This is what he said—and I wish I could imitate the Boanergean style in which, with the echo of the sea in his ears, he thundered out:

I plead on behalf of the mass of the people; not on behalf of the rich people in the cities and towns, who have their electric light and gas, but for the great mass of the people, who are obliged

Mr. DAVIN.

to buy this oil. This is class legislation of the worst kind. It bears most seriously upon the maritime provinces, and it bears with enormous weight upon the poorer classes in the maritime provinces.

Yet the present Government have 5 cents a gallon on it still, or about 80 per cent, with no sign that it is to be swept away. I see my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) smiling. I do not think we shall hear from him about coal oil. He is one of the distributors of the coal oil, and they are as much responsible for the high price of coal oil in the North-west as anybody else. My hon. friend has about 20 cents on every gallon of coal oil he sells: and yet he is a friend not only of the Government, but of those who properly talk so much about the burdensome and extravagant duty. Mr. Casey was also eloquent upon the subject. He said that the oil producers in the west were ringsters and combinesters. The duty on petroleum he declared to be a protection of 150 per cent, which was outrageous and should be cut down at least one-half. Now, what is the result of all this now? The duty is reduced from 6 to 5 cents per gallon on the refined and from 3 cents to 2½ cents per gallon on the crude. The duty of 6 cents a gallon, which was hitherto enforced, the Liberals declared to be a protection of 100 per cent, and a measure of extortion which the late Government allowed the combines to practise on the people at large. But now they have a protection of from 80 to 85 per cent in the shape of 5 cents per gallon. I spoke a short time ago about the mesmeric influence of polite society on my Patron friend, who wanted to interject something that was not a point of order. I should like to know whether the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has mesmerized his colleagues and the Government and converted them to his views on this subject. I hope that on Tuesday next, as the result of the ventilation of these things in this House, we shall see coal oil on the free list in the revised tariff which is to be brought before us, or else greatly reduced. I hope, above all, that we shall see lumber on the free list, which, the other day, I moved should be put on that list. Sir, that duty upon lumber is a fearful impost on settlers in those prairies out west. All you have to do, when you have 20 per cent upon lumber, is to divide the cost of a farm house on these vast prairies by five, and the quotient gives you what is paid into the treasury by the farmer. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) told us in his speech in the rink at Winnipeg how this duty pressed heavily on the farmers. He knows well that there is a combine not far from Winnipeg, and I hope we shall have his influence in the direction in which I am now pleading. There is a gentleman in this House who is no longer capable of taking part in our debates, owing to his high office, but who, in other years, eloquently discoursed upon the necessity of

reducing the duty upon the cheaper cottons. Well, Sir, that duty has not been decreased but increased by this tariff. With regard to those cheaper cottons, I have also urged the Government to lower the tariff. But we have a stronger support than the hon. gentleman I have mentioned, who is not in the Government, we have one of the Ministers themselves, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, we all know, with his unmeasured power of eloquent vituperation, branded these duties upon the necessaries of life as legalized robbery, and used still stronger expressions than my limited power of enunciation would enable me to get round—all denunciatory of the very men, of whom the tariff of this Government is in the interest, as much as any tariff could well be. I hope we shall see implements on the free list or at least the duty reduced. I am not going to move a motion because we have the declarations of those hon. gentlemen that they are going to stand by the Government through thick and thin. They have left the independent position of Patrons, they have taken up their position, not on a Patron but on a Liberal base, as thick and thin supporters of the Government; and what their conduct means is this, that on every Patron in this House, Ichabod is written. Their glory is departed, their usefulness is gone, they can effect nothing. The principles they undertook, the pledges they made, the promises they scattered broadcast over the western prairies, and on the strength of which they were elected—all these are now obliterated and trodden under foot by these men who came here—I was about to say on false pretences, but will refrain from doing so—and who have falsified their promises and pledges in a way that it is depressing to contemplate, that is degrading to parliamentary life and injurious to the country.

#### FAST STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. WALLACE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I understood the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his reply to the leader of the Opposition, to say that the Government had no intimation from the Imperial Government regarding the trans-Atlantic service. I would like to ask whether they have had any communication from Mr. Peterson, of Newcastle, with regard to the signing of the contract. I would like to ask, also, whether there is any ground for the rumour that has been circulated that Mr. Peterson, of Peterson, Tate & Company, of Newcastle, the gentleman who contracted for these steamships, is a German, and that the German Government is making up a portion of the subsidy required for the fast Atlantic service, and that in return the company will give preferential rates on German freight from Great Britain to Canada?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not heard of any such rumour, or that Mr. Peterson is a German. So far as I can recollect, he is a Scandinavian.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a Dane.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall make it my particular business to inquire whether Mr. Peterson has entered into a contract with Kaiser Wilhelm for the purpose of giving preferential rates, but I am afraid my hon. friend has been what, in vulgar parlance, is called stuffed. We have not received any communication from Mr. Peterson other than the report that everything is going satisfactorily.

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

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—

Collingwood Harbour—Improvement of. \$80,000

Mr. BENNETT. Before this item passes, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what the intention of the Government is with regard to a large contract which it is rumoured the Government is about to undertake. A short time ago, in answer to an inquiry, the hon. Minister of Public Works said that already the large sum of over one-quarter of a million dollars had been expended on the harbour of the town of Collingwood, and if rumour is right, a contract now for considerably over \$250,000 is to be let, or has been let, with the view of completing the work at that town. At the outset, I do not wish to be understood as remonstrating against an expenditure at the town of Collingwood in this regard. I fully realize the fact that, owing to the falling of the waters of Lake Huron, the people of Collingwood have been placed at a very manifest disadvantage. A large town of some 6,000 people is there. The people have considerable enterprise and public spirit, and it has been a most unfortunate thing for that town that by the receding of the waters the harbour which, at one time, had a good average depth of water, is now limited to some twelve or thirteen feet and utterly unnavigable by the large tonnage which now sails on the upper lakes. I do not wish to be understood as representing a selfish interest at all. While at the town of Midland we have unlimited depth of water, and although we are a rising town, we should be very loath to in any way endeavour to damage the interests of Collingwood by pursuing a dog-in-the-manger policy and forcing the trade of the upper lakes to centre at Midland, which it inevitably would be, were it not the policy of the Government to come to the assistance of the town of Collingwood. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House when in Opposition, were always very quick to condemn appropriations for

public buildings or harbour work on the ground that these were simply thrown out as a bait to capture constituencies. But if that was their cry in the past, what can they say of the present instance, where upwards of a quarter of a million dollars is to be expended in a single harbour, when, almost within shouting distance, is another harbour where hardly a single dollar is required to be expended. If it is the policy of the Government to place this large contract, I think it is only fair that the House should know what is the amount of the contemplated expenditure. The sum in the Estimates is \$80,000. The Minister, I think, will frankly admit that that is hardly half, perhaps not even one-third, of the contemplated expenditure. If the hon. Minister intends to undertake the work of deepening the harbour of Collingwood to the depth to which it should be deepened in order to accommodate the traffic of the upper lakes, I am informed the expenditure will considerably exceed a quarter of a million dollars. And while the Minister is generous in expending this large sum in one harbour, I trust that, though I have the honour to oppose the Government, he will extend his consideration to a harbour that requires only a trifling grant. The Minister was pleased to send a dredge to Midland to do some trifling work; but no sooner had that dredge got into the harbour and done one or two days' work, than, to our great amazement, it was ordered to leave the port and abandon the work which it had commenced. I think it is only fair to every constituency that, where public interest demands it, there should be a fair expenditure of money; and I am going to protest against the Minister fighting the town of Collingwood with a quarter of a million dollars against a town that requires but \$1,000, on the ground that it is not fair-play. If the Minister is going to act upon it as a principle that any constituency which may be pleased, as it has the right to do, to oppose this Government, is to be sat upon, then that fact had better at once be known. Now, as I said at the outset, I am not speaking to enter a protest against this large expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars in the town of Collingwood. But I rise to ask the Minister to give the committee information as to the extent of the estimated expenditure in Collingwood harbour, and furthermore, what will be the depth of the water to be attained at that port, when this work is completed. We should be told, also, whether the appropriation asked now is part of the total contract and if the contract when completed will give the harbour of Collingwood a depth of water that will accommodate the tonnage of the great lakes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to give my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) the information he seeks. We have entered into a contract with Messrs. Boon & Armstrong for a total amount of \$144,000. The

Mr. BENNETT.

work consists of dredging a channel 4,000 feet long, 2,000 feet in what I may call the outside harbour to be dredged to 20 feet, and 2,000 feet in the inside harbour to be dredged to 18 feet. I ask for the sum of \$80,000 this year, because that will be quite sufficient to pay for the operations of the present season. My engineers report to me that the completion of this contract will be quite sufficient to give to the harbour of Collingwood all the accommodation that it would require. Now, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is not altogether fair in his readiness to reproach me with being a partisan. Not very long ago the hon. gentleman called at my department and I frankly told him that in a few days a dredge would be working at Midland. I will repeat what I have already said in this House, that whenever it is reported to me, or whenever I find out that a work is necessary in the county which is not represented by a friend of the Government, that will make no difference.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the width of the trench that is to be 2,000 feet long?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will vary somewhat, but the average width will be 450 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not find fault with the promise of the hon. Minister that a dredge would be placed in Midland to do some work this summer. All I can say is that the dredge is not there yet, and what I did refer to is the fact that though the Minister last year gave me his word that certain work would be done at the town of Midland, no sooner was the dredge there and perhaps two days' work done, than, for reasons best known to himself, for reasons he has always been afraid to state to the House, the dredge was sent out of the harbour. I allege that this was done through political influence, and I have every reason to believe that the Minister acted on that occasion on political considerations. I trust that as an earnest that he has dismissed the idea of carrying out such a policy in the future, he will have the dredge in Midland this summer and do the trifling work that requires to be done there. The Minister has stated that the work would cost \$144,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the amount of the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. At the same time he tells us the nature of the work, I must confess that I regret to see that there should be such an immense amount of public money expended on what must seem to every hon. gentleman, if he realizes what is being done, a work of most trifling nature. The hon. Minister proposes to dredge a channel to a depth of 20 feet, 2,000 feet in length and about 150 yards in width. The Minister and the House must see that the Government are spending about \$150,000 to dig a trench to permit vessels to be towed in, because it is utterly impossible for sailing

vessels to sail in through such a channel. If ever there was an expenditure of public money that should call forth the condemnation of hon. gentlemen opposite—that is if they have been correct in their denunciations of public expenditures in the past—this is one, and more especially when the hon. Minister must admit that almost within hailing distance there is a natural harbour, the harbour of Midland, where there is a very large elevator, and on the other side, there is the town of Owen Sound with a natural harbour. Yet the hon. gentleman proposes to take \$150,000 to dig a trench to endeavour to permit vessels to come into the town of Collingwood, when he knows that it cannot possibly become a point for grain distribution, or handling of freights to any large extent. Of course, we all know the reason why it is done. The reason is, not on grounds of public policy, not because the town of Collingwood is to be accorded it as a matter of right, but simply because the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), as a powerful supporter of the Government, has demanded that it should be done. I am not condemning the Government for doing this work on behalf of the people of Collingwood, because the wharfs there are in sore straits, but I am saying this in order to show that these hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition were always ready to denounce an expenditure, no matter how trivial it was, simply as a bait, as an allurement, to constituencies to send representatives to support the then Administration. Yet, in face of all their past professions and promises, they are plunging this country to-day in an expenditure of \$150,000 simply to dig a trench, nothing more, and the Minister, I believe, knows that it does not at all come up to what the people of Collingwood asked for. I say that the people of Collingwood can never expect to have a good harbour there when they have nothing more or less than a trench 150 yards wide in which to tow vessels. Now, I want to ask the Minister this further question: Is there any understanding with the people of Collingwood, or with the representative of North Simcoe, that there is to be a further appropriation made so that the harbour, when completed, will at least present the appearance of a natural harbour, or is the Minister prepared to state that the Government does not stand pledged to do anything further than to dig this trench of 150 yards in width, at a cost of \$150,000?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Had the hon. gentleman known the facts of the case, he would not have spoken in the very unfair way that he has spoken. When I came into office I found that tenders had been asked for by the late Government, and plans had been prepared. Messrs. Boon & Armstrong were the lowest tenderers, for

the sum of \$144,000. Of course, the hon. gentleman is a better engineer than those that I have in my department, and he says this amount of money is excessive.

**Mr. BENNETT.** I did not say that.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I understood my hon. friend to say that this sum was only sufficient to dig a little trench. Well, as I said, I found plans had been prepared and tenders asked for; and the chief engineer of my department had reported that the tender of Boon & Armstrong was too low, that it could not be acted upon, and the Minister had accepted the advice of the engineer, and had decided not to accept Boon & Armstrong's tender because it was found to be too low. I sent back the cheques with the tenders. Later on Boon & Armstrong came to me and offered to change the conditions, and the chief engineer arranged to make the conditions as stringent as possible. They represented that they were quite able to do the work for the amount tendered, and although the chief engineer thought it was a very low price, I consented to give them the work, imposing, as I said, upon them very stringent conditions. I am glad to inform my hon. friend that they have placed the security to our credit in one of the banks of Canada, that all arrangements are completed, and that they are about to start work. Now my hon. friend finds that the width is not sufficient. I am sure that he knows that in many places in the St. Lawrence the width of the river is no broader than that, and still large vessels are able to pass up and down. I did not change the plans that I had found prepared. I found the tenders in my department, and after careful consideration I gave the contract to these gentlemen.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Now the Minister has not answered the very pertinent question that I put to him, namely, is it the intention of the department to limit the expenditure at Collingwood simply to the excavation of this trench?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The intention of the Government is first to carry out this work, and we shall see later on what to do.

**Mr. BENNETT.** That is the point to which I wish the Minister to commit himself. Now, I asked him to what further extent, after the expenditure of \$150,000 has been made, does he intend to saddle the country? Does he intend to carry out the pledges which have been made to the people of the town of Collingwood—because I understand that they have been assured that an expenditure will be made there of over a quarter of a million dollars. Now, I want the House and the country to understand where the Minister stands. He is asking us to-day to make him a grant of \$150,000, in round numbers. He proposes then to dig what is only a trench into

the port of Collingwood, and then next year, or some subsequent year, the Minister will come to the House and make his apologies, and say, It is quite true we have resolved to expend \$150,000, but now that we are doing the work it will be found to be totally inadequate to the requirements, and Parliament will no doubt be asked to vote another \$150,000 to complete the unfinished work. I point out this fact, that the Minister is only getting in the thin end of the wedge, and that, behind the curtain, there is no doubt a proposal to spend on this harbour, not only \$150,000, but a further proposition will be submitted which will involve an expenditure considerably over a quarter of a million. The hon. Minister of Public Works has already frankly stated that, in his opinion, a further expenditure would be necessary there.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
I never said that.

**Mr. BENNETT.** If the Minister will not give the House an assurance that a further expenditure will be made there beyond \$150,000 in dredging this trench, it will be utterly impossible for sailing vessels to come in unless they are towed in, and the hon. gentleman is aware that a large carrying trade on the upper lakes is by sailing vessels. The Minister will then have sunk there, if he makes no further expenditure, \$150,000. I am rather inclined to hold the opinion that the Minister is doing exactly what a short time ago he intimated he would do, namely, spend \$150,000 this year and during next and subsequent years, come down to Parliament and ask for further grants in this regard. I should like to ask the Minister this further question: Has an application been made by the contractors, Boon & Armstrong, under which their plant and dredges will be admitted from the United States free of duty?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
No, there has been no arrangement of the kind. Of course, they will supply their own plant.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Has the request been made that this plant should be admitted free of duty?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
I have no knowledge that any request of this kind has been made. In regard to the trench, as the hon. gentleman describes it, it is accepted by the people of Collingwood as a proposition that is satisfactory to them. What I stated was this—that the average width of the dredging to be done was about 450 feet, but inside of the harbour the width would be about 600 feet.

**Mr. BENNETT.** That is the basin.

**Mr. BENNETT.**

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
Yes. The work is under contract now, and no further agreement has been entered into between the Government and other parties.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is the amount to be given towards the work by the Grand Trunk Railway and also by the town of Collingwood? The Minister has stated that the late Government decided to ask for tenders for this work. One of the conditions was that a certain sum was to be contributed by the Grand Trunk Railway and another sum by the town of Collingwood, and there was no undertaking entered into by the Government that even then they would enter into a contract. Is the Minister aware that a report was made by the marine officer, by an officer of the Imperial service in the employ of this Government, in which he showed that within any reasonable expenditure it would be impossible to make a harbour at Collingwood? Is the hon. Minister aware of that fact?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
I understand there has been a report made by an engineer; but, at the same time, I have in my own department engineers in whom I have confidence. They have prepared plans and have made careful examinations in regard to the practicability of the work. I may have acted wrongly in carrying out a plan which was adopted by the Conservative Government. I hope, however, I have not been misled. Since the acceptance of the plan by the town of Collingwood, I have not entered into any arrangement with other parties.

**Mr. BENNETT.** I desire to ask if the Controller of Customs has had any application made by the contractors, Boon & Armstrong, asking that the dredging plant for the work at Collingwood be admitted free of duty, and if there is any communication in the department in relation thereto?

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson).** I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman a definite answer. My impression is that some applications have been made, but where the works were situated or who were the parties mentioned, I cannot at present recall. If the hon. gentleman desires, I can obtain the information for him.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The hon. Minister of Public Works can surely give the committee accurate information as to the amounts to be given by the town of Collingwood and the Grand Trunk Railway.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
There has been no arrangement made. We have entered into a contract for \$144,000; there is no arrangement made beyond that.

**Mr. BENNETT.** In the event of Boon & Armstrong making a request that their dredges and plant should be admitted free of duty from the United States to perform this work, can the Controller of Customs express an opinion as to whether he will assent to their request or not. It would be grossly unfair to do so when there are Canadian dredges on the upper lakes that are private property.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The hon. gentleman surely does not desire me to express an opinion on a subject which I do not know as having been before me or not. I will, however, look into the matter and make inquiries.

Committee rose, and the Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

### ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Mr. Speaker,

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. **SPEAKER** informed the House that the Governor General had been pleased to give in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

An Act for the relief of Adeline Myrtle Tuckett Lawry.

An Act respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company, Limited.

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

An Act to incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.

An Act respecting the Canadian General Electric Company, Limited.

An Act to confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.

An Act respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.

An Act granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$26,000, required for defraying certain expenses of the Militia contingent to be sent to England for the Jubilee of Her Majesty in June, 1897.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

**Mr. SPROULE.** I must take some exception to part of what was said by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) about the expenditure in the town of Collingwood, on account of there being other good harbours in close proximity to it. It is true that there are other good harbours in the Georgian Bay not far from the town of Collingwood, and where the expenditure of public money is needed from time to time; but it is also true that the town of Collingwood is one of the live towns on the Georgian Bay. The residents of that town have expended a large amount of money on the harbour, and they have three lines of steamers chiefly owned by themselves. They have the largest abattoir and meat packing establishment in the Dominion of Canada, and the lake trade in that town is very large and is increasing every year. Now, for some years past, owing to the falling of the water, it has been impossible for the people of the town to do their trade satisfactorily or profitably, because vessels when more than half laden were unable to get into the dock. I confess that I for one think the Government are doing right in making this expenditure. I think perhaps they might have gone a little further, and given an outline of the work that is to be done there, and ascertain what assistance the town is prepared to give, because I understood that an offer was made by the town a year or two ago, that in the event of the Government undertaking this work, the residents of the town would contribute \$15,000, and the Grand Trunk Railway \$10,000, which would make \$25,000. I wish to ask the Minister (Mr. Tarte) if that \$25,000 is to be included in this \$144,000 for which the contract has been let.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
No.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I am quite sure it will take a larger expenditure than this to make the harbour what it should be, and I have no doubt but that the Minister will take care that he will avail himself of the offer made by the town and the railway company, and have it included in the next expenditure he proposes there. While I think the channel is not as wide as it should be,

it will at least enable vessels that are owned there to carry on the trade. There was a very urgent necessity for this work. The town required it, the country generally required it, and the trade of the town could not be properly carried on without it. It is not by any means, money thrown away. I know that my constituents are largely interested in the town of Collingwood because many of them do their trade there, and the same remark would apply to all south of the Georgian Bay. I am quite sure that if the Minister undertakes to complete the work, though it may require a large amount of money, he will be justified in making that expenditure, because the importance of the trade of the place is entitled to it.

Mr. WALLACE. This is only part of the scheme to make Collingwood harbour a good harbour, and I think it very necessary that the money should be expended, and expended judiciously, but the Minister should give the House an outline of the work. As I know from my visit there, the harbour itself requires deepening on account of the falling away of the water, and on account of the larger class of vessels that are now navigating the upper lakes. Would the Minister explain what the whole programme of the improvements comprises?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry not to be in the position to give more information. I have had a good deal of communication with the mayor, and the city council, and the people of Collingwood, and I have had several interviews with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I understood from the people of Collingwood that these improvements would be sufficient for the time being.

Mr. WALLACE. Does that complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that by any means. I say that it is considered as sufficient for the time being.

Mr. WALLACE. They are deepening the channel going in. When they get into the harbour would they not require to deepen the harbour so as to accommodate these larger vessels? The navigation way that was sufficient ten or fifteen years ago, is not sufficient under the present circumstances when there are larger vessels trading on the lakes than formerly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite understand that, and the work we are now doing is precisely what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) points out. The first part of the work is the dredging of 2,000 feet outside the harbour to a depth of twenty feet, and then we dredge on the inside of the harbour to eighteen feet.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that this work which is now in progress, and which I believe has been contracted for, is to do

Mr. SPROULE.

all that is proposed or required to be done in the harbour. The town, and the railway company interested in the town, agreed to give \$25,000 towards that work, and an arrangement was entered into by the late Government to the effect that if the town and the railway company would give the \$25,000, the Government would supply whatever sum further was required in order to make a complete and perfect job.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister says the town is giving none of this money.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not any part of the \$80,000, but the town is giving \$25,000 towards the total sum.

Mr. SPROULE. \*I asked was the \$25,000 included in the contract which amounts to \$140,000, and I understood the Minister to say "no."

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not in the House at the time. When the town of Collingwood pressed for these improvements some four or five years ago, the late Government sent an engineer to Collingwood and had an estimate made of what it would require and what it would cost. In January last year the Government called for tenders for that work as specified by their engineer. Tenders were received, but owing to the fact that no money was granted during the session of 1896 the work was not awarded. The matter thus stood when the change of Administration took place, and the result was that one of the tenderers, Messrs. Boon and Armstrong, tendered at a much lower sum than the Government engineer estimated, and the contract was awarded to the firm for about \$140,000. I understand also, that the town are to contribute towards that the balance of the \$25,000 which they have not already spent. During the summer or spring of 1896, a certain sum was spent under an arrangement made with the Government that that amount should be credited on the \$25,000 which the town and the railway company agreed to give between them. The balance of that, I understand the town is prepared to hand over to the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the Minister should take advantage of their offer and have it included, because it would be a saving of so much money. They are quite willing and ready to give it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite prepared to take it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Public Works has failed to state to the House, what must be the most important question in the whole matter, and that is: What is his intention to do in reference to Collingwood harbour. He tells the House frankly that he proposes in the coming season, and under the present contract, to make the channel of a certain width, 450 feet. He

tells us that outside it is to be eighteen feet, and then when he comes inside the harbour, he is to give a basin of twenty feet deep. A little while ago, the Minister so to speak, poked fun at me on my knowledge of engineering. To that, my answer is, that I do not assume to know anything about engineering, but I think it would be sagacious advice to the Minister and perhaps to his department, to have the deep water outside and the shallow water inside.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me tell the Minister something. Collingwood harbour is at the bottom of a bay which has a sweep of over 100 miles from the North-west when the wind blows in that direction, and it is better that the outside should have deep water than the inside.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that surely. If I did not, I must have made a slip of the tongue.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad that the deep water is to be at the outside. But if the Minister is not going to avail himself of the joint contribution of the Grand Trunk Company and the town of Collingwood of \$25,000, it must be that he anticipates an expenditure of more than \$150,000 to make a good job of the whole work, and it is evident that he is going to hold that in reserve. As I said at the outset, I am not opposing this grant on the ground of the amount involved, because I believe the town of Collingwood ought to receive sympathy and consideration from the Dominion Government. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that it is an enterprising town; and if Parliament is to be asked to assist the town, it should be told what is to be the extent of the assistance, and then it will know whether it should grant the assistance or not. No other town would be accorded such a very large grant for an uncompleted work, particularly under the circumstances. It is simply making a rival harbour to two harbours nearly adjoining it, which I take it is due to the great influence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with the Minister of Public Works. I have no objection to a grant being made to help the town of Collingwood, because I believe it should be helped. But it is the duty of the Minister to give Parliament the details of what expenditure he is prepared to assume for the town. The House will then be responsible, if it undertakes an expenditure of over a quarter of a million dollars for that harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said over and over again that I have entered into a contract for \$144,000. I have said that there is no other agreement, and that I do not anticipate any other ex-

penditure, and have not been requested to make any other.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the hon. gentleman has shifted his ground.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am obliged to my hon. friend from the adjoining riding for the compliment he has paid to my influence; but I am afraid that it is not altogether deserved. This work was undertaken when I certainly had not any influence with the preceding Administration, for the purpose, I think, of weakening any little influence I might have in my constituency. Most urgent and pressing efforts were made to have this work undertaken, and I certainly had not a word to say against it. But I found matters in this position when the Government changed, that the work had been proposed, that tenders had been called for, that the tenders were then lying in the Public Works Department, and that one of the tenders, since accepted and embodied in a contract, was for \$144,000. I found the present Minister of Public Works hesitating as to whether, with the information he had from his engineer of the cost of the work, it would be safe or prudent to let it for that lesser sum. But ultimately, after full inquiry and investigation, the Minister became satisfied that he could in the public interest safely make a contract for \$144,000, being some \$60,000 less than the estimated cost. As I understand the matter the proposition was that this work would be a completed work, and that when this contract is performed nothing more will be required for the Collingwood harbour, so far as can be seen at present. In consideration of that, the town was willing, with the assistance of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to contribute \$25,000. The arrangement I understood, was that whatever the cost should be the town was willing to pay \$25,000; and if the cost is \$144,000, the country will have to pay that amount less the \$25,000, or to be strictly accurate, that portion of the \$25,000 which has not yet been expended. During the spring of 1896 the necessities of the harbour were such that the then Minister of Public Works authorized the corporation to expend \$2,000 or \$3,000 on work required to be done immediately, on the understanding that that sum was to be credited to the \$25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the Minister has made the further statement now that this is to be regarded as a complete and total work, and that he will not come to Parliament in a future session and ask for a large further grant, I have only to say that it will be a matter of deep regret and mortification to the people of the town of Collingwood, who have been led to understand, as I gather from conversations with gentlemen from that town and from reading the files of their newspapers, that they were to have a work of a large and a substan-

tial nature. I can tell the Minister frankly that a depth of eighteen feet of water will not place the harbour of Collingwood in a position to compete with either Midland or Owen Sound for the grain trade of the west, from Port Arthur and Duluth. At present we have vessels coming into Midland carrying as much as 130,000 bushels of grain, and eighteen feet of water is not sufficient to accommodate them.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened to this discussion with a great deal of interest, because this matter was before the late Government for some time. In the first place, I want to ask my hon. friend, if, as it appears, the \$80,000 is voted for 1897-98, and that there is no corresponding appropriation for the preceding year, whether any preceding vote for Collingwood harbour was made for this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there was a vote of \$25,000 charged to capital account. I think there was some debate last year on the same ground.

Mr. FOSTER. I was inclined to dispute the accuracy of that statement. I quite remember the debate. The estimates, as they were brought down, proposed to vote these items and some others on capital account. The debate arose as to why these should be charged to capital account whilst all other similar appropriations were charged to the consolidated fund, and it ended with the Minister of Trade and Commerce advising and the Finance Minister accepting the advice, to transfer it from capital account and charge it to the consolidated fund. My own impression is that when we came to that agreement, it was struck out from the capital account, but was not afterwards charged to the consolidated fund, so that there was really no vote of money for Collingwood harbour in the Supply Bill. What I want to call attention to is this: My hon. friend led me to think that what he was doing by this vote of \$140,000 was simply making an entrance to the harbour, but I have mistaken entirely the whole trend of the communications which extended over four or five years between the town of Collingwood and the Government, if the entrance to the harbour was all they required. It seems to me they had two objects in view; in the first place, a deeper and a better harbour; and in the second place, a deeper entrance to that harbour.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand the work was, just as the hon. gentleman says, intended to be, not merely the entrance to the harbour, but the harbour itself, and it is for this whole work that the contract was let.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is so.

Mr. FOSTER. This contract does not make a complete work.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, it is all the work which the Government engineer thought was necessary, both inside and outside.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the Grand Trunk Railway, also. They saw the plans.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows better about the present condition than I did. He and his department ought to know whether or not this expenditure of \$140,000 will complete the whole work in Collingwood harbour, or whether it is simply the entrance.

Mr. McCARTHY. It will do the very work you called for by your invitation to tender which was sent out in January, 1896. That tender is now being embodied into a contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are absolutely the same.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite understand that, but the impression I wish to have confirmed or dispelled is this, that no matter whether contracts were called for or not for this very work by the preceding Government, this is not the whole work, but simply the entrance. I understood from the hon. Minister that this would not complete the work, but that what was required to be done afterwards would have to be looked into afterwards.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I meant to say was this: Suppose in ten years or twenty years more, there should be more accommodation required, that would be looked into.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes that matter clear. But my hon. friend will admit that he should not lead the House into a large expenditure for an initial work without taking the House into his confidence as to the cost of the whole work. My own opinion was that the preceding tender was more a tentative tender to find out what the actual cost would be, and it was not carried out because we had not the money voted. It was not proposed to put that tender into execution until we had the authorization of Parliament in a vote. That, I think, is a fair principle to go upon. Here you are simply coming down and saying you want from this Parliament \$140,000. On being asked what for, you reply: Well, my engineers have looked into this thing, they have made me a recommendation, and I have undertaken, in the name of the Government, a contract calling for an expenditure of \$140,000, not one dollar of which is voted. My hon. friend will find that that is a very bad rule, especially in large expenditures. Parliament should be left unfettered and it is the right of Parliament to demand that before a Government binds a country by a contract, Parliament should be called upon to give its adhesion to the

scheme and vote the money for carrying it out.

An essential part of this bargain all the way through, and of the negotiations, was the co-operation of the Grand Trunk Railway and the town of Collingwood. It was freely offered by them and accepted as the basis of the negotiation, and I was very sorry to see my hon. friend ignore it. I think he will find that the records of his department will confirm this statement, and he should see that that aid is got from the town of Collingwood and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. McCARTHY. The town raised the money for it. They passed a by-law.

Mr. FOSTER. While we had no vote in the spring of 1896, the work was urgent, so we said to the people of Collingwood: If you will allow a portion of your contributions to go to this work, on which we have no money now to expend, that work can be done and paid for out of your money.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a very distinct recollection of the application of the town of Collingwood. The Government contended that it would cost more than the town thought it would cost. The town said \$150,000 will do all the work we required: and if you will do the work, as we have it mapped out by our engineer, we will contribute \$25,000. The town did this. What they asked then was that the outside channel should be 400 feet wide and eighteen feet deep, and that the inside channel should be 600 feet wide and twenty feet deep. That is the way the contract was let and that was regarded as the complete work, which they would be quite satisfied with. That is all they expected and for which they were prepared to give their money.

Rainy River..... \$20,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is days' work.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the whole work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible to give exact amounts as to the cost of the work, for the work consists mainly in removing large boulders. Before we do any more work, I must have a complete survey made.

Mr. FOSTER. From what vote has the hon. gentleman paid for the work that is being done now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Out of the vote of last year. I do not remember what the amount of the vote was.

Mr. FOSTER. It is misleading that you have not that in the parallel column.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that it was charged to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. It was in the Estimates, but do I understand it was not in the Supply Bill?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I remember quite well that we changed the item from income to capital. I have the Supply Bill here, and I will send it across to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. I see that is so. Then, the instructions of the House were not carried out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not my fault.

Mr. FOSTER. No, that is not your fault.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister's reason for doing this by days' labour and not by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is almost impossible to do such work under tender. There are boulders here and boulders there. It is a work which has to be done with great care, and that is the reason why I sent one of the officers of my own department. I might have found a good man there, but I thought it better to send one of the officers who are under our immediate supervision.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask, with reference to the work at Owen Sound harbour, for which \$35,000 is asked, is that under contract, and if so, who are the contractors?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredging at Owen Sound is done by a dredge which we engage so much an hour—\$8 per hour, which is the usual price that we pay for the dredges that we have to secure from outside parties.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister has not answered the other part of the question. Perhaps I might ask him further: Is this dredge the property of Mr. John A. Barron and of Dr. Horsey, son-in-law of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald)?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the dredge is the property of a company.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not the hon. Minister aware that Contractor John A. Barron and Contractor Horsey, who, I may say, is the defeated candidate in North Grey, are the owners of the dredge that has this contract at this princely rate of pay? Were tenders called for in this case?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We never ask for tenders in such cases, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) looks at the record of past transactions, he will find that I am paying the same rate as has always been paid. My officers informed me that there was only one name known in connection with the company, that of

Mr. Canan. We have a clerk of works who looks after the work of this dredge and makes reports.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

#### FAST ATLANTIC SS. SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Before we proceed with the business of the evening, I may mention for the information of the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we did receive, this afternoon, a formal communication from Her Majesty's Government to the effect that they approved of the arrangements for the fast Atlantic line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) in a position to say, generally, what the terms of the arrangement are?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The arrangements are those, substantially, which were previously communicated to the House. An offer was made by the Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Company to perform the fast Atlantic service at a stipulated speed rather exceeding twenty knots per hour, say 500 knots per day, from port to port. This is to be done in consideration of \$500,000 a year to be paid by us, and \$250,000 or thereabouts to be paid by Her Majesty's Government. Of course, I will, at the earliest moment, lay on the Table the contract and details.

#### THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell, for Mr. Macdonell.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell, for Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell, for Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison, for Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Minden and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell.) Title changed to "The Minden and Muskoka Railway Company."—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Mr. TARTE.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule, for Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 80) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Sun Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

#### RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RAILWAY.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Hamilton) for second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.

Mr. McALISTER. I wish to state that I received a telegram yesterday from the warden of the municipal council of the county of Restigouche.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that he has already spoken on this question.

Mr. McALISTER. I was simply going to read the telegram. At the close of a special meeting of the municipal council, held at Dalhousie, the warden sent me a telegram, as follows:—

Special meeting of Restigouche Council to-day. Resolution unanimously passed that Bill respecting Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company and Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company do not pass.

That is merely the telegram; the resolutions will be prepared and forwarded in a few days. I ask that this Bill be not further proceeded with until the resolutions come to hand. There will be a joint meeting of the two municipal councils of Bonaventure and Restigouche counties either at the end of this week or at the beginning of next.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it only reasonable that my hon. friend's request be complied with, and that this Bill stand over until the hon. gentleman receives further information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is evident that a Bill like this can be considered much better in committee than here. The hon. gentleman who proposed the Bill has generously said that he does not want to block Bills behind it, and the leader of the Opposition will see that details had better be considered in committee than on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### RESTIGOUCHE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. CAMPBELL (for Mr. Domville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.

Mr. McALISTER. Explain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Full explanations will be given in the Railway Committee, and it is certainly better that objections should be taken and discussed there rather than in the House on the motion for second reading.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will hardly be able to do that. The explanation should be given on the second reading, and the promoter of the Bill should be here to explain it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). This is a Bill connected with the Bill which has just passed its second reading. It is to make connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McALISTER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) state where this connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. gentleman says. I am not acquainted with the details of this Bill but I am safe in saying that the work proposed to be authorized will, if constructed, connect with the Intercolonial Railway on one side of the river and with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway on the other. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood Hamilton) desires that this Bill should pass to the second reading, and I apprehend that there will be no public interest jeopardized if it were referred to the Railway Committee. The whole matter can be fully discussed there.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### DOMINION SAFE DEPOSIT AND TRUSTS COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Gibson) moved second reading of Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).

Mr. WALLACE. I would take objection to the second reading of the Bill, from the fact that the proposal is to change the name of the company to the "Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company." This Parliament has already chartered a company called the Dominion Deposit Company, and I think such a conflict of names should not be allowed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The name could be altered in committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the names conflict it is not likely that the committee would pass the Bill under this name. I quite agree that in the case of a company such as this, the greatest care should be taken not to have conflicting names. If the Bill be allowed to go to committee, we will have evidence as to the companies existing under similar names, and we can change the name of this company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BENNETT. Relative to the grant of \$35,000 for dredging at the port of Owen Sound, before six o'clock I asked the Minister of Public Works who the contractors for this work are, and also the manner in which the work was being performed. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to inform the House that the work was being done by a firm of contractors at \$8 an hour. I then asked the Minister who this firm were, and asked if Mr. John A. Barron and Dr. Horsey were members of it, and the hon. gentleman assured me that the only person he knew in the firm was a Mr. Canan. May I ask the Minister if the work is being done by a joint stock company, or if he is aware of the presence of Mr. Barron and Dr. Horsey in the contracting company; and if there is a written contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The name of the firm in the department is the Canan, Sadler Company.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Minister if Mr. Sadler is known to him as being Mr. Sadler of Lindsay; and furthermore, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has ever been interviewed in reference to the work that has been done this year by Mr. Barron as a member of that firm or on behalf of that firm?

Mr. CAMPBELL. And suppose he has?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) wants to know, "suppose he has." All I wish to know is, if Mr. Barron and Dr. Horsey are of the firm, and if there

is nothing wrong about it then there is no reason for suppressing the fact if these gentlemen are in the firm.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Is it a limited company?

Mr. BENNETT. I have asked the Minister that and he has not been able to inform me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether it is a limited company or not. The only thing I know is we have secured a dredge from the Canan, Sadler Company, and the same dredge has been employed by my department for the last eight or ten years under the very same conditions.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it dredge No. 9, please?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes..

Mr. CLARKE. Have any tenders been called for this work which is to cost \$35,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No tenders were asked. We are just doing the work by the hour, as I have said.

Mr. BENNETT. I must ask the Minister to please be good enough to answer the question: Is Mr. John A. Barron a member of that concern?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot really say whether he is a member of that firm or not.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, then, can the hon. Minister state whether there is any correspondence on file in his department; or has there been any personal interviews between himself and Mr. Barron as representing this company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember that Mr. Barron ever represented himself as one of the firm. He may have spoken to me about the work, but I really do not remember that he has ever said to me that he was a member of the firm. I do not remember either whether there is any correspondence with Mr. Barron. If my hon. friend asks me for the correspondence, I will gladly bring it down.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand from the drift of the statements of the hon. Minister, Mr. Barron saw him in reference to the contract being performed by this company at Owen Sound, and the question was, no doubt, in his mind whether or not Mr. Barron represented himself to be a member of the firm. Do I understand the Minister to assent to the statement that Mr. Barron has seen him on one or more occasions in reference to this contract being performed by this firm?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope my hon. friend will not put in my mouth words which I did not use. I have

Mr. BENNETT.

said that I do not remember whether or not Mr. Barron spoke to me about this. He is a friend of mine, and he may have spoken to me about it, but I really do not remember now.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there two dredges engaged—one at number 9 and one at number 4, or only one at number 9?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only one dredge is now engaged.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there an overseer who keeps track of the time the dredge is working, entirely independent of the company that is doing the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The man engaged by us is a Mr. Ross. He has been recommended to me.

Mr. SPROULE. He is appointed by your department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and we have given a great deal of attention to the work. We have required reports as frequently as possible.

Harbours and Rivers—Manitoba..... \$11,500

Mr. DAVIN. I would like some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote for general repairs and improvements is the vote we take every year. We cannot say in advance where the money will be spent. As to the wharves on Lake Winnipeg, they are not yet located. We intend to have surveys with the view of locating them.

Dredging ..... \$218,000

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister be good enough to tell us how many dredges we have now available?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have nineteen dredges in different parts of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are they distributed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five in Ontario, five in Quebec, six in the maritime provinces, one in British Columbia, and one in Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. Are any of these dredges in the Georgian Bay now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have one at Collingwood.

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if we may expect a dredge at Campbellton on the Restigouche this year, to complete what has been done there. A dredge was sent there early last season after navigation opened, but it was removed before the work was completed, and unless it is sent there again soon, the work that has been done will be practically of little use.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately I cannot extend any hope to my hon. friend. As he knows numerous calls are made upon us, and we cannot comply with one-tenth of them. I am very sorry I cannot do better with the number of dredges we have.

Mr. McALISTER. I may say that the port of Campbellton is one of the most important ports on the north shore; and any person acquainted with the place will know that the facilities we have are far from adequate to the requirements of the place. The price that lumber has brought in the last few years has been so low that unless it is handled with a great deal of skill and economy, it is impossible to make it pay. As we are situated there, vessels cannot get in to the wharfs, and sometimes, when loaded, they have to remain several days before going out, from the fact that the bar is outside of the loading ground, and they can only get out at the spring tides. Last season the dredge dredged a part of that bar, and the work should be completed. I do not think there is any place in the maritime provinces more needful in this respect at present. At the port of Dalhousie, at the mouth of the harbour, the sand is accumulating around the public wharf, and vessels cannot be got in, and I think if at all possible the dredge should be sent there also.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer has taken a note of what my hon. friend has said. I quite realize the importance of the work, but the hon. gentleman will understand that it is impossible to comply with all the demands.

Mr. McALISTER. There are six dredges for the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is one at Prince Edward Island, two working in the St. John harbour, which is a very important and urgent work, and three in Nova Scotia. We gave my hon. friend three months of dredging last year and must give other places a show.

Mr. McALISTER. The way the current runs in this harbour, the bar is filling in constantly, and in a very short time what has been dredged will be filled in again. In the spring, when the river is high, earth and other material running down lodge in the cut, the channel will fill in again unless the cut is made clear through.

Mr. DAVIN. Why has the appropriation for Manitoba been reduced by \$1,800 as compared with last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer tells me that the \$1,800 of last year was to cover work that had been done and had not been paid for, so that the appropriation is still the same.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Where is the dredge in Prince Edward Island going to work during the coming season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Charlottetown first, and Summerside afterwards.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that some dredging was done at the breakwater at Souris, two seasons ago, but the work was not completed, and the dredge was to have returned the following spring. The dredge was required there to make the work already done of service and enable the breakwater to be fully used. I hope the hon. Minister will see his way clear to send her there, after she has got through with the western portion of the island, if not sooner. There was also some dredging promised me at Murray River and elsewhere. The latter is becoming quite a central shipping place, and as there is hardly sufficient water there to enable shipping to get backwards and forwards, a little dredging is much required. The hon. gentleman will find in his department a petition from the people of that section some years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I had the dredges, I would do all the dredging required, but I cannot comply with all the demands made upon us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many of these dredges are employed in the maritime provinces?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many are to be used in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three, one in Guysborough county, the other at Liverpool, and the other at Yarmouth.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will they be employed at these places the entire season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where does the hon. gentleman propose to employ them afterwards?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer tells me that our programme is not yet mapped out for Nova Scotia. We have work to do there now, and later on will decide what to do next.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has any call been made for dredging the port of Halifax?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think I received any petition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the vicinity of the new railway wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps some petition was sent to the Railway Department, but it has not come to my attention.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will not be unmindful of Lunenburg, but will see that the dredging which is absolutely required is done there. It is the most important of the dredging required in Nova Scotia, and judging by the smile on the hon. gentleman's face I should say he contemplates sending a dredge there early in the season. I might mention another work in my county, which is also important, and that is the crooked channel, at the La Have Islands at the mouth of La Have River. It is a channel which is much needing dredging, for at every low tide boats are compelled to go out into rough water at great risk to the occupants. It is a work that should have been attended to some time ago. I give the hon. Minister an invitation to the county of Lunenburg. If he comes there we will treat him well and endeavour to show him how very important is the work I am speaking of, and how necessary it is that it should be attended to as the first after Lunenburg and Mahone Bay are cared for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As a matter of fact, I intend making a tour of the maritime provinces and gladly accept the kind invitation of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it be convenient for the hon. gentleman to have some dredging done at Thornbury and Meaford? There was some dredging done at Meaford, year after year, but the work is not yet finished, and a dredge would be only required there a week or two to finish the work which is very much needed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that it be sent not too late in the season, because in the fall it is not so handy for a dredge to do the work as in the summer.

Mr. MARTIN. On the south side of Prince Edward Island, the harbours of Murray River, Wood Islands and Vernon River Bridge require dredging. Those harbours were to have been attended to some years ago. Last year the intention was to attend to this work, but the dredge went to Charlottetown and Crapaud instead. I hope that when the hon. Minister is making his tour of the maritime provinces, he will visit Prince Edward Island, and I tender to him, on behalf of the people, a very hearty welcome. When he visits that province, I think he will be disposed to be a little more generous, especially with regard to those works to which I call his attention.

Mr. GILLIES. I would draw the hon. Minister's attention to a work much

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

required in my county at Fourchu Harbour, a place on the confines of the two counties of Cape Breton and Richmond. The hon. Minister is aware, from the information furnished him by myself and by the officers of his department, of the great importance and necessity of having that work done. It is a point, as the hon. Minister knows, of very great consequence to the people in that part of the country. It is a work which, when once completed, will be of a permanent character. There is no danger of it filling up, because the mud there is of such a character that when once the channel is made, it will be kept open by the running stream between the ocean and the harbour. If the hon. Minister will consult his officers, and particularly his chief engineer, he will bear out what I have said and will, to a word, corroborate my statement in this regard. A dredge was sent there the year before last, and did some excellent work. Last year the dredge was sent there and did further work, but was sent out post-haste to another county at a very important stage of the work. But when I represented the matter to the Minister of Public Works, he was good enough to have the dredge sent back, but she was again taken away before the work was completed. There are full plans of the work in the hon. gentleman's department. The cost will be very moderate, and it is very important and will be permanent. The dredge was taken away from there and sent to Larry's River, Guysborough county, though the work there is not as important, nor of such public requirement as that at Fourchu. Larry's River is surrounded by harbours, whereas Fourchu has no harbour on the east nearer than Louisburg, which is more than twenty-five miles away, and on the west, St. Peter's, which is fifty miles away. I trust that when the dredge completes her work there she will be sent to Fourchu to complete the work that has been begun there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that to complete the work my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) is speaking of, would require three months. As soon as I find time to do that work, I will gladly do it.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the Minister if I may expect the dredge to be sent there some time during the present season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot speak positively, but my chief engineer tells me that he hopes to be able to send the dredge there this season.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I wish to call the attention of the Minister to changes in the staff of the dredge "Canada." Some time ago my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who is absent from the House to-day, put some questions to the Ministry as

to the reasons for the dismissal of Captain Mackenzie from this dredge. If I remember well the reply of the hon. Minister of Public Works was that the captain was not dismissed, that this was an annual appointment and that he was not reappointed. I would like to call attention to the facts of the case, which do not quite agree with that answer. Captain Mackenzie was appointed, I believe, some time in the autumn of 1896. He had no reason to believe that his appointment was an annual one. I understand that the practice in connection with these dredges has been that in the fall, when the season's work is completed, the crew are paid off except the engineer and captain, who, I understand, are retained and continue in charge of the dredge and continue to receive their salaries. In 1896 the crew of the dredge "Canada" were paid off at Liverpool, N.S., and the captain and the engineer remained in the dredge all winter. Repairs were being carried on, and these officers continued regularly in the service of the department, and were on the pay-roll of the department. But, without notice, on the 21st of April, I think, just the day after the local election in Nova Scotia, Captain Mackenzie received peremptory notice dismissing him, without any explanation whatever. It would seem that the Minister had not been correctly informed in his reply given to the House, because I think there can be no question about the fact of the captain remaining in the dredge all winter engaged in repairs, and not dismissed until the 21st April, when the dredge was about to begin work, and when, as Captain Mackenzie might suppose, his position was sure for another year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The facts as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Bell, Pictou) are, I believe, about right. It has been the rule, or perhaps it would be better to say the habit of the Department of Public Works to keep the engineer and captain of a dredge, or one of them, as caretaker, but at half pay. When the time came this year to engage a captain for the dredge "Canada," I thought it was quite permissible for me to engage another man than Mr. Mackenzie. He was not engaged by the year but by the month, and at half pay for the winter season, and when the time came to engage a captain I thought it would be just as well to engage another man, who is a very capable man, indeed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are we to understand that the officers on board these vessels are not to be regarded as permanent employees? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) stated the other day in reply to an inquiry that all the officers of the vessels in the service of the Government were continued, all were treated as permanent employees, and retained in their positions. I do not see why a distinction should be drawn between the officers com-

manding the vessels in the service of the Marine and Fisheries Department and the officers engaged in this important work of dredging. The hon. Minister, I believe, will know that Captain Mackenzie had been for many years—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For only one year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was he employed for only one year? At all events, the practice, I believe, was not to make any changes, but to continue the employment of the captain of a dredge, provided he performed his duties in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, and I presume there was no fault found with the manner in which Captain Mackenzie performed his duties.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I think the hon. Minister will admit that there is an advantage in having for this service a man experienced in the work, that every year a man is in the service qualifies him better to perform his duties efficiently. It is carrying the spoils system to an unnecessary length to dismiss a man simply because some other person else wants his place.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would say with respect to the dredge "Prince Edward," that it has been the habit for many years past to continue the captain's services from year to year. He might have been paid by the month, but he was kept on during the winter season. The captain that has been there for the past year has been displaced, and another man has been put in his place, I understand. Now, with respect to this man, I do not think that any fault in the world could be found with him except that he might have voted Conservative. He is a man whose character is above suspicion, he is a man the like of whom can seldom be found in any community, a most thoroughly reliable man, and I wish that the public service in every capacity had men like him. Now, I must take this occasion of expressing my great regret that the Minister of Public Works has not seen fit to continue that man. I had great pleasure in recommending him for the position; I knew he was thoroughly reliable to put into a position of trust. He has filled that position with credit to himself and satisfaction to the public; and I think it is a great mistake on the part of this or any other Government to dispense with the services of a public servant of that kind who has filled his position in the manner that that man has done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that it would be quite correct to say that officers of the class mentioned by the hon. gentleman are perma-

ment officers. They are engaged by the month, they are not appointed by Order in Council, and it seems to me that they cannot be classified as permanent officers. I quite agree with all that the hon. leader of the Opposition has said that the services of men of experience should not be dispensed with, but I would add that they should not be dispensed with unless we find men equally as good to take their places. In the case of Captain Mackenzie, he had been engaged for only one year, and he has been replaced by a man as competent as he was. Now, the case of Captain Macdonald was a very peculiar one, indeed. I may say to my hon. friend that I did not dismiss Captain Macdonald. What took place was this: The chief engineer went to Halifax, in either January or February, and on inquiry found that there were two men employed on the dredge "Prince Edward," these were Captain Macdonald and the engineer. The chief engineer found that two men were not necessary, and then he instructed Mr. McCormick to make the choice between the two men, and he chose to retain the engineer, because repairs had to be made to the boilers. I may say that although he was not authorized to do so, he dismissed Captain Macdonald, although he did what was for the best. When the time came to engage another man, I took Captain Larkin. I am very glad to say that there were no complaints at all against Captain Macdonald, but he was a good and capable officer.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I must say further with respect to this matter, that I did understand before the change was made, that it was quite settled among the leading friends of the hon. gentleman down there, that Captain Macdonald was to be continued as captain of the dredge; but there were one or two parties in the county that Captain Macdonald comes from—I am now speaking only from what I have been told,—that one of my late opponents in the election and another gentleman who was formerly an opponent of mine, brought pressure to bear on the Government, and succeeded in having the services of Captain Macdonald dispensed with. I only hope that the Minister has got as good and as worthy a man in his place. I believe the chief recommendation of the man who has taken his place, is that he was the prosecutor of Mr. Hackett in his election trial.

#### Roads and Bridges—

Bridge across the Saskatchewan at Edmonton, N.W.T..... \$50,000

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if it is intended to expend this money this present season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This question is under the very serious consideration of the Government. I received not long ago a cheque from the town of

Mr. TARTE.

Edmonton for \$25,000, and later on I received through the Bank of Montreal the balance of the money contributed by that town toward the construction of this bridge. I am not quite free to say any more than what I am saying now.

Mr. CLARKE. Are tenders to be called for the construction of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, of course. If we go on with the work there is no doubt that tenders will be asked for.

Telegraph Lines—British Columbia—To provide for an alternative line connecting Cape Beale and Carmenah with Victoria by extending the French Creek-Alberni Line southwardly to the south-west coast of Vancouver Island..... \$4,600

Mr. McINNES. When does the Minister propose to begin the work on this telegraph line?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We expect to begin work in a month.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to point out to the Minister of Public Works the position that Prince Edward Island occupies in reference to telegraphic communication. I do not suppose there is any other part of the Dominion which suffers in that respect as much as Prince Edward Island. Under the terms of union the Dominion Government undertook to maintain a telegraphic service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and it was supposed that it would give the public such a service as the public had in other parts of the Dominion. Now, the fact is that a telegram from Prince Edward Island across the straits of Northumberland, a distance of only nine miles, costs 50 cents, while for an equal distance in any other part of the Dominion, the charge is only 25 cents. I am sure the Minister of Public Works, in reading the terms under which Prince Edward Island entered the confederation, will conclude that the understanding was that the Government would establish such a telegraphic service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland as would afford the people the same advantages that they have in other parts of the Dominion. I am aware that the company holds, as it were, a monopoly of that service, but I think the Minister of Public Works should make an arrangement with the company in order that cheaper rates should obtain between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Every hon. member will agree that messages going from the capital to that province are charged 25 cents or 50 cents more than to any other part of the Dominion, except to British Columbia, and that this is a state of affairs which should not continue. The Government, having undertaken that service, they should charge the customary rates in other parts of the Dominion, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will see that some

arrangement is made by which lower rates will prevail across the straits.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** If I am not mistaken, the Dominion Government pays annually the sum of \$2,000 to the Government of Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. MARTIN.** It is not paid to the provincial government, but to a company called the Anglo-American Telegraph Company.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I think the Government give \$2,000 to the local government; at all events, I will look into the question.

**Mr. MARTIN.** The hon. Minister will find that the money is paid to the Anglo-American Company. The island had a telegraph service before it entered confederation, and the rates were nearly as low as they are to-day. When the rates are being lowered all over the Dominion, the time has arrived when this matter should be looked into, and the same low rates extended to the island as are enjoyed by other provinces of the Dominion.

Miscellaneous—Towards a monument to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie..... \$5,000

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I should not like this resolution to pass without taking the opportunity of expressing the gratification that I feel at seeing the provision for a statue of the late lamented Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I believe there is no appropriation which appears in these Estimates under consideration, that will give more genuine satisfaction to the people of Canada, without respect to party, than the appropriation for a statute to the memory of a man, whose memory will never die, even though it should not be preserved in marble or in bronze. The services that great man—for he was a great man—rendered to his country, by his devotion to British institutions, by his readiness on every occasion to maintain that which he believed would best promote the interests of Canada, will, I am satisfied, never be forgotten by the people of Canada, irrespective of party. It is a source of great pleasure to me to have the opportunity to support this vote, which I think should have appeared in the Estimates long ago.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** It gives me great pleasure, and it must have given great pleasure to both sides of the House, to hear the terms in which the leader of the Opposition has spoken of my lamented friend Mr. Mackenzie. Of this I feel certain, that the leader of the Opposition has expressed the feelings of all men, now that the echoes of the party strife in which Mr. Mackenzie took part have disappeared. I believe, from one end of Canada to the other, there will be a general feeling of satisfaction that the memory of Alexander Mackenzie is fittingly honoured. Long be-

fore his death, I think the opinion was entertained all over the Dominion, that whatever his little failings may have been, Mr. Mackenzie was, at heart, as sincere a lover of his country as any man could be; and more than that, that in many ways both parties acknowledged that Mr. Mackenzie saw clearly and distinctly a great many matters in respect to which his judgment has been vindicated by events which have come to pass since he ceased to hold the position my hon. friend now fills. But I rose more particularly to say, that I feel the hon. gentleman has done himself and has done his party credit by the manner in which he has expressed his appreciation of the services of that lamented statesman.

Telegraph Lines—North-west Territories. \$20,000

**Mr. HAGGART.** Has the Government not got rid of a good many of the telegraph lines in the North-west Territories?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** No; the lines are about the same. There are slight increases and decreases in the mileage, but, speaking generally, we have the same lines.

Mail Service..... \$2,257,137

**Mr. CLARKE.** I notice that in the Toronto division there is a decrease of \$1,200 for second class clerks, and a decrease of \$780 for third class clerks. What is the explanation of that.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock).** The decrease of \$1,200 arises from the transfer of Mr. Crocker from the inspector's office to the railway mail service office, and the \$780 arises from the death of Mr. Whiteside, and it is not necessary to fill the office.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I notice the vote to meet the increased cost of living in the North-west Territories, Manitoba and British Columbia has been reduced \$10,700.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That is merely a book-keeping entry.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Then, as a matter of fact, the officers in the North-west Territories have not been deprived of anything.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** No. It is because of the arrangement making the mail service an independent branch. The \$10,700 is voted in another form.

Steam communication between Halifax and Newfoundland, via Cape Breton ports... \$2,000

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Is it proposed by the Government to make any provision for steam communication between the Island of Cape Breton and the railway on Newfoundland?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** That railway is not yet completed, as I understand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood they expected to be able to have a steamer on the route during the present season.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is, perhaps, better acquainted with the locality than I am, but I think that a considerable section of that railway is still uncompleted. I believe the railway has made its way to within sixty or seventy miles of the point in Newfoundland opposite Cape Breton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It possibly may not be completed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe some contract has been entered into when the railway has been completed; but until that, I hardly think we are in a position to ask for a vote.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco ..... \$5,000

Mr. HAGGART. There seems to be a decrease of \$5,000 here. If I remember rightly, there was an arrangement between British Columbia and the Dominion, that that service should be kept up. What is the cause of the decrease?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. One year there was some difficulty with the contractors, and they did the service, but the sum was not paid. The subsidy is only \$5,000 a year, but in last year's Estimates it was voted for two years.

Steam communication during the season of 1897, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona daily; between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's; between Grand Narrows, East Bay and Irish Cove..... \$7,000

Mr. GILLIES. By what company is the service to be performed, and under what conditions as to running?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Bras d'Or Steam Navigation Company, and they have three steamers employed.

Mr. GILLIES. I notice a discrepancy between this item, as set forth in the Estimates, and the item formerly put in the Estimates. It used to read formerly, "Steam communication during the season, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, daily; between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's, and to East Bay and Irish Cove."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Between Grand Narrows, it is now.

Mr. GILLIES. That will not do at all. The great object of this service is to have direct communication between Port Mulgrave and the Bras d'Or Lake in a direct line; but here the service stops short at St. Peters, and the other portions of the Bras d'Or Lake get their communication

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

from Grand Narrows. I want the Minister to change the reading, to make it read: "Between Port Mulgrave and St. Peters, thence to Irish Cove and Grand Narrows, and then back to St. Peters and Port Mulgrave."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I candidly confess that I am not as well up in the geography of the Bras d'Or as I would wish to be; and if the hon. gentleman has any fault to find with the way this is arranged, and if it is not in accordance with the terms of the contract, I will cause investigation to be made; but this is verbatim et literatim as it was in the Estimates of 1896-97.

Mr. GILLIES. But it was changed in the contract.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As I understand, the contract has not been changed.

Mr. GILLIES. I want the service continued in the future as it has been in the past, namely, between Port Mulgrave and St. Peters, thence to Irish Cove and Grand Narrows, and back to St. Peters and Port Mulgrave. East Bay has connection with Grand Narrows by the boat from Grand Narrows. As the item reads here, the people at Irish Cove and the large surrounding districts on the front and rear would only have connection with the Grand Narrows; but the object of the service is to give them direct connection with the railway at Port Mulgrave.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will take a memorandum of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and if he will come to my office at any time convenient to him next week, we could look into the matter together. I think this is in accordance with the contract that has been going on for a number of years; but there may be ground for the change the hon. gentleman suggests, and if there is, and we are not tied up by the terms of the contract, I shall be glad to make it if we can do it without additional expense.

Mr. GILLIES. There is no additional expense. The item appeared this way in the Estimate formerly, but when the contract was drawn up, it was in the terms I suggest. If the hon. Minister will tell me that the contract will be drawn up in the terms I suggest, I shall be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I could not make that promise until I have gone over the matter in detail, but I will be quite willing to consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion. If my hon. friend will send me a memorandum putting in writing the alterations he wishes made and will step over to my office, I will look over the matter with him with the contract in my hands. I think the hon.

gentleman will find I am correct in saying that there has been no alteration made for some years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt the contract is all right, and perhaps only requires some change in the verbiage to make the item agree with the contract.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have here the estimates for 1895-96, which prove that I was correct, as the words are identically the same with those I have used.

Mr. GILLIES. The estimate was amended in the committee just as we are asking to have this amended now. By referring to the contract the hon. gentleman will find that the service now performed is exactly in the way mentioned in the contract between the Government and the company.

Steam communication from 1st April, 1897, to 31st March, 1898, daily, between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso: four trips a week between Port Mulgrave and Guysboro', and from 1st April, 1897, to 30th November, 1897, semi-weekly, between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, such trips to be extended once each week to Margaree ..... \$8,000

Mr. GILLIES. By what company is this service performed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At present by Hugh Cann & Sons, of Yarmouth.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I would point out, before we pass this item, that a portion of the duty assigned to that company has not been performed during the past season, namely, the trip to Margaree. I would ask the hon. Minister to take a note of that, and to compel the company to perform their service in full or withhold their appropriation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will take a note of that.

Mr. GILLIES. Has a contract been entered into between Hugh Cann & Sons and the Government to run a daily trip between Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso? If so, what is the date? Was this service performed last year under a written contract, and what is the date of that contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contract was simply for the year ending 31st March, 1897, and was apparently a written contract. That contract is now under consideration. If I recollect rightly, the contract was sent to these gentlemen for execution, but has not been returned.

Mr. GILLIES. If that service was undertaken under a written contract, it was very ill-performed. They were under contract to have a daily service from Mulgrave to Canso

and Arichat, and for two weeks at a time there was not even a semi-weekly trip. The boat they had was totally inadequate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think they had two boats.

Mr. GILLIES. That makes it worse. It is a difficult service to perform, heavy ice collects there, and a very strong boat is required to do the service properly. An excellent service was given two or three times a week by Mr. McDonald, of Halifax.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There were very grave complaints made to the department as to the services rendered by Mr. McDonald.

Mr. GILLIES. There was no complaint at all as to the regularity of the service performed by him. During the winter he had to perform a weekly service, and I am sure there were not three trips missed during the whole period. Last winter, however, there was constant ground of complaint that the service was not performed at all, owing to the weakness of the boats. I would like the hon. Minister to see that the company puts on a boat fit for the service, and if they miss any trips during the season a certain proportion of their subsidy should be withheld.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will certainly do that.

Mr. GILLIES. If that is done, they will make some effort to put on a proper boat for the service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will make inquiries forthwith and may tell the hon. gentleman that if the service is not properly performed he can rest assured that the parties will not get paid.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I quite endorse what my hon. friend has said, that one of the boats is totally unfit for the work. The "J. M. Cann" gives fair enough service, but the "Weymouth" does not. The company should be compelled to put proper boats on the route under their agreement.

Penitentiaries..... \$417,650

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was understood that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) should be here when the penitentiary Estimates were discussed. But if the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has no objection, we might consider the penitentiary items, reserving one item, with liberty to full discussion, covering the whole penitentiary vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that will meet the case.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). But I want it to be well understood that I wish to observe the spirit of

the tacit compact that these Estimates should not be brought up in the absence of the hon. member for Pictou.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce meets the case, one item to be reserved, with full liberty to discuss the whole penitentiary vote.

Penitentiaries—Kingston..... \$167,300

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps you had better reserve that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stand.

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SPECULATION IN BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. PARMELEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter or cheese. He said: I suppose at this late stage of the session there is no hope of this Bill becoming law this session. My object in introducing it is to bring it before this House and the country, so that it may be discussed by the Dairymen's Associations. I am credibly informed that a practice of speculation has grown up in butter and cheese which is decidedly detrimental to the interests of the producers. As everybody knows, the butter and cheese industry is perhaps the largest industry in this country, and if we could eliminate speculation from it, we would be taking a step in the interest of dairymen. The export trade in butter and cheese is controlled by a few firms who, I understand have a practice of cabling over large offers, which have the effect of making the English importer timid, of placing the English market in a waiting mood, of depressing values on this side, and enabling our Montreal shippers to purchase our summer makes at prices lower than they ought to be. The object of this Bill is to make it a criminal offence for the shippers of butter and cheese to sell or offer to sell these articles in the English market in advance of their being made in this country. If a

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Bill of that sort can be passed, it will have the effect of improving one of our most important industries and of giving our dairymen far better prices than they are now obtaining. I do not think it necessary that I should go further into an explanation of the Bill at the present time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: The amendments proposed are important for the inland lakes, but do not apply in the case of sea-going steamships. They are made on the report of the Board of Engineers for the Dominion. As the law stands, a first-class engineer is qualified to take charge of a steamboat, irrespective of her horse-power, and that is found to work badly. By the change proposed a first-class engineer can be qualified to take charge of a steamboat, not with respect to her tonnage, but her steam power, so that it would not matter so much what the tonnage of the vessel would be, if this Bill passes. A third-class engineer would be qualified to take charge of a single cylinder engine of 30 horse-power and a compound engine of 45 horse-power, which is equivalent to a single cylinder engine of 30 horse-power.

The other alteration is in subsection 5 of section 42 of the old Act. Applications have been made from time to time to the department to enable fourth-class engineers to act in conjunction with or as assistants to first-class engineers. Curiously enough, as the law now stands, a fourth-class engineer can act as an assistant to a second- or third-class, but not to a first-class engineer, and the change proposed will enable a fourth-class engineer to act in the capacity of assistant to any engineer. It also proposes that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be authorized upon the report of the inspector of boilers and machinery in whose district the steamboat is running, to grant permission to an applicant, sufficiently qualified by his knowledge of steam machinery and engineering, to act as engineer on a steamboat carrying passengers within certain specified limits on the Canadian waters. As the matter now stands, there are small steamboats in our lakes and rivers which are run by men possessing practical knowledge of engines, but who have not their certificates, and the large steamboat owners have petitioned time and again that the Minister in charge, on the report of an inspector of boilers and machinery, may authorize an assistant, who is not a qualified engineer, to act as engineer on these smaller boats.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to amend the North-west Territories Act. He said: The provisions of this Bill are somewhat miscellaneous in their character. I need not explain them at length now, because they will hardly be understood until the printed Bill is in the hands of hon. members. I may say, however, generally speaking, that the main provision of the Bill is to change the constitution of the government of the North-west Territories in this respect, that whereas they have what is called an executive committee, a committee that was entirely a statutory body—and I fancy without precedents in our constitutional system—under the proposed Bill they will have an executive council which will, to the extent of the statutory powers conferred upon the Government of the North-west Territories by the Act, exercise such powers in the same way as the executive council of a province. The effect will be rather as to the methods in which the Government is carried on than as to any extension of the powers of the Government itself. The natural effect of this provision will be that the system of responsible government in the North-west Territories will be more clearly defined and established than it has been heretofore.

Various clauses of the Bill are amendments for the purpose of bringing the Act into conformity with this provision. The other amendments which are not mere verbal changes, are in the first place, a provision which places it within the power of the legislative assembly of the Territories to deal with the qualifications of justices of the peace, that being a purely local matter which may be better disposed of by themselves than by the Parliament of Canada. The appointment of clerks of the courts in the Territories is also given to the executive government of the Territories. The sheriffs and clerks of the court have heretofore been appointed by the Federal Government. The sheriffs will continue to be appointed by the Federal Government, but by this Bill, if it receives the assent of the House, the clerks, who are paid entirely by fees, will be appointed by the Territorial Government. Another clause refers to the qualifications of police magistrates. Another clause gives the Territorial assembly power to pass ordinances respecting the road allowances. I may say that the fact that the Department of the Interior has been compelled to deal with every local application respecting road allowance in the Territories, has been a source of great annoyance and difficulty to the people there, and also of considerable annoyance to the department itself.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) is introducing this Bill. I should like to ask him one question. He

used the expression "Executive Council of the province." Does he intend to change the name from "Executive Council of the North-west Territories?"

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. No; the word "province" is not used in the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister used that word in his speech. So far as I can see, the Bill is designed to bring in reforms which I have contended for year after year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Are there any changes with regard to the limitation of the legislative powers of the legislature?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It just occurs to me—I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman's question—that I omitted to state one feature of the Bill. It gives the Territorial Assembly power to deal with questions of insurance, the incorporation of local insurance companies, and other necessary insurance business. This is a power possessed by the provincial legislatures, but heretofore not possessed by the Territorial Assembly. Difficulties have arisen through the lack of local regulations, and it is to meet these difficulties that this change has been made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### LAND TITLES ACT.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894. He said: I may explain that the Land Titles Act, 1894, is an Act under which what is known as the Torrens system of registration is carried out in the Territories. It has been discovered by the registrars under that Act that the law makes no provision for the registration or use of what are known among lawyers as general powers of attorney. These instruments have been registered and acted upon in the Territories several times since the passing of the Act, but on a close construction of the Act, it appears this is not provided for, and it is to provide for this omission that the present Bill is proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### DOMINION LANDS ACT.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The first clause of the Bill is to give to the Immigration Commissioner at Winnipeg power to grant leave to persons who may be nominated by him to act as agents for settlers who may come in and wish to make homestead entries. Several clauses relate to the powers of offi-

cial of the department, which, I presume, I need not explain at this stage of the Bill. Section 4 of the Bill embodies the provisions of a Bill introduced by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), which has passed its second reading, and the main provisions of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), which has also passed its second reading. I may say that I introduce these clauses in order that all the changes made in the Dominion Lands Act may be embodied in the same Bill, as it is inconvenient to have more than one Act passed in the same session amending the same main Act. Section 5 of the Bill provides that where an assignment or transfer of the homestead or pre-emption right of a settler is made, it shall not necessarily work a forfeiture of the settler's rights. Heretofore these provisions have been made under the Dominion Lands Act, but a new provision was made every year or two to cover this case. I have so drawn this section that it will apply to future cases, and forfeiture will not be worked unless it be deemed necessary, and the Government so decide. Section 6 gives power to the Minister of the Interior to grant grazing leases without going to the Council to get them ratified. Sections 7, 8 and 9 relate to matters of detail in connection with school lands. Section 10 amends section 96 of the Dominion Lands Act by changing the word "and" to the word "or." It was intended that the Commissioner of Dominion Lands should act otherwise than jointly with some other officer, and to carry out the original intention of the Act, this change is made. Section 11 gives power to vary the forms of the Act. Section 12 gives power to the Minister to decide, in cases of dispute, whether a woman is sole head of the family or not. Section 13 provides for those cases in which a patent is issuable to a person who turns out to be dead before the patent is issued. This will enable the department to deal with a great number of cases which have been hanging fire for years. In these cases the department has not issued the patent because the person could not be found, and thus the title to the property has been hung up and nothing done with it. The people entitled can be found, but not those to whom the patent was originally to have been issued. This amendment will enable the department to issue the patents to those originally entitled to them, and the question of title can then be dealt with by the courts of the province in which the property happens to be. Section 14 applies to cases of persons who may be insane or mentally incapable of performing homestead duties. The guardian or committee of the person so becoming insane or mentally incapable may carry out the provisions of the Act. Section 16 relates to the registration of liens given by settlers upon their claims. Sections 17 and 18 refer to the abandonment by settlers of homesteads which they

Mr. SIFTON.

have obtained, and on which they have a lien after it has been decided by competent authority that the land is not of such quality that it is possible for them successfully to make a living upon it. These clauses are provided to meet the case of the Crofter settlement in the southern portion of Manitoba. Section 21 authorizes the Minister of the Interior to make a special survey of lands in the Yukon district, departing from the ordinary terms of the Dominion Lands Act. This becomes necessary on account of the nature of the country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.—(Mr. Davies.)

### SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It was understood that we should proceed to-day to submit to the House such amendments as may be deemed necessary to the tariff resolutions, and it is our desire to carry out that intention; but it will be more convenient if we are permitted to do that at a later period during the afternoon. I would therefore propose that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply, with the intention that at a later hour we shall take up the tariff resolutions in accordance with the previous understanding.

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

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of immigration agents and employees in Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1898..... \$30,000

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Minister goes into these items of Estimates, perhaps it would be well for him to state briefly to the House the policy that his department is pursuing in reference to immigration. We have had it stated that there was to be a brand new and energetic immigration policy under the new Minister, and we would like to know the lines on which it is to proceed, and the differences that exist between it and the policy which has been pursued during the last five or six years. The Minister may not know, but I will remind him of the fact that last year, when he was not present, and we did not have the extreme felicity of possessing a Minister of the Interior as we have at this time, the Prime Minister was acting as Minister of that department, and when I asked him for the lines of policy distinguishing the new immigration work from the old, he was good enough to tell the House there were no distinctions, that they were following out exactly the same lines as before. That may have been excused

because of not having a responsible Minister here ; but, of course, now we are expecting something new, and we would be very glad to have the Minister favour us with a statement of his policy and the differences between it and the old.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr Sifton). There is, of course, no objection whatever on my part to making a statement as to the work which the department is doing in connection with immigration. Whether my hon. friend is justified in his evident assumption that the Government have promised something brand new and extraordinary in the way of an immigration policy, I am hardly prepared to say. As the hon. gentleman remarks, I was not here when the Prime Minister made the statement at the last session of Parliament ; I do not think, however, that the hon. gentleman would be justified in assuming that, in consequence of anything said by the Prime Minister, or anything that may have been said on behalf of the Government, this Government has promised anything in the way of an extraordinary, unknown, or unprecedented departure in connection with the work of immigration. The hon. gentleman no doubt, as well as the leader of the Opposition who sits beside him, knows very well the difficulties in connection with the great and important subject of immigration. It is one of the most, if not the most, difficult subjects that the present Government have fallen heir to, and with which they have to grapple. For my part, I would deem it a very foolish and absurd thing for myself, or any other member of the Government, after having been in charge of the administration of this department for a few months only, to undertake to speak with any great degree of assurance in regard to what is likely to follow from the policy which we may undertake to pursue. We have not made any large promises, Mr. Chairman, and we do not propose to make any large promises at the present stage of the proceedings. I think I will be justified in saying that we intend to pursue a policy which will in some respects be an improvement upon that of the hon. gentlemen who proceeded us, in this respect at least, that in that portion of the country where we hope to secure settlers, where we hope to locate them permanently, we are endeavouring to take greater care in regard to their location, and in regard to the care which should be bestowed upon them when they arrive in the country. I may say that my own experience as a resident of the North-west for somewhat over twenty years, led me to the conclusion, and confirms me in the conclusion that one department of the work which has been most neglected in the past has been the care of the people when they arrive in the North-west, where we hope to make permanent citizens of them. I do not say that I have successfully grappled with that portion of the work up

to the present moment. I am quite aware that the efforts I have made in the way of organization of a bureau, from which these settlers will be handled and by whom they will be located, have not resulted in a perfect system being attained, and I do not expect without more than one year and more than two years of careful examination of the results of the work to be able to bring about a system which will approach exactitude and perfection and meet the difficulties of the case. I might say, however, that we have organized a bureau in the North-west which has for its particular object the locating and the settlement of people there—a bureau similar in principle to that which existed in former years under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which, theoretically, existed in later years, but which became so far absorbed in the Dominion land system that it was of very little benefit, and I say that without any special desire to reflect on the gentlemen who were engaged in the work, because it was made a secondary portion of their work when it should have been a primary portion. Apart from that, I have endeavoured to take advantage of the evident desire of a great many ex-Canadians now resident in the western states to make their homes in north-western Canada, and I have for the purpose arranged a staff of officers, and they are at present at work in the western states, particularly in Michigan, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and Kansas, and we have excellent reports as to the probability of their efforts being successful. Like other arrangements that have been in operation for a short time, I do not feel like speaking in a too sanguine tone as to the results. I can only say that the system has been carefully organized, and we hope that good results will flow from it.

As regards immigration from Europe, my hon. friends opposite, and particularly the leader of the Opposition who, for many years, occupied the position of High Commissioner in London, England, will certainly not expect a Minister who has been a few months in office, and who has not been for many years at least in the old country, to speak with any great degree of certainty or knowledge of details of immigration work in Europe and the British Isles. Since I have been in office I have devoted as much time as it was possible for me to take from other duties that pressed on me, to obtain details of the work, and I have had the advantage of close conversation on these matters with Sir Donald Smith, now High Commissioner, who has made a careful study of the whole question, and I have gone into it with him in great detail. I am not, however, in a position to speak with any great degree of confidence in regard to the results of that work. I find, however, that, in the opinion of Sir Donald Smith, of the steamship agents, and of the transportation companies' officials, we are now suffering and are likely to suffer for the next year or

two, from the fact that efforts in that direction has been relaxed during the last two or three years. Hon. gentlemen who formerly occupied the Treasury benches seemed to have become discouraged—I do not know whether it was due to the result of the last census or not—and they did not carry on the work with the same vigour. We are now, I am told by those acquainted with the facts, suffering from the lack of vigour shown in the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite; and while I do not speak from my own knowledge but from the opinions of those most competent to judge, I arrive at the opinion that such is the case. I hope to be able to overhaul that branch of the work during the next six or eight months, and to bring about a system whereby a knowledge of the resources of Canada will be acquired in a much larger degree by European peoples than has hitherto been the case. I might say upon that point that, while I do not hope that this Government will, in a short space of time, be able to fill up the North-west, yet I have the strongest hope that when the people of Europe, the people who are unable there to make a livelihood for themselves, become acquainted with the territory which we have and which we can offer them, the tide will turn and we shall have a stream of immigration poured into the north-western portion of Canada such as we have not seen of late years. It may be that it will be slow in coming; it may be that it will be a difficult task, as I have no doubt it will be, to bring it about and to get the tide turned in our direction. But we have a number of things in our favour, and if these are used to advantage, we will be able, in the near future, to accomplish even greater results than we have anticipated. I hope I have made myself clear to my hon. friend, that it is not the intention of the Government to uselessly spend a very large sum of money. I think I would be justified in asking my colleagues to recommend to this House a vote, not of \$175,000, but of \$1,000,000 for immigration purposes, if I could show that the money would be used to advantage, and would bring about commensurate results; and I think the work of immigration is so important that if it could be shown with any degree of probability that commensurate results would almost certainly be obtained, any reasonable sum would be voted cheerfully by this House for the purpose. But, on this the first occasion when I have had the honour of explaining a vote of this kind, I wish to say this, that strong as my feelings are in connection with this subject, and strongly as I feel that if a knowledge of the resources of Canada could be brought before the people of the older countries, a great stream of immigration would flow in, I will not ask Parliament to vote any money, the expenditure of which cannot be successfully explained. In regard to details, it will be seen that I have left some money not appropri-

Mr. SIFTON.

ated to any specific purpose, which will be used to pay for work done here and there as occasion may arise. That is particularly necessary in immigration work. One of the main difficulties which has attended immigration work in the past has been that there has been too little flexibility in connection with portions of the work. It is sometimes represented that an agent can do good work at a certain place. The best man is appointed and sent there. Later, it turns out that his work is not to our advantage, and the officer is withdrawn or recalled. A few weeks later it is represented that advantageous work can be done in another district, and a man is appointed and sent there; and consequently, during the year the work of the department is undergoing change, and for that reason it is absolutely impossible to closely and accurately define the work in advance, as it is possible to do in connection with other departments of the Government. I do not think it is necessary at this stage to make further explanations; if, however, there are other details desired, I shall be glad to afford any information in my power.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the House will have heard with some disappointment, and perhaps not, but I am quite sure the country will read with disappointment the rather meagre explanation that has been made by my hon. friend, inasmuch as the people had been led to expect something more and something definite. My hon. friend stated there had been no large promises made that he had heard of. Well, I take issue a little with him in that respect. The immigration policy in Canada is, with the ablest men and under the most carefully-considered conditions, a very difficult problem to deal with, but that did not restrain the criticisms of the former Administration, for the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite were not only continuous but very definite and carried out on well-known lines. Those criticisms were the stock-in-trade of hon. gentlemen opposite for the last ten years. With the gradual approach of the elections of 1896 that was one of the points which probably received, after the tariff issue, as great attention as any other in the whole programme that was discussed before the people. The great need of opening up the North-west to immigration, the great quantity of fertile land there waiting for population, the essential interest this country had in increasing its population in those fertile and productive regions, all these were expatiated upon, and the late Government were criticised very strongly and very continuously on the ground that they had failed to fulfil those conditions. As the time of the elections drew nigh, that was put before the electorate, and it was stated that the Liberal party, and, if they won, the incoming Liberal Government, would make a revolution in regard to this matter, that they would fill up the North-west, that they

would discard the old methods and the old policy, and would introduce a new vigorous immigration policy which would rapidly fill up the North-west, and consequently tend to the improvement and progress of this country. If one had done nothing else but read the columns of the Toronto "Globe" for six months before the elections and for the six months after the elections, he would have seen that that was a very large burden of its song. The new Government has come in, and the old party has gone out, and for a year the new Government has had the opportunity of incubating and maturing its plans—plans I suppose which were already known, for the criticisms made by hon. gentlemen in Opposition must have had some basis. One year has passed away, and the new Minister who was specially presented to the country as the man who was to introduce something new in the way of an immigration policy, who was the one to redeem the credit of the country as regards immigration matters, has made a statement, and it has been a very mild and very tame statement indeed. The hon. gentleman has declared that the Government has no new policy; he has not delineated any new policy. He has made a statement that he has only been a few months in office and cannot be expected to have his policy outlined and settled. There is a great deal in that plea. The hon. gentleman knows, as his colleagues know, that there is every difference between offering criticisms from the Opposition benches and framing and adopting a policy to meet the circumstances of the case, and a little of the active work of Government has wonderfully sobered the hazy ideas of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues. The hon. gentleman says he has been only a few months in office, and he asks for delay. But the hon. gentleman was only a few weeks in office when he "fired out" some of the ablest officers in his department. He did not ask for delay then—he knew all about it himself. But he now pleads for delay, and we must give it to him of course. Are there any differences between the old line of policy and the new? The hon. gentleman has not stated one. He declared that he will try to take good care of incoming immigrants. He then stated that that matter was not lost sight of by the late Government, but he thought they had failed in some respects. It was a cardinal point with the preceding Minister of the Interior and with his predecessors that good care should be taken of the immigrants from the time they came into the ports of Canada until they were settled on the lands of the North-west, and from the time they landed in Halifax or Quebec until they went to their homes in the North-west, they were attended by the officers and servants and followed by the kindly services of the Dominion Government. My hon. friend stated that the Government will throw still greater force in that direction.

That will be all the better. But the line of policy is exactly the same in that regard as that followed by the old Government, and it remains to be seen whether there will be any greater efficiency in the service, and whether greater vigour can be infused into the department by the hon. gentleman than by his predecessors. I very much doubt it. The hon. gentleman then declared that he had organized a bureau to look after that branch of the work and for various other purposes with respect to settlement in the North-west, a bureau similar in principle, to use the hon. gentleman's own words, to the bureau carried on by preceding Ministers of the Interior. It is carrying out the same idea, the principle of caring for and guarding the immigrant from imposition, being a friend to him in a strange land, guiding him to his future home, and making him feel from the time he touches the shores of Canada until he arrives at his home in the North-west, a rude home though it be, he is surrounded by and has the advantage of the kindly offices of the Government; and for this work, of course, the hon. Minister has a staff in hand. A new line of policy inaugurated by the late Minister of the Interior was that of looking largely to the re-settlement of Canadians and the descendants of Canadians in the North-west, and some four years ago my late colleague the Minister of the Interior inaugurated a system of imparting intelligence, not only by means of the press and by circulars, but by active and able agents, who traversed the very same states of which the hon. gentleman has spoken to-day, and who made known to the people there the advantages of our North-west, and who, in every possible way made them acquainted with the conditions of that portion of the country, and made known the kindly wishes of the Government, and offered the kindly services of the Government in transporting those people from their homes in the western states to Canada. And for the three or four years that this policy was pursued, some of the best settlers who are to-day in the North-west were brought in from those north-western states, most of them probably at one time Canadians, or descendants of Canadians, but who, finding the conditions of life less favourable than they had hoped in the home they had chosen, transferred their families and their goods to Canadian territory. My hon. friend takes up that line of policy and is going to carry it out; and he has already looked out a staff of able men whom he will send out as immigration missionaries to prosecute the work—the same policy, on exactly the same lines, and for the most part with the same salaries.

With reference to Europe, my hon. friend has not very much to say, except that we are suffering there from relaxed efforts. Well, there may be a difference of opinion about that. It is not a fact that the efforts

in the way of sowing information in Europe have been in the last eight or nine years appreciably relaxed; but it is a fact that in certain years the conditions have so changed that no amount of effort you could put forth would be as successful in drawing immigrants from Great Britain and some other portions of Europe as would be the case in former years. When a person is doing fairly well, inducements for him to immigrate are less alluring than when times are hard and he is not doing well; and for the last three or four years, one of the strongest difficulties the preceding Government had to contend with in inducing immigrants to come to this country was in the fact that during that period the kind of people we wanted were doing fairly well, and were disinclined to break up their homes in the old country and start for the new. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in expatiating on this, but my hon. friend, from conversations with his officers, and from his own knowledge, is aware that this is the fact. The late Government sowed information through the schools, through the press, by its own agents, and in other efficacious ways, and in none more so than through the late High Commissioner, who is worthily succeeded by Sir Donald Smith, in the effort to arouse the different communities of Great Britain to a knowledge of the fact that Great Britain had a large dependency here, where there were fertile lands in abundance, to which it was possible for her to transplant her hardy sons without losing any subject from the flag in the transplantation process. My hon. friend is going to throw some more effort into this work, and for all that effort and the good resulting from it none will be more glad than the gentlemen on this side of the House; but let me point out that this was exactly the line of policy pursued by the late Government.

My hon. friend is not going to ask for millions of money, and he is wise in that, but he thinks the process of settlement will be slow. That is the sobering effect of coming to view the subject from the standpoint of the facts; but my hon. friend indulges in a prophecy, the fulfilment of which he first put a few years ahead, but afterwards said that it might take a long time—a prophecy that at some time in the dim and distant future streams of people from the old country would come into Canada and build up homes for themselves. It was not so twelve or fifteen months ago. Then all that was necessary was to wave the Liberal flag, and, like the magician's wand, it would direct streams of population into the North-west. But now the process is to be slow and difficult; and the fulfilment of my hon. friend's prophecy must be relegated to many years in the future.

But my hon. friend desires flexibility in his votes. For instance, he says, if I put a

Mr. FOSTER

man in Wisconsin, and I find afterwards that he is not doing much, I wish to be in a position to put him somewhere else; I do not want to be tied up. Was any Minister ever tied up? You have a vote for foreign agents, which covers all foreign agents, and you have a vote for agents in Great Britain. This is the same amount of flexibility, no more and no less, that a Minister ought to have; and it is the same that has been in existence in the last ten years; unless in its practical application my hon. friend makes it more flexible to serve some purpose of his own.

My hon. friend has prophesied that by-and-by, after a slow and difficult process, the North-west may be filled up. Does my hon. friend not see fitting before him the ghosts of his twelve-months-old promises? How was he going to fill up the North-west twelve months ago? How was the Toronto "Globe," how was the Liberal party all over this country, going to fill up the North-west? By making the conditions of life easy to the people of the North-west; by sweeping away this robbing and murdering system of protection, which was bleeding the farmers white, and by giving them free agricultural implements, cotton goods, woollen goods and everything else necessary for them in their conditions of life. How could you expect to get people to go to the North-west while you were taxing the farmers to keep up these heavy eastern monopolies? And here is my hon. friend, with his far-off prophecy and his pleading for flexibility, putting 20 per cent duty on agricultural implements, making cottons higher than before, and taxing woollens 35 per cent; in all of which my hon. friend must see the ghosts of his past promises fitting before him—at night when he lies down and in the morning when he wakes up; and, if he has a conscience, it must be uneasy as these ghosts flit past him, while behind them, waving as on an airy screen, is that North-west farmer's prayer. "Let Mr. Laurier only give us free trade," and "God bless Mr. Laurier" will be put up as a motto on the wall of every bedroom in the North-west.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I wish to call the attention of the House to something which took place in the province of Quebec in the last election. My hon. friend who has just sat down has drawn a contrast between the promises made in regard to this immigration policy in some parts of Canada and the relaxation of those promises now that the Government is in power. My hon. friend is probably under the influence of French domination as regards this policy of immigration, because while in the province of Ontario and the North-west the speakers on the Liberal side and the Liberal organs were promising that if the present Government came into power we would have a great stream of immigrants flowing into the North-west, all the Liberal organs in the province of Quebec, and a great many

of the speakers on the hustings and a great many of hon. gentlemen opposite from that province, went through Quebec promising that if the present Government came into power we would not see all these foreigners coming into the North-west and Manitoba to stifle what they called "Nos Chers Compatriotes." These were the cries raised in the province of Quebec. These people said that the Conservative Government had spent millions of dollars bringing into this country aliens and foreigners—Icelanders, Mennonites, Englishmen and Scotchmen—to the great detriment of the French Canadian population of the country. It seems to me that if the promises which were made by my hon. friend and the Government supporters in other parts of Canada have not been realized, the only reason is that the Minister of the Interior has felt the influence of French domination and probably the great influence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). That is the reason why these great promises which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition, have not been carried out.

I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to another side of the question. Whilst our friends in the province of Quebec were blaming the Conservative party generally for their immigration policy, whilst they were blaming them for bringing into this country people from the other side of the ocean, another standing ground of complaint was that they had nothing to bring back from the United States our French compatriots, who, they alleged, by the policy of the late Government, were compelled to leave their homes in the province of Quebec and go into the great American Union to earn their livelihood. I see nothing in the explanations which have been given by my hon. friend which can lead me to believe that the policy pursued by the late Government in this connection has been altered by these hon. gentlemen. I would like to ask him if he is ready to assure the House that he is going to fulfil any of the promises which were made, not by himself, but by a great many of his supporters in the province of Quebec, that a very serious effort would be made to bring back into this country, into the North-west Territories especially, those French Canadians who had left our province in order to earn their living in the United States. If he were to do this, he would be fulfilling the promises made during the elections, and would also redeem to a certain extent the promises which had been made by those gentlemen who accused the Conservative party of having brought into the country a great many foreigners, while they left our French Canadians in the eastern states to starve. The hon. gentleman has told us that he would send agents to the western states to bring back to this country Canadians who had emigrated to that part of the union. Well, if he does that in the western states he is bound to

do it also in the eastern states. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give us the names of the agents now employed by the Government in Europe to promote emigration to this country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I do not think it is necessary for me to reply at any length to my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), whose remarks were evidently couched in a spirit very different from that which animated the remarks I have made. It must have been perfectly evident to the hon. gentleman that in the explanation I gave, I did not attempt to make any political capital. I spoke in the most gentle possible terms of the efforts my predecessors had made and in no way attempted to reflect upon their policy, but simply endeavoured to explain, as a matter of business, what I thought it was my duty to explain in going through the Estimates. The hon. gentleman, however, sunk, as I think, to a lower plane altogether, in a debate of this kind, by discussing the question, not for the purpose of obtaining information, but of scoring a point against the Government from a party standpoint. It would be an extremely easy matter for me to elaborate a scheme which would contain a great variety of points and might be regarded as something new, and which might perhaps in appearance, be somewhat impressive. But the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that this Government will be judged, not by promises, professions or schemes, but by results. It may be that in some respects the revision of the tariff has not been satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. The proper place to discuss that is not in the Committee of Supply, but when the tariff is under discussion in the House proper.

I think that when Parliament adjourns, it will be found that more has been done by this Government in three or four months to ameliorate the condition of the people in the North-west than was done during ten years by the hon. gentlemen who preceded it.

In reply to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), I may say that it is my intention, as it is my desire, to carry out the promises which my hon. friend says were made by my political friends in Quebec in connection with the repatriation of French Canadians who have settled in the eastern states. I sympathize most strongly with the desire of the people of that province, and I have no doubt the Prime Minister is actuated by the same feeling, that those Canadians who have left us should be brought back to live in their own country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). We have begun.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have at present a number of men who are principally engaged in that work. I have the names of four of them—Messrs. Swanson, Morin, Corbell, Mousseau. These men

are almost entirely engaged in this work. Three of them were employed by the late Government and were retained because their services, so far as I can judge from the short time I have been in office, were fairly effective, and I thought it was better to continue them in office. An additional agent has been appointed, named Brousseau, who, I have reason to believe, will prove an efficient officer. In addition, the Repatriation Society of Montreal—an institution with the details of which no doubt the hon. gentleman is more familiar than I am—is provided for to the extent of \$3,000 in the Estimates, which I have no doubt will meet with the hon. gentleman's approval. I may say in addition that we have during the last month or so taken steps to bring back numbers of French Canadian people from different places where unfortunately they had been beguiled into going. A large number was brought back only a few days ago from the city of Detroit, where they had collected almost in a state of destitution, having settled in different parts of Michigan and gradually drifted down to Detroit. These people I have brought back and settled in the Lake St. John district. In addition to that, the Government has been under the necessity of spending something in the neighbourhood of between \$3,000 and \$4,000, speaking from memory, for the payment of expenses in bringing back French Canadian people who went to Brazil under representations that were made that they would be able to succeed there to a much greater extent than was proven to be justified by the facts. These people got into a state of distress in Brazil, and we considered it was a proper thing for the Government of Canada, having regard to the dignity of the Government and of the country, and of our own citizens, that we should pay the expenses of these people and bring them back. And we have done so. I may say that these people went out to Brazil notwithstanding the strong protests of the officers of the department, who, at the time, told them that the results would not be commensurate with their hopes. I do not know whether I have answered all of the hon. gentleman's questions. Any further information that he desires, I will be glad to give him.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Can the hon. Minister tell me how many agents he has in Europe?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) wishes me to include agents in the British Isles?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are sixteen at the present time, according to the memorandum I have. I may be one or two out on account of late changes.

Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask if the expenses of these people who were brought back from Brazil were paid out of the immigration vote?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes; they were charged to the immigration vote, but we propose to ask for a special supplementary vote to recoup the immigration vote the amount that was paid out.

Mr. FOSTER. You might as well have it paid out of the Hudson Bay expedition vote.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I was rather surprised at the statement he made. He must have had the misfortune to strike places where bigotry existed. So far as I am concerned, and so far as my friends who sit about me are concerned, we heard no such things as trying to raise a national cry against the immigration of persons from Great Britain and elsewhere. We have always stated, taking the census figures as our proof, that there was really a decrease in our population, allowing for the natural increase, that our people had gone away and that we had spent large sums of money to bring immigrants here, but without any success whatever. We told what the Government had done for immigration with a view to increase population, but as to complaining that the English people or any other people had been brought here to choke the French Canadian element, my hon. friend has really been very unfortunate to strike places where such a thing was stated. My friends and I had no such misfortune. This is the first time I have ever heard such a statement made. I have been in a good many counties and never heard such a statement as the hon. gentleman refers to. My hon. friends beside me, I believe, could say the same.

Mr. BENNETT. It is painfully plain that there is a wide divergence between the idea that the Government have to-day of an immigration policy and that which has prevailed in this country for the past few years. I can recollect well the denunciations fast and furious in this House of the immigration policy of the past Administration. It is quite true that the First Minister rather pulled in his horns, if I may say so, in regard to the immigration policy of the late Administration, when he said:

Though I must say I am not altogether an admirer of the immigration policy of our predecessors I quite approve and commend the system which has been, I will not say inaugurated, but attempted to be inaugurated, by them, with a view to securing immigrants from the western states.

But, rather strong denunciations from the back benches, and foremost among those who uttered them was the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) who declaimed

against the immigration policy on these lines, and who, speaking for the great province of Manitoba, made this statement :

I recognize that there will be political differences with regard to the tariff, but I am strongly convinced that the best immigration policy that can be adopted for Manitoba, the North-west Territories especially, is to lower the duty on the necessaries of life to a minimum, and also to lower, in fact, to wipe out entirely, the duties on agricultural implements.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think so to-day.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman may think so, but I will be bound to say he will not vote so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am prepared to vote for the abolition of the duty on agricultural implements.

Mr. BENNETT. The spirit may be strong but the flesh will rather wilt, when it comes to the point. There is another gentleman who sits opposite and gives the Government a strong allegiance. He gave them another line of policy. I refer to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who said :

It is a matter of the utmost necessity for the binding together and building up of this Dominion, that there should be a strong settlement from the eastern provinces of Canada in the North-west, because that is the only guarantee that we have that it shall remain part of Canada, the only means of cementing the eastern and western parts of Canada together.

Now, after all this kindly advice by, I will not say subservient, but I will say admiring supporters of hon. gentlemen, is to be unheeded. Their ideas are to be neglected, and the policy is not to be to attract people from Ontario or from the western states, but if the statements of these immigration agents themselves are to be credited, an entirely different policy is to be adopted. There was a gentleman, Mr. Devlin, who was a member of the last Parliament, and who was recently appointed as immigration agent in the old country. But, strange to say—and I am sure the hon. First Minister does not know it—Mr. Devlin has particular instructions as to the class of immigrants he is to direct to this country. We have enough trouble in this country, I should have thought, with cries of race and creed ; but Mr. Devlin has gone to the old country commissioned by the Government to carry out a new idea and build up an Irish Catholic party in this country. If the immigration money of this country is to be disposed of for any such purpose as this, I am sure affairs are coming to a deplorable pass. Yet, speaking at Aylmer, Que., Mr. Devlin made use of this most remarkable language. I hope the Minister of the Interior will say that Mr. Devlin had no warrant to make such a statement :

Were it otherwise, I would not accept the mission which he—

Speaking of the First Minister (Mr. Laurier).

—confides to me, and which I hope will be fruitful in as far as our race is concerned, and also the best interests of our country. I thank you, my dear friends of Lowe, and, speaking to you, I address myself to my fellow Irish Catholics of Canada, who have always been so kind to me. I am proud to observe that you appreciate the importance of the step the Government is taking in regard to Ireland, the land of your birth and your love.

Now, that seems to be a strange utterance. Here Mr. Devlin is commissioned by the Government of Canada, and he says he is specially commissioned by the First Minister and he says his duty is to go to Ireland, not to ask immigrants to come here, irrespective of religion but to endeavour to attract hither Irish Roman Catholics. I have no objection to Irish Roman Catholics or Irish Protestants either coming to this country, but I do regret to see a gentleman commissioned specially as Mr. Devlin says he is, by the Prime Minister, to go over there and endeavour to import into this country people of a particular faith. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) raised his voice in protest because one Alfred Jury, of Toronto, had been sent out to the old country as immigration agent. I do not know Mr. Jury personally, but I do know him by repute as having been for years past one of the most noted atheist and free-thought speakers in Toronto and any gentleman from Toronto will bear me out in this statement. I do not assume it was simply by reason of the fact that Mr. Jury had been on the platform in Toronto protesting against Sunday cars, protesting against Sabbath desecration, as the opponents of Sunday cars pleased to term it, that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) objected to Mr. Jury ; but I believe the reason he objected to Mr. Jury was the fact that he is a Western Ontario man, and that Mr. Jury's record in the city of Toronto for a number of years past has been simply that of an advocate of socialism, free thought and atheism of a most pronounced plan. Well, Sir, if we are going to have immigration from the old country, if we are to have men like those in the sphere in which Mr. Jury will move, if he is at all true to his likings in the past, then I say that the result will be most deplorable. And if in Ireland Mr. Devlin is simply to confine himself to the particular field that he has stated he is going to explore, then I say that will be a deplorable fact as well. On the whole, the statements made by the Minister of the Interior to-day as to the immigration policy, will, I think, be disappointing after the promises that have been made as to the new era that was to be introduced. In view of the statements of Mr. Devlin, made on the eve of his departure, and not repudiated—and I hope they will be repudiated here to-day—and the fact that a man of the stamp

of Mr. Jury has been commissioned, I can only say that the immigration policy of the new Government will not, I think, have any very beneficial results as compared with that of the past few years.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that the Minister of the Interior has not been able to boast sufficiently to satisfy the late Minister of Finance. I note, however, with approval that he prefers to refer his success to the arbitrament of actual trial. The hon. Minister had not the advantage of being here in the years when the hon. gentlemen opposite used to do their boasting, and has not been trained to that style of administering affairs; consequently, he will have to triumph in the line which he himself has chosen, and I have every confidence that he will come out of it with success. It is for that reason that I wish to bring to his attention a suggestion in connection with immigration matters, not expecting any promise or any definite answer to it, but to have the matter discussed. The bulk of our immigration expenditure heretofore has been for the benefit of the newest parts of Canada, I think it is possible to do something for the older parts. Taking south-western Ontario, for example, perhaps the most fertile and prosperous part of Canada, with the exception of every other locality in which every hon. member here may happen to live, we have suffered to some extent by the development of Manitoba and the North-west. There has been such an emigration to those new districts as to reduce the demand for land in that part of Ontario. Now, I believe that a good deal could be done by judicious management to attract that class of tenant farmers from Great Britain who are possessed of considerable capital. Those farmers are required to possess a certain capital before renting a farm in England, and the amount of capital that they are required to possess there before renting would be sufficient, at present rates of farm lands in Ontario, to buy them very comfortable farms here. I think they would be the most valuable class of immigrants that we could possibly attract; and I would suggest that the hon. Minister should devise some means of bringing to the attention of this class the favourable openings for them in the older parts of Canada. We know that the Britisher, as our friends across the line call him, rather likes to settle in a place where there are institutions something like those that he has left, and the prospect of having good schools and churches and roads and everything of that kind, would be an inducement. Most of the immigrating class in England, and most of the tenant farmer class to which I refer, are not aware that such things exist in Canada. They look upon Canada either as a backwoods district or as a prairie district, or as a mining district; they are not aware that there are great extents of country here where they

Mr. BENNETT.

can, for a small capital, get comfortable and well-established homes. I would ask the Minister's attention to this matter, and if he has thought about it at all, I would ask him to say what conclusion he has come to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to detain the committee, but this is an extremely interesting subject. There can be no doubt in the mind of any person who has taken the trouble to investigate this subject, that the importance of successful immigration cannot possibly be overrated. There is also no doubt that our efforts in the past have not been as successful as we desired. There were reasons which tended to check the efforts that were being made to bring immigrants into this country. Take one circumstance that is familiar to the mind of every hon. member present, the drop in the price of wheat, that was a tremendous blow to immigration. When wheat fell to one-half what it was worth a few years ago in the North-west, everybody felt that the great attraction that our North-west had presented to immigrants was very seriously affected, and that it was impossible to stem successfully such an adverse current as set in in consequence of the price of wheat dropping to a point that made its production unprofitable even in the North-west of Canada, where it can be produced, I believe, more cheaply than in any other part, certainly of North America. This constituted a very great obstacle to our efforts to bring people into this country. Now, my hon. friend by my side (Mr. Foster) has referred to the fact that the Government are following very much in the footsteps of their predecessors. Well, I take it that is a fact that we ought to congratulate ourselves upon; I am sure I shall be the last person to find any fault with hon. gentlemen opposite for following as closely in the footsteps of their predecessors as they possibly can, and the more nearly they approach to the modes by which the various departments endeavoured to promote the interests of this country, the more likely, I think, they will be to succeed in the work in which they are engaged. But there are other reasons besides the one which I have alluded to, that affect very seriously our efforts to bring immigrants out of the United Kingdom and other countries into Canada. One of these reasons is the greatly improved condition of the class of persons who are accustomed to emigrate. No doubt that has been a very serious drawback. We know that the love of home, the love of one's own country, so dominant in the human heart everywhere, is extremely difficult to get over, and it is only necessity that compels people to seek in foreign lands new homes for themselves, and the fact that the general condition of people in Great Britain and Europe is improving, tends to diminish the volume of emigration. Now, I was in hopes that before this we would have had laid upon the Table of the House the

arrangements that are proposed in reference to the fast service. I saw a statement, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman opposite if there is any truth in that statement, that Messrs. Peterson & Tate, contractors for the fast service, were making arrangements by which they would be able to commence their operations in a month, or to commence the service. I suppose it must have referred to the commencement of the organization for the construction of the ships or something of that kind; but I thought it was just possible that they might have been able to make arrangements for obtaining the service of a line of steamers that would enable them very promptly to commence the work. I do not know whether there is any foundation for that statement, but I should have been only too glad if it were true. I am told by the Messrs. Allan, who have investigated this subject with the greatest possible care, and who have given the subject of immigration the closest possible attention, that one of the gravest difficulties that Canada has to contend with in reference to immigration, is the existence of the fast steamers to New York, and that the poorest immigrants will make the greatest sacrifices in order to get a ship that will take them across the Atlantic in a day or two less than other lines. I therefore look forward to the establishment of the fast steamship service as a most invaluable adjunct in increasing the tide of immigration to Canada, because we all know very well that if the immigrant starts with the view of reaching Canada and comes through the United States, there is a strong probability that he will not reach his destination but will be induced to remain in that country. Reference was made to my successor in the position of High Commissioner in Canada. I am quite sure no person could fill that office who would be better able, from his knowledge of the subject and from his deep interest in this Dominion, to turn as rapidly as possible the tide of immigration to the North-west. But from a summary I saw a day or two ago in one of the newspapers, I was not surprised to see that my successor stated that every possible effort which could be made by the Immigration Department in England had been made, and that the same efforts would be continued, but in order to materially increase the results he felt sure it would be necessary to supplement the assistance given by a considerable addition of a large sum of money. I see that the Minister of the Interior proposes to take a largely increased vote. I am very glad to see it, because I believe the prospects of effecting such successful results are very much greater at the present moment than they have been recently. In the first place, the price of wheat—the low price of which in recent years had a most material effect in frustrating our efforts to secure immigra-

tion—has materially improved, and I hope that improvement will continue, and that wheat at all events will command a price which will make its cultivation profitable to the producer. I am quite sure nothing would be a greater stimulus to immigration so far as the North-west is concerned. There is also another influence, which at the present moment will conduce to bring a large body of people into Canada, and that is the immense development of the mineral resources of the country. Within the last year discoveries have been made not only of gold and silver but of copper and lead and other minerals, that must necessarily attract population. In fact, experience in various parts of the world has shown that nothing has been so successful in attracting population to a country as the discovery of gold. I believe our country is so rich in mineral wealth that parties coming here and engaging in mining enterprises will obtain a very rich reward, and not only will the country be benefited by the creation of wealth taken from the bowels of the earth, but people coming into the country—as occurred in British Columbia many years ago when there was a large influx of population in connection with the placer mines of Cariboo, after the gold was supposed to be exhausted, although I believe it was only commencing to be discovered, as will shortly be proved to be the case—will remain in the country and engage in agricultural and other industries. So the mining population brought into British Columbia for the purpose of developing the mineral resources of the country, and also into Rainy River, Lake of the Woods and other portions of the Dominion, which are proving to be so eminently rich in mineral wealth, will have the effect of attracting agriculturists to the North-west because the mining industry will produce a demand near at hand for food products. The time is therefore especially propitious for an active immigration policy, and I believe the Minister of the Interior is perfectly right in availing himself of the opportunity now afforded, and in asking from Parliament an increased vote for the purpose of placing in his hands the means necessary to give the greatest possible effect to his immigration policy. So far as repatriation is concerned, I am quite sure there is no hon. member who does not regard efforts made to induce Canadians, who for any reason have left the province of Quebec or any other portion of the Dominion to settle in the United States, to return as of great importance, and these efforts will commend themselves to the approval of every member of this House. There is no class of immigrants that are better calculated to advance the best interests of the Dominion than those engaged in agricultural industries, especially in the adjoining states, and who having found the superiority of British institutions over those of any other country, will be glad to come back to the

homes of their fathers. I am very sanguine that the efforts the Government will now be able to make, under the improved condition of things, will result in a very largely increased immigration to this country, and that result will be hailed with the utmost satisfaction, not only by every hon. member of this House but by every man in Canada, who knows how important this question is to the progress and prosperity of the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend the member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) contradicted me rather flatly just now. When I made the statement to which he referred, I knew whereof I was speaking. I understand quite well that in a part of the country like Arthabaska, where he resides, these statements I have quoted, and which I imputed to hon. gentlemen opposite, would not have been made, for the very simple reason that there are a great many English-speaking electors there, and therefore it would not be politic from a party point of view to say anything against immigration from the British Isles. I was quite surprised to hear my hon. friend make the lapsus linguæ he did, when in referring to immigrants he spoke of English and other foreigners brought into this country. That is a sample of statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite in some portions of Quebec. When those hon. gentlemen come here they have to face the music, for many of their colleagues are of English origin, and they then deliver speeches which are quite opposite in character to those delivered not only in the back parishes of Quebec but in other portions of the province where there are no English-speaking electors. I state distinctly before this House that such speeches have been made, not from one platform, but from a dozen platforms by members of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Where?

Mr. CASGRAIN. In several parts of Quebec, in Montmorency, in Lévis and other counties, and in the district of Montreal, as the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) reminds me, the principal organs of the Liberal party present the same arguments to the French population of Quebec. I am surprised that any hon. gentleman should question the accuracy of this statement; I am quite aware that in some cases they were astonished at the arguments used by Liberals in the province of Quebec. Just as they were ashamed during last session when I reproached them with having, all through the province of Quebec, in the campaign of 1896, accused the Conservative party of expending \$3,000,000 in buying rifles with which to fight the battles of the English Empire. They were ashamed of that argument just as

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

they are ashamed when I bring up the statements they made in the province of Quebec and which they would be ashamed to make before this House. But some of these gentlemen, speaking French in this House, have used language covering not quite the same argument, but an argument which went to a certain extent in the same direction. I take from "Hansard" for 1896, the following words which fell from the lips of one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, supporting the Government. This is a translation of what was spoken in French:

I have already had the opportunity of protesting against the expenditure incurred for immigration purposes, a policy which, to my mind, far from favouring our interests, is directly opposed to it. The Government have expended large sums of money to assist the passage of newcomers having an imperfect knowledge of our manners and laws, often picked up the lower strata of European towns, while we have allowed the exodus to take away our farmers, the backbone of the country, to the United States.

If this language can be used in this House. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider how it is emphasized and what kind of language is used when these gentlemen are speaking to their French Canadian fellow-citizens of the province of Quebec. I have brought to the notice of the House these arguments that have been used not so much to score a point against gentlemen opposite as to induce them, when they are discussing public questions on the platforms of Quebec, not to use arguments that they are ashamed to have brought up before their fellow members here.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am not going to discuss what has been said at the last election. If we were to repeat all that has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, the hon. members would be the first to be ashamed of their conduct. I must say that I fully endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne). There is only one English elector in my riding, and I never heard a word spoken in the sense of those referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain). But I have heard this by candidates on the other side, especially in the last election—I have heard them accuse us of seeking to prevent French Canadian Catholics going to Manitoba and the Northwest because they said we were against separate schools. That is the argument they used to fight us, and they said that in the position we took we were fighting against the French Canadians and in the interest of foreigners.

Mr. TAYLOR. I expected to hear the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) question the Government whether they had selected any person to canvass for emigrants from the North of Ireland. Mr. Devlin, it appears, has been specially

appointed by the Government to go to the South of Ireland and seek to bring to this country Roman Catholics exclusively. Mr. Edward O'Kelly who has also been appointed as immigration agent to Ireland, I am sure, has not been appointed to go to the North of Ireland, because he is of the same religious belief as Mr. Devlin, and will, I am sure, operate in the same field. I think the hon. member for North Wellington, who, I am informed, is a member of the Orange order—at least I am informed that just previous to the last election he went up and joined the Orange lodge in his own county so as to catch a certain wing of the Orange vote in the last election, and I think the hon. gentleman will not deny that—should inquire of the Government whether they intend to select an Orangeman to go to the North of Ireland and see if we cannot get some immigrants from there. But I wish to inquire especially from the Minister of the Interior what Mr. Jury's mission is. I presume he is sent to the old country for the purpose of soliciting immigrants to come to Canada irrespective of their vocation in life. I remember very well when Mr. Jury led an agitation in Toronto a few years ago—the "Globe" was full of it—which resulted in protests being sent down here, and voiced by Mr. Jury himself who came before a committee to protest against the Government spending public money to induce immigrants to come to this country. This is the same Mr. Jury who is now appointed immigration agent. Resolutions were passed by the labour organizations, of which Mr. Jury was one of the principal spokesmen, protesting against the Government taking money from the treasury for the purpose of inducing immigration to this country. But now, this same Mr. Jury is sent as special agent, and I would like to know what his mission is. The Minister said that the late Government relaxed their efforts somewhat. This may have been due to the efforts of Mr. Jury and the labour organizations, who, perhaps, were put up specially to create this excitement, an agitation through the country, charging this Government with having spent money to bring immigrants to this country while many of our people were out of work because there was no work for them to do. I hope the hon. member for North Wellington, as he is the only member of the Orange order on the other side of the House, will see to it that the Government appoint an immigration agent whose duty it will be to canvass the North of Ireland and see that a few Orangemen are transplanted to this country to level up and offset the effect of Mr. Devlin's special mission, as Mr. Devlin himself describes it, to induce Irish Catholics to go to the North-west.

Mr. McMULLEN. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has called upon me to make a statement, and as my name has been

mentioned by another hon. gentleman in connection with immigration, I wish to say a few words. As to what my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said with regard to my joining the Orange order immediately before the last election with the object of getting an increased number of votes, I can tell him that his information is wholly incorrect. There is no truth in these statements.

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe that the exact facts were that the hon. gentleman joined the order a few years ago, but withdrew his certificate, and then, shortly before the last election, he deposited his certificate with a lodge whose name I have forgotten in one of the townships of his own riding.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman's information is wholly incorrect. Now, with regard to the question put to the Minister. I have been instructed by him to say that the instructions given to Mr. Jury and Mr. Devlin, have been to operate largely among agricultural classes in order to secure the immigration of this class, this being the class we stand most in need of. Their attention will be largely directed in that line. Now I wish to say, in reply to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), that I very closely and pointedly criticised the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to immigration which they adopted when in power. The money that was spent on immigration during the last ten years was virtually squandered. There was no results from it, the best evidence of which was that the census showed that we had hardly our natural increase, apart from the number of immigrants who were supposed to have come to the country. I also criticised the expenditure, because the late Government sent a great many of their camp followers to different parts of the United States, not because they were fitted to become desirable immigration agents, but because they wanted something to do. At one time I believe they had no less than forty-three tramping through Nebraska, Kansas and other western states taking a holiday, and drawing allowances as immigration agents. We had a striking illustration of that in this House on one occasion, when it was brought out that one immigration agent had withdrawn \$3,100, and the entire result of his efforts in the United States was that he had brought to Canada three German Jews, who shortly after their arrival in Winnipeg were caught with packs on their backs travelling around selling the worst kind of jewellery, and were arrested and tried and sent to jail; and in the course of their trial it was proved that they were brought from Chicago to settle in the North-west as farmers, but instead of that they were peddling spurious jewellery. I strongly protested against the money of the people of Canada being used to promote the immigration of that kind of peo-

ple, and I do hope that this Government has turned over a new leaf, and that, while following to a certain extent the line of the late Government in sending men to the United States as immigration agents, they will appoint a better class of men, and that their efforts will be more productive than those of their predecessors. I am quite ready to grant any reasonable amount of money, so long as efficient work is done; but I object to public money being squandered. One man named Holmes, who lived at Napanee, and was supposed to be a devoted friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, was proved in the Public Accounts Committee to be drawing a salary as an immigration agent in the United States while he was living in Napanee. That was the sort of thing I objected to in the late Government, and I will object to it if my hon. friend permits it to take place. We want the money spent on immigration to be properly spent. We want our agents to do earnest work in bringing people into the country, and I hope that my hon. friend will pursue a policy which will show better results in the next census.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to say a word to the hon. Minister of the Interior in reference to one of the late immigration agents, a gentleman who has occupied for many years a very important position in the Immigration Department of Great Britain; I refer to Mr. John Dyke. Mr. Dyke, while occupying a very good position under the Government of the province of Ontario, was induced by a former Minister of Agriculture, I think the Hon. Mr. Pope, to abandon that position, and devote himself to the work of immigration. I believe it would be impossible to overrate the value of Mr. Dyke's services in that capacity. In addition to his duties at the very important port of Liverpool, he had the supervision of the Scandinavian and continental immigration generally; and I am able to bear testimony not only to his great ability, but to his untiring industry, and to the great success which in the face of very great difficulties, attended his efforts. I am quite aware that his health recently has not been so good as it was before, and while I held the position of High Commissioner in London, I made the most earnest efforts to induce the Government then in power to place Mr. Dyke in a position to be superannuated in case his loss of health should at any time oblige him to leave the service. I regret to say that I was not able to secure that object, but I take this opportunity to say to the Minister of the Interior that anything he can possibly do to recognize the services of Mr. John Dyke in connection with immigration will not, I am satisfied, be misplaced, but highly approved of by every one who has come in contact with him and has had an opportunity of knowing how long and faithfully he has served Canada in the position he has held.

Mr. McMULLEN.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). What the hon. leader of the Opposition has said of Mr. Dyke's services corroborates what I have heard from everybody else who has had anything to do with Mr. Dyke in connection with the discharge of his duties; and it is a matter of great regret to me that Mr. Dyke's health does not appear to be such as to enable him to cope fully with the duties of the office. While I cannot say anything definite to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the representations he has made have been made by others, and that every effort will be made to recognize Mr. Dyke's services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the item passes, I would like to ascertain from the hon. Minister who is the immigration agent at Halifax at the present time? I understand, from a statement that has appeared in the public press, that the former agent has been dismissed, and that the appointment has been tendered to a gentleman in Halifax who has declined it with a good deal of indignation. If such a state of affairs exists, perhaps the hon. gentleman would state who is acting at the present time, whether the former agent, Mr. Clay has been dismissed, and whether the appointment has been tendered to any other gentleman in the city of Halifax?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The office of chief agent at Halifax is vacant in consequence of the dismissal of the late agent, whom, I regret to say, I was compelled to dismiss by reason of the fact that charges were made against him of improper conduct in connection with the accounts of the institution. A commission was appointed, and reported that the charges, some of them at least were proved, and it became necessary for me to remove Mr. Clay from office. Another Mr. Clay, I am not sure whether a relative or not, is the second official in rank, and he is acting in the capacity of chief agent at present. I have not yet decided upon the appointment of an agent to take the place of the official who has been removed, and therefore cannot say who will be appointed or where his residence will be.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what are the instructions given the agents with regard to the class of immigrants desirable for this country. I understood from the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he had been instructed to say that the agents were instructed to bring out particularly the agricultural classes. I must say that I entirely dissent from the proposition that only the agricultural classes are to be brought out to this country. Agricultural pursuits are pretty much depressed in Canada at present, and unless men can find employment in other pursuits rather than exclusively in agriculture, we cannot hope to make much progress as a country. We must find something for men to do here besides farming;

and if we bring the agricultural class alone to Canada, we should see that those we bring are men of means. It is a false and a dangerous policy to bring out men without means to follow the pursuit of agriculture. I do not at all object to the sum demanded, because I think it may be well spent if properly spent. But I think it would be a misappropriation of the money, were we to use it in bringing out to this country agriculturists who are not possessed of some considerable means. That argument, of course, I do not apply to the repatriation of Canadians. I think that our money would be well spent in bringing back our own people who understand our country and who would make all the better settlers for their enforced absence from it and consequent better appreciation of its advantages, but I think it would be a serious mistake to bring in immigrants, whether from England or foreign countries, who have not a very considerable amount of means to start with. They would simply be a drawback to all those who are engaged in a calling which is now well known to be in a very depressed condition—the calling of agriculture.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister said that a bureau had been organized in the Northwest, but did not say where.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
At Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIN. What officers are there ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
There are six in Winnipeg. That is to say, they operate from Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the immigration agent at present in Regina ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
There is none at present.

Mr. DAVIN. There was a Mr. Stemshorn there, who had only \$40 a month, and who proved himself one of the best officers in the department. He was a German, speaking German, and from the opening up of the North-west Territories he had done good service. He worked as a clerk in the office and acted as an agent to meet the Germans and others coming in, and nothing could exceed the zeal which he manifested towards the incoming settlers. But the moment the hon. gentleman became Minister of the Interior he dismissed this man, so far as I know, without rhyme or reason. He was a most exemplary officer, he had the confidence of his superior officers, and certainly as an immigration agent he was in my opinion most zealous and effective. I would also ask my hon. friend what he meant when he said he quoted Sir Donald Smith as saying that we were suffering from a cessation of effort in recent years. Did he mean that a sufficient amount had not been voted from year to year or that the agents for whom it was voted had lain on their arms and done nothing ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
I did not express any opinion as regard to that, but referred to the opinion which Sir Donald Smith and the heads of transportation companies had expressed, that sufficiently vigorous efforts had not been made in the last three or four years, and that we would be likely to suffer to some extent for the next year or two because of that fact.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. gentleman going to remedy the evil ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
The hon. gentleman will be able to tell better next year.

Mr. DAVIN. If Sir Donald Smith complained that nothing had been done because the sinews of war had not been voted, then the hon. gentleman is not asking as much as was voted in recent years. I find the following amounts were voted :—

1886-87.....	\$279,000
1887-88.....	229,525
1888-89.....	116,389
1889-90.....	95,125

The first vote in 1891 was \$101,525, but the total vote ultimately was \$251,525. I may say, as a fact that cannot be controverted, that the change in that vote took place in consequence of a disturbing speech made from this side of the House by myself, criticising the Government of that day for not giving sufficient. In 1891-92, the vote was \$197,000. In 1893, the vote was \$197,000; in 1894, it was \$200,000, and in 1895, \$130,000. Now, I know very well that complaint was made, from time to time, by the late High Commissioner in London that sufficient means was not at the disposal of the Minister of the Interior to deal actively with immigration. And if, in this case, Sir Donald Smith has made the same complaint, I am not sure that the Minister is taking a sufficient amount of money to meet the defect that Sir Donald speaks of. At the present time, undoubtedly, there are favourable circumstances that may well give the Minister hope and confidence in telling us to look for results. At the same time, it would not be unreasonable of us if we expected a little more from the Minister than he has given us. I think that the Minister might have given us a statement of his plans. After the statement made, we are not very much enlightened as to what is being done. All we know is that the Minister is proceeding very much on the lines of his predecessors. Now, there is one advantage he has, which, undoubtedly, his predecessors had not. He is confronted with an Opposition that will criticise his efforts as a Minister dealing with immigration, fairly. If you look back on the debates in committee, you will find that hon. gentlemen on the other side, when in Opposition, whenever this vote was before the committee criticised it from no fair

standpoint. The criticism of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) to-day, was, in my opinion, very mild. I have before me the debate upon this item in 1891. We have here speeches from the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) and other members of the Opposition of that time. And what do they all say? What is the reason given by them that the Government's efforts in favour of immigration were not successful? Why, the very thing mentioned by the hon. member for York—namely, that the tariff prevented immigrants coming into the North-west Territories, that this tariff was a wall that kept them out. This is a fair point of criticism when hon. gentlemen opposite come down here asking a vote for immigration, I think only \$40,000 more than we asked the last time, but with the tariff that opposes the same barrier to immigration going into the North-west Territories.

Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—because the other points have been taken up by other speakers before me—if he will say why he dismissed Mr. Stemshorn from the position he had in Regina, in which position, I know, he was most useful.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I dismissed him because I was informed, on authority which appeared to me to be perfectly unimpeachable that Mr. Stemshorn had neglected his duties for the purpose of going out and informing the German settlers in the hon. gentleman's electoral division that if they voted for the hon. gentleman's opponent and the result of their votes should be to bring into power a Liberal Government, they would not get the titles to their lands, and the country generally would go to the dogs and would not be fit to live in. I thought that a gentleman occupying such a position should not act in such a way, and I summarily dismissed him; and, under similar circumstances, I would do the same again.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I would like to ask if the hon. Minister gave Mr. Stemshorn an opportunity to reply to that charge.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I did not, because I was quite satisfied of the truth of it. It was quite notorious, and the hon. gentleman knows it, no doubt.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I know nothing of that kind. The hon. Minister says it was quite notorious; I know nothing of it, and Mr. Stemshorn denies it strenuously.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have not the slightest doubt that what I have stated is correct. I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of saying that it is correct.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Well, now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very peculiar state of things. Here is a Minister who is also a lawyer, and he

**Mr. DAVIN.**

tells us that this charge is made against Mr. Stemshorn behind his back, but he is not allowed to reply to it and is dismissed without a hearing; that he is not to be given a hearing, though he asks for it; and the hon. Minister tells us that he, who had no means of knowing anything about it and except an ex-parte statement, is confident that the thing is as he says.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman's assumed innocence may work with members of the House who are not acquainted with the manner in which these things are done in the North-west, but it has no effect upon me. The hon. gentleman cannot but be aware of the fact that a considerable number of officials of the Government were employed and used almost entirely, before election, as election agents. It was notorious in the North-west that this was going on, and I was not prepared to advise the waste of public money in investigating the actions of men who acted as election agents simply, and about whose conduct there was no doubt whatever.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The hon. gentleman says he does not propose to waste public money. It seems to be regarded as a great waste of money to criticise hon. gentlemen opposite. It was not a waste of money for them to criticise the Conservative Government, but it is a great waste of public money to come here and defend any poor man who is oppressed if the hon. Minister has the certificate of a person who is a Liberal that there is some ground of suspicion against him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Is not that notorious? We have the "Hansard" here, and we have records here of entire sittings taken up with the discussion of this immigration vote. But they are not to be criticised. Last session, they were not to be criticised, because it was too soon after the election, it was a short session and there was another session before them. This session they are not to be criticised because a number of them are going over to be infinitesimal joints in the tail of a magnificent ceremony. The business of the people of Canada is to be neglected, things are to be hurried through, and justice for citizens of Canada is not to be fought out here, because, they cry out, this is to be a short session. We have got into power, they say, and, though we have criticised everything in the past even down to table napkins for Rideau Hall, we are not to be criticised. Do we not remember the night spent over the case of Mrs. or Mr. Wallace in British Columbia—

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies).** McManus, not Wallace.

**Mr. DAVIN.** No; it is not McManus. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries (Mr. Davies) has interjected the name "McManus."

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I thought that was the person to whom you referred.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I said Wallace. I saw the account in the paper, that must have been prompted by a Minister, and I may tell my hon. friend and his colleagues that they will hear more about that question, and about Mrs. McManus, too. But the position taken here by the Minister of the Interior is that he does not propose to waste public money in having an inquiry as to whether Mr. Stemshorn was or was not guilty of being an offensive partisan. Just to show how incorrect the Minister is in this case—he says that for months before the election this man was an active agent for the Conservative party.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I said there were many officials that had been employed for months, I did not say that this gentleman had been employed for months; I said he had been employed, and had made certain statements, and had acted in a certain way; I had no reason to doubt that my information was correct, and I took the responsibility of acting upon it.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the meaning of trifling with this Parliament in this way? What is the meaning of saying that for months agents had been so employed if it had no bearing on the case in hand? If it had no bearing, then why withdraw the statement? Because the moment I could show that the statement that this man had been for months acting as a political agent was not correct, the hon. Minister rises up and withdraws what was meant to be a charge against this man.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. Finance Minister desires to make a short statement in relation to his tariff resolutions, before the adjournment at six o'clock, and I would ask the hon. member for West Assiniboia if he would kindly allow him to do so.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to place on the Table of the House, when I conclude, the amended tariff resolutions. I may say that we are proposing a number of changes in these resolutions. The House will, of course, desire, before proceeding with them, to have the printed papers in their hands, and they will be distributed before the evening session. In the meantime, I may facilitate the business of the House if I ask the attention of

hon. members to the nature of the changes, or the principal changes which we propose to make. In the case of the Inland Revenue and Excise Department, it will be remembered that we brought down a resolution imposing a duty of ten cents a pound on raw leaf tobacco unstemmed, and 14 cents a pound on the stemmed; that is an excise duty. It has been represented that it is desirable, in the interest and convenience of the trade, that that duty, if it be imposed, should be imposed by way of a customs duty. There would be a manifest disadvantage in imposing it at the first stage as a customs duty, for reasons which I think perhaps it is not necessary to enter into, but which the House will quite readily understand, reasons which are very largely in the direction of increased public revenue. We propose, however, that the excise duty on raw leaf tobacco shall be continued until the first day of July, and thereafter as respects any raw leaf tobacco which is now in warehouse, and which remains in warehouse after the first of July, but as respects all importations of tobacco after the first day of July, we propose that that duty shall be levied by way of a customs duty instead of an excise duty. In the meantime, as respects the levying of excise duties, we shall ask the House to authorize the Department of Inland Revenue to make such changes in the regulations as will facilitate the payment of excise duty on the raw leaf at convenient times, so that dealers who might feel it an embarrassment to be called upon to pay those duties immediately, will find the department anxious to make every reasonable arrangement with them, so that that duty may not be found to be too oppressive.

Mr. FOSTER. They pay in instalments.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think the idea is that they might be able to pay in proportion to the use of it, practically as they do now on the manufactured product, that is to say, as it comes out of the warehouse. We leave the Department of Inland Revenue to make arrangements. This is only a temporary provision to extend to tobacco now in warehouse; and we think that any arrangement which will facilitate the handling of the business to the convenience of the tobacco trade will be readily concurred in by the House.

Mr. DUGAS. You make a difference on stemmed tobacco?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Ten and 14 cents are the two rates, which I believe will be quite reasonable and in proportion to the value of the two articles. In the matter of excise duty on cigarettes, a change was made from \$1.50 a thousand to \$3. We propose that that change shall stand as respects cigarettes made from foreign leaf tobacco; but we propose that as respects cigarettes made from Canadian tobacco, the old rate of \$1.50

shall stand ; so that as between our former resolutions and the present one, there is a reduction in favour of Canadian leaf. These two articles are regarded, perhaps, by some as coming in competition. The parties in the tobacco trade, however, seem to think that they are not so closely in competition as would be thought from a general view of the question. However that may be, if there is any advantage in this for the grower of Canadian tobacco, we are desirous that he shall have it. With regard to customs duty, we have made a number of increases, but in the great majority of cases the changes that we make are in the direction of a decrease. We have desired to meet the views of manufacturers who complained that they were severely affected by our tariff reductions : we have desired to meet them, so far as it was possible to do so, not by increasing the duty upon their manufactured article, but by endeavouring to diminish the cost of their raw material, and in a number of cases we have been able to do that. There are a few items in the tariff where the rates were comparatively low, and when you apply to those items the preferential rate, which is one-eighth in the first stage, and one-quarter at the next stage, the result would be that the rate would come down below what, perhaps, any of us would consider fair, and would bring the tariff down to 15 or 17 per cent. In a very few cases it will be found that we have changed these duties in the direction of an increase, but in every case in which we have increased the duty, it will be found that, having regard to the reciprocal tariff rate, the net result will be that the duty on those articles is substantially lower than under the old tariff. In three or four cases. I think, we have adopted specific duties. We have endeavoured to resist, as far as possible, the somewhat general demand of manufacturers that specific duties should be maintained ; but there are three or four cases in which it seemed that the convenience of the, Customs Department and generally the difficulties created by the situation, might best be met by specific duties. Those, however, are quite exceptional, and we have, in the main, adhered to our desire—

Mr. FOSTER. It cuts down about half the changes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to be able to assure my hon. friend that the number of cases in which we adopt the specific duties is quite small, and I should be pleased if we could make it even smaller. Let me now draw attention to a change with regard to the reciprocal tariff. In schedule D it will be found that there is a slight change in the wording, but it is of no substantial importance ; it is merely a change in the wording which describes the articles excepted. The description of spirits, wines, malt liquors, &c., is

Mr. FIELDING.

changed, but it makes no change in the substance of the schedule. In the enacting clause in relation to the reciprocal tariff, section 16, it will be found that one or two words which are mere surplusage and are repeated have been omitted. But we have also introduced into that section a subsection, in accordance with an intimation given at an earlier stage of the discussion, as to doubts that unquestionably existed in relation to the effect of foreign treaties. In presenting the Budget to the House I was asked by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the effect of those foreign treaties upon the reciprocal tariff, and my answer was that it was a matter of doubt, that we were not prepared to admit that those treaties did apply or should apply to Canada, but we could not give at that time final judgment in regard to it, for we would be influenced to a considerable degree by the judgment of Her Majesty's Government. We hold to that position to-day. We maintain that those treaties do not apply to Canada, and that our course is entirely consistent with any obligation we might owe as a part of the Empire. Nevertheless, there being a doubt in the matter, not so much in our own minds perhaps, though we go so far as to say that the thing is not certain—in view of all the discussion that has taken place, we think it is well to make provision therefor, if it shall appear ultimately that those treaties are held to apply to Canada. We provide by subsection B of section 16, as follows :—

That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

We do not anticipate that we shall have any occasion to act under that clause, but in view of any possible doubt in the matter, it seems wise that we should provide for the possibility by putting in this clause. If we should find that the treaties with Germany or Belgium or any other foreign treaties are held to apply, undoubtedly it would open the question in a new form and might necessitate our reconsidering the whole subject. At all events we want to be free to reconsider the whole subject, if that view should be taken by competent authority. But our own judgment was that the treaties did not apply, and nothing has occurred since to apply, and nothing has occurred since to change the judgment of the Government in this regard. If it should be determined that the treaties apply, it would be our duty to recognize them and act on them, but then the whole question would have to come up for further consideration.

I now propose an amendment, which may be regarded in some quarters as desirable, to the what is commonly called the combine clause, No. 17. We propose before the Government shall take final action under that clause that they shall refer to a judge of

one of the higher courts the question as to whether or not a combine exists of the character contemplated by the resolution: that is to say, the determination of the question shall not be a political determination but a judicial determination, and upon that determination the Government shall then proceed to carry out the intention of the clause.

Mr. TAYLOR. Another back-down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is in the right direction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the item surgical instruments: in our original tariff surgical instruments were placed on the free list. We propose to deal with them as we have dealt already with barbed wire and binder twine, that is to fix the date at which they should come in under the free list at 1st of January, as in the other two cases. In the meantime surgical instruments will pay the present rate of duty, 15 per cent.

In the matter of mining machinery, in our tariff resolutions we included a class of mining machinery exclusively used for mining, and provided that it should be admitted duty free. Under the old tariff there was a clause of somewhat similar character restricting it to machinery not made in Canada. There was difficulty in the interpretation of that clause and there would be difficulty in the interpretation of our new clause, owing to the uncertainty as to what is mining machinery exclusively used for that purpose. We have had interviews with gentlemen interested in the manufacture of mining machinery and also with many people who use such machinery, and after very full discussion we determined to place 25 per cent duty on certain articles of mining machinery and to specify all the articles which we wished to make free. There are a few items of mining machinery which are made in Canada, and which are well made and satisfactory to mining people, and these classes will still have to pay 25 per cent. Then we place on the free list a large number of items which are desired by the miners. Item 535 in the amended resolutions reads as follows:—

Mining, smelting and reducing machinery, viz.:—Pressure or exhaust fans, rotary pressure blowers, coal cutting machines except percussion coal cutters, coal heading machines, coal augers and rotary coal drills, core drills, miners' safety lamps, coal washing machinery, coke-making machinery, ore drying machinery, ore roasting machinery, electric or magnetic machines for separating or concentrating iron ores, blast furnace water jackets, converters for metallurgical processes in iron or copper, briquette making machines, ball grinding machines, copper plates, plated or not, machinery for extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes, monitors, giants and elevators for hydraulic mining, amalgam safes, automatic ore samplers, automatic feeders, jigs, classifiers, separators, retorts, buddles, vanners, mercury pumps, pyro-

meters, bullion furnaces, amalgam cleaners, gold mining slime tables, blast furnace blowing engines, wrought iron tubing, butt or lap welded, threaded or coupled or not, not less than 2½ inches diameter, when imported for use exclusively in mining, smelting, reducing or refining.

These articles all go on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. Speaking generally, are these articles manufactured in Canada or not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think some are, but not many.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is a difference in the specification?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Largely so. The items we place on the dutiable list are: ore crushers and rock crushers, stamp mills, cornish and belted rolls, rock drills, air compressors, cranes, derricks, percussion coal cutters. These are to be dutiable, and all the others are on the free list.

Item 257, covered wire for electrical purposes, has been changed from 25 to 30 per cent. The preferential rate will bring that down to 18¾ per cent, which is below the former duty. This is an article made both in the United States and England.

Item 257, rubber belting, is classified in the resolutions with leather belting. We have separated them. The leather belting remains at 20 per cent, and we have placed rubber belting with other rubber goods at 25 per cent. Under the old tariff it was 32½ per cent.

In clause 197, plate glass, small sheets not to exceed 25 square feet we have reduced from 30 to 25 per cent. This will be subject to a further reduction under the preferential rate, if brought in from the old country. Silvered glass which we placed at 30 per cent, we have increased to 35 per cent, on the ground that it is the highest class of glass and should pay the highest duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was it a slip of the tongue when the hon. gentleman said that those goods might come from England under the preferential rate? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had abolished the preferential rate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not correct if he understands anything of the sort. I can assure him we have not abolished the preferential rate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the hon. gentleman that he had not only abolished it, but he had abandoned the term "preferential rate." He now calls it reciprocal rate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will read the original resolution he will find it always spoken of as a reciprocal rate. If preferential rate is mentioned in my remarks, it is an expression which means the same thing.

Linseed oil was 20 per cent, and the reciprocal rate would be 15 per cent. That is lower than a fair revenue tariff, and we propose to place it at 25 per cent, which under the preferential rate would make the duty on this article brought from England  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.

Newspaper outsides were placed at 20 per cent in the resolutions. We found that we had placed a half manufactured article at a lower rate than plain printing paper, which was clearly something that should not have been done, and so we have placed both at 25 per cent.

Cut nails and spikes, item 248, under the old duty paid  $\frac{3}{4}$  cent per pound. We first placed them at 30 per cent. We have agreed to make a specific duty, but at half a cent instead of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a cent, which was the rate under the former tariff. This rate is subject to a still further reduction by the preferential rate. Nuts and bolts, 269: The old duty was 1 cent per pound and two different ad valorem rates. This is one of the three or four specific duties we have retained. We propose that the duty shall be  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent and 25 per cent ad valorem as against 1 cent and 20 and 25 per cent ad valorem. On wire nails, the old duty was 1 cent per pound. We had placed them on the 35 per cent list. We now make them three-fifths of a cent per pound, as against 1 cent per pound under the old list.

On item 235, bridges and structural iron work, the duty was 30 per cent, and we have now placed it at 35 per cent, which will be subject to the reciprocal rate. The old rate was 1 cent per pound; the present rate will go materially lower, especially under the preferential or reciprocity rate.

As regards item 409, buttons, we have increased the duty on pantaloons and shoe buttons from 20 to 25 per cent. The button item has been changed in form, and all buttons except those mentioned, will pay 35 per cent. That will make a clear definition.

Twine and cordage, item 414. These were reduced to 20 per cent, and we now place them at 25 per cent. Cordage will probably come in from the old country, and under the preferential rate the duty will be reduced to  $18\frac{3}{4}$  per cent, as against the former duty of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem. The former duty was equivalent to 29 or 30 per cent. The present duty will be 25 per cent, subject to the preferential rate or reciprocal rate.

In the case of customs duty on tobacco we make a change, without, however, increasing or decreasing the duty. In the first resolution the customs duty on manufactured tobacco was 45 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. We think it better to have a specific duty instead of a compound duty, and we place the duty at 50 cents, instead of 45 cents per pound and  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent ad valorem. The effort is to make it equivalent, and I think we have done so. The 5 cents per pound added is intended to

Mr. FIELDING.

be equivalent to the ad valorem duty. In regard to cut tobacco, item 425, we have applied the same rule. The first resolution provided for a duty of 50 cents per pound and  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent ad valorem, and we now make it a specific duty of 55 cents per pound.

On the coal duties, we still reserve final action, as was formerly stated, but in the wording of the tariff resolutions as submitted some new words were inserted which have created difficulty in regard to coal screenings. We have rewritten the item but we have not changed the rate. There is no change in the duties on coal or coal screenings for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. You make a change in the regulations?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever have been the customs regulations in the past, will be continued.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Are the screens to be larger?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have never had any mention of screens in our customs regulations other than a half inch screen, and this is mentioned in the tariff of the United States. I think this is the established size of screens. However, the matter has been regulated in the past by the regulations of the custom-houses, whereby whatever proportion of slack came in was charged as slack and the remainder came in at the higher rate. Whatever the practice has been in the past, we desire to continue until we finally deal with the coal duties.

Roofing slate we placed at 25 per cent. But there was a limitation in the old tariff that it should not exceed 90 cents per square. We left that out. We are told that in some cases the rate of 25 per cent would be unreasonably high, and so we have provided that it shall not exceed 75 cents per square.

The duty on grindstones has been reduced from 20 to 15 per cent. Under the old tariff there was a specific duty of \$1.75 per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to grind the face of the poor.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have somewhat re-arranged the duties on marble and other stones, under items 187, 188 and 189. They will be found to be as follows. There are three classes of duties. Rough stones are dutiable at 15 per cent. Those in the first stage of manufacture, dressed or building stone, and marble sawn, whether on two or more sides, are dutiable at 20 per cent. The finished marble and granite is 35 per cent, as in the resolutions brought down. As the granite will come to some extent from the old country, this rate will be subject to the cut on British goods. The change is a reduction

on the lower forms of marble and granite from 20 per cent to 15 per cent. Worsted yarns and worsted tops are dealt with in items 375, 376 and 377. We have had some difficulty over these, owing to the conflicting interests of the various woollen mills. There are a few woollen mills in Canada which make worsted yarns, and there are a considerable number which do not make them, but which desire to use them to improve the manufacture of cloth. In the resolutions first brought down, the item fixed the duty at 15 per cent on worsted yarns costing 20 cents per pound and under. This does not express what we had in mind. Instead of "under" it should read "over."

Mr. FOSTER. That was a clerical error.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have a few clerical errors, but we have also a few which we confess we do not want to blame the clerks for at all. Like other human beings, we have made a few mistakes, and we have the good sense to acknowledge them and come here to make them right.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some of them are very pleasant.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad some of them are pleasant. Next to pleasing our friends on this side, we like to please our friends over the way. Worsted yarns costing 30 cents per pound and upwards will be dutiable at 20 per cent. That is an encouragement to the woollen mills which do not spin these yarns. A reduction to 15 per cent, we think, would be perhaps a pretty severe reduction to those who are making these yarns. The rate decided upon will, we think, give them a fair chance to continue the spinning, and not make the yarns too expensive for the large number of mills that want to use them in order to make a better quality of cloth. Worsted tops we propose shall be dutiable at 15 per cent when made from wools of a similar character to those grown in Canada; when made from other wools they shall be on the free list. These items have given us considerable trouble owing to the conflicting interests of the different branches of the woollen trade. I do not suppose we can compliment ourselves on making it wholly satisfactory, but I hope it will be reasonably so to the different interests. I have said that we have endeavoured to make a number of things cheaper to the manufacturers rather than to increase the duties on the finished product—giving them cheaper raw materials. In conformity with that view, we have provided that the cloths used for the making of umbrellas, parasols, neckties, and so forth, to be cut into shape for such purposes in bond, shall be dutiable at 20 per cent. We make a similar proposal in regard to the shirt trade. We propose that cotton fabrics, fronting linens, interlinings and flannel

shirtings, when imported for use by the manufacturers, and to be cut into shape for such purposes in bond under proper regulations, shall be dutiable at 15 per cent. This is a concession to the manufacturers of shirts, collars, cuffs, blouses, shirt waists and things of that sort. In item 24, we reduce the duty on soap powders and pear-line from 35 to 30 per cent. In patent medicines the old duty was 50 per cent on liquid medicines and 25 per cent on medicines other than liquids. In our first resolutions we proposed to make the duty on liquids 35 per cent, leaving the others 25 per cent as before. On reconsideration, we have come to the conclusion that the proper line of division is between the medicines which contain spirits and those which do not contain spirits. On liquid medicines containing spirits, we place the duty at 50 per cent as before; but on those which do not contain spirits, and on what I may call dry preparations, we make the duty 25 per cent. On the item of books, it will be remembered that the old duty was a specific duty of 6 cents a pound. In some cases that seemed to bear harshly, and we changed it to an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent. I do not think that, applied generally, is a high rate, but on a certain good class of books it did bear heavily, and we thought we might reconsider it. The conclusion we have reached is to place paper covered and unbound books, those of a very cheap character, and not as a rule the best kind of literature, at 20 per cent. These we say shall not include Christmas annuals, juvenile books and toy books, which are cheap, and which come in in large quantities at the Christmas season; these will come in at a lower rate. On books other than these the rate will be 10 per cent. We propose that the concession hitherto given to colleges and universities with regard to the free admission of books, not printed in Canada, which are on the curricula of the universities, for the use of students, shall continue, with the omission of the words "for the use of students." Practically very few of these books are used by others than students, and, for the little revenue obtained, we think it is not worth while to retain this distinction.

Mr. FOSTER. It is practically no difference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not very much. Then, we have enlarged the scope of the item with reference to libraries, in which we thought there were certain libraries not included. While keeping in view the intention of the old tariff in that respect, we make the item read: "books specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, libraries of universities, colleges and schools, or for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific or art association or society, and being the

property of the organized authorities of such library, and not in any case the property of individuals—the whole regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.” We put in a proviso which we think will convenience the book trade of the country. It is said that every book store is a centre of education, and we do not wish to do anything to inconvenience the book trade. They have, heretofore, not been able to sell books as freely as, perhaps, they should have sold them to the universities, in consequence of the privilege being granted to the universities and not to the book trader. We propose to allow the bookseller this privilege. On importing the books, he will pay the duty in the usual way, but on proper evidence that he has sold them to a library that might have imported them free, he will be entitled to a refund of the duty. He will thus be enabled to continue to do business with the library. I think the change is one which will be of great advantage to the book trade. Then we propose to put on the free list for everybody books such as would be used by young men interested in the study of mechanical arts :

Books, viz.: Books on application of science to industries of all kinds, including books on agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fish and fishing, mining, metallurgy, architecture, electric and other engineering, carpentry, ship-building, mechanism, dyeing, bleaching, tanning, weaving and other mechanical arts, and similar industrial books ; also books printed in any language other than the English and French languages, or in any two languages not being English and French, or in any three or more languages ; and bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books and religious tracts.

A part of this item is based upon the old tariff, but that portion which places upon the free list books on the application of science to industry is a new item, and I think the House, on both sides, will regard it as worthy of consideration. We also include the item which was in the old tariff putting on the free list books printed by or for any Government or by any association for the promotion of science or letters, and official annual reports of religious or benevolent associations and issued in the course of the proceedings of the said associations and not for the purpose of sale or trade. Printed music, under the old tariff, bore a specific duty of 10 cents per pound. Under our first resolutions we changed this to 20 per cent ad valorem. We found that this bore severely upon some good music and we are going to reduce it to 10 per cent. Then we have printed and lithographed matter. Under the old tariff this bore specific duties under two items, one at 6 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem, and one at 15 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. There is a large class of this matter which has no commercial value, being printed for distribution by people who sell patent medicines and other goods. The customs authorities say they cannot put a commercial value

Mr. FIELDING.

upon it. We retain, in that case, the specific form of duty. That class of lithographed goods which has no commercial value, we make dutiable at 15 cents per pound ; but, as respects the lithographed matter, labels for cans and matter of that class, we impose a duty of 25 per cent. Stereotypes, electrotypes, &c., item 292 of the present tariff, the former duty was 2 cents per square inch. We reduce this to 1½ per square inch. In another case, where the duty was three-eighth cents per square inch, we make it one-quarter cent per square inch. Steel tubes for bicycles, formerly 15 per cent, now 10 per cent. Pig lead, formerly 20 per cent, is reduced to 15 per cent. As it comes from England, there will be a further reduction under the preferential clause. Buckthorn and strip fencing, formerly 25 per cent is reduced to 20 per cent. The item of wire we have divided into several items. Brass wire is made dutiable at 10 per cent, copper wire 15 per cent, other wire of iron or steel is 20 per cent. We have placed spring steel, spiral spring steel, billets and axle-bars for the manufacture of carriage springs and axles on the free list. Steel for tool makers is reduced from 15 per cent to 5 per cent. Scrap iron under the old tariff was \$4 per ton ; under our first resolutions we made it \$1.50 per ton ; it is now made \$1 per ton. Steel ingots, billets, iron puddled bars, &c., under the old tariff were \$5 per ton ; under our first resolution, \$4 per ton ; now reduced to \$2 per ton. These are articles used largely by manufacturers, and as we are dealing more generously with the producers of these goods under the bounty, we think the reduction is one that can fairly be made. Structural iron is reduced from 15 to 10 per cent. Bridge plates of steel for bridge manufacturers under item 223, is reduced from 15 to 10 per cent ad valorem. Rolled iron or steel plates, used by boiler makers, are reduced from 15 to 10 per cent ad valorem.

Veneers of wood, item 321, are reduced from 10 per cent to 7½ per cent. Glycerine, for the manufacture of explosives, formerly 20 per cent, is reduced to 10 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Have you increased the bounty on iron ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find the bounty resolutions on the Order paper, and, for the present, we do not propose any change concerning them. Those resolutions propose an increase in the bounty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But you are reducing the duty on iron still further, and I want to know if you are increasing the bounty further at the same time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We reduce the duty on the billets, but not on the pig iron. There is an increase in the bounty on steel billets over the bounty under the former Administration, but no other change in that respect now.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The size of the billet is changed from what it used to be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not dealing with the size of the billet. It is the cause of some embarrassment. We think we can deal with the item without regard to size.

There is a prohibition in the Act in respect to prison labour. It is found that in some cases people make articles of a similar character and mix them up with articles made by prison labour, so that it is extremely difficult for the customs authorities to draw the line. We have amended the item so as to cover such cases. The item now reads as follows:—

604. Goods manufactured wholly or in part by prison labour, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, jail or penitentiary. Also goods similar in character to those produced in such institutions, when sold or offered for sale by any person, firm or corporation having a contract for the manufacture of such articles in such institutions or by any agents of such person, firm or corporation, or when such goods were originally purchased from or transferred by any such contractor.

In other words, where a person is in a business selling certain articles which are the product of prison labour, and he offers other things of a like character which he says are not the product of prison labour, it is difficult to draw the line between them, and the law is to be made to exclude all the goods of that character offered by the person engaged in that business.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? There is a large quantity of that class of goods in the country. How does he propose to deal with them?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will bring such cases to the notice of the Controller of Customs, I have no doubt that the matter will be dealt with.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot deal with that in a customs tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to the item of books, we inserted in the list of prohibited books, reprints of British copyrights. But that brings up the somewhat difficult question of the copyright law. The item was put there not so much as the declaration of the policy of the Government as a statement of what was regarded by many as the existing law. But we have deemed it better to leave the copyright matter as we found it, and the schedule of prohibited goods, in this respect, as at present. Therefore, excepting reprints of British works copyrighted in Canada, we do not propose that they should be prohibited. The item will be changed accordingly.

I have to thank the House for remaining so long and listening so patiently, and I place these resolutions on the Table.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

The House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman who is in charge of these resolutions kindly tell me whether the expressions from "e" to "i," inclusive, involve any change from the definitions as given in the preceding Customs Act?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). These are just the same as in the hon. gentleman's own tariff.

That the importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in Schedule C hereto appended, is prohibited; and that any such goods if imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and may be destroyed, and that any person importing any such prohibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. I see there is a change in the wording here. "Shall" has been changed to "may." Is it to be at the discretion of the Government to destroy or not such goods?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As I understand, it is optional on the part of the Crown. I am told that cases have arisen in which it was not thought expedient to destroy absolutely.

Item agreed to.

That all medicinal preparations, whether chemical or other, usually imported with the name of the manufacturer, shall have the true name of such manufacturer and the place where they are prepared, and the word "alcoholic" or "non-alcoholic" permanently and legibly affixed to each parcel by stamp, label or otherwise; and all medicinal preparations imported without such names so affixed shall be forfeited.

Mr. FOSTER. There does not seem to be any reason why the additional word "alcoholic" or "non-alcoholic" should be inserted. The Controller of Customs or his officers would not take the simple fact that the label was marked alcoholic or non-alcoholic as proof. The liquids would have to be tested.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). This would be simply an aid. We are making a distinction between liquid medicines which are alcoholic and those which are non-alcoholic. Of course, it would be always open to us to make the test and this would be useful.

Mr. FOSTER. You would not rely upon that.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. Not solely.

Item agreed to.

12. That packages when imported shall be subject to the payment of the following duties, viz.:—

(a.) All bottles, flasks, jars, demijohns, carboys, casks, hogsheads, pipes, barrels, and all other vessels or packages, manufactured of tin, iron, lead, zinc, glass or any other material capable of holding liquids, and all packages in which goods are commonly placed for home consumption, including cases, not otherwise provided for, in which bottled spirits, wines or malt liquors or other liquids are contained, and every package being the first receptacle or covering inclosing goods for purposes of sale, shall in all cases, not otherwise provided for, in which they contain goods subject to an ad valorem duty or a specific and ad valorem duty, be charged with the same rate of ad valorem duty as is to be levied and collected on the goods they contain, and the value of the packages may be included in the value of such goods ;

(b.) Provided that all such packages as aforesaid containing goods subject to a specific duty only, and not otherwise provided for, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent ad valorem ;

(c.) That packages not hereinbefore specified, and not herein specially charged with or declared liable to duty, and being the usual and ordinary packages in which goods are packed for exportation, according to the general usage and custom of trade, shall be free of duty ;

(d.) Provided further, that all such special packages or coverings as are of use, or apparently designed for use other than in the importation of the goods they contain, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as would thereon be levied if imported empty or separate from their contents ;

(e.) Provided also, that packages (inside or outside) containing free goods shall be exempt from duty when the packages are of such a nature that their destruction becomes necessary in order to release the goods.

Mr. FOSTER. The provisions in this resolution are a little differently arranged. Perhaps my hon. friend the Controller of Customs will tell me whether or not there is any change from the old law.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. There is not any change ; but we take power, if the package is not of any value whatever, that a duty may not be charged, but that it may be destroyed.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no generic change.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. No.

14. That with respect to goods imported for manufacturing purposes that are admissible under Schedule A hereto appended for any specific purposes, at a lower rate of duty than would otherwise be chargeable, or exempt from duty under Schedule B hereto appended, the importer claiming such exemption from duty, or proportionate exemption from duty, shall make and subscribe to the following affidavit or affirmation before the collector of customs at the port of entry :—

I, (name of importer) the undersigned, importer of the (names of the goods or articles) mentioned in this entry, do solemnly (swear or affirm) that

Mr. FOSTER.

such (names of the goods or articles) are imported by me for the manufacture of (names of the goods to be manufactured) in my own factory, situated at (name of the place, county and province), and that no portion of the same will be used for any other purpose or disposed of until so manufactured.

Mr. HENDERSON. It appears to me that this resolution might be made much more workable by inserting a provision that an affirmation might be made before some other person than the Controller of Customs. It is very inconvenient for a manufacturer say twenty miles from a custom-house, to have to proceed there to make this declaration, and it might be much more convenient if it could be made before a notary public or a commissioner. That, I believe, is the practice, although the law does not seem to provide for it.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. Parties living at a distance could enter the goods through an agent. The subject has been considered, but it was not thought well to adopt the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has thrown out.

Mr. HENDERSON. Neither an agent nor a broker can make this declaration, as it should be made by the manufacturer himself. I believe this provision is got over by the manufacturer making a declaration before some person who has no authority to take it. It would therefore be well to make the law so that it could be complied with.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. In most manufacturing towns there is a custom-house, and I presume that in a case where there is no custom-house, this concession which is referred to by the hon. gentleman is made to the manufacturers.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have taken these declarations by the hundreds, and I am quite sure I have no authority to do so. However, the goods are passed in this irregular way. To my mind the law should be changed so that this can be done regularly.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. We will consider the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

16. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule D.

(a.) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b.) That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any coun-

try which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

(c.) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House must have sympathized with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in the painful duty which devolved upon him to-day. After a brief month during which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) had posed with great distinction as the founder of preferential trade between the mother country and Canada, after having enjoyed that popularity for a month, and having posed as having conduced to the unity of the Empire, by having formulated a system of preferential trade between the mother country and Canada; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was obliged to come down to the House to-day, and to dispel all the illusions of his friends on that subject, and he was obliged to turn back in the most complete manner on the position he occupied such a short time ago. I dare say the House will remember that when the Minister of Finance first propounded this resolution—for which another very dissimilar one has now been substituted—I ventured to make the following remarks:

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to the fact that the treaty is not made between Canada and other countries. The treaty is made between Great Britain, Belgium and Germany, and applies to all countries that have most-favoured-nation treatment with England. The express terms of one of those treaties, at all events, is that England will not permit any higher rate of duty to be charged upon articles coming from those countries than is charged upon like articles coming from Great Britain herself. If I am correct in my reading of the treaties, the proposal of the hon. gentleman is entirely delusive, and will have no effect whatever.

I may remind the House that we not only have the statement of the Minister of Finance, that he proposed to apply this, as he called it, "preferential clause" to England alone; but we also have the authoritative statement of the First Minister: that goods from Belgium and Germany would not be admitted in like manner as goods from England. The hon. gentleman in his brilliant peroration said:

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says that our project of freer trade with England is a delusive one.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Hear, hear.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It is so delusive that when I place these resolutions on the Table of this House to-night, they go into effect, and I speak with pride, in the name of the Liberal party, and the hon. gentlemen around me will share that pride, when I say that to-morrow morning, in every custom-house from ocean to ocean, the doors will open on terms of preferential trade with the mother country.

The hon. gentleman spoke with pride, and

that pride was shared in the most hearty and enthusiastic manner by his friends behind him, who, labouring under the illusion that the hon. gentleman had some foundation for the statement he made to the House, burst into song, and rendered "God save the Queen" in the most enthusiastic fashion. I wonder what were the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day, when the Finance Minister, after a short-lived month of his ill-deserved popularity, had to make the announcement, that his statement then was an utter delusion, and that the warning given him from this side of the House turned out to be well founded. Were not hon. gentlemen opposite completely deluded by the statement of the Finance Minister, as to what the effect of his resolution on the policy of the Government would be? We heard no wild cheers from the Opposition benches to-day when the Finance Minister admitted that he had learned wisdom from this side of the House, and learned also that the important public measure which he had put before this House, and before the people of the country, was an utter delusion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) recognizes that now, if he did not recognize it before.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) venture to deny that, in the face of the fact that a day or two after he made the first announcement of his policy, I told the House and the country, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) would be obliged to do one of two things: Either to withdraw that resolution from the consideration of the House, or to come down with an additional resolution providing for the extension of this privilege to Belgium and Germany, and to all other countries that had the most-favoured-nation clause with England. I told the hon. gentleman further: That there was not a Governor in a British colony where self-government existed, who would permit a Bill containing that clause to receive the Royal assent. Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows right well, that to-day he occupies the humiliating position in this House, of having to confess that he completely misled the House. He has to admit, that if he was not deceived himself, he had deceived the House, and he has further to admit, that this tariff Bill with that clause in it, could not obtain the Royal assent from the Governor General. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was compelled to admit, that all he had led this House to believe he was accomplishing for Canada and the Empire, was nothing but a delusion. But, the Finance Minister still ventured to tell this House:

We maintain that the treaties do not apply, but as a doubt exists—

Why, Sir, the Finance Minister still puts

his opinion against all the constitutional authorities upon this subject, and he declares, that he and his colleagues still believe that the course they pursued a month ago was the correct course.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does my hon. friend say "Hear, hear?" I tell him that the course the Government pursued a month ago was nothing short of a declaration of independence on the part of Canada. It was a declaration in the face of the world that Canada refused to be bound by the treaties which England had made in regard to Canada, as well as to herself. That was the attitude which the hon. gentleman occupied when he made his Budget speech, and now he is obliged to come here, and to take it all back, and he is forced to adopt a course that we on this side of the House told him he would have to adopt. But the Government still endeavour to shelter themselves behind the absurd statement:

We maintain that the treaties do not apply, but as a doubt exists—

Sir, if a doubt still exists I trust I will be able to clear away that doubt, and I trust that this "doubting Thomas" will get rid of these doubts which have induced him so to mislead this House, and to mislead the people of this country.

For sixteen years Canada has been endeavouring to get the Belgium and Germany treaties modified, and to have this colonial clause eliminated from them. What reason had we for wishing to get this clause of these treaties eliminated? Why, Sir A. T. Galt, my distinguished predecessor as High Commissioner for Canada, applied to Her Majesty's Government in 1881, asking them to induce Germany and Belgium to abrogate this clause which prevented Canada from treating the products of the mother country on any other terms than those extended to the goods of Germany and Belgium, and all other countries which had most-favoured-nation treatment with England. The Imperial Government made application to both Belgium and Germany, in this direction, and both these countries refused. On a subsequent occasion, in 1891, hon. gentlemen opposite know, that application was again made. The hon. gentleman knows that application was again made to the Imperial Government to obtain a modification of these Belgian and German treaties—what for? What concern was it to Canada if the hon. gentleman and his colleagues now entertain doubts that these Belgian and German treaties in any way interfere with preferential trade between England and Canada? I hold in my hand the declaration of Lord Knutsford, Secretary of State for the Colonies, when applied to in 1891, as follows:—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

His lordship observed, regarding the favoured-nation clause of the German and Belgian treaties, that "the undoubted effect of these two clauses is to prevent lower duties being charged in British colonies on the importation of goods the produce of the United Kingdom than are charged on similar goods the produce of Belgium or Germany. Moreover, under the most-favoured-nation clause contained in most of the treaties in force between Great Britain and foreign states, this privilege, which is enjoyed by Belgian and German goods in the British colonies, is extended to the goods of all the various countries parties to those treaties.

I think the hon. gentleman will find that if he has doubts on this subject, he is the only public man who has given attention to it who entertains the slightest doubt upon it. Then, in 1892, this question came up again, and with a like result. In that year, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, one of the most eminent statesmen in the Empire, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer of the British Government, in the House of Commons, said on this subject:

The treaty of 1862 with Belgium, and the treaty of 1865 with the Zollverein, do not prevent, as I think my right hon. friend is aware, the establishment of any kind of relations between the different colonies of this country. All they do prevent is the establishment of, so to speak, preferential relations between the United Kingdom and one of the colonies, and one of the colonies and the United Kingdom.

I think this ought to be quite as authoritative as the opinion of the hon. Minister of Finance; and yet, with these statements before him, the hon. gentleman pretends to this House that he still doubts whether these treaties have the effect of doing what Lord Knutsford and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach declare they do, that is, prevent Canada giving any preference to the goods of the United Kingdom coming into this country. Well, Sir, the House will remember that the Ottawa conference in 1894 took up this question of preferential trade, and passed a resolution upon it; and, Sir, I will read that resolution to the House:

Therefore resolved, that this conference records its belief in the advisability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.

Lord Jersey reported the result of that conference to Her Majesty's Government in an elaborate state paper; and the hon. gentleman has in the archives of the Privy Council at this moment a copy of the document which I hold in my hand, that is, the answer of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Marquis of Ripon, to that appeal on the part of Canada and the South African and Australasian colonies that measures should be taken to provide for preferential trade within the Empire. The Marquis of Ripon quoted Article 15 of the Belgian treaty, which says:

Articles the produce or manufactures of Belgium shall not be subject in the British colonies to other or higher duties than those which are or may be imposed upon similar articles of British origin.

The French translation of the treaty agreed to at the same time uses the words Great Britain instead of the word British. The despatch of the Marquis of Ripon on this important question which was sent to the Governor General of Canada for the advice of the Governor General and any persons who might be called on to administer the public affairs of this country, quoted article 6 of the Zollverein of the German Empire, as follows :—

The stipulations of the preceding Articles I. to VI. (they contain the whole treaty) shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions, the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The Marquis of Ripon then gave the opinion of the law officers of the Crown ; and I have already mentioned that the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Russell, one of the most brilliant lawyers and eminent judges, gave the authoritative opinion that these treaties do prevent preferential treatment by the British colonies in favour of the United Kingdom. Lord Ripon goes on to observe :

In regard to the third proposition, it seems clear that, under the terms of Article XV. of the Belgian Treaty, and of Article VII. in the treaty with the Zollverein, the British colonies cannot grant to the produce of the United Kingdom any preferential treatment as to customs duties without such treatment being also extended to Belgium and Germany, and, through them, to other countries which have ordinary most-favoured-nation clauses with Great Britain.

I may say that there were two applications. One was that Great Britain should by legislation remove the difficulties which stood in the way of preferential arrangements being made between one British colony and another. In reference to that Lord Ripon said :

While, however, Parliament has thus removed all legislative restrictions on the colonies, so far as Imperial legislation is concerned, it will be necessary, in order that Her Majesty's Government may be in a position to give effect to their responsibility for the international obligations of the Empire, and for the protection of its general interests, that any Bill passed by a colonial legislature providing for the imposition of differential duties, should be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure, so as to allow full opportunity for its consideration from these points of view.

For this reason the Governor General of Canada was told in 1894 to reserve all such Bills, and these gentlemen who express these doubts have this document under their hands and are not warranted in having any doubts, because nothing could be more clearly expressed.

For this reason, and in order to prevent inconvenience, it will be desirable, if such duties are included in a general Tariff Bill, that a proviso should be added, that they are not to come into force until Her Majesty's pleasure had been signified.

I give that to the hon. gentleman as the most conclusive evidence possible that this proposed arrangement was one that was utterly in the face of all the authorities, and the hon. gentleman ought not to have been ignorant of this, because he had these authorities, the very highest in the Empire under his hand, to give him the information, if he had it not before.

Now I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he supposed that this resolution would be the great means of establishing preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada. So confidently was that conviction expressed that the hon. gentleman ventured to conclude his speech by saying, in reply to my statement that his project was delusive :

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says that our project of freer trade with England is a delusive one. It is so delusive that when I place these resolutions on the Table of the House to-night, they go into effect, and I speak with pride, in the name of the Liberal party, and the hon. gentlemen around me will share that pride, when I say that to-morrow morning, in every custom-house from ocean to ocean, the doors will open on terms of preferential trade with the mother country.

Are the doors open now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) and some hon. gentlemen. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, preferential trade with the mother country does not mean, and the hon. gentleman knows it does not mean, placing the mother country in the same position as Belgium and Germany and the other nations entitled to the most-favoured-nation clause. No person knows better than the hon. gentleman that it is a perfect abuse of the term "preferential trade" to apply it to any such system as that. The hon. gentleman is aware that this construction, which he admits now he has been compelled to accept, brings us back to the same condition of things in which this country was practically from 1873 to 1878. I ask the hon. gentleman if that was any value to England ? Had we preferential trade from 1873 to 1878, when we had a lower tariff on English goods than you will have even under this present tariff, modified in this way ? Will the hon. gentleman attempt to tell me that Canada had preferential trade with Great Britain from 1873 to 1878, when the trade and revenue accounts of this country show that during that period the imports from the United Kingdom into Canada fell \$37,500,000 ? Was that preferential trade with England ? Is that what he is seeking ? Is that what he assumes is going to be a great boon to the mother country ? Sir, I have no hesitation

in saying that the policy which has been pursued for the last eighteen years was, to an infinitely greater extent, a British policy than the policy of the Mackenzie Government from 1873 to 1878 or the policy that is propounded now. Why, the moment you admit Belgium and Germany and all these other countries to come into competition with England, where is the boon to England? Where is the preference? Can the hon. gentleman pretend not to know that Germany is making rapid strides in her manufacturing industries and fast overtaking England? The Marquis of Ripon says, in this very despatch, on page five:

There can be no question as to the fact, that in many branches of trade in which Great Britain once held a distinct superiority, other nations now compete on equal terms.

Then where is the preference? The hon. gentleman will find, if he will turn to the "Times" of the 30th of January of this year, this statement:

It is true, too, that the value of exports from Germany, for example, has risen faster than those of this country. For the United Kingdom the value per head in 1870-74 and 1890-94 were £7 7s. 3d. and £6 2s. 1d., while those for Germany were £2 16s. 7d. and £3 2s. 9d. Already, in markets which were once exclusively ours, we find our rivals forcing their way, and the official report sounds a note of warning that their competition with us in neutral markets, and even in our home markets, will, unless we ourselves are vigilant, probably increase. "Every year will add to their acquired capital and skill, and they will have larger additions to their populations to draw upon."

So much for the competition of Germany to which this trade is also opened, because the preference is destroyed by permitting Germany, Belgium and all those other countries to share in it. I see the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) gloating, as he well may, over what has happened. I see the hon. gentleman in a position to claim that his policy has triumphed, that the policy of free trade, the policy of striking down the manufactures of the country has been at last obtained; and if he could not obtain it directly, the hon. gentleman has been sagacious enough to obtain it indirectly. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has deluded his hon. leader, the First Minister, who had pledged himself to the protectionists of this country that he would not injure our manufactures, into the belief that this proposed preferential clause meant nothing, because England could not accept it and it would have to be withdrawn, and then the general tariff would remain fairly protective and carry out the pledges which the First Minister had given the people.

I see in the "Times" of 29th January, 1897, a statement made by a gentleman of very high authority, Sir Courtenay Boyle, a leading gentleman connected with the Board of Trade. What does he say about this competition:

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

The increase of population in Germany and the United States has recently been greater than the increase in the United Kingdom, and those countries, enjoying, as they have, a period of peace which has lasted for nearly a quarter of a century, have rapidly developed manufacturing and industrial power.

I give that to the hon. gentleman as an additional reason why this clause of preferential trade has been divested of every particle of preference. Its effect will be simply this. The industries of Canada built up at such enormous cost, industries which have made Canada what it is to-day, industries that represent an enormous amount of capital invested, industries that have enriched Canada by the progress and prosperity she has enjoyed while they have been in operation—these industries will become paralyzed again, when exposed to a reduction of 25 per cent on this general tariff, and one after another they will succumb. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, be a little more fortunate than he is to-day. A month ago, when he exposed his tariff to the world, he thought it was perfection. He was extremely proud of it. But what has been the result? Why, he has been listening for a month to deputation after deputation coming to tell him that he had struck down their prosperity, that their doors had to be closed and that thousands of employees had to be hungry in the streets for want of employment which he had destroyed. He has done the best he could, I admit, to patch up this heterogeneous mass, and, I hope, has improved it a little. But he allows these Canadian industries to stand exposed, as they are to-day, under his new proposal, by which not England alone is to have the benefit of a preferential trade, but all the world, comparatively speaking, because the countries that have most-favoured-nation treaties with England embrace almost all the manufacturing industries of the world. So, the hon. gentleman finds that while he has brought about most deplorable results so far as Canadian industries are concerned, his preferential trade with England vanishes like a dream. The hon. gentleman still calls this preferential trade with Great Britain. I say again the term "preferential trade" has a well-understood meaning, and every one in this country recognizes that meaning. Preferential trade within the Empire means the reception of goods from England in Canada and of goods from Canada in England upon different terms from those which goods from foreign countries would enjoy, it means the whole structure of a united Empire growing out of the commercial relations which exist between Great Britain and her colonies, if within the bounds of the Empire there were a different tariff from that between any part of the Empire and the rest of the world. The United Empire Trade League has long been fighting that battle loyally and vigorously, and have shown the people of England and her colonies that such a system would build

up a trade which would be equally useful to the colonies and the mother country and that it would make England a mightier Empire even than she is to-day. The hon. gentleman might have done something to assist and carry out this scheme if he had even been true to the declaration of his leader. And I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to that. What did Mr. Laurier do in his last appeal to the country? He declared again and again from platform to platform, that he was as devoted to the principle of preferential trade, of discriminating trade between the motherland and Canada as Sir Charles Tupper was. He did more; he pledged his solemn word to the electors of this country that if they put him in power one of his first acts would be to send a commission to England to negotiate preferential trade between Canada and England with Lord Salisbury upon the lines I have indicated. Where is that pledge to-day? The hon. gentleman has made a reduction in the general tariff, without protecting the industries of Canada, sufficient, in my judgment, to have accomplished preferential trade within the Empire. Did the hon. gentleman make the proposal to England that she should denounce the German and Belgian treaties? I confess that I was not without hopes, knowing how thoroughly the First Minister had pledged himself to this policy of preferential trade, that when these gentlemen found themselves in a position where they must either withdraw this clause or extend it to all the world, they would take the opportunity of saying: England has refused the offer we made, she says she cannot accept it; and therefore we will now withdraw it and will use the proposal for the purpose of obtaining preferential trade within the Empire. I have studied the question closely; I have watched the course of public opinion; I have felt the public pulse in England as shown by the utterances of the press and of the most eminent public men, and I do not hesitate to say that I believe that, if hon. gentlemen opposite had taken that course, they would have obtained from the mother country that immense boon for Canada. What would preferential trade mean for Canada? What would a fiscal policy do for Canada that would add to the value of every acre of land in the Dominion? What would a fiscal policy do for Canada that would add to the value of every animal in the Dominion? What would a fiscal policy do for Canada that would add to the value of every bushel of wheat, of every bushel of grain of any description, and every product of the soil throughout the country? Why, Sir, it would do what the "Saturday Review" said it would do—a ten per cent duty on the products which came in competition with those of the colonies in Great Britain would put Canada in a position, within a few years, to furnish England with all the bread she requires and all the meat she

requires. When these gentlemen were determined to strike a blow at the protectionists, when they were determined to paralyze the industries of this country, why could they not make an offer such as I have suggested, which would have cost them nothing. They would have had a better revenue at the end of the year; and if they found they could not have from England the concessions of preferential trade, they could say: We have done the best we could to meet your views, but now we will have to follow our own course. In 1891 the Senate and House of Commons passed an address to Great Britain declaring their readiness for preferential trade. In 1891 Lord Salisbury was approached by the United Empire Trade League, and was asked to have the Belgian and German treaties denounced. His answer was: The public mind is not ready yet for such a course; if you believe in it, go out and fight for it, and after you have convinced the country that it is a good thing, your battle will be won. They took him at his word; they did battle all over the country. At the close of the last election, when Lord Salisbury was brought into power by a triumphant majority, they went back and said: We obeyed your mandate; you told us to go and fight for preferential trade and we have fought the battle and won it—for if your lordship will look at the addresses and speeches of a majority of your own supporters throughout the country you will find them pledged to maintain preferential trade by favouring goods from the colonies as against goods coming from foreign countries. Well, Sir, that was not at all discouraging. Then, in 1892 this House of Commons passed the following resolution:—

That if, and when, the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the market of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Now, what happened? Why, Sir, every person knows that that great historic event, one of the most important that has ever taken place in Canada, resulted from this resolution. Every person knows that here in Ottawa, at the seat of Government of Canada, you had assembled the most eminent men from South Africa, the most eminent men from Australia, the most eminent men from New Zealand, and you had meeting with them and meeting with Canadian statesmen, a representative of Her Majesty's Government, a distinguished nobleman sent to take part in those deliberations; and, Sir, the result of that conference was the passage of this resolution:

That this conference records its belief in the advisability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies in which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more fav-

ourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.

Now, is there anything unreasonable in that? England is the only country in the world who does not give her colonies a more favourable fiscal treatment than it gives to foreign countries. I say that under these circumstances there was every reason for looking forward with confidence and with hope. Sir, the abandonment of this policy by the course that has been pursued here, is a breach of faith with the public men of all the outlying portions of the Empire, it is a breach of faith with them to turn round and abandon the preferential trade policy to which they have been pledged, and to take a step that, in my judgment, is as fatal to preferential trade as it is to the industries of Canada. When the United Empire Trade League went back to Lord Salisbury, he met them in a very different spirit from that in which he met them before. He did not pretend that there was not an overwhelming change in the public sentiment of England, but he said :

That he was in thorough accord with the views expressed by Mr. Chamberlain as to the extreme importance of securing as large a share as possible of the mutual trade of the United Kingdom and the colonies for British producers and manufacturers, whether located in the colonies or in the United Kingdom.

Lord Salisbury, according to the letter from which I quote, goes on to say :

While the Prime Minister fully recognizes the inconvenient character of the stipulations in question—stipulations which would never again be agreed to by this country—he is not prepared to give notice for the termination of these otherwise valuable treaties until a definite scheme has been produced offering such probabilities of increased trade within the Empire as would fully compensate for the risk involved.

Hon. gentlemen had the means which they are now abandoning without giving any special advantage to England whatever, they had the means of showing how trade within the Empire could be greatly increased, and of taking a step greatly in advance. I need not remind the House that the Toronto Board of Trade passed a resolution, and that the present representative of Toronto West (Mr. Osler), president of the Toronto Board of Trade, moved the resolution that passed at the third congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. That resolution was as follows :—

Whereas, in view of recent events, and the attitude of other nations towards Great Britain, and the fact that there exists within the British Empire resources in men and materials and arable land for its every requirement ;

Whereas, while the trade legislation of other nations is framed to subserve their local interests, all British trade and other legislation should aim to secure within the Empire a union of interest of a federal character, and the policy of each British community should be designed to

retain within the Empire subjects whose labour would otherwise go to foreign lands ;

Whereas, Canada has already formed a basis for closer relations with the mother country and other colonies by building a highway across British America, by creating steamship connections between Vancouver, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Australia, by offering a large subsidy for a fast Atlantic steamship service, as well as by her precedent of confederation, making for British unity ;

And whereas closer commercial relations between the mother country, her colonies and dependencies will be hastened by further subsidizing fast steamship services and completing postal, wire and cable communications with the different portions of the Empire, thus making such routes for commerce, food supply and munitions of war the fastest and most secure from attack ;

Resolved, that, in the opinion of this conference, the advantage to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of a zollverein, based upon principles of the freest exchange of commodities within the Empire, consistent with the tariff requirements incident to the maintenance of the local government of each kingdom, dominion, province or colony, now forming part of the British family of nations.

Well, Sir, this resolution was moved by Mr. Osler, president of the Board of Trade of Toronto, before the third congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, and it was responded to by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, in a speech of the deepest possible significance. That hon. gentleman, immediately upon taking charge of the Colonial Department, issued a despatch to all the colonies asking them to point out the most effective means by which trade within the Empire could be promoted. The hon. gentleman recognized that England had it within her power to change a policy under which every pound of her trade that is given to a foreign country is building up a foreign country, that every pound of her trade that goes outside of her own Empire is contributing to the greatness, prosperity and power of a country with whom the next day she may be at war ; and that England, possessing, as she does, these enormous resources, and invaluable possessions in the great outlying portions of the Empire, in Australia, in South Africa, and in Canada, is in a position to adopt a system of commercial preference within the Empire, which would increase the greatness, not only of the United Kingdom by the augmentation of her trade, which all statistics show is immensely greater, in proportion to the population, with the colonies than with foreign countries, but would build up great possessions like Canada, Australia and South Africa, all of which would make her, as I said before, a still greater and more dominant power in the world than she is at present. Well, Mr. Chamberlain took up this resolution and made it the basis of a speech—I will not read his speech again, because I used it on a former occasion ; but I will say that the whole point of his argument was that if the colonies would approach the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

mother country with a proposition of that character, they would not meet with a refusal, or, at all events, they would meet with the fairest and fullest consideration, and, in a broad and patriotic spirit. Now, the Hampshire "Advertiser" had an article upon this subject, of which I will read a short extract. Speaking of Mr. Chamberlain's attitude on this subject, it said :

He has come to the conclusion, apparently, that a practical solution of the whole problem can be found in the adoption of a customs union, and his speech was, in effect, an invitation to the colonies to approach the Colonial Office with a view to getting at an agreement. We have often referred to the almost infinite advantages to be gained by a welding together of all parts of the Empire in a solid Imperial federation, and Mr. Chamberlain has accepted a modification of the ideal which certain ardent men have for a long time past been advocating. We are all agreed upon the wisdom of the closest possible union ; but where we are not agreed is in regard to the practicability of finding a foundation of material interest sufficiently real and mutually advantageous to prove abiding and satisfactory.

No doubt will be left in the mind of any person as to what would be the result of such a measure, if properly pressed. I deplore again in the deepest manner the fact that this Government, while professing to desire to draw the mother country and Canada more closely together, while admitting as the Minister of Finance did, the immense advantage it would be to this Dominion to have preferential trade with England and the products of our country admitted on more favourable terms than those of foreign countries, has not only not availed itself of this opportunity, but has taken measures which make it utterly impossible to accomplish it. Hon. gentlemen may ask me why I say they have rendered it impossible of accomplishment. I refer hon. members to a passage in Lord Ripon's dispatch which covers the case. The noble Lord says :

Such denunciation would be a step of the greatest gravity, and, whilst Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the desirability of removing any treaty stipulations which may hamper the action of the colonies in regard to trade relations, they consider that the advantages to be derived from such a step should be very clearly shown to outweigh the disadvantages before it could properly be resorted to.

Yesterday you had the advantages in your hands. Yesterday you were in a position to say to England : If you will denounce the Belgian and German treaties at the close of the year, we will be prepared to receive from England and from England alone all products of her industries at 25 per cent less duty than we will impose on the products of other countries. That proposition, looking at the effect it would have had on Canada, looking to the importance as regards England that this country should not only be prosperous but great and secure a

large population and have her enormous and practically illimitable resources developed, and Canada thus become the right arm of the mother country, is one that although it might not have immediately resulted in the object desired to be obtained, yet it would have laid the foundation in the hands of parties anxious to promote the unity of the Empire and prepared to adopt such measures to accomplish the object in view. It is to be deplored that such an opportunity should have been lost. I am glad the First Minister has given the House the light of his countenance for a few moments because I have been endeavouring to draw attention to a point on which, if he does not take a deep interest in regard to it, he should do so, that is the redemption of pledges. When the hon. gentleman sought power he pledged himself to two measures : first, he declared that he was a devoted advocate of preferential trade within the Empire ; second, he announced that if returned to power, he would send a commission to negotiate with Lord Salisbury for the purpose of endeavouring to secure that result. The hon. gentleman has had an opportunity that will not again present itself in his lifetime, and he has thrown it away. Not only has he failed entirely to obtain preferential trade within the Empire for Canada, but he has adopted the most complete and effective means he could take to prevent this boon ever being obtained. And why ? Because if Lord Salisbury or Mr. Chamberlain—who has shown his anxiety to endeavour to secure the unity of this great Empire on a commercial basis—were to go to the House of Commons with a proposal such as this : if the Imperial Government would denounce the Belgian and German treaties at the end of the year, Canada would make a reduction in favour of England and England alone, provided England imposed moderate duties on articles in her markets coming into competition with those of Canada, I believe such a result could be accomplished. The hon. gentleman may not be so sanguine as I am, but I believe that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, if they had grappled with this subject in a statesmanlike manner, could have accomplished this object and secured a boon to Canada that would have been of inestimable value. But they have not done that, they have disarmed Mr. Chamberlain and the United Empire Trade League and all the friends of preferential trade in the Empire, of the most potent influence possible to be used to secure preferential trade. It is one thing to go down to the House of Commons and show the great advantages that would immediately accrue to the mother country under a policy of that kind, and it is another thing to go down and talk about the advantages of adopting such a policy when we have nothing more to give away, when in fact we have thrown away the very means by which

this result could have been accomplished. So, in my judgment, the hon. gentleman has unfortunately taken a course that is diametrically opposed to the statement urged by the Minister of Finance, and for which the Government has obtained such kudos here and elsewhere for what was supposed to be an effort to establish preferential trade between Canada and the mother country. I hold in my hand a report of a speech delivered by an eminent member of the present Administration, Mr. Goschen. In dealing in parliament with this subject on February 17th, 1891, Mr. Goschen said :

I think it is possible that the advantages of the consolidation of the Empire may be so great that, if the increase in the price of the loaf is extremely small, the producers, with whom the power now lies far more than with the consumers, may not object. I differ with the honourable member for Leeds, who supposed that if we had any customs union or arrangement by which favour was shown to the colonies, the United States would have a right to interfere. I do not think the United States would have a right to remonstrate or interfere in the way he suggested. The right honourable gentleman suggested England would be brought to her knees, but I must enter my protest against such an extreme view, that under no circumstances could we make any arrangements with our colonies without bringing in the other bread-producing countries. If we find we could make the whole Empire one as regards customs, surely we have the right of Zollverein union as Germany has with Bavaria or the United States among themselves. I claim for ourselves the same right. We ought to have securities from the colonies, not merely that they would put a 5 per cent extra on foreigners, but that their tariff itself should be such as would be likely to protect this country from loss.

That was precisely the position the hon. gentleman occupied with this tariff in his hand, and had he taken the ground: We have offered you preferential trade; you say you are bound by treaties that forbid you from accepting our offer, and, that being the case, we will now give you a substantial advantage of 25 per cent reduction on the general tariff of our country, and we will give that exclusively to England, if you will give us a similar preference. I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is another point in which I believe the public of Canada, and the British public, will be greatly disappointed with reference to this tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) by a very ingenious handling of words—and I must confess he did it with great success—led the House to suppose that this was a British tariff, and that it was anything but an American tariff. He (Mr. Fielding) led the House to suppose that his object was to draw the bonds closer between the mother country and Canada, and to let the United States understand that if they were not disposed to trade fairly with Canada, Canada proposed to wait and see what attitude the United States were going to assume before granting her any favours.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The House and the country understood the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to say that, but yet we find, that instead of this being a pro-British tariff it is a pro-American tariff. I, as a Canadian, am most anxious to preserve the most friendly relations, commercial and otherwise, with the United States of America, but I have to remember that we have been taught again and again by the most severe lessons, that that country has little regard for us. When the Hon. George Brown went down to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States of America, and when he made generous offers on the part of Canada, he was met with the declaration: Mr. Brown, we may as well understand this matter at once, you must agree to discriminate against England or we will not negotiate a reciprocity treaty with you. That was the answer to Mr. Brown, and that hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown), to his credit be it said, turned upon his heel and replied: Then my mission is at an end because the Government I represent will never consent to discriminate against the mother country in favour of any foreign nation. And later, when representatives of the Canadian Government went to Washington to negotiate a treaty with Mr. Blaine they were met with the open statement: If you want to share in the advantages that American citizens enjoy, you have got to become American citizens. Sir, no person can study the McKinley or the Dingley tariff for a single moment, without coming to the conclusion that the policy of the United States is to cripple Canada in every possible way. We have unfriendly tariff Bills, and alien Bills, we are threatened with the abrogation of the bonding privilege, and there is nothing but threats from the American Government, and nothing to show that they are prepared to trade with us upon equal terms. Let me show how this tariff announced by our Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is not a pro-British tariff. When he came to deal with the mother country, what did he do? Before he made this cut of one-eighth which is to last for a short time, and then to be followed by a reduction of one-fourth, he increased his tariff over and above what his friends denounced as the high protective tariff of the Liberal-Conservative Government. The proposed reduction was a delusion to a very considerable extent, because it was not a reduction of one-eighth on the tariff as it stood when he came into power, pledged to carry out a very different policy. The Liberal-Conservative Government were charged with discriminating against England, but if you turn to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) you will find his statement on record, that out of \$5,000,000 worth of cottons imported into this country, \$4,500,000 worth (under our anti-British tariff as these gentlemen called it) came from England, and only half a

million dollars worth from the United States of America. On a former occasion I dealt with the false imputation that the Liberal-Conservative tariff discriminated against England, and, Sir, I do not intend to repeat that argument now. How did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) treat the United States under this tariff? He intimated that he did not intend to make any change in the coal duties until he knew what the United States would do. But the hon. gentleman took duty off corn. That is a great American product, and yet it is made free. Does that show anything else than that while the United States has turned the cold shoulder on our country, Canada has cringed towards her. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has no justification for taking the duty off corn. I say that his action in that respect is a severe blow struck at the agricultural interests of this country. There are a few cattle feeders, who would like to have their corn free, and they will thank the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and I dare say they will be able to show their gratitude to him; but a large number of the farming population of this country were engaged in growing corn on Canadian soil, and with Canadian hands, and the action of the present Government in admitting American corn free has paralyzed these hands, and has made it impossible that another ear of corn can be grown in Canada. That has been done by taking the duty off this product which is so abundant in the southern states of the Union. And, Sir, what more? It is an injury to the farmers who raise the coarser grains; it destroys the value of pease, oats, rye, barley; it not only sweeps away the corn-fields that were blossoming over a considerable portion of Canada, but it strikes down all these large industries by the introduction of free corn, which has more fattening qualities, and can be used in some respects to more advantage. But even that is not without its injurious effects. The Canadian, as he walks along the streets of London to-day, looking into the windows of the great groceries, is delighted to witness the spectacle of Canadian cheese with the price and American cheese with a considerably lower price. He is also delighted to witness the spectacle of Canadian bacon labelled at a much higher price than American bacon. Why is that? It is because the pea-fed bacon of Canada is much better and much more highly prized than the corn-fed bacon of the United States.

Mr. GIBSON. What has that to do with cheese?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say the high position which the cheese industry of Canada occupies has been attained by furnishing to the palates of the English people an article of higher quality than they were able to get from the United States. A few

years ago the cheese of the United Kingdom was largely supplied by the United States. To-day the American cheesemakers have lost that position. They have been distanced, and the only difficulty Canadians now have is to prevent Americans getting their cheese into the English market labelled as Canadian cheese. So that I tell my hon. friend that it has a good deal to do with it. I say that the excellence and pre-eminence in the great market of the world which our cheese has obtained it would be a pity to lose by doing anything tending to lower the character and standing of Canadian cheese. In the same way, by taking off duty on corn you strike a blow at the character of Canadian bacon which has secured for it a great reputation and a high price in England. But the hon. gentleman has also lowered the duty on wheat and the duty on flour. In fact, wherever there was an opportunity the hon. gentleman has tried to show the United States, what they have always believed, and what is one of the most fatal errors in the minds of American statesmen, that Canada is dependent upon them, and that they can at all times trample on our best and dearest interests; and the Finance Minister, without any desire on their part to reciprocate, is prepared to lower the duty on one article after another. Take the duty on iron. The hon. gentleman knows that under the National Policy we had built up an iron industry in this country which was gradually increasing, which showed a great increase in 1896; and yet the hon. gentleman has struck a fatal blow at that industry, not for the benefit of England, but for the benefit of the United States. Does he want the proof? Let him look at the iron girders coming from Detroit for the construction of the great bridge at Montreal. That is the way the hon. gentleman has shown his independence of American interests. I am as ready as any man in this country to treat that great republic with all the consideration to which it is entitled. No one has a more sincere admiration for it than I have. Its magnificent development has astounded the world. But on the northern half of the continent of America, with our great natural resources, all we need is to have faith and confidence in ourselves, and foster Canadian industries on Canadian soil, in order to build up a country which will be all that Canadians desire. So distinguished a man as the Hon. David Wells gave utterance to this tribute to the position that Canada had attained under the National Policy:

In the Dominion of Canada, separated territorially from us on the north by an imaginary line, there has been no panic, no unusual demand for money, no stoppage of industries, no restriction of trade, no increased rate of interest; in short, nothing beyond the ordinary course of events, except so far as these events may have been influenced by contiguity to what may be termed a

financial cyclone, whose pathway of destruction was contiguous to, but not within, Canadian territory.

This is a tribute to Canada uttered during the time of one of the greatest depressions the United States or Canada has known for many years—a contrast by a high American authority drawn between Canada and the United States. While on this subject, I may be permitted to read a passage from a greater and still more eloquent man than Mr. Wells in regard to Canada. The Hon. William A. Seward, when Secretary of State, after a lengthened visit to Canada, uttered the following prophetic words:—

Having its Atlantic seaport at Halifax and its Pacific depot near Vancouver Island, British America would inevitably draw to it the commerce of Europe, Asia and the United States. Thus, from a mere colonial dependency, it would assume a controlling rank in the world. To her other nations would be tributary; and in vain would the United States attempt to be her rival, for we could never dispute with her the possession of the Asiatic commerce, nor the power which that commerce confers.

That, Sir, was from one of the most eloquent and distinguished men of the United States about the date of confederation, or a little before. I would like to know what that distinguished gentleman would have said if he had lived to the present day and had seen a great transcontinental line of railway extending from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific, with towns and villages built up all along its course, and with a development of the whole country such as the most sanguine men at that time would not have ventured to predict. Now, I propose to bring these remarks to a close by embodying in an amendment to this resolution the views I entertain. The first is that this proposed tariff, exposing the industries of Canada to competition with all the world, and the reduction of 25 per cent below the general tariff which is adopted, will be fatal to Canadian industries. That may not be felt perhaps immediately, but at a very early day it will be felt; and, the gentlemen on the back benches have enlightened us by telling us that after personal communication with the Government, they have obtained a pledge that this is only the entering of the wedge, and that it will be driven home until every vestige of protection is rooted out. My second and great objection is that this policy has destroyed the prospect of obtaining preferential trade, the most gigantic boon which, in my judgment, could be obtained for Canada, and one which, if the hon. gentleman was determined to make his attack on the industries of the country, they ought to have secured if for no other reason than as some compensation for the injury they were doing. Then the third and last point is one of some importance,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and I propose again to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the statesmanlike views on this subject—that is with reference to that part of this clause which leaves it in the power of the Government to control, to a considerable extent its application—of the Marquis of Ripon. That part of the clause reads:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to—

That puts the entire lowering and raising of duties in the hands of the Government of the day, because it leaves the decision to their judgment, whether Japan or any other country shall come into competition with us; and I hold that the principles embodied there is a most vicious principle. I hold that everything that touches the tariff, everything that touches the fiscal policy of the country, ought to be settled by the members of the Commons and not by the members of the Government, and just in proportion as you encroach upon the rights of Parliament, you are encroaching upon the rights of the people and adopting a policy that is of an utterly unsound character.

Now, I will read, in confirmation of my views, the following sentence from Lord Ripon's despatch on page 9:

I trust, therefore, that the colonial legislature—  
This is a despatch to the Governor General but it is addressed as if Lord Ripon were speaking to the House of Commons of Canada:

Her Majesty's Government trust, therefore, that the colonial legislature will not seek to divest themselves in any measure of their power to fix the amount of their taxation in order to confer on the executive a power the exercise of which, without the fullest deliberation, might inadvertently give rise to serious complications, not only with other colonies, but with foreign powers.

The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that there is good ground for questioning the course which this Government have pursued. I shall now read the resolution which I propose to move in amendment to the clause before the committee. I move that all the words after "that" be left out, and the following be substituted therefor:—

That in the opinion of this House the reduction by 25 per cent of the duties upon all imports except wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane, or beet-root, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes in favour of any country whose tariff is or may be made on the whole as low as that of Schedule D, is calculated to imperil the industrial interests of Canada and is in principle opposed to preferential trade of any kind with the mother country.

That on several occasions the Government and Parliament of Canada have requested Her Ma-

esty to be pleased to take such steps as might be necessary to terminate the effect of the provisions of all treaties which prevent the Parliaments of the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies adopting such tariffs as may be required for the promotion of trade within the Empire, but no decisive action has been taken in this direction.

That the desire for preferential trade with the United Kingdom is now general throughout Canada.

That this House is of opinion that the Government of Canada should cause Her Majesty's Government to be advised that so soon as the difficulties in the way are removed the Parliament of Canada is ready to enter into a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain and Ireland.

That this House cannot consent that any arrangement made by the Government of Canada with any country involving serious considerations of tariff and revenue should become operative without the sanction and ratification of Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). I confess to entertaining a feeling akin to consideration that an hon. gentleman, with the record of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, should have delivered such a speech as we have heard from him to-night upon such a subject as that now before the committee. The hon. gentleman has posed for many years as the author and the advocate of what he has termed preferential trade with Great Britain; but while he has always, and at all times and under all circumstances, been ready to discuss that question, so long as it remained an academical question, the moment it is presented to him in a concrete and practical form, he turns his back upon it, and for two long hours opposes not only the author of the proposition but the proposition itself. One might be pardoned also if one were somewhat annoyed at the extreme length of the hon. gentleman's disquisition. In what possible way the hon. gentleman could drag in to this debate the very interesting question whether pease or corn are the better food with which to fatten hogs, and how that question could have any effect in determining whether the proposition before the House is a legal one, it is certainly difficult to conceive. The hon. gentleman had to-night one of the greatest opportunities of his life. He had the opportunity of showing that he was not merely a politician but a statesman. He had the opportunity of rising above the trammels of party and showing that he preferred the welfare of the country and the Empire to mere party politics. He has shown himself, however, unable to rise to that position, and he stands here to-night in the humiliating position of a man who professedly has been a supporter and an advocate of the great proposition of free trade and fiscal development within the Empire, but who to-day abuses and denounces that very proposition when it is presented to him for acceptance.

In his opening sentences he sought to persuade the House that the simple amend-

ment proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance, in order to make plainer the proposition originally tabled by him was a reversal of that proposition. He endeavoured to lead the House to believe that we had withdrawn that proposition and were now submitting something entirely different. WeM, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there can be any doubt in any impartial mind that the suggested amendment which my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has submitted in the resolutions before the committee, does not in any sense or way alter the proposition originally tabled. And any hon. gentleman who sat here and listened to that resolution as it was explained by the Finance Minister knows that it was, and was intended to be, an offer of reciprocal trade to any country which would accept the conditions embodied in the resolution. It was not confined to one country more than another; and when questions were raised as to whether we should not be bound to extend the concessions we were making to those countries that had treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause whether they gave reciprocal concessions or not—I say when legal, technical legal questions, were raised as to whether we should not be bound as to extend these concessions, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) to remove the possibility of doubt, placed on the face of the resolution this clause:

That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

When the Finance Minister tabled that clause, he was only making that more clear which he himself thoroughly well understood and which everybody who listened to his speech understood—

Mr. FOSTER. Which the Premier did not understand.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The Premier thoroughly understood it. The Premier took that stand which the Finance Minister took, which every member of the Cabinet took and holds to-day, that these treaties did not apply and did not bind Canada. The Premier took the stand, which is now carried out in every customs-house in Canada, that these treaties do not bind Canada, and that German and Belgian goods are not entitled to preferential treatment because of these treaties. I do not intend to go into a long dissertation upon the history of these treaties, but to submit, briefly, the reasons upon which we base that legal conclusion; and I think I can satisfy, if not all, a great majority of the members of this House that the extravagant and extreme language which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has thought fit to use was not only unworthy of the great question he was discussing, but wholly without warrant in the case. When this resolution was tabled, the hon

gentleman declared it an illegal and unconstitutional resolution. Can he lay his finger, Sir, upon a single paragraph published in any newspaper of weight in the world endorsing that extravagant statement of his? Can he produce the opinion of a prominent lawyer, or even of a fledgling lawyer, endorsing the absurd and ridiculous statement made by him that the resolution was unconstitutional and illegal? He, the leader of the great Conservative party, pronouncing 'excathedra' in such extravagant language such an opinion is, I am proud to say, alone in the position he takes. But, Sir, he tells us that no one but the Finance Minister has any doubts that the Belgian and German treaties do apply. Well, the gentlemen who are colleagues of the Finance Minister, and some of them are not altogether undistinguished as lawyers in the localities from which they come, hold the same opinion as the Finance Minister. The leading organ of public opinion in England, the London "Times" newspaper, in its leading editorial, published after the proposition had been received by the cable, pronounced itself upon this doubt in the following language:—

There is, in the first place, much doubt whether the treaties in question have any bearing on Mr. Fielding's propositions.

So, the hon. gentleman says that no one in the world has any doubt but the Finance Minister. I give him his answer in the editorial opinion of the leading organ of public opinion of England. What have we more? The cable has told us, within the last few days, that one of the most distinguished lecturers upon international law in Great Britain, Sir Charles Malcolm Kennedy, lecturer upon international law at University College, Bristol, states that in his opinion, the German and Belgian treaties do not apply to this proposal. I quote this opinion to show the ridiculous absurdity of the position that the hon. gentleman takes that he alone is right and that there is no ground whatever for our contention that these treaties do not apply. This is what the despatch says:—

Unusual importance attaches to the statement of Sir Charles Kennedy, who, during a lecture on international law at the University College, Bristol, yesterday, touched on the new Canadian tariff. In view of Sir Charles's position as an expert, and in view of the fact that he only recently retired from the head of the commercial department of the Foreign Office, his words have weight.

Sir Charles Kennedy said that, while on the surface the new preferential clause of the Canadian tariff appeared contrary to the Belgian and German treaties, the circumstances of the case were materially altered since these treaties were enacted.

For instance, said Sir Charles, self-government has been conceded to Canada, including the power to regulate her own fiscal policy. Acting on that power, Canada has prohibited the entrance of prison-made goods, an export favoured by Belgium and Germany.

Mr. DAVIES.

Moreover, he continued, Canada is willing to concede tariff preference to every country on reciprocal terms. This tariff rule was adopted by the United States, and had, to some extent, been recognized by the powers already having agreements with the United States, including England and France.

Now, on referring to the authorities to ascertain who this gentleman is, I find that he is not only a distinguished lecturer upon international law, but that he has been for forty years in the Foreign Office in England, and that he has been accredited by Her Majesty to leading cities in Europe—to Paris, the Hague and other places, to carry out diplomatic embassies with which he was entrusted. And though the hon. gentleman must have read this, he calmly says to his followers that this whole thing is illegal and unconstitutional, that there is no doubt that the treaties apply, and that nobody has any doubt about it except the Finance Minister. I ask his friends and followers if this is a creditable position for the hon. gentleman to take, especially upon a question which we had a right to hope would have been raised above party fights.

The hon. gentleman has hardly attempted, I think, to discuss the proposition itself, to show how far these treaties do apply or to give reasons why they do apply. With the permission of the House, I will give, shortly, some reasons why, in my humble judgment, these treaties do not apply to the proposition before us. Two questions meet us on the threshold of this inquiry. The first question is: Do the German and Belgian treaties apply to the proposition now before the House in the absence of any Imperial or Canadian legislation giving effect to these treaties? The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who has just spoken, is not a lawyer, but he will understand, I am quite sure, the full meaning and import of the words that I have used. The second question is: If the German and Belgian treaties do apply, do the tariff resolutions, in the form in which they present themselves conflict with the terms of the treaties?

Now, Sir, taking up the first question, I admit frankly that the constitutional right of the Crown to make treaties binding the Empire is unquestioned. But that right has a limitation, like many other rights and powers that the Crown possesses, a clear and distinct limitation; and that limitation is that the carrying of treaties into effect is subject to the discretion of the Imperial or Colonial Government which may be affected by the treaties. That is a proposition of constitutional law, which I take it, will not be challenged by any hon. gentleman. The Crown in its prerogative right, simply acting by virtue of its prerogative right alone, has no right to make a treaty which can impose a tax upon a subject of Great Britain. The Crown, acting by virtue of its prerogative right, has no power by treaty to impose a tax upon a Canadian subject; nor has the

Crown, acting by virtue of the same right, the power to apportion taxation, or define the manner in which taxes should be levied upon Canadian or British subjects. I say therefore, that while the Crown has an indisputable and undoubted right to make treaties, that while it is the only representative that foreign powers can look to to make treaties, and an undoubted right to make them with foreign powers, the moment the Crown makes a treaty which affects the fiscal legislation of an autonomous or independent colony, that treaty has no legal effect and cannot be brought into legal effect until the Parliament which has this autonomous and fiscal control, by proper enactment brings it into effect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the Imperial Parliament ever took any action upon the German and Belgian treaties?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I am coming to that. If the hon. gentleman will permit, I want to present first the purely legal argument, and I will show the hon. gentleman why they did not do it. I say that this argument must equally apply to treaties which impose a prohibition or restriction on constitutional rights which otherwise are absolute. Now, the constitutional right of this Parliament of Canada to declare what taxation shall be raised, how it shall be raised, in what manner customs duties shall be levied and appropriated, is absolute and unquestioned, and is undivided with anybody else; and I say if the Crown, by virtue of its prerogative alone makes a treaty which interferes with that absolute and unqualified right, that treaty does not apply to us until this Parliament has sanctioned it. But my hon. friend asks, has the Parliament of Great Britain passed any law making this treaty applicable to Great Britain? Just the very point I was stating. There has been no Imperial legislation making this treaty law. If there had been Imperial legislation making this treaty law, that Imperial legislation would have applied to Canada as well as to Great Britain, because the Imperial Parliament has the power to legislate over Canada as well as over Great Britain; but because there is no Imperial legislation, and because there is no Canadian legislation, we submit to the House that the treaty does not bind Canada. There was no occasion for any Imperial legislation quoad Great Britain and why? The treaty, so far as Great Britain is concerned, is a mere treaty applying the most-favoured-nation clauses to Great Britain, and nothing else; in so far as the colonies are concerned, it adds on this one clause of prohibition, prohibiting us from levying taxation or customs duties. That prohibitory clause does not apply to Great Britain. The portions of the treaty which apply to Great Britain are only those

most-favoured-nation clauses which come into operation by themselves; but so far as the prohibitory clause is concerned which applies to the colonies, my submission to this House is that that prohibitory clause requires Canadian legislation to give it effect. Well, Sir, what position did Canada stand in in 1862, when this treaty was entered into? Had Canada customs autonomy then? Had she fiscal independence then? I say she had, Sir, and I want to draw the attention of those hon. gentlemen who do me the honour to follow my argument on this point, very closely to what I am about to say now. The question which every legal mind will ask itself is, What was the condition of Canada in the year 1865, when this treaty was agreed to? At that time Canadian fiscal independence was a fact, a fact which not only had been demanded by Canada, but which had been conceded and acceded to by Great Britain. We are all familiar with the correspondence which took place in 1859, when Canada passed a customs law, clauses in which contained differential duties. The object of passing that customs law was challenged by the Duke of Newcastle, who was then Colonial Secretary, and animadverted upon in the most strong and vigorous language. Sir, what reply did he get from the Finance Minister of the day? I will read you a paragraph referring to that. Sir Alexander Galt, the then Minister of Finance, in answer to a despatch of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 13th August, 1859, said:

Respect to the Imperial Government must always dictate the desire to satisfy them that the policy of this country is neither hastily nor unwisely formed, and that due regard is had to the interests of the mother country as well as of the province. But the Government of Canada, acting for its legislature and people, cannot, through those feelings of deference which they owe to the Imperial authorities, in any manner waive or diminish the right of the people of Canada to decide for themselves both as to the mode and extent to which taxation shall be imposed. The provincial ministry are at all times ready to afford explanations in regard to the Acts of the legislature to which they are party—but, subject to their duty and allegiance to Her Majesty, their responsibility in all general questions of policy must be to the provincial parliament, by whose confidence they administer the affairs of the country. And, in the imposition of taxation, it is so plainly necessary that the administration and the people should be in accord, that the former cannot admit responsibility or require approval beyond that of the local legislature. Self-government would be utterly annihilated if the views of the Imperial Government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada. It is, therefore, the duty of the present Government distinctly to affirm the right of the Canadian legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best—even if it should unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial Ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such Acts, unless her advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of its inhabitants.

Sir, that claim to fiscal independence, that claim to customs autonomy, was acknowledged by the Duke of Newcastle, and the Bill which the Canadian Parliament then passed, and which was sent home for his approval, received the assent of the Queen without any other question. I say as a matter of constitutional law which is within the knowledge of every one, that from that time down to the present there has been no attempt to interfere with the exercise by the Canadian Parliament of its undoubted right in this regard. Now, Sir, I say more; I say the subsequent enactment of the British North America Act of 1867, the removal from the Governor's instructions, of the clause relating to differential duties, and the concession lately given to us of our right to be consulted in making treaties, settles this point now beyond all question. It is not now in controversy, it is admitted by everybody, by writers upon constitutional law, by statesmen, politicians and everybody else. I submit, therefore, in closing this branch of the argument, that if I have made my point clear, in view of Canada's customs autonomy in the year 1865, when that treaty was entered into, it was not and could not have been the intention of the Imperial Government to bind Canada without her consent. The words of the treaty, it is true, if read, generally, are broad enough to cover Canada, but I say these words must be read with the constitutional limitation which I have referred to, that where a treaty made by virtue of the Crown's prerogative, limits the power of the Colonial Parliament in the imposition of its customs taxation, that treaty is operative only as, and when the Parliament assents to it. Now, Sir, I will call attention on that point to a distinguished writer on constitutional law, Mr. Anson, a book quoted and acknowledged everywhere as one of the highest authorities upon this branch of the subject. He says on page 279:

This much appears to be certain, that where a treaty involves either a charge on the people or a change in the law of the land, it may be made, but cannot be carried into effect, without the sanction of Parliament. Such treaties are, therefore, made subject to the approval of Parliament, and are submitted for its approval before ratification, or ratified under conditions.

Such are treaties of commerce which might require a change in the character or the amount of duties charged on exported or imported goods.

I submit that is a strong authority for us to take on this constitutional point. I go further, and say that the constitutional point was discussed and admitted by Lord Kimberley, when he was Colonial Secretary, at the time he was in correspondence with the Australian colonies on the subject matter of this treaty. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to that correspondence, and they will find that as far back as 1871

Mr. DAVIES.

the delegates of the different Australian colonies, New South Wales, Tasmania and Australia, claimed the right to impose preferential duties as between themselves and foreign countries, irrespective of the wishes of the Imperial Government, and they submitted a memorandum, two paragraphs of which I will venture to read to the House. It is signed by the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Premiers and the Chief Secretaries of the several colonies. It says:

As members of the British Empire, the relations of which with other countries are conducted by the Imperial Government, we deny that any treaty can be properly or constitutionally made which, directly or indirectly, treats these colonies as foreign communities.

With the internal arrangement of the Empire, whether in its central or more remote localities, foreign countries can have no pretense to interfere, and stipulations respecting the trade of one part of the Empire with another, whether by sea or land, are not stipulations which foreign governments ought to be allowed to become parties to in any way.

The article in the treaty with the Zollverein to which Lord Kimberley refers,—

This is the very one now under discussion.

—is, therefore, one from the obligations of which we should claim to be considered free, if it were interpreted so as to prevent these colonies from imposing differential duties as between themselves and foreign countries.

There is the claim made broadly; there is no question about it. My hon. friend smiles, but I suppose he would hardly challenge the fact that in the words I have read their claim to be free of obligations at this time was preferred in this diplomatic note in as clear and distinct a manner as it is possible for the English language to make it clear and distinct. It is true Lord Kimberley overruled the objections. But why? When I call the attention of the House to his reasoning, I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite to answer this question: does a single word of the reasoning used in overruling that claim apply to Canada? If it does, then I can say that this authority is against me and not for me; if not, then I say that by the very strongest inference this authority is in my favour. In the despatches which Lord Kimberley wrote—and I may say they were exceedingly lengthy and remarkably lucidly reasoned—he said:

I will deal, in the first place with the point raised as to the obligation of the Australian colonies to conform to the Seventh Article of the Zollverein treaty.

Her Majesty's Government apprehend that the constitutional right of the Queen to complete treaties binding on all parts of the Empire cannot be questioned, subject to the discretion of the Parliament of the United Kingdom or of the colonial parliament, as the case may be, to pass any laws which may be required to bring such treaties into operation.

The right to pass the treaty, he says, is un-

questioned, subject to the discretion of the Colonial Parliament which is affected by it to bring the treaty in to effect. Here is the argument :

But no Acts of the Australian legislatures could be necessary to give validity to a stipulation against differential duties, inasmuch as by the Australian Colonies Government Act, 13 and 14 Vic., chap. 59, sec. 27, it is provided that "no new duty shall be imposed upon the importation into any of the said colonies of any articles, the produce and manufacture of, or imported from, any particular country or place, which shall not be equally imposed on the importation into the same colony of the like article, &c., from all other countries and places whatsoever.

So that the constitutional Act of the Australian colonies contains a special stipulation prohibiting them from imposing preferential duties in any shape or way, and therefore, Lord Kimberley says : it was not necessary for you to pass colonial legislation to give effect to the Zollverein treaty ; your Constitutional Act contains words rendering that unnecessary. I need not remind hon. members of this House that no Constitutional Act that Canada has now or had at the time of that treaty ever contained such a prohibition upon her power. Lord Kimberley goes on to say :

Moreover, the Australian Colonies Government Act and the New Zealand Constitution Act prohibit the colonial legislatures from levying any duty, imposing any prohibition or restriction, or granting any exemption or privilege upon the importation or exportation of any articles contrary to, or at variance with, any treaty concluded by Her Majesty with any foreign power.

So that here they were with two constitutional limitations in their Act, in the Imperial charter given to them : one saying, you shall not under any circumstances be permitted to impose any preferential duties ; and the other saying, you shall not be allowed to pass any law against any treaty entered into by Her Majesty. Their mouths were closed. Why should you reason further ? But I call attention to this fact, that neither of these constitutional prohibitions is in our Act. I therefore submit that in the face of our customs autonomy, in the absence of any such restrictions as exist in Australian Constitutional Acts, and in virtue of the limitation on the treaty making power of the Crown, and the absence of Imperial or colonial legislation giving effect to these treaties, they do not apply to Canada.

I am aware that the opposite conclusion has been for the time tacitly assumed ; we have gone on assuming that treaties apply as a matter of course. It may be that my argument is all wrong. I do not profess to be able to speak *ex cathedra* on a great constitutional point of this kind ; but I do profess that my argument is sufficient to say that we have exceedingly good ground for coming to the conclusion that these treaties never did or never were intended by the Crown to bind us until we have as-

sent to them. Now, I proceed to the second branch of the inquiry. Assume I am wrong ; assume that the treaty applies to Canada and requires no colonial legislation or assent to bring it into effect—what then ? The second question is, does the tariff resolution conflict with the terms of that treaty ? Sir, hon. gentlemen have on their desks this resolution, and I may be permitted to call their attention specially to it :

1. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be imported direct into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff.

There is no differential rates of duty proposed there ; there is no preferential duty enacted there in favour of any one country, and withheld from another. All trading countries are placed upon the same footing by that resolution. The enactment is general ; but the privileges offered are accompanied by a condition. The condition is applicable to all. Those who choose to take advantage of the condition can do so, and those who refuse to accept the condition cannot surely ask for the concession. If any foreign country applies a tariff to our goods as favourable as the reciprocal tariff is to theirs, then they get the benefit of our reciprocal tariff. If they do not apply such a tariff to us, then they do not get the benefit of our reciprocal tariff. The carrying out of the condition lies with the other countries and not with us. The words of the treaty read as follows :—

The produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to a higher or any other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

This resolution does not submit Belgian or German goods to any higher or other duties than the goods of Great Britain. You cannot read anything of that kind into this proposal, and it is a violently forced construction to say that the resolution does.

It is true that the fiscal policy of Great Britain enables her to get the benefit which we offer, because she complies with the conditions upon which the offer is made. Germany and Belgium can do so to-morrow, and if and when they do so, they will receive the advantage equally with Great Britain. But until they come within the terms of the resolution and offer us a reciprocal tariff as favourable as our reciprocal tariff, they cannot ask, either that their goods shall be received here at the lower rate, nor can they complain if their refusal to accept our offer subjects their products to higher or other duties than Great Britain. I say that this resolution neither discrimi-

nates nor differentiates. It attaches no terms which are not common to Great Britain and to all countries, and if Great Britain's fiscal system entitles her, as it does, to the immediate benefits which are daily flowing from the acceptance of our conditions; and if Germany and Belgium do not get the same advantages now, it is not because of our legislation, or our offer, but because of their own refusal to comply with the conditions which we have put in our offer. At any moment and by their own act, they can claim all the benefits under this offer, and I say it would be intolerable—both sides of the House will acknowledge that—that they should be allowed to enjoy the benefits, while repudiating the concessions on which alone the benefits are tendered.

Now, I say, that Canada makes this offer by virtue of her customs autonomy, and in the exercise of her undoubted constitutional right. She contends it is not open to the charge of preference or partiality, because its application depends on the voluntary action of any foreign nation that may wish to take advantage of it. We rejoice, we have rejoiced from the first, that the mother country comes under the clause at once, and that we were enabled to open—as the Minister of Finance said—the door of every custom-house in Canada the day after the tariff was tabled, to the products of Great Britain at lower rates than the products of any other country in the world. We are all pleased that such is the fact. We do not conceal our satisfaction at being able in this practical way to testify our gratitude to the mother country for what she has done for us; but we challenge the right of any foreign power, under cover of the favoured-nation clause, to reap the advantage of the offer with one hand, while repudiating the conditional reciprocal concessions which are the essence and reason for that offer. If the treaty applies to Canada, then, while we cannot make a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain, neither can we be prevented from making a general reciprocal trade offer, which it is open to all countries in the world to accept.

Now, Sir, I have endeavoured to place my views on this point before the House as clearly as I could, and I must say that upon this branch of the case I do not entertain any reasonable doubt whatever, that Sir Charles Kennedy's opinion is the right one, and that this offer will not be held to violate the conditions of that Zollverein or Belgian treaty, and if so, we can claim that we stand in the proud position: that we have achieved by one master stroke what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has been years talking about. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has been a strong advocate (I acknowledge that) of what he is pleased to call preferential trade; but as was wittily remarked in one of the English papers the other day: the hon. gentleman treated this question like a buried bone

which he exhumed from time to time merely for vain show. We have not been burying this bone and exhuming it from time to time for vain show. We have not been treating this question in an academic way. We have boldly grasped the nettle; we have solved the problem. Unless our legal position is entirely wrong. I say that undoubtedly we have solved the problem, and the best illustration which I can give of that statement, is the fact, that to-day, as was said, the customs offices in Canada are receiving British goods at the preferential rate. But, Sir, if that is all wrong; if we are wrong in our first legal point that the treaties do not apply, and if we are wrong in our second point, and it is held that our resolution does distinctly infringe the treaties, then, I say, we occupy the proud position, the great vantage ground, the only vantage ground from which this question can be successfully fought, for if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) wants to obtain preferential trade with Great Britain, he can obtain it in this way and no other way. If he wants really and practically to give the advantage which we are offering to British goods, it can be given in no other way than this, because this is the only possible way by which we can hope to get the treaties denounced. What has been the result of all the talking, and what has been the result of the meetings of the Imperial Federation League? What has been the result of the eloquent speeches which the leader of the Opposition has delivered from one end of Great Britain to the other, calling for the denunciation of those treaties? Sir, they have gone up in smoke; but what position do we stand in to-day? We stand in such a proud position, that we are told by the great organ of public opinion the London "Times": that even if we are wrong in our legal position; even if we are wrong in the constitutional point we have submitted, our case is so strong that the mother country will be obliged to denounce the treaties at once. What does the "Times" say? In its article published on the 26th of April, after the text of our offer was cabled to it, it said:

We have no hesitation in saying, that if any such stipulations stand in the way of a free and fair arrangement of duties between this country and her great colony in North America, the earliest opportunity should be taken to relieve us from their obligation.

Could anything be more definite, more clear, or more pronounced? I say upon all these points we occupy a splendid vantage ground. I may call the attention of hon. gentlemen to some remarks which were made in that regard by Lord Salisbury some time ago, as showing what his opinion is of these treaties. In addressing a meeting of the United Empire League as far back as 1891, Lord Salisbury is reported in the "Times" to have said:

With respect to those two unlucky treaties, they were made by Lord Palmerston's Government some thirty years ago, when, I am sure, our relations with our colonies could not have been fully considered. We have tried to find out from the official records what species of reasoning it was that induced the statesmen of that day to sign such very unfortunate obligations, but I do not think they could have known what they were signing. I have not been able to discover that they at all realized the importance of the engagements into which they were entering. We shall be very glad indeed to take any opportunity that may arise for delivering ourselves from these unfortunate engagements.

Sir, we tender to the Premier of the Empire the opportunity he has asked for. We ask him in a practical way to implement his pledge; and there is not a man who knows Lord Salisbury who does not believe that he will carry out that pledge. Sir, we say that if this treaty does apply and entitles Germany to the favoured admission of her goods without concessions, then it must be denounced; first, because it was made without our knowledge or assent, and imposes a dangerous limitation on our constitutional powers of raising our revenue; second, because concessions to Germany, in view of her hostile tariff, would be unpopular and inexpedient in the extreme, and because the trade returns show that the results of the trade between Canada and Germany are not such as flow naturally but are results achieved by means of a very onerous tariff which Germany imposes on Canadian goods; and third, because on broad grounds of policy it would not be right to ignore the good feeling existing between Canada and Great Britain, and to compel Canada, by virtue of treaties concluded without her knowledge or assent, and unratified by her Parliament and that of Great Britain, to extend to nations with hostile tariffs the commercial privileges we cheerfully extend to the motherland. I say that this proposition does not deserve to be denounced in the opprobrious language the leader of the Opposition has chosen to use, because it has touched a chord of sympathy which has vibrated through Canada and the Empire, and has lifted the question out of the region of political jugglery, and the mists of academic discussion into the region of practical politics and accomplished fact. Search the annals of colonial history, and you will search in vain to find a parallel case where so difficult a problem has ever been so boldly grappled with, and so satisfactorily solved. The proposal has been received with paeans of praise and almost unqualified approbation by the daily press of Great Britain, and the more staid and quiet weeklies also. It has dissipated at one blow and for ever the slanderous charges of disloyalty against the great Liberal party, and has opened a door whereby the trade of this country can be turned into British channels, and the fiscal federation of the Empire promoted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether the hon. leader of the House proposes to go on with the debate further tonight, or whether he will consent to an adjournment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If the hon. gentleman prefers not to go on this evening, we will agree to an adjournment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That when this House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Friday next, at three o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

On the order for the introduction of a Bill to amend chap. 50 of 49 Victoria (North-west Territories Act),

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) having introduced a Bill to amend the North-west Territories Act, it will be unnecessary for me now to introduce this Bill, and I desire to have the order dropped.

Order dropped.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 117) to provide for the registration of cheese factories and creameries, and for the branding of dairy products, and to prohibit misrepresentation as to dates of manufacture of such products.—(Mr. Fisher.)

## DISMISSAL OF MR. EDWARD AULT.

Mr. REID (for Mr. Broder) asked :

Why was Mr. Edward Ault dismissed as an assistant in the engineer's office at Morrisburg ? Was any charge preferred ? If so, by whom ? Was any investigation held ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Edward Ault was a time-keeper on the Williamsburg Canal, and was not holding a permanent office thereon. My instructions to the superintending engineer of the Williamsburg Canal were identical with those to the superintendent of the Welland Canal, and in accordance therewith, he was directed in reorganizing the staff of employees for the present year to select and retain in the service all of those who were well qualified and who had not made themselves obnoxious by taking an active part in the elections. I see no reason to doubt that Mr. Rubidge carried out my instructions, and I presume that the services of Mr. Edward Ault were dispensed with on the ground that Mr. Rubidge did not consider the interests of the service required that Mr. Ault should be continued in the employ.

## DISMISSAL OF MR. A. B. ROBERTSON.

Mr. REID (for Mr. Broder) asked :

Why was A. B. Robertson dismissed from his position as lockmaster at the head of Williamsburg Canal ? Was there any investigation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. A. B. Robertson was not a permanent employee, nor was he dismissed as the result of any directions from the department having special reference to him. Mr. Rubidge received the same instructions as to the reorganization of his staff on the Morrisburg Canal as were given to the superintendent of the Welland Canal, and it is presumed acted upon such instructions. There were only two out of the nine persons employed on the Morrisburg Canal last year who were not employed for the current year, Mr. Robertson being one of them. Mr. Robertson believed that his tenure was a political one. The department, if Mr. Robertson so desires, would be willing to hold an investigation into the question as to whether the reports of his having purchased the position are well founded or otherwise.

## ROBERT McMANUS.

Mr. ROGERS (for Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan) asked :

1. What information is in possession of the Government in regard to the character and record of Robert McManus and Mrs. McManus, late postmaster at Northfield, British Columbia ?

2. Was this Robert McManus a deserter from the English Army ?

3. Did he act as spy and informer in the Behring Sea arbitration against Great Britain ?

Mr. DAVIN.

4. Are there any papers on record in the possession of the Government giving the particulars as to the character and doings of said McManus and his said wife ?

5. If so, what is the nature of such particulars, and will the papers be placed upon the Table of the House ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). From papers in possession of the Government it appears that Robert McManus deserted from the Life Guards on the 25th day of September, 1869 ; that he came to Canada and enlisted in the 2nd Battalion or Quebec Rifles and accompanied the regiment to the Red River in September, 1870 ; that he deserted from that regiment ; that he made certain affidavits on behalf of the United States against Great Britain in connection with the Behring Sea arbitration. There are certain papers of a confidential nature in the possession of the Government to which it is not deemed proper here to make reference further than to say that they will be shown to any gentleman who is a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

## THE TARIFF AND HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Maclean) asked :

1. In drafting Tariff Resolution No. 15, now before the House, did the Government consider how its operation might be affected by the following clauses of Lord Ripon's despatch of June 28th, 1895 :—

" 34. While, however, Parliament has thus removed all legislative restrictions in the colonies, so far as Imperial legislation is concerned, it will be necessary, in order that Her Majesty's Government may be in a position to give effect to their responsibility for the international obligations of the Empire, and for the protection of its general interests, that any Bill passed by a colonial legislature providing for the imposition of differential duties should be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure, so as to allow full opportunity for its consideration from these points of view."

" 35. For this reason, and in order to prevent inconvenience, it will be desirable, if such duties are included in a general Tariff Bill, that a proviso should be added that they are not to come into force until Her Majesty's pleasure has been signified."

2. Is it the intention of the Government to attach a proviso to the Tariff Bill that Resolution 15 is not to go into force until Her Majesty's pleasure has been signified thereto ?

If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Government fully considered Lord Ripon's despatch. We are acting under the view that tariff resolution No. 15, now before the House, does not come within the class of measures referred to in the despatch.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) mean resolution No. 16 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I took the number as it appeared in the question.

I see that it should be No. 16. We will allow this to stand as a correction.

#### RETIREMENT OF LT.-COL. GRAY.

Mr. KAULBACH (for Mr. Clarke) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to grant Lieut.-Col. Gray, late inspector of stores, the usual retiring allowance granted to staff officers on being retired, or on the abolition of the office held by them?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is not the intention of the department to grant to Lieut.-Col. Gray, late inspector of stores, the usual retiring allowance granted to staff officers on being retired, or on the abolition of the office held by them, as the position he held, for one year, was regarded as a sinecure.

#### THE NEW BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is Mr. Reid, of New York, who is now placing the machinery in the building for the new Bank Note Company at Ottawa, Mr. Geo. M. Reid, a son of Mr. Robert Reid, the collector of customs of London, Ontario?

2. Is Mr. Geo. M. Reid a member of the new Bank Note Company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Government have no information as to who is placing machinery in the building for the new Bank Note Company at Ottawa.

#### RAILWAY TO STANLEY BRIDGE.

Mr. POWELL asked :

1. Has the Government, or any member thereof, received any petition or petitions praying for the construction of a railway from the Prince Edward Island Railway to Stanley Bridge?

2. If so, (a) How many signatures are subscribed to such petition or petitions? and (b) Is it

the intention of the Government to construct or aid in constructing such railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Department of Railways and Canals has not received any petitions since the present Government came into power asking for the construction of a railway from the Prince Edward Island Railway to Stanley Bridge.

#### JUDGE JONES, COUNTY OF BRANT.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has Judge Jones, of the County Court of the county of Brant, retired from such position?

2. If so, who has been appointed in his stead?

3. Has Judge Jones been allowed a pension or retiring allowance?

4. If so, what is the amount of such pension or retiring allowance?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Judge Jones has retired from the position which he occupied as judge for the county court of the county of Brant, and Mr. A. D. Hardy, of Brantford, has been appointed in his place. Judge Jones has been allowed a pension. The amount of the pension to which he was entitled and which he now receives, is \$144.44 per month.

#### PATENTS FOR FENCES.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Sproule) asked :

1. How many patent rights have been granted that are now in force for fences with wire fastenings?

2. When and to whom were they granted, and when do they expire?

3. Does the Minister of Agriculture consider it in the interests of the agriculturists of the country to grant such patent rights?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The following patents have been granted in Canada for farm fences and are still in force :

Pat. No.	Patentees.	Date.	Period Granted.
16,813	A. & A. J. Russell, expires 1898.....	May 5, 1883.....	15 years.
17,100	C. Piper, expires 1898.....	June 25, 1883.....	15 do
19,012	J. B. Oliver, expires 1899.....	April 2, 1884.....	15 do
22,402	J. B. Oliver, expires 1900.....	Sept. 5, 1885.....	15 do
23,290	C. Avery, expires 1901.....	Jan. 30, 1886.....	15 do
23,957	W. F. Shedd, expires 1901.....	April 30, 1886.....	15 do
25,241	W. F. Shedd, expires 1901.....	Oct. 27, 1886.....	15 do
26,798	C. Crabbs, expires 1902.....	June 1, 1887.....	15 do
27,271	G. Russell.....	July 26, 1887.....	10 do
37,666	L. S. Newman.....	Oct. 23, 1891.....	10 do
41,397	O. Preston.....	Dec. 28, 1892.....	6 do
41,896	J. Spillinger.....	Feb. 8, 1893.....	6 do
45,275	W. J. Johnston.....	Feb. 8, 1894.....	6 do
46,973	A. Massena.....	Sept. 6, 1894.....	6 do
47,794	E. L. Schenck and H. F. Owen.....	Jan. 3, 1895.....	6 do
47,948	G. Lohberger.....	Jan. 18, 1895.....	6 do
49,241	E. Litt.....	June 17, 1895.....	6 do
50,217	T. Stillaway.....	Oct. 9, 1895.....	6 do

In all, eighteen patents are now in force; 78 applications for patents for fences have been refused since January, 1891. In reply to the last part of the question, an opinion of this kind would have to be determined upon the merits of each particular patent. The ten and six years patents may or may not be renewed, consequently expiry dates cannot be given.

#### LAND GRANTS TO THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LISTER asked :

How much of the land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been patented? Does the exemption from taxation on the land grant run from the date of patent for each parcel of land, or from the date of the Letters Patent incorporating the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and providing for land subvention?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I would like to let the first question stand. Information has been furnished to me by the department to answer the question, but I am not absolutely sure of its accuracy, and I wish to examine it more closely before the answer is given. As to the second part of the question, the exemption runs from the date when the patent issues.

#### POST OFFICE AT PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Roche) asked :

1. What disposition has the Government made of the site purchased for a post office and public building in Portage la Prairie some three years ago?

2. If sold, how much was got for it, and to whom was it sold?

3. Has the purchase money been paid?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The site in question is still in the hands of the Government.

#### EQUIPAGE OF THE "DIANA."

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. The names, residence, duties assigned and salaries of all officers and men engaged to go by the "Diana" on the expedition to Hudson Bay?

2. The names and residence of all those not under pay who are permitted to accompany the expedition either as representatives, agents, passengers or otherwise?

3. The names, residence and salaries to be paid to the representatives of other governments, corporations or individuals?

4. Was the application of the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company to send Captain Bourke, R.N., as their representative on the expedition accepted by the Government? If so, does the Government know why Captain Bourke refused to go?

5. What offer did the Government make to Captain Bourke?

6. Did the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company apply to send a representative in the event of Admiral Markham declining to go?

7. If so, why did the Government not grant the application?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am not able to give the hon. gentleman a complete list of the crew. Commander Wakeham is sending that forward. I think the first officer and the interpreter are missing from the list that I have in my hand, and the name of the carpenter appears to be missing. But as nearly as possible, with the information at present in the department, the names are here given. Commander Wakeham, in charge, and receives his present salary, with any gratuity the Governor in Council may subsequently decide to add. Dr. Macdonald holds the position of physician and meteorological officer at \$100 per month. A Mr. Drinkwater is secretary and photographer, at \$75 per month. Then the officers of the ship are Captain Whitely, whose salary does not appear to be placed here, I forget what it is fixed at. The others are given in the following list :

Name.	Capacity.	Advance.	Allotment due two months after sailing.
Jas. G. Joy.....	Mate .....	\$ cts. 50 00	\$ cts. 25 00
Alfred King.....	Boatswain .....	37 00	18 50
Thomas Crossman.....	1st Engineer.....	80 00	40 00
Moses Crossman.....	2nd do .....	None.	None.
Jacob Bishop.....	Oiler .....	30 00	19 00
Matthew Moore.....	Fireman .....	30 00	15 00
Isaac Bishop.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
Ellazer Barrett.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
Joseph Babstock.....	Quartermaster .....	32 00	15 50
William Parsons.....	A. B. ....	30 00	15 00
William Hanalon.....	do .....	30 00	None.
Samuel Edwards.....	do .....	30 00	None.
Isaac Greenland.....	do .....	30 00	None.
E. Noseworthy.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
George Kennedy.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
John Pomeroy.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
James Woodford.....	do .....	30 00	15 00
James Duff.....	do .....	30 00	None.
George Harris.....	Cook .....	22 00	11 00
Robert Barry.....	do .....	None.	None.

Mr. FISHER.

These sailors, whose names I have read, the engineers and the fireman, are all men who were selected in Newfoundland to form the equipage of the ship. 2. Dr. Bell and A. P. Low, of the Geological Survey, in charge of a staff accompany the expedition. The salaries of these officers and pay of the men are arranged for by the Department of the Interior. 3. James Fisher, Esq., Q.C., of Winnipeg, Manitoba, represents the Government of Manitoba and North-west Territories and the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company. No salary or remuneration has yet been settled upon. 4. Yes, the application was accepted, but not as the representative of that company. No; the company stated that Captain Bourke would be unable to accompany the expedition. 5. The Government merely accepted Captain Bourke in lieu of Admiral Markham. 6. Yes. 7. The Government were willing to accept either Admiral Markham or Captain Bourke, R.N., on the expedition because it was thought their great naval experience, and, in the case of Admiral Markham, his Arctic experience would have been of great service. They were not being permitted to accompany the expedition as representing any special company, but on account of their great experience. No other equally experienced person has been suggested to take their place. If any such had been suggested, the Government would have been willing to accept him, but it was not thought necessary to appoint any additional representatives unless they were possessed of qualifications such as those of Admiral Markham or Captain Bourke.

#### POSTMASTER OF HARTNEY, MAN.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. Has the postmaster of Hartney, Manitoba, been dismissed?
2. If so, why?
3. Were there any charges against J. H. Hartney?
4. If so, were the charges investigated?
5. Was any notice given to J. H. Hartney? If so, what notice?
6. Did the Postmaster General receive a petition from the residents praying that if J. H. Hartney was dismissed, S. H. Dickson should be appointed?
7. Was that petition signed by ninety-five per cent of those using the post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The late postmaster of Hartney, Manitoba, was dismissed upon charges made by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, testifying to the postmaster having been guilty of offensive political partisanship during the last election. The postmaster was given the usual official notice some time before the office was transferred to his successor. A petition was received by the department asking for the appointment of Mr. S. H. Dickson as postmaster, but the department is not able to state whether the number

signing do or do not amount to the percentage mentioned in the question.

Mr. FOSTER. No. 4 has not been answered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have answered the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that he did not answer question No. 4.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have answered the whole question.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be in your view.

Mr. SPEAKER. It lies in the judgment of the Minister.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. In the Manitoba "Free Press" the correspondent—and I believe the correspondent is the same as the correspondent for the "Globe" and "Witness," and in both papers there have been misstatements about myself under date of May 22nd, in correspondence dated 21st May from the gallery here, it is stated :

Mr. Davin explained how it came about that he did not divide the House on the question of free coal oil. His party had gone back on him. The Patrons gave him loyal support, and, under conditions like these, what could a man do?

This is what I said :

Mr. DAVIN. I have a notice of motion on the Orders, and I wish to explain to the House and to the country why I think it useless to move that motion. The motion is as to the duty on coal oil. I had, on the same Order paper, a notice respecting the duty on agricultural implements and other matters, and, when it came to the vote, those gentlemen in this House from whom I might have expected support, did not support me.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it necessary to name them? Why, they are known to fame already. But I will name them, seeing my hon. friend asks me to do so. One of them is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). He certainly was bound to support me, because he had his constituency placarded with bills, "Vote for Richardson and free implements." And I suppose that when he goes back to his constituency, as go back he will within two or three months, he will have it placarded, "Vote for Richardson, who voted for keeping the duty on agricultural implements."

Now, I am not going to impugn the motives of these hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and other gentlemen who came into this House professing Patronism. I have no right to do it. On the contrary, I assume that they have voted as they have done with the best of motives as they understand it and up to their lights. They seem to be under the impression that no good could come from a vote or for a motion if this voting were to be a minority; and I find that some newspapers that used to take an interest in these questions and

used to advocate free implements, also take the view that a man should never bring forward a motion in this House if he is likely to be left in the minority.

Then I go on to mention some of the Patrons, among them the member for East Assiniboia and others, as hon. gentlemen whom I had expected would support motions such as I gave notice of, and who had risen and declared they would vote with the Government. There was therefore no use in dividing the House on the question of coal oil. I never said that my own party, which is the party on this side of the House, had gone back on me; on the contrary, what I said was that the very people mentioned in the despatch as supporting me were those who did not support me.

#### THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) laid on the Table papers relating to the Alaskan boundary. He said: The leader of the Opposition a day or two ago asked that papers relating to this matter be laid on the Table. I have had prepared a copy of the convention to which the hon. gentleman referred, and the Order in Council which ratified that convention. If the hon. gentleman desires any further papers regarding this subject—the papers are very voluminous—I shall be happy to bring them down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date of this arrangement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Order in Council was approved on 23rd January, 1897, immediately after it had been received here.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to ask the Postmaster General when he intends to bring down the evidence taken in the inquiry as to the postmaster at Northfield, B.C., moved for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will endeavour to bring the return down to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. The House will not sit to-morrow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then I cannot bring it down to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. You mean Friday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not on Friday—it is an unlucky day.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. DAVIN.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a few words with respect to the amendment which the leader of the Opposition has proposed, and more particularly in connection with the speech which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has addressed to the committee with respect to this matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made some rather pointed allusions to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and among other things he ventured to suggest that some of his statements were absurd and that the speech was not in accordance with a statesmanlike policy. I venture to think with all deference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for whose ability I have the very highest regard, that the hon. Minister need not have travelled very far out of his own speech to find statements very much on the border line of absurdity; and so far as a statesmanlike speech is concerned, the remarks of the leader of the Opposition will compare most favourably with the speech the hon. Minister thought fit to address to the committee last evening. The hon. gentleman is a member of the Government which has seen fit to characterize itself as a business Government. Some of the hon. gentleman's friends have mistaken that expression, I believe, for that of a business-is-business Government; but we must assume that this is entirely a mistake, and that those hon. gentlemen are what they profess to be, a business Government. Well, what has this business Government done? This business Government has brought down a policy to the House; it has professed to be making a tariff which contains preferences in favour of the mother country, because although the tariff on the face of it is called reciprocal, from first to last the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to it as being in effect a preferential tariff in favour of the mother country. They have done that, and one would suppose that before doing it a business Government, at least, would have ascertained definitely whether such a measure as that would have the effect claimed for it by hon. gentlemen opposite, or whether it would have the effect suggested by the Opposition; but the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries last evening gave us alternative after alternative, if this is wrong why such and such is the case, if that is wrong such and such follows, and so on from one alternative to another, not placing the position of the Government on any sound principle which would commend itself to the judgment of the House.

The hon. gentleman said that the leader of the Opposition had retired from the position he had taken in the past in favour of preferential trade with England. I venture to say that if the speech of the leader of the Opposition impressed the hon. gentleman in that way, it impressed no other

hon. member in that way, because from first to last the speech was a vindication of the policy for which my hon. friend has laboured as assiduously and as earnestly in the past as any hon. gentleman in this House or out of it, either here or in the mother country. I did not understand the hon. leader of the Opposition to take back a single word he ever uttered in the past in favour of that policy, and I cannot realize how the mind of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) could have been so clouded as to cause him to assume, that the hon. leader of the Opposition had receded from the position he has taken in the past on this question. The speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition was a plea in favour of a preferential tariff. It was an attempt, and a successful attempt, to show that this proposal of the Canadian Government is the very last means in the world to arrive at that happy consummation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to state as fairly as I can what I understood the hon. Minister of Marine to lay down as his view of the treaty and his view of applying to the German and Belgium treaties the construction which the Controller of Customs has already seen fit to adopt. In the first place, I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) to argue, that the German treaty is not binding upon Canada, and if I am in error the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) will see fit to correct me. Now, that would depend upon the question as to whether the power which made this treaty with the German Zollverein was competent to make a treaty binding upon the whole Empire; and in the second place, it depends upon the consideration, as to whether or not the terms of that treaty do plainly set forth that it is to be binding not only upon Great Britain and Ireland but upon the British colonies. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) denies that Great Britain had power to bind the Empire by such a treaty. I believe that no member of this House who has made these matters a subject of investigation will venture to deny for a moment, that so long as the Imperial Government and the Imperial Parliament are supreme over the British possessions throughout the world, the power to make a treaty binding upon the whole Empire is possessed by the Imperial Government, and by it alone. If that be the case, let us turn for a moment to the treaty and observe what its provisions are. It provides first:

That the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty who dwell, either temporarily or permanently, in the states of the Zollverein, shall enjoy therein, in respect of the exercise of commerce and trades, the same rights, and be subjected to no higher or other taxes than the subjects of any third country, the most favoured in these respects.

That is followed by somewhat similar provisions with a reference to which I need not detain this House. The third article of the treaty I desire to refer to, because it is

important in one respect of the argument which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) addressed to the House. It is:

That no other or higher duties shall be levied in the Zollverein on the exportation of any goods to the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, nor in the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty on the exportation of any goods to the Zollverein, than are or may be levied on the exportation of the like goods to any third country, the most favoured in that respect.

The 5th article of the treaty provides:

That any favour, privilege or reduction in the tariff of duties of importation or exportation which either of the contracting parties may concede to any third power, shall be extended immediately and unconditionally to the other.

And the 7th article provides:

That the stipulations of the preceding articles 1 to 6 shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions, the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any other country, of a like kind; nor shall the exportation from those colonies or possessions of the Zollverein be subject to any higher or other duties than the exportation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

I shall not trouble the House with any reference to the Belgian treaty, because, so far as my argument is concerned, that treaty stands in exactly the same position as the German treaty. In view of these articles of the treaty, what is our position in Canada? We have it conceded that the Imperial power has a right to make a treaty binding upon Canada, and we have an express provision in that treaty, that it shall have effect in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, but that it shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, and that in those colonies and possessions the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom.

Let me ask, then: On what does my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) base his argument that this treaty is not binding upon Canada? I do not know that I was very well able to follow the argument of the hon. gentleman on that point, but I understand it to be principally this: that this treaty is not binding upon Canada because no legislation has been introduced into Canada for the purpose of ratifying it or carrying it out. That is what I understood him to say, and if I am wrong I wish he would correct me.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman has correctly stated my position; if he inserts the word "Imperial" in addition—neither Imperial nor Canadian.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has asked me to insert that word, because it gives point to the argument which I propose to make. I do not understand that any legislation was necessary in a case of this kind, and I believe that there has been no Imperial legislation with regard to this treaty, in so far as it relates to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) agrees with me in that, and if you carry out his argument to its legitimate extent, then, this treaty is not only not binding upon Canada, but it is not binding upon the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is any distinction between the two?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) permit me, if this is to be a legal argument. The prohibitive clauses of the treaty apply to Canada alone and are not intended to apply, and do not apply to Great Britain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) shall not escape in that way because there is a prohibitory clause in the 3rd article of the treaty which says:

No other or higher duties shall be levied in the Zollverein on the exportation of any goods to the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, nor in the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, on the exportation of any goods to the Zollverein, than are or may be levied on the export of like goods to any third country, the most favoured in that respect.

If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) is right so far as article 7 is concerned, then the same result which he claims for Canada would obtain so far as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is concerned, in respect to the third article; because the third article contains a similar prohibition in respect to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to that which is contained in the 7th article in respect to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Majesty. Therefore, the argument of my hon. friend drives him to this logical result: That the 3rd article of that treaty, although it has been in force for some thirty-five years is not now binding upon the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. That seems to be a most astonishing result of the position of this Government with respect to the binding effect of this treaty. I am bound to say that if there was anything in the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), I think it would have occurred to the law officers of the Crown to whose mind this treaty has been present for the last thirty-five years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sure my hon. friend wants to put my position accurately on this point. If my hon. friend looks through the records, he will find that when the question

was raised in the Imperial Parliament some years ago, the then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, I think it was, stated that there was no necessity for Imperial legislation, as no action was contemplated by the Imperial Government which required legislative action.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And nothing has occurred in Canada which requires legislative action, except this, that the Government of which my hon. friend is a member proposes now to pass a resolution, and upon that to frame an Act which, according to the construction put upon it by members of the Government who have spoken in this House, would result in a direct violation of this treaty, if it is binding upon Canada. That is the position of affairs, and no other, if the argument of my hon. friend is carried to its legitimate conclusion—a conclusion from which I think he, upon sober, second thought, would be the first to shrink. Now, my hon. friend has had before him for the last twenty or twenty-five years the utterances of Imperial and Canadian statesmen with regard to the binding effect of these treaties upon Canada. During all that time—if I am in error, my hon. friend will correct me—it has been conceded that these treaties do bind Canada. It has been taken for granted by statesmen who have spoken in the Parliament of England, and by Canadian statesmen and lawyers of the first rank who have spoken upon this question in this House. It has been taken for granted by gentlemen on the other side of the House who now occupy the Treasury benches. It was taken for granted in this House when the joint address of 1891 was passed; it was taken for granted when the French treaty was adopted in 1894; it was taken for granted, and so far as I am aware no man raised a dissenting voice, when the Act respecting commercial treaties was adopted in 1895; and during all these years no man has ventured to suggest, until my hon. friend spoke last night, that these treaties were not binding upon Canada. And why did they not suggest it? Simply, I submit, for the reasons I brought to the attention of the House a moment ago. The German treaty in its terms is binding upon Canada, and the power which contracted that treaty with the German Zollverein had power to make a treaty binding the whole Empire. These are the reasons, which I submit are sufficient to satisfy any gentleman who has given any attention to this subject, that the treaties are binding. Now, what argument does my hon. friend bring to the consideration of this subject other than what I have already suggested? In the first place, he quotes an article from the London "Times." I have as much respect as any gentleman for the editorial utterances of that paper; but I venture to think that my learned friend produces very poor authority in face of the utterances of

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Canadian and Imperial statesmen, and the law officers of the Crown of England, to the effect that I have already mentioned. The hon. gentleman referred to a cable despatch giving the views of Sir Charles Kennedy on this question. The views of Sir Charles Kennedy are very briefly and no doubt very imperfectly stated in this despatch; but so far as they are stated, I venture to think they do not commend themselves to the reasoning faculties of any gentleman in this House:

Sir Charles Kennedy said, that while on the surface the new preferential clause of the Canadian tariff appeared contrary to the Belgian and German treaties, the circumstances of the case were materially altered since those treaties were enacted.

In what respect have the circumstances of the case been changed? I am not aware of any respect, and the hon. gentleman did not see fit to inform the House. The only respect in which the circumstances have been changed, so far as I am aware, is the passing of a clause of the British North America Act, which possibly the hon. gentleman might have thought would afford some argument in his favour, but which he did not see fit to quote. The clause in question is section 132:

The Parliament and Government of Canada shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada, or of any province thereof, as part of the British Empire, towards foreign countries, arising under treaties between the Empire and such foreign countries.

Now, I submit, and I have very strong authority to support my contention, that this section does not confer upon the Parliament of Canada any other or greater powers than those which were possessed by the legislatures of the different provinces previously to confederation. In support of that, I will refer to what is said in the second edition of "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," by Mr. Todd, at page 277. After quoting the clause I have just read, he says:

This clause of the Confederation Act embodied no new principle, but merely conferred upon the Dominion Government the powers formerly exercisable by the several provinces in Canada.

But my hon. friend proceeded further to state, and I mention it in connection with this point, that the British North America Act did effect some change in this respect. So far as I understand the British North America Act, no clause in it affects this matter except the clause I have mentioned, and the enactment of that clause did not in any way touch the question to which reference is made in this telegraphic despatch. Now, the same quotation, upon which the hon. gentleman depended for his argument to some extent, proceeds as follows:—

For instance, said Sir Charles, self-government has been conceded to Canada, including the power to regulate her own fiscal policy.

And the provinces had the same power before confederation, and did impose duties upon goods coming from the mother country, and upon goods coming from other countries:

Acting upon that power, Canada has prohibited the entrance of prison-made goods, an export favoured by Belgium and Germany.

The enactment referred to did not make any distinction between Germany and the rest of the world, including Great Britain, in this respect; they are all precisely in the same position under that statute. The rest of the report of Sir Charles Kennedy's address does not deal with this branch of the case, and I will leave it until I come to another branch of my hon. friend's argument, which I propose to deal with in a moment. That being the case, what is the position of Canada in respect of this treaty. As I have already said, the Imperial Government possesses the treaty-making power, and this treaty has, by express words, included Canada. How, then, does this question of legislation in Canada, to which my hon. friend has referred, touch the matter at all? It does not touch it at all, because up to this time there has been no need of any legislation in Canada with regard to that question. I concede that there may be a case in which it is necessary to supplement the provisions of a treaty by legislation, either Imperial or colonial. An extradition treaty, for instance, would require to be supplemented by provisions to enable the courts to deal with a criminal whose extradition is demanded. The Imperial Act of 1819 relating to the inshore fisheries was rendered necessary because it was desirable that the courts of the different provinces of Canada should be invested with the power to carry out the treaty of 1818 by making seizures of American vessels. In all such cases, it is necessary, desirable and right that the provisions of the treaty should be supplemented by legislation. But that does not at all touch the question, as to whether, between nation and nation, the treaty does affect the whole of the Empire or not. As between the Governments of England and Germany, this treaty became binding upon the entire British Empire, and any legislation, whether passed by the Imperial Parliament or the Canadian Parliament, in violation of the terms of the treaty would be a direct violation of the compact made by the parties to that treaty. The result of any such legislation, which the German Zollverein might consider in derogation of the rights conferred upon it by the treaty, would be a conflict between the two nations, which would, perhaps, end in war. And if the Canadian Parliament should see fit to pass an Act which conflicted with the terms of the treaty, the Imperial Government would no doubt feel bound to exercise the right it possesses of disallowing such legislation.

Another consideration suggests itself. For the past thirty or thirty-five years, British

subjects, including Canadian citizens, have participated, so far as the treaty with the Zollverein is concerned, in the provisions of that treaty. Let us assume, for a moment, that my hon. friend is right in concluding that Canada had the option of being bound or not bound by that treaty, could Canada, after enjoying the rights conferred upon her by that treaty for so many years, in all fairness, claim now to take advantage of that portion of the treaty which confers benefits upon her and repudiate that portion which confers favours upon the Zollverein and imposes burdens upon Canada. Such a contention would be monstrous, and yet it is the legitimate conclusion to be derived from the speech made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) last night. Does the hon. gentleman state that the citizens of Canada have not the rights in Germany conferred upon British subjects by that treaty? If we have enjoyed those rights for the past twenty-five years, is it competent now for the Parliament of Canada to pass legislation discriminating against the citizens of Germany by imposing upon the citizens of that country who are exporting goods into Canada higher duties than they would be entitled to pay under the terms of the treaty? Such a conclusion would be monstrous, and yet it is the conclusion to which we would be legitimately driven by the argument of the hon. gentleman.

So far as the authorities are concerned in support of the proposition that this treaty is binding upon Canada, I shall not weary the committee by reading them. The joint address of 1891, the utterances of Canadian and Imperial statesmen to which I have referred, the utterances of hon. gentlemen in this House in 1894 and 1895, Lord Ripon's despatch subsequent to the report of Lord Jersey at the Intercolonial conference, the report of Lord Jersey which contains the opinion of the law officers of the Crown—all these authorities, one after the other, have laid down the proposition, have taken it for granted in many cases, that this treaty is binding upon Canada. And all that my hon. friend has offered in support of the view which he alone and for the first time in the history of this country, has brought forward with regard to this treaty, is an editorial in the London "Times" and a brief, imperfect, report of an address of Sir Charles Kennedy. Well, if this question is to be decided by the weight of authority, there does not seem to be very much question about it. But, irrespective of the weight of authority, to which I have referred, I think, so far as my own apprehension of the case is concerned, I have made it abundantly plain that, conceding the propositions which, I understand the hon. gentleman does concede, and which he must concede, there can be no doubt, in fact, that this treaty is binding in every respect upon Canada and upon the inhabitants of this country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Now, my hon. friend referred to a couple of other authorities, which, for the moment, I did not mention. He referred to the Duke of Newcastle's despatch in 1859. I have only to refer him, as to that, to the way the despatch is dealt with in the second edition of Todd, pages 229 and 230, already quoted by me. Sir Alexander Galt then took a certain stand respecting the fiscal policy of this country. He claimed that the people of this country had a right to control its own fiscal policy, even though it should be different from the fiscal policy of the mother country. That is a right that has long since been conceded. But the despatch in question did not deal with the question of the binding effect of an Imperial treaty upon Canada. The hon. gentleman also referred to the despatch of Lord Kimberley in 1872. I shall not weary the House with any extended reference to that, further than to say that it did not deal with this particular question, except in one portion of it, which the hon. gentleman did not see fit to read to this House; but which I will take the liberty of reading. The last clause of the despatch in question is as follows:—

But although for these reasons Her Majesty's Government might not feel justified in refusing to allow the colonists to adopt the policy which they think best for their own interests, they desire to point out that, in order to meet the views of the colonial governments, as expressed in the papers now before me, it would be necessary not only to repeal so much of "The Australian Colonies Government Act," 13 and 14 Vic., Chap. 59, as prevents the imposition of differential duties, but to exempt the colonies in question from the operation of any future commercial treaties which may be concluded by this country, containing stipulations against such duties, leaving them at liberty, subject to the obligations of existing treaties, to make such arrangements as they may think fit for reciprocity with each other or with foreign nations; and, before so serious a step is taken, they would ask the colonists gravely to consider the probable effects of a measure which might tend materially to affect the relations of the colonies to this country and to the rest of the Empire.

And so the view of Lord Kimberley is that if the colonies are to take the position that, so far as the making of treaties is concerned, the Imperial Government is not to be supreme, such a contention, if carried out by the colonies, if forced upon the home Government by the colonies, would have most serious results upon the relations between the colonies and the mother country. And such, undoubtedly, must be the result of the policy advocated by the hon. gentleman last evening. If, in the face of this treaty, which has been held by the home Government to be binding upon Canada, which has been held by her statesmen to be binding upon Canada, this Government sees fit to proceed with these resolutions and give them the interpretation put upon them by hon. gentlemen opposite, one of two results must follow—this country must repeal the legislation and retire from the

position the Government is assuming or come in direct conflict with the Imperial Government on this point. In addition to that, I would like to point out that on page 272 of the work of Todd, to which I have referred, the following passage occurs, which I think is of great importance in this connection :—

Finally, it should be observed that the responsibility of determining what is the true construction of a treaty made by Her Majesty with any foreign power, must remain with the Imperial Government, who can alone decide how far Great Britain should insist upon the strict enforcement of treaty rights, whatever opinions may be entertained upon the subject in any colony specially concerned therein.

And so the hon. gentleman will see that it is not so much the opinions of the lawyers to whom he referred last night—members of the Government—for whose opinions I have every respect, but the opinions of the Imperial Government that must be considered. I should have supposed that the business Government of which my hon. friend is a member before bringing down this resolution, would have seen fit to consult the Imperial Government, whose opinion must be paramount on this subject, that they would not venture upon a step which may be regarded as a direct violation of treaty rights, without consulting the Imperial Government and ascertaining whether that Government would see fit to depart from the construction which the law officers of the Crown have so long placed upon these treaties so far as they relate to Canada.

I must apologize for detaining the House so long with respect to this matter, but I desire to make a short reference to the second branch of my hon. friend's argument. The hon. gentleman, so far as I understood him, said :—First, this treaty was not binding upon Canada ; second, if this treaty was originally binding upon the provinces, it did not become binding upon Canada, by reason of some provision, which he did not see fit to state to us, contained in the British North America Act ; third, if it was binding upon Canada notwithstanding the British North America Act, it is not binding upon Canada by reason of the fact that legislation has not been passed ; fourth, if I am wrong, he said, on all these, I take the position—and it seems a remarkable position for the Government to take after the declaration of the Finance Minister in bringing down the tariff—that this treaty does not discriminate against these countries, and, therefore, does not violate these treaties. Whether it amounts to a discrimination against these countries, it certainly does amount to a violation of these treaties. In what language is this resolution couched :

16. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the

terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule D.

The argument of the hon. gentleman, so far as I could follow it, amounted to this : He said, this resolution is not a violation of this treaty ; this, at all events is not a discrimination against these countries, because it contains or is coupled with a condition with which it is possible for these countries to comply. Well, is that the right which these countries have under the treaties ? The provisions of the treaty which I have read, do not say anything about conditions, but they give an absolute and unconditional right to the German Zollverein to have their goods admitted into Canada upon payment of the same duties as those levied upon goods from the mother country. My hon. friend says that this resolution, as interpreted by the Controller of Customs is not a violation of the treaty ; that it is not a discrimination, because the German Zollverein can fulfil the condition and so bring themselves within the terms of the resolution. I would put this case to my hon. friend. Suppose this resolution were in these terms : That goods from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland should be admitted at the lower rates of duty under schedule "D," and that goods from any other country whose tariff policy is made to accord with the tariff of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland should be admitted at the same rates of duty. In that case, would my hon. friend venture to say that the conditions of the treaty were not violated ? And will he venture to say that such a resolution is not exactly the same thing in principle and effect as the resolution that the Government have brought down ? They have brought down a resolution, which, in its terms, can apply at present only to the mother country, and possibly two or three other countries. They say that the German Zollverein has all its treaty rights under that resolution, because it can modify its tariff and make it the same as that of Great Britain, or, as the resolution says, "on the whole, as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to." What would be the difference between the two resolutions ? But you could reduce the matter to an absurdity by suggesting other conditions. Suppose the Government brought down a resolution that any country adopting the British constitution or the British mercantile law should be entitled to the benefits of the duties under schedule "D"—the offer of the lower tariff would be made upon a condition which any country could fulfil ; but it would smack of absur-

dity, as I think the hon. gentleman will himself admit to say that such a resolution fulfilled the treaty obligations. My hon. friend shakes his head; I suppose by way of dissent. I will repeat what I said before—that if you should put the resolution in the form of allowing advantages to Great Britain directly so long as the tariff of Great Britain remains as at present, if you should also provide that any other country with a tariff as low as that of Great Britain should be entitled to the benefits of schedule "D," that would be the same in principle as this resolution, as it is interpreted by the Government; and I think that no hon. gentleman who has given this matter any consideration at all would venture to say that such a resolution would not be a direct violation of the rights of the German Zollverein under this treaty.

Now, the hon. gentleman has one other point which, it seemed to me, was still less in accord with what we might expect from a business Government. The Government of this country saw fit to open the doors of the custom-house to British goods at a certain low rate of duty and to shut the doors of the custom-house to goods of the German Zollverein and of Belgium so far as the low rate of duty was concerned. And my hon. friend comes down to the House and says that this business Government, after having done that, have this consolation at least—that if they are wrong, probably Lord Salisbury will come to their rescue and denounce these treaties. Is it likely that the British Government, or the German Government, for that matter, would have their hands forced by the Government of this country in that way? Is it a proper way to obtain the denunciation of these treaties to pass a resolution which is in direct violation of these treaties—because the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of this portion of his argument, must admit that the passing of this resolution, as it has been interpreted by the Government, will be in direct violation of these treaty rights? According to him, then, the proper and statesmanlike way to deal with a great question like this is to bring in an Act which is in direct violation of treaty rights, of treaties solemnly made with the German Zollverein and Belgium, and then look to the mother country to denounce those treaties because this country has seen fit to pass a resolution in violation of them. I venture to say that that is not a statesmanlike way of settling this question, but that the better way, the statesmanlike way would have been to first definitely ascertain the position of this country with respect to these treaties, and to learn whether the views hitherto expressed by English statesmen and lawyers would be receded from by the British Government, before taking a step which may have more far-reaching consequences in the history of

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

this country than any gentleman on the other side has hinted at.

So far as this branch of the case is concerned, I commend the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to the very able speech made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), a week or ten days ago in this House, which, to my mind, contained an unanswerable argument to show that this resolution, if acted upon in the spirit in which the Government say they propose to act upon it, will be a direct violation of those treaty rights. I was surprised that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in dealing with this question after a speech of that kind from this side of the House, did not venture to open his mouth to controvert a single argument which that hon. gentleman addressed to this House. I venture to say that those arguments have not been answered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I venture to say that those arguments, which express my own ideas much better than I would have been able to express them myself, cannot be answered by that hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, to the satisfaction of any person who applies a reasonable amount of diligence to the consideration of this question.

Now, Sir, if I have been right in the view which I have taken of this question so far, what becomes of the noble contribution which the Minister of Finance has made to Her Majesty in this her Jubilee year? What is this noble contribution? The noble contribution is this: That hon. gentlemen opposite, without taking the trouble, in an important matter of this kind, to ascertain whether they were right or wrong, have seen fit to take a step which can, to my mind, have only one of two results: Either it is bound to bring this country into direct conflict with the mother country on this point, or else it is bound to bring the mother country into direct conflict with Germany. One or the other of these results must follow.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Let us have it, then, and we will know where we stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend opposite says: Let us have it. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that it is a fitting contribution to Her Majesty in her Jubilee year, that we should either bring ourselves into direct conflict with the mother country on a question of this kind, or that we should so force the hand of the mother country by heedless and reckless legislation of this character, that she will be brought into direct conflict with Germany. Does the hon. gentleman mean either one or the other of those things? Is he serious in the suggestion which he has made? Does he desire that this country should be brought into direct conflict with the mother country on a ques-

tion of this kind, or does he desire that Great Britain should have her hand forced in this matter so that she should be brought into direct conflict with Germany? If there is anything in the suggestion of my hon. friend, it means one or the other of those things; and I leave it to his own good sense to determine which of them he thinks would be most in the interest of this country and of the Empire as a whole. Sir, I yield to no man in my desire, consistently with the interests of Canada, of promoting preferential trade, but I think that the course which the Government has taken in this regard is not a course which is likely to promote that result. It would have been well, in this Jubilee year of Her Majesty, that some contribution of this kind should have been made, but hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not seen fit to take a course which was likely to lead to that happy result. They have seen fit to take a course which is likely to lead to one or other of the results which I have referred to, and I do not think that they can be congratulated in adopting that course. I am most anxious that the trade of this country, so far as the interests of this country will permit, should be in the direction of the mother country and in the direction of other colonies of the Empire; and I agree with the view which my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has so often advocated, that it might be well in the interests of this country in the long run to make some sacrifices at first for that purpose. Possibly I would not go so far in that direction as my hon. friend; I would not like to see any of the great industries of this country cut down or shattered, or the bread taken out of the mouths of our workmen for that purpose. We might well make some amount of sacrifice for a purpose that would be in the interests of this country and of the Empire and that would well repay the sacrifice in the end; but to take the step contemplated by the Government, as I said before does not seem to be calculated to attain that result. Such a result might have been attained by further negotiations with the home Government for the purpose of obtaining a denunciation, either in whole or in part, of these treaties, negotiations tending to have the home Government deal with the question in a statesmanlike spirit and in the best interests of the Empire, negotiations which possibly, not this year, not next year, not immediately, would have that result, but negotiations which in the end would bring about what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has so long fought for, preferential trade between Canada and England, preferential trade between England and the whole Empire.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not think for a moment that on a question of this kind and of such grave importance, hon. gentlemen representing the Government of Canada would

allow the speech, the able, argumentative, and conclusive speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Borden), to remain unanswered. It does seem to me that hon. gentlemen opposite either do not perceive the gravity of the question which is now being determined by this House, or if they do perceive it, they are absolutely dumb, and unable to make an argument in favour of the policy which they have proposed.

You may search the records of government in this Parliament from 1867 to the present and you will not find any instance when a question of the greatest importance, involving a generic and absolute change in the administration of affairs by this Parliament has been proposed by a Government, has been combatted by an Opposition, when the Government has not had the courage or the ability to put their side of the case before the House and the country. If hon. gentlemen think they can take refuge in craven silence against arguments like these, if they think that the force of their mechanical majority can win the day, hon. gentlemen must remember that in this country reason is to-day stronger than brute force, and argument counts for more than a solid vote in this Parliament. I call on hon. gentlemen opposite as Liberals, as they profess to be, to answer this one question: Is it a light thing that in this year of grace 1897, men who have declared, through the mouthpiece of their leader, that they are Liberals of the old English school, should propose to shear this Parliament of one of its greatest and best rights, the right of saying what shall be the taxes levied on the people, and what shall be the revenues that this country shall derive from which to pay its public expenditures? Yet to-day this resolution is put before this House by Liberals of the old Liberal school, to denude Parliament of its right to say from year to year and from time to time what shall be the tariff conditions which shall prevail between this country and every other country in the wide world. Sir, if this resolution passes and the Government get this power, the Government are in a position, through the will of the Controller of Customs, to make a commercial treaty at any hour of any day with any country, and this Parliament has nothing to say about it. I say, as one member of this Parliament, I refuse to sit still and allow a measure of that kind to be carried without entering my earnest protest against it, and I do not hesitate one single moment to say this, that if a Liberal-Conservative Government had proposed a departure of this kind, the Liberals would have raised the country; their organs, their speakers, their men from one end of the country to the other would have let loose the dogs of war and would have protested to the very strongest and very bitterest end against this denudation of the power of Parliament. I wish to press that opinion strongly. The argument upon

the merits of the case as regards the treaty has been ably sustained on this side of the House, and has not been met, and I venture to say, cannot be met by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say cannot be met. They have themselves shown the white feather. When they came down with this tariff a month ago, their brave leader, who is not in his seat to-day, declared in the face of this Parliament and the country that they did not intend, as they were not bound to do, to give one-eighth or one-fourth remission of duties to Germany or Belgium, or any nation which had a most-favoured treaty with Great Britain. They declared that by the words of the resolution. A month's cogitation leads to a change. They have now come down with another tariff. It takes away all the certainty and definiteness of their former position, for it contains a clause to enable the Government to admit Germany and Belgium and all nations having the most-favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. Why was that clause put in? Because the element of strength which hon. gentlemen opposite supposed they possessed a month ago, they do not now possess. Looking to the near future they dare not go one step further with this legislation without giving themselves a chance to crawl out of the position they had assumed with respect to Imperial treaties. If hon. gentlemen had the courage of their convictions they would have inserted in the tariff clause just so much as they declared to be the opinion of the Government in the matter, but the very moment they introduce this clause which enables them to open the door by Order in Council to every one of the most-favoured nations, that very moment they recede from their position and acknowledge the weakness of their position. So on that point the argument is against hon. members on the Government side of the House, and the conclusion is against them forced by their own introduction of this clause. Yet they stand up behind their own admission and declare: true we have admitted it, but we do not believe it is true; true we have unlocked the door, but we do not believe we ought to have done so or ever will open the door; true, we have acknowledged that these treaties may have something to do with Canada, because we see them looming up before us and we have provided a means of escape, but, at the same time, we do not intend that there shall be any escape or any necessity for escape. My hon. friends to-day by the terms of their tariff have opened up 25 per cent reduction to nine-tenths of the great manufacturing countries of the world; and yet they stand up like school boys and declare that this is preferential trade in which Great Britain alone is favoured. They say Great Britain alone is the favoured one, when Germany and Belgium are to-day knocking at the door; when hon. gentlemen opposite have themselves inserted the key which is to open

Mr. FOSTER.

the door, and put it into the lock by means of section b of the tariff clauses which have been brought down after a month's deliberation. There is no need for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to press this question further, but there is this other question to be pressed. As a Liberal-Conservative, who is in favour of adequate protection to the industries of Canada, I am not going to sit still and see a horizontal cut of 25 per cent in duties opened up to other countries competing with us, Belgium, Germany and France and twenty or thirty other countries as well as the mother country. As a consistent protectionist I cannot do it, and I do not propose to do it, and I do not propose that hon. gentlemen opposite shall go forth in this country and masquerade in a garment cut as if it were staid preferential trade hue, when it is a garment of twenty-one colours or more, and when every country having a most-favoured-nation treaty can use it and also other nations provided their tariffs equally fulfil the conditions. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the debate on this resolution, a new thing introduced by a new Government, and I ask you if you are aware that a single moment has been given by the Government to explain what it really means, or how it is to be carried out. Who in this House knows to-day? I doubt if the Ministers themselves know; but so far as any explanation is concerned, no one of their followers and no one in the country knows what it means. I ask the Controller of Customs to-day before he invites Parliament to pass this resolution to explain the methods of its operation. He is to be the great arbiter. Imperial treaties are nothing. What Germany and the mother country agreed upon and settled by a definite and sanctioned by an absolute treaty amounts to nothing; a new condition is to be interposed by a colony, and that condition is to be interpreted by a gentleman in the Canadian Government who is not even a member of the Cabinet. Now, I ask the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), before he expects us to vote upon the question; I ask him to explain how he proposes to carry out that resolution? There is a country across the sea by the name of China; an immense empire with 400,000,000, and does he (Mr. Paterson) know, or does he not, that if you to-day take the average tariff of China, it is lower than the reciprocal tariff which he proposes. Is he going to say to this Parliament, so that Parliament may vote with its eyes open: that the great Chinese Empire will have, first by one-eighth, and afterwards by one-fourth of a reduction on the duties an open door into the Dominion of Canada for anything that it may produce and that Canada may wish to buy. Is the condition to be interpreted by a general average of the tariff as a whole, as compared with the average reciprocal tariff of Canada as a whole, or is it to be conditioned upon the average tariff upon selected articles; or in what way?

Or, is it to be simply conditioned upon the will or the whim of the Controller of Customs for the time being. I have never yet seen an important proposition like this put before a business Parliament with such an utter lack of definiteness and knowledge as to how it is to be carried out, as this proposition has been put before us. Is there any Minister in the Government who can explain it? Is there any man amongst these business men who can stand upon his legs and tell us what this means? Are they all struck dumb, or has incapacity brooded over them until it has reduced them to a state of utter and craven silence in the matter? Have they no word of explanation for an intelligent Parliament? Do they expect us to vote without knowing the machine that we are placing in their hands? Again, I ask the Controller of Customs: Is this in each case to be decided by his own will and his own whim, or is there a definite method upon which it is to be based? If there is a definite method, in the name of all that is parliamentary let him give us that definite method before he asks us to vote. Am I asking too much? Sir, I am asking nothing too much. I am asking what, if hon. gentlemen deny this Parliament, and put their measure through simply with their majority—I am asking what will be their strongest condemnation amongst business men and intelligent men this wide country over.

Now, Sir, I go to another point. There is not only the indefiniteness of that proposition, and not only the extremely vague nature of what these conditions may be, but I come again to this essential point: How is this proposition to affect the industries of this country? Granted that all those most-favoured treaty nations may come in; granted, Sir, that these countries which are not under these treaties, but which fulfil the condition of having a tariff on an average equal to, in point of vantage, this reciprocity schedule; granted that they can come in; taking in Japan, taking in China, taking in many other countries in the world under that condition; granted that, Sir, I want to ask hon. gentlemen who sit on both sides of this House, who are protectionists in their hearts, who are protectionists from party affiliations and on party principles so far as Liberal-Conservatives go, who were protectionists during the whole fight which culminated in the elections of June, 1896, and who in every district in this country went to manufacturers upon the Liberal side, and told them, "vote for us, we are not going to destroy the industries of this country;" to that class of men I appeal. Sir, there are to-day sitting in this House men connected with industries in this country, who have Liberals and Conservatives as promoters of these industries, and as regards which industries the Liberal leaders gave assurances to the Liberal promoters of these industries that if they would vote for

them and stick to the Liberal party, their industries should not be put in jeopardy or danger. Hon. gentlemen cannot deny it from the top of the Government down to the very lowest peg in the Government support. I appeal to those who believe in keeping the industries of this country for Canadians, under what is a fair and adequate protection; I appeal to them, whether or not they are willing to allow countries with the cheapest labour in the world to come in at a reduction of 25 per cent in the duties which are placed in favour of goods manufactured in Canada, and to have open access to Canadian markets, to compete with Canadian labour and with Canadian capital on the basis of higher cost of capital and of infinitely higher wages for labour itself. But, Sir, I go from that which is an important consideration: I go to a higher consideration still, and that is this: That we are asked by this legislation to make of ourselves not a Parliament, but a dumb show. So far as the tariff of this country is concerned, for five years, if this Government remains and for twenty-five years if the same Government remains and the same conditions exist, commercial treaties can be made with every country in the world, now with one and now with another, involving the very greatest changes in the conditions of trade and of industry in this country, and Parliament will not be asked to, and Parliament will not have the right to open its mouth with reference to them. Is this Parliament willing to abrogate its functions in that way? Have we sunk so low in this year 1897 that we are going to give thirteen Grit men in this country the power to make commercial treaties for us, and to arrange our tariffs for years to come? Why, Sir, the wonderful thing is that any thirteen Grit men would have the cheek and the gall to ask such a thing. If any hon. gentleman thinks for a moment of the history of the growth of responsible government, does he not know that one of the basic powers of Parliament, obtained through a series of the greatest struggles in the country, was the power of Parliament to set its tariff views, and so regulate what should be the revenues of government. That is the function of the lower House of Parliament. So great a function of Parliament is it, so great a function of the Commons is it, that the powers of the Lords in Great Britain and the powers of the Senate in this country are very greatly shorn with reference to that branch of legislation. It is made a predominant prerogative of the Commons both in England and in Canada, and in every constitutionally governed British country.

Yet, to-day we are asked to relegate to a chance Cabinet our right of declaring whether we shall have a commercial treaty with any country, and upon what terms; and to entirely substitute that Cabinet for the voice of Parliament. Can we trust them?

Can the country trust them? Go back to 1891. Is there a man amongst them on that side who, in 1891, was not trailing along after the colours of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and discrimination against Canada?

No, Sir, and their leader, who does not sit in the place where the leader's master just now does sit—their leader, who does not sit there, declared that not for one year, but for many years, they were going to follow that line of battle until they got what they were after. Are they wiser to-day than they were then? They are more powerful; they are no wiser. From 1891 till now they have not grown, Sir, in the appreciation of this country. I will tell you what they have done; they have got power under false pretenses. They have shown themselves, from the lowest to the highest, capable of swallowing themselves whenever they have thought it best for their party interests. These same kaleidoscopic gentlemen, who can turn on the colours at any hour of the day, and swallow themselves in a great final act at any time they choose, are capable of swallowing themselves on this occasion and making still another change. There sit men on that side of the House who would love nothing more dearly than to make a commercial treaty with the United States on the lines of their policy of 1891. Give them this power, absolve this House from its functions, go to your interim work, and the members of this House may come back to the next session of Parliament and find that unrestricted reciprocity with the United States has been brought about by the authority of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), backed up by the Cabinet of thirteen, who make up their minds upon his opinion. Why, Sir, there is not a country in the world whose goods they cannot admit into Canada on whatever they think is a fair condition; for there is nothing at all to bind them to any definite condition. If the Controller of Customs were to say to-morrow, "If the United States will give us free fish and free fishing, or two or three other concessions, we will consider that that act puts them on the ground of advantage, which will make it for the advantage of Canada to admit them under this clause;" and these hon. gentlemen could legally do it. They are bound by no conditions. There is no programme, no process, set forth. This is a blank resolution, which leaves it simply to their own will to fill up and to put into governmental and executive form, as to what country shall have these advantages, and what not. Now, Sir, I proceed to a still higher consideration. Hon. gentlemen opposite have for the last twelve years agitated in this Parliament for the power for Canada to make her own commercial treaties independent of the mother country. From Mr. Blake's time down they have proposed resolution after resolution, they have argued for it, they have declared that Canada

should have that right. The contention on this side of the House has been that so long as Canada is a dependency of the British Empire, the Imperial power must have the paramount and absolute right to make treaties. But that absolute and paramount right is not arbitrarily carried out; for Great Britain to-day enters into and concludes no treaty with reference to Canada without inviting the co-operation of Canada in the negotiation, or without inviting the consent of Canada to the instrument after it is negotiated. She is a wise mother and a gentle mother, but she is still the mother of this country; and so long as we are children, she must be the mother, and we must pay filial obedience to her in that respect. These hon. gentlemen have declared for the right of making commercial treaties without reference to Great Britain. They have been defeated on every occasion. These brave and straightforward fighters, when they are unable to carry their point by placing it fairly and squarely before Parliament and the country, seek to smuggle it in under a clause of the tariff—a place where I take the liberty of saying no great and high-minded Government would place a measure of that gravity and that importance; to cover it up between the clauses of a tariff Act, which imposes certain disabilities as regards the function of parliamentary endorsement. Why did not these gentlemen come out under their full colours; and if they wanted to have independent treaty-making powers, which means independent powers as a country and a Government in the long run, why did they not come out and say so in the open? Why did they smuggle in this great power between two tariff resolutions, and bind it up in the general tariff conditions of the country, so as to prevent free and proper inquiry and action by the combined legislature of the country? But more than that: has Britain no Imperial obligations? Has she no treaties to-day? If a colony were to get the treaty-making power absolutely and fully under the guise of a tariff Act, and were to exercise that power, what would be the result if a complication should arise between Great Britain and the sovereign powers with whom she has treated? She is either a sovereign power, or she is not. When she stands side by side with Germany, Germany does not see Canada or Australasia, or Cape Colony or the Dependency of India. What Germany sees is the Queen and Parliament and Government of Great Britain, and them alone; and when the Queen and Parliament and Government of Great Britain make a solemn treaty with Germany, they are to carry out that treaty to the very last letter, loyally and truly, or lose their prestige as a great power, or, what is worse, become involved in possible complications which may have the direst and gravest consequences, not only in the matter of trade, but in the matter of national existence as well. So, I say, give

this power to these gentlemen, and they can make a treaty of commerce with any power under the sun without any reference to Great Britain's treaty obligations at all. That is the gravest point of all in connection with this matter. Sir, I am not going to multiply words. I rose simply to call the attention of the country, and I have done it, to the fact that hon. gentlemen are proposing a complete revolution in parliamentary methods, and that they cannot explain and defend their resolution on good and arguable grounds; that they are asking, under the cover of what they wrongfully declare to be preference for Great Britain, for power to open Canada to a competition from almost every country in the world; that they are doing that not upon any well-defined line or method of procedure, but simply on the will of men who form the Government of Canada for the time being; that under this, they propose to get the actual, the virtual right to make a commercial treaty with any foreign country as well as with any dependency of Great Britain, and to make that treaty entirely without the control and without the overshadowing influence of the Imperial treaties which Great Britain has existent to-day. They ask Parliament to consent to this and thus consent to the utter abnegation of the duties of Parliament and the highest and dearest privileges of Parliament. Sir, we appeal first to hon. gentlemen opposite and this House, and then from hon. gentlemen opposite and this House we carry our appeal to the country, and we are confident that we have the right side of this question. We are confident that we are standing up for the privileges of Parliament, for the sanctity of Imperial treaties, for the best industrial interests of this country, when we oppose a resolution which proposes by such a drastic method as this to take away the power of Parliament and to tread to the very verge of excessive danger, a path upon which no true British or Canadian citizen should in this Jubilee year wish to enter.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would be glad to avoid wearying the House, but I rise just to say a word or two because I feel that a preferential duty on British goods is a direct violation of the principle of protection. I would certainly not give, unless for a very material consideration, any advantage to either the workmen or the manufacturers of Great Britain, or, for that matter, to the workmen or manufacturers of any country in the world. This preferential consideration will not, however, weigh heavily upon the Government, which looks upon protection as an expedient and not as a principle. I am not willing, on the contrary I am most unwilling, that British manufacturers should have the money that Canadian manufacturers need. While, therefore, I came here pledged to support the Conservative trade policy, feeling that

even its line, in this particular, is beyond my limit, I prefer choosing the lesser of the two evils and will vote for the amendment now before the committee. I hope that hon. gentlemen on this side may be mistaken in their opinion that Canada must give to the manufacturers of Germany and Belgium the preference which this Government proposes to extend to the manufacturers of Great Britain. As a matter of law, it is argued that Germany and Belgium can claim this preference; but I hope and believe that, as a matter of principle, neither Germany nor Belgium will get this preference. It is all right to say that this preference goes so far as a matter of law, but as a matter of practice it should only go so far as the Government will let it go. There is something more sacred, yes, more important than even the principle of protection, involved in the claims of Germany and Belgium for preferential treatment; and as a Canadian I hope that the Government will stand firm. If Germany or Belgium complain through the British Government, I trust that this Government, through the same medium, will return the answer, that Canada intends to administer her own customs laws without any advice from Berlin or from Brussels, or for that matter, from Downing Street.

Mr. CRAIG. From the evident and unconcealed desire of hon. gentlemen opposite to close this discussion and prevent, if possible, debate on this preferential arrangement by their policy of silence, it is clear they regard the proposition as one that cannot stand very much light. I thought myself that the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was rather apologetic yesterday in his remarks on this preferential arrangement, and I fancy that hon. members on the other side feel convinced, after reading the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries last night, that the less said about it on their side the better. At any rate they are endeavouring to carry out their policy of silence. It looks indeed like a conspiracy of silence. I am sure that some hon. gentlemen opposite would like to speak on this question. I have seen one or two, one particularly, taking notes and apparently ready for the debate, but the order seems to have gone forth to say no more, and the desire of the Government seems to be to rush this thing through and give the country as little information as possible about it. While, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the House, this resolution, which is one of the most important questions that has occupied our attention for years, involving the most important interests, is one which it seems to me we ought not to dispose of as we would an ordinary resolution of no particular importance, and therefore I propose to state some of the reasons why I am opposed to it. In the first place, I am opposed to it because it is most indefinite. Let me read it for the benefit of the House:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply,—

In my opinion, nothing could be more indefinite. No amount is fixed, no percentage is taken, but it says: "Terms which, on the whole, are as favourable"—I do not see how anything could be more indefinite. I can imagine a resolution framed, declaring that when the tariff of other countries was not above 15 per cent or 20 per cent or 10 per cent against this country, we were willing to allow them to enter their goods at the preferential rates, but instead of that we find the most indefinite arrangement conceivable. It is sufficiently indefinite without the words "on the whole." The words "on terms which are as favourable to Canada"—who is to interpret that?—are indefinite enough, in all conscience, but when you add the words "on the whole," any possible definiteness is taken away.

I object to this resolution, not only because it is indefinite, but because it is arbitrary. I feel, in speaking on this resolution, that I am addressing myself to hon. gentlemen opposite in the hope that I may possibly convert some of them. I do not know if that is a vain hope or not. But I hope their minds are not made up without hearing discussion at all. I hope they are not so hidebound in the party affiliations that they are not willing to listen to any reasons at all upon this question. I want to address myself to members on the other side, and especially to members who have come here calling themselves independent. I hope they are independent and will listen to arguments with an independent mind; and I hope to be able to give them some reasons for voting against the resolution, and in favour of the amendment.

I object to this resolution, not only because it is indefinite, but because it is arbitrary. As I have said, there is no standard in it; the matter is to be left entirely to the Controller of Customs. I was very much amused last night at a remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). He said that Germany and Belgium could come within the resolution by conforming with its requirements. But what are those requirements? And how are these countries to know? They do not ask to know, because they claim to come in under the existing treaties. But suppose they have not this right and ask on what terms they can come in, what will be the answer? They will be told: Go and see the Controller of Customs; if he says you can come in, you can come in, but if he says you must stay out, why, stay out. When the question was asked in the first place whether Belgium and Germany could come in, hon. gentlemen opposite said that the Controller of Customs had decided that

Mr. CRAIG.

these countries could not come in. On what ground has he decided that? I do not think he has investigated their tariffs. I do not think there ever was a more arbitrary provision put on the Statute-book than this under which it is proposed to leave treaty-making and tariff arrangements of the country in the hands of the Controller of Customs. How is he to be guided? I think he himself will be puzzled to know. Shall Japan come in? That country has a low tariff. He has no means of judging whether she is legally entitled to come in or not, but he gets over the whole difficulty by simply saying: I have decided. The resolution is so indefinite that his decision is simply arbitrary. I object to a resolution leaving in the hands of the Controller of Customs the power to say to one country: Come in under the low tariff, and to another: Stay out.

But I object to this resolution for another reason, and that is that it is dangerous. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has elaborated that point. He has shown how dangerous it is to take out of the hands of Parliament the power of making treaties, for that is what this resolution virtually amounts to, and conferring that power upon the Controller of Customs. I hold that a more dangerous proposition never was placed before Parliament. Is it to be supposed that this Parliament is to pass such a resolution, allowing the Government to make treaties with Germany, Japan, China or any other country? They may make a treaty with the United States, and we would have nothing to say, because we will have handed over all our powers in the matter. The United States may make an offer to the Controller of Customs. Is he obliged to communicate it to Parliament before it is confirmed? Not at all. The Government may say: We think that this complies with the terms of the resolution, and so they may allow the United States to come in. There might be differences of opinion in the Cabinet itself, and in that case, I suppose, the Controller of Customs would be the arbiter. I am surprised that the Government should place before the House a proposition to take out of the hands of Parliament power to make treaties and hand it over to the Controller of Customs and the members of the Government. I think that is taking a long step backwards. We call ourselves a free people. We here call ourselves an independent Parliament. But if we are prepared to accept such a proposition as this, we deserve to have a Government that will demand that we shall yield them still further powers. If we are prepared to abdicate our independence and leave to the Government the power to make treaties practically on their own terms, they may send delegates to Washington, as delegates have been sent to Washington before, and negotiate a treaty without any need to come to us for con-

firmation. Suppose that when the delegates went to Washington they were asked what their powers were. They could reply: We have absolute powers; here is the resolution passed in the House of Commons. I can imagine representatives of the United States learning of such a thing. They would think it very strange that any Parliament should give such treaty-making powers to its representatives. If this Parliament votes, as I am a little afraid they will vote, to give the Government such powers as this, I do not know what will be thought of us.

I have another objection to this resolution. Not only is it arbitrary, indefinite and dangerous, but it is deceptive as well. When the Government placed it before this Parliament it was pretended to us and to the country that it was a proposal to give preferential trade to Great Britain. And I must say that that seemed a very good stroke of policy at the time, and a great many people in the country were carried away with the idea. In this Jubilee year, it was thought a good thing for Canada to say to the mother country: We make you an offer of preferential trade. Some people have been very much surprised when I told them that Great Britain was not mentioned in this resolution at all. But Great Britain is not mentioned in it, though we are told that it is intended as an offer of preferential trade to Great Britain. That is why I call it a deceptive resolution. The Finance Minister was very positive at first in stating that Germany and Belgium were not included under this resolution and would not come in under the arrangement. But what does he say now? He says: Well, perhaps Germany and Belgium may come in under this arrangement; we do not claim to know all about it; we did claim a little while ago to know all about it; but we are afraid to claim that now, and Germany and Belgium may come in, so we will add another clause, "b":

That the Governor in Council may extend the benefit of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

Now, the point I wish to make is this—that while the Finance Minister at first was positive that Germany and Belgium would not come in under this arrangement, he is not positive to-day. I come to the conclusion that if the Finance Minister says it is possible they may come in, he has found out that they can come in. The Government are letting themselves down easy. After a while it will be admitted that they must come in. This little clause "b" is put in to empower the Government to extend the benefit of this arrangement to Germany, Belgium and other countries. I am inclined to think that this was intended to humbug the people of the country. The Government were placed in an awkward position. On the one hand they had to please the manu-

facturers, and on the other hand, they had to please the farmers, particularly those farmers who are free traders. They did not alter the main tariff very much, but left that as it was under the National Policy. In the changes they have just made they have restored duties almost to what they were under the tariff of the late Government. In many cases they have restored complete protection. Now this would not do at all with their free trade followers, and what do they say? They say to the manufacturers: Look at our tariff, it is all right, we have made it all right for you. The Premier, in going through the country, said: We won't injure you, we are not going to injure the manufacturers of this country. And it was very laughable to hear the Minister of Public Works in this House on one occasion say: Why, we are not a lot of fools about this tariff. He meant to say: We are not going to destroy the industries of this country; people have said that we were going to be consistent and carry out our pledges, but we are not going to carry out our pledges at all. I suppose the man who carries out his pledges is a fool, after all, and so we are not going to be fools, we are not going to carry out the pledge that we made to the farmers in order to get into power, we are not going to be free trade in any respect, we are not going to take the duty off agricultural implements, or reduce it on manufactured goods, except in a slight measure. They said that to the manufacturers of the country and to the workingmen of this country. But what did they say to the farmers who were expecting free trade? They turned round and said to them: Well, that is all right, but by this preferential clause the duties will be reduced at once one-eighth on goods coming from Great Britain, and 25 per cent or one-fourth in the course of a year; and not only on goods coming from Great Britain, but we are able to make such arrangements that if any country in the world, if the United States desire to come in, they can come in. The Montreal "Witness" had a very strong article on this point in which it said: It will never do to give this preferential arrangement to foreigners like the Germans or Belgians and deny it to our fellow-kinsmen in the United States; and the "Witness" hoped that they would come in in a short time. And so they were able to say to all free traders in this House—when I say free traders, of course, I mean not actual free traders, but men who want the tariff reduced—they say to them: Well, we had to make this protective tariff in order to keep our promises to the manufacturers, promises which were made to them quietly, yet you will find out that after all we are going to keep our promises to you also by this preferential tariff, we are going to reduce the tariff after a while 25 per cent, and if you will only have a little patience you will find that, as has been said by some of the

western members of this House, we are going to reduce the tariff by instalments until we get where the free traders want. So I say this resolution is deceptive on the face of it. It pretends, though not so strongly, to a preferential arrangement in favour of Great Britain, while actually it does not do so at all. Now, I go further, I object to this resolution not only for the reasons that I have mentioned, but because I hold it is injurious to the interests of this country: I hold it is most injurious to our manufacturing interests. And, Sir, I go further than that, I hold that anything that injures the manufacturers of this country injures the workingmen of this country, and not only injures the workingmen, but injures the farmers of this country. Why, it is very well to be voting money for cold storage to carry our produce to the workingmen of Great Britain; but, Sir, is it a consistent thing to be doing that, to be giving money for cold storage to carry these products to distant countries, and at the same time to be destroying the industries which employ workingmen who are a home market for our farmers? I maintain, whatever may be said to the contrary, that the best market is the home market. The farmer does not need any cold storage to get his butter, to get his eggs, to get his cheese to the workingmen of this country, he takes them to their doors almost without any trouble at all, and I maintain he gets better prices for them. His goods do not have to pass through two or three hands. So I maintain that this resolution is injurious because it will injure the manufacturing industries of this country, and in doing so, will injure the workingmen of this country. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). I myself am not in favour of reducing the tariff to any country to the injury of our own workingmen. Why, Sir, they talk about loyalty. Well, Sir, I am loyal to Canada, and I hold that in being loyal to Canada I am loyal to the Empire. Is not Canada a part of the Empire? Are not the workingmen of this country a part of the Empire? Are we going to look upon ourselves as foreigners? Why, Sir, many of us are Englishmen, or Scotchmen, or Irishmen, we are part of the Empire. Many of our ancestors, and some of us ourselves, have come from England to this country—not to build up a foreign country, but to build up a greater England in this country. We are part of the Empire, and I hold that it is preposterous to talk about injuring one part of the Empire, injuring the workingmen of one part of the Empire, in order to benefit the workingmen of another part of the Empire. Sir, what with steamship communication and telegraph lines, the world is becoming gradually smaller. While not many years ago we might have looked on Great Britain as a long way off, the Empire to-day is being consolidated by fast Atlantic

Mr. CRAIG.

lines, by cables running under the ocean, and we are becoming not only one nation in name, but one nation in reality. So I hold that when I am loyal to Canada I am loyal to the Empire; I hold that Canada is not a mean part of the Empire. Why, Sir, it is absurd to talk about loyalty and then to turn around and say that we are going to injure the workingmen of this country in order to benefit the workingmen of Great Britain. I am loyal to Great Britain; I am proud of Great Britain, as we all are. I am proud of her history, and what she has done in the past. I am proud of her to-day. Her policy to-day is free trade because it suits her best; our policy is moderate protection because it suits us best; and I maintain that if the statesmen who rule Great Britain were in Canada to-day, they would be found alongside the Conservative party advocating moderate protection for a country situated as we are. I do not take any stock in theories, either of protection or of free trade. I look at these matters in a common-sense and business-like way. I want to do what is best to build up the country, and I hold that this resolution is injurious to our manufactures and I oppose it on that ground. But, Sir, if I am disposed to withhold these favours from Great Britain because we are part of the Empire, what should I say of the proposition that we should give this reduction to Germany, to Belgium, and to twenty other countries scattered over Europe? It seems to me that this is a most preposterous idea. And what are we going to get for it? Why, Sir, what could I say, suppose I were to vote for this resolution, what could I say to a lot of workingmen, suppose they were thrown out of employment by German goods coming into this country, when they ask me: Why did you do this? Well, I might have some excuse if I said I was doing it to favour Great Britain, although I think they would say there was not much loyalty about that after all. They would say I had no business to be loyal at their expense; and I think the Government has no business to trade on loyalty at the expense of the workingmen of this country. I think the workingmen would say that I had no business to be loyal at their expense; if I wanted to be loyal at my own expense, that is all right. But what could I say, what excuse could I give, for having voted for a resolution like this, which I hold would be injurious to the workingmen of this country, when goods came from Belgium, from Germany, or other countries? Sir, I maintain I would have no excuse at all, I would stand before these men ashamed of having voted for such a thing. And what are we getting for it? What are we getting from Germany? We are getting nothing, we are not going to get anything. Nobody asked us to do this, we act of our own free will. We say: We are quite willing to do this for you, we are willing

to offer you this, but you need not give us anything at all. Why, Sir, it reminds me of the former efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House. They talked about negotiating reciprocity treaties and gave the United States the impression that the Liberal party would grant more favourable terms than the Conservative party offered. It seems to me that they are very fond of giving away the benefit of our tariff protection. It may be that they look on this as one way of killing protection. Well, if they do, let them say so. But they don't do that, they do it on a pretense of loyalty. Well, Sir, I hold, and I repeat, that I will vote against this resolution because it is injurious. Now, I am going to turn from that resolution, which I condemn for the reasons that I have given, and I will consider for a moment the amendment which has been proposed. I propose to support this amendment because it agrees with my sentiments. I see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) laughing. I suppose the hon. member thinks that I am going to support this amendment because I sit on this side of the House, but that is not the reason at all. If he has listened to what I have said, I am sure he would not think so about me at all. I am reasoning this matter out. Why, I have not heard any reasons given by hon. members on that side of the House. They are willing to go it blind, they are willing to follow their leader without hearing any reasons given. I am willing to accept reasons for what I do, and I am not only willing to take reasons, but I am willing to give reasons for what I do. I wish to look at this amendment and consider it. I am afraid some hon. gentlemen opposite have not even read it, and perhaps they do not think it worth reading simply because it was moved by the leader of the Opposition. I will read it for their benefit. It is as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House the reduction by 25 per cent of the duties upon all imports except wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane, or beet-root, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes in favour of any country whose tariff is or may be made on the whole as low as that of Schedule "D," is calculated to imperil the industrial interests of Canada and is in principle opposed to preferential trade of any kind with the mother country.

I agree with this amendment, because it agrees with what I have just been saying. I have been arguing that this section imperils the industrial interests of Canada. I do not think that proposition needs any argument in its support. What have we seen during the last two or three weeks? The tariff was brought down. Why was it not proceeded with? Because the Finance Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce were receiving delegations who

stated that the new tariff imperilled their industrial interests. Did the Finance Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce tell those deputations to leave? No; they have been receiving them, and in the meanwhile the House has been waiting for the consideration of the tariff to be taken up. Those deputations represented that the tariff imperilled their interests. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to act as the Government did and not turn a deaf ear to our statements when we declare that this resolution is calculated to imperil the industrial interests of Canada. It is also stated that this resolution is opposed to preferential trade of any kind with the mother country. I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite really hold that opinion. I will read it again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. CRAIG. I am bound to have hon. gentlemen opposite educated; if they do not vote rightly, they cannot blame me. I do not want those hon. gentlemen at a later stage to say that they did not understand the resolution. It is in principle opposed to preferential trade with the mother country. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite something they do not know, apparently, although they should know it, because it appeared in the "Globe." The "Globe" said that if Germany or Belgium came in under the treaty that was an end to the preferential arrangement, and knocked it on the head. It has been proved beyond controversy by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) that Germany and Belgium will come in under the favoured-nation clause; and in that case the resolution is opposed to any kind of preferential arrangement with Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite at first declared that their resolution would not apply to Germany and Belgium. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said last night that he was not certain on that point, that he could not pronounce on it ex cathedra, that perhaps it might be decided by a higher authority that Germany and Belgium may come in. What do we on this side of the House advocate? We advocate that before any measure of this kind is adopted, the Imperial Government should remove obstacles now existing and clear the way for a preferential arrangement with Great Britain. I now come to a portion of the amendment which all hon. members can support, namely:

That the desire for preferential trade with the United Kingdom is now general throughout Canada.

I need not argue that point. After the great professions of loyalty made by hon. gentlemen opposite they will not dispute the point, and the same feeling prevails on this side of the House. So members are united on this portion of the amendment, and if it were taken out of the rest of the amendment, no doubt they would all be prepared to vote for

it. I am glad it is not necessary to educate hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this portion of the amendment, and that the Empire can accept as the voice of this whole Parliament the declaration that the desire for preferential trade with Great Britain is now general in Canada. The amendment goes on to declare further :

That this House is of opinion that the Government of Canada should cause Her Majesty's Government to be advised that so soon as the difficulties in the way are removed the Parliament of Canada is ready to enter into a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain and Ireland.

Is there any dispute about this? I think we are all agreed in regard to it. I am in favour of a real preferential arrangement; I am not in favour of a pretended preferential arrangement, for I am not in favour of shams of any kind. What is meant by a real preferential arrangement? It is reciprocity—we get something for what we give. Some people are so very loyal that they reproach hon. members on this side of the House for saying that we want to get something in return for what we grant. If we were acting as individuals we might be so generous as to give all we possess, but we are acting for the people of Canada, and the people do not desire to give to everybody concessions for which they receive nothing in return, concessions not asked for, and which are not going to benefit anyone except workingmen in England. I do not think that our people are called on by reason of their loyalty to make concessions in order to benefit some workingmen in Great Britain. Moreover, such concessions may not benefit those workingmen, because the increased profits might be taken by middlemen; indeed, from this reduction of 25 per cent in duties I am satisfied the consumers will not benefit. It will prove only sufficient to cripple some of our manufacturers, and yet not be sufficiently large when the result is distributed to amount to anything. I agree with this part of the amendment, and will support it—and because hon. gentlemen opposite agree with it, they will vote against it. The effect of the resolution as submitted will be this, that while pretending to give Great Britain a preferential tariff, it will open our markets to all the countries of the world at reduced rates of duty. I also object to take the tariff-making power out of the hands of this Parliament. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) should object to this power passing into the hands of the Government, and I am sure if it had been proposed by a Conservative Government no member would have talked longer and louder than that hon. gentleman in opposition to it. Then he would have appeared as the great defender of the rights of Parliament, and if Parliament had not granted it, he would not have had a word to say against that action. The hon. gentleman is now, however, perfectly satisfied to take the treaty-making power out of the

Mr. CRAIG.

hands of Parliament and place it in the hands of the Government. Well, Sir, it is astonishing what a difference it makes when hon. gentlemen move from one side of the House to the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite mean that ironical "Hear, hear" as a reproach to me, but I can tell them that my principles are just the same on this side of the House as when I was on the other side. I have done this session, what no gentleman on the other side of the House has had courage enough to do, for I have voted against my party when I thought they were wrong.

Mr. GIBSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. I would like to see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) or the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) do that. It would be a treat to us to see either of those hon. gentlemen do so, but I am afraid we will have to wait a very long time before they give such an exhibition of independence as that.

Mr. GIBSON. Our Government is always right, you know.

Mr. CRAIG. Now, Sir, as I want to get through before six o'clock—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. Well, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish me to finish so soon, I shall not do so.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

#### CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. OLIVER moved to add the following section to the Bill :—

Such route and plans shall provide for the establishment of a station for receiving and delivering freight and passengers within the present corporate limits of the town of Macleod.

Mr. TISDALE. When this Bill was under consideration the other evening, I stated that in its present form it evidenced a compromise agreed upon unanimously in the Railway Committee. The promoters of the Bill there contended that they should have the ordinary extension of time without any conditions whatever, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) contended in the line of his present amendment and as a compromise it was agreed by the Railway Com-

mittee that it should be left to the Government to decide upon a route whenever the company made the extension. Therefore, in opposing this amendment I am simply asking that the House carry out the Bill as passed unanimously by the Railway Committee. From what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) said the other night, he seemed to question the correctness of my understanding as to what took place in the committee, and I would ask the chairman of that committee (Mr. Sutherland) to say whether I am correct or not. It will be a surprise to me if that hon. gentleman does not say that my understanding is the correct one.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) understands one thing and I understand another as to what took place in the Railway Committee, and there can be no object in our contradicting each other. I will repeat briefly the circumstances of this case for the information of hon. gentlemen who are not on the Railway Committee. The Calgary and Edmonton Railway was chartered to be constructed from the town of Calgary, south to the international boundary line. It was constructed for 100 miles of that distance until it reached the north bank of the Old Man's River, about two miles from the town of Macleod. That town has been in existence ever since the Government of Canada asserted its authority over the North-west Territories; it was established by the Mounted Police when they first went to that country, and has been a town ever since. The town site is the property of the Government, and the property owned by private individuals was sold to them by the Government on the understanding that it was to be a town site. At the present time the Government own the buildings occupied in the town by the Mounted Police, which have cost many thousands of dollars. This company had a charter to extend its line to the boundary, but, having reached the north bank of the Old Man's River, they ceased constructing, and their right to construct from that point to the boundary lapsed by process of time. They asked for a revival of the privilege to extend to the boundary. It was asked as a condition that they establish a station within the present town of Macleod. They refused to accept this condition, and said they did not want to build to the boundary, but only to connect with the proposed Crow's Nest Pass Railway. In order to do that, they would require to cross the Old Man's River and to pass either through or very near to the present town of Macleod. On behalf of the property owners of that town, the largest and most interested of whom is the Government of Canada, I ask that that company shall be required, when they make the extension, to establish a station within the town of Macleod. That is all that the people of the town of Macleod ask, and it is for this House now to say whether that is a reasonable request or not. Is it not rea-

sonable that when a railway has necessarily to be constructed within a very short distance of an existing town, the company should be required to establish a station within that town for the convenience of the inhabitants, and for the convenience of the people of the country who do business there. It has been argued that it is not necessary to insert this provision in the Bill, but I claim to the contrary, because unless the provision is inserted, the people of Macleod would have no guarantee that a station will be established there. I admit that the Bill provides that the railway must run either through or in the vicinity of the town of Macleod, but that is of no benefit whatever to the business interests of that town. There must be a station within the boundaries of the town, or no benefit will accrue, and unless this Parliament provides that a station must be established there, the people who have their money invested in real estate in Macleod, will have no security on which to proceed with improvements, pending the establishment of a railroad station. If this were a new town it might be right not to consider this proposition, but Macleod is the oldest town in that part of the country, and I submit that in the interests of the seven or eight hundred people who are living there, and who have about half a million or three-quarters of a million dollars invested in buildings there, it is only fair that the assurance should be given them that the railway should erect a station in the town. It will not cost the Dominion of Canada one cent to secure, by this means, the permanent establishment and prosperity of Macleod. As to whether it would be an imposition upon the railway company to ask them to establish a railway station—not to deviate their line—but simply to establish a station at a certain point of their line where it would be of advantage to an important town, I shall give to the House a few facts as regards the relation of that company to the country, and as to the mutual obligations and advantages which exist and have been enjoyed.

The railway is 295 miles in length. It was built, I believe, at the instigation of the Government of Canada, with the sanction of the Parliament of Canada, as a colonization road, for the express purpose of opening up and developing the country, of giving the country interested railroad advantages; and for that reason it was heavily bonused. It received assistance in the shape of a land grant amounting to 1,888,000 acres for 295 miles, and money assistance to the amount of \$80,000 a year for twenty years, which amounts to \$1,190,198 of present value at 3 per cent. If the land is worth \$1 an acre—and the company is allowed the right to select the land—their total grant in money and land amounts to \$3,078,198 of cash value for the building of 295 miles of road, which at a fair estimate would not cost more than \$10,000 a mile. In other

words, they have received in cash value from this country \$3,073,195 in order to enable them to build a road which at an outside estimate would not cost more, and did not cost more, than \$2,950,000, leaving a difference of \$128,000 in their favour. That is to say, the road would cost them absolutely nothing and give them \$128,000 profit. Every shovelful of earth, and every pound of iron on it was paid for, and overpaid for, in cash or land by the people of this country. So that, if it is asserted that extraordinary obligations are being laid on this company by asking them to establish a single station at a certain point on their line, this country has given the company full consideration for any such trifling concession now asked from them. But beyond that, I find, on referring to the railway statistics published for the past year, that the company themselves estimate the cost of the road at \$3,717,882, and upon this they have issued bonds for \$5,458,940, a difference between their own statement of the cost of the road, and the amount of money they have borrowed in respect of the road and their lands of \$1,741,068, upon the whole of which bonds interest is charged at 6 per cent, or \$327,536 a year. This has to be met by the traffic of the road, or if not met, it will depreciate the credit of the country to that extent. I will not detain the committee at any length on this point. I will merely say that when the Calgary and Edmonton Company built the road, they built it out of the money provided by the people of Canada, and having done so, raised upon it \$1,741,000 more than its total alleged cost, on which we have either to pay interest or have our credit injured to a greater extent than the actual value of the money. This scheme has depreciated the value of railway securities in north-western Canada by reason of the vast interest charges that have to be paid. It is for this House to say to what extent this company have a right to be considered above the interests of the settlers of the country and the town property which actually belongs to this country. If any interest is to be considered before another, it is certainly the interest of the people of the country, and the interest of this Government in protecting as far as possible the good faith of the country. All we ask with regard to this matter is that when these people make their extension, they shall be bound, not to any particular time for making it, but simply to establish a railway station in the town of Macleod, so that the interests of that town, and the interest of this Government in the town site, shall not be sacrificed. I am sorry to say it has been the practice of every railway company in the North-west to sacrifice the interests of town sites which existed before they began operations. Instead of employing their powers in building up the country, they have played the part of land pirates, using the powers granted to them by this House

Mr. OLIVER.

for the purpose of depreciating the actual value they found in the country before they went there.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I think the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is perfectly right in his contention that the people who are asking for these powers from this House, should be compelled to build that road into Fort Macleod. I know something about these people, because they have a railroad built to the town in which I live, namely, the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway. There is an old saying that the burnt child dreads the fire, and we know, from the way in which they have acted in the past, that we have nothing to expect from them unless they are forced and tied down to do what is right in the interest of the settlers. When they built the road to Prince Albert, by way of Saskatoon, they passed by that town, and built a town site of their own, practically ruining Saskatoon; and when they reached Duck Lake, they went about a mile from the town, and compelled the people of Duck Lake to move to their town site. When they reached Prince Albert, a large and flourishing town which has been in existence for eighteen years, they would not come into the town and locate a station there until the property owners agreed to give them one-half of their property. It is a well-known fact that in a new country settlers must go in ahead of railways, and if there is no protection for the towns, people will not invest their money in them. When people go into a new country with capital, they want to invest their money in a town through which a railway is likely to run; and if they know that railway corporations are going to be allowed to steer clear of those towns which have been established and thus ruin them, they will not invest one dollar in the country. This is a matter which the Government should seriously consider, because if railway companies are to be allowed to give the towns which are established the go-by, you will never get a town built in the Territories until such time as the railway companies have located it. This company has no right to ask any concessions from the Government. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is perfectly justified in the stand he has taken, and the same remarks made with regard to the Calgary and Edmonton Railroad all apply to the railway which runs into Prince Albert, and which was built by this company at the same time. That road cost them, by their own figures, \$2,539,600, and they sold bonds to the extent of \$3,109,840, leaving a clear balance of \$1,269,000, besides an enormous land grant which they got from the country. Now, they have been running that road for the last five years, and I had occasion the other day to bring to the notice of the House and of the Government the manner in which

they are running it. They do not keep section men on the road, and the line is simply grown up with weeds in the summer. The company will not spend a cent on it. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler), in the Railway Committee the other day, expressed a great deal of sympathy for the bondholders. That is all very well, but if he had expressed a little sympathy for them, when the companies were issuing the bonds, it would have been better for all parties interested. I may say, in connection with these roads, that a letter was published some time ago in the Toronto "Globe," written by Mr. Hugh Sutherland, of Winnipeg, a gentleman connected with the Hudson Bay Railway, which showed up all the transactions of this company, and that letter has never yet been replied to. If such a letter were written concerning any hon. gentleman in this House, he would take steps to have the matter righted or make some reply, but so far the company have been silent. Under the circumstances, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is doing nothing but his duty to his constituents in trying to protect them, because if this company are allowed a loop-hole they will take advantage of it. That has been our experience in the past, and we can see no reason to hope for anything better in the future.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 70) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk) moved that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

The company shall, without delay, make application to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for a grant of running rights for its railway over the Canadian Pacific Railway between Chater and Brandon, and shall bona fide and without delay prosecute such application to a hearing and result, and upon acquiring such running rights shall forthwith and in a bona fide manner proceed to effect, if possible, an arrangement with the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company for a connection at Brandon with the said railway, so that the trains of the company may, when required, be run over the Canadian Pacific Railway and over and upon the line of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway at Brandon as aforesaid, and to this end shall co-operate with the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company in laying down tracks and sidings and in making other construction necessary for the purpose, and shall contribute such proportion of the outlay incident thereto as may be agreed upon between the company and the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company, or in case of a failure to come to an agree-

ment with the last mentioned company such proportion as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may adjudge and determine the company shall be bound by any terms which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may impose upon it in granting such running rights over the Canadian Pacific Railway and in making such connections with the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway as aforesaid.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to draw the attention of the committee to the extraordinary clause which is proposed to be added to that Bill. It is one to compel a railway to grant running rights over it to another railway, it is, in fact, an injunction to compel a company to make application to the Railway Committee. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether this amendment is relevant to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that, according to our rules, the clause which it is proposed to move is relevant to the Bill. It may be an extraordinary clause, but that is for the committee to decide.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I may say that the principle of this amendment was practically agreed to in committee, and the clause in question was drafted by the Minister of Railways, or by his law clerk.

Mr. TISDALE. Was this clause shown to the promoters?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). Not to my knowledge. They were in the Railway Committee.

Mr. LISTER. This is practically an agreement. I think the Minister of Railways ought to be here for the purpose of explaining.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman will remember, when the point was brought up in the Railway Committee, that the Minister intimated that he proposed drafting just such a clause, and that he would do it in committee. I have no doubt that what my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell) says is absolutely correct, and that this is the clause which the Minister proposed to draft. It is only designed for the purpose of compelling the North-west Central Railway Company to connect and to exchange traffic with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Manitoba and Northern Pacific.

Mr. LISTER. Have these companies been notified?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is customary that an exchange of traffic should take place between these companies. Collusion may occur, and they may decline to request the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for such connection, and the design of this clause is to compel them, at least, to make application, so that the interests of the people in that country may be protected by securing an exchange of traffic.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I believe it is designed to overcome a difficulty in the Railway Act. I understand the Act provides that the initiative in a case of this kind to compel an interchange of traffic must be taken by one of the railways interested. The purpose of this clause is to compel one of the railways interested to act under that clause.

Mr. LISTER moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the British Yukon Chartered Company. (Title changed to "British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.")—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Mining and Advisory Corporation of British America.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company, Limited.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Columbia River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. Champagne.)

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had almost concluded my remarks, and I would have closed them in a few minutes. I was referring to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, and saying that I objected to the resolution moved by the Finance Minister because it proposed to take power with respect to tariff-making and with respect to the tariff itself out of the hands of Parliament. I look at this matter entirely as a business man. I do not profess to discuss the legal question, whether Germany and Belgium come within this resolution or not. That has been, I think, sufficiently argued, and to my mind it has been conclusively proved that those countries do come within the scope of this resolution. But I find we have to choose between two resolutions; hon. gentlemen opposite have to choose as well as I have, and I wish they would choose intelligently

Mr. RICHARDSON.

and without reference to party. I suppose that is a vain wish. One strong reason urged why this resolution should be adopted by the House has been that the London "Times" and some other English papers have endorsed it most heartily. I am not at all surprised that the London "Times" and other English papers have applauded the Government for taking this step. What is the result of this step, what does it mean? It means a large concession to English manufacturers, it means taking a large slice off our tariff on English goods. It would be very strange if the English papers did not applaud this resolution. I can imagine that all the papers in Canada, no matter what their party leanings, would applaud the action of the United States Government if they made material reductions in the duties on all goods going from Canada to that country. Would it prove that such a policy would be beneficial to the United States? It would no more prove that than the action of the London "Times" shows that this resolution now proposed is for the best interests of this country. Those newspapers are not thinking of Canada but of England, they are not representing Canadian but English thought. I am not at all surprised at their position, and instead of this being an argument in favour of the action taken by the Government, to my mind it is the very opposite. But we have to choose between two policies presented to the House. I have discussed both of them. I have found one is indefinite in terms, arbitrary in execution, dangerous to parliamentary freedom, deceptive in its provisions, injurious to Canadian industries. This seems a very strong indictment, and it might be thought that in using some of these terms I was copying the strong and sometimes eloquent language of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I hold that I have completely proved, and I make this statement without fear of contradiction by hon. gentlemen opposite, that these terms are applicable without any exaggeration to the resolution proposed to the House by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not intend to repeat the argument; it suffices for me to state what this policy is. The other policy which is offered to the House for our choice is plain and business-like. There is no deception in its terms; it can be understood by all who read it, and I should be very glad if hon. gentlemen opposite would read it and learn what it means. More than that. There has been a claim made on behalf of the policy of the Government and of this resolution that they constitute evidence of the loyalty of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am glad to say that the Conservative party need no evidence of their loyalty. That has been proved—and I do not think that the party opposite has any need to make any demonstration as to their loyalty. All the

Canadian people are loyal, no matter what their nationality may be. We have in this country two great nationalities, an English-speaking nationality and a French-speaking nationality, and it is a great source of pride to me that we are all loyal, and no one can reproach another for being disloyal. No party ever constituted here has been disloyal. Sometimes in party debate or in order to make a political point against an opponent a charge of disloyalty has been made; still when we sit down and consider the matter we are prepared to claim for all parties that we are all equally loyal to the Empire and loyal to our country. The policy embodied in the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition is a policy that is loyal to the Empire and loyal to Canada. It would tend to build up the Empire and it would tend also to build up Canada. I had hoped to live to see the day when this policy would have been a reality. I am afraid that the policy which will be adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, the policy propounded by the Government, will tend to delay that time, so that I may not have the pleasure of seeing it. But that is a policy which would people our North-west. It has been admitted many a time not only by this side of the House but by the other side of the House that if it were possible to secure a true preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain, obtaining such concession as we thought desirable and receiving concession from Great Britain in return, it would be the best immigration policy that could be instituted. Then it would not be necessary to send agents to Great Britain and Ireland to induce farmers to come to our great North-west, but on account of the prosperity that would flow from such a policy, they would be anxious to go there and engage in raising produce, which would have a preference in the mother country. Not only would it build up our North-west, but it would build up our cities. A market would be found in the great North-west for our manufacturers, and while goods would come in from Great Britain at lower rates of duty, still at the same time we would have a large market for our manufactures in the North-west, and so we would be able to provide ample employment for our workmen, and in this way such a policy would tend to build up the whole country. That policy would indeed create a greater Britain. For myself I have no hesitation as to which policy I will choose, and I have given my reasons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CRAIG. I hear some hon. members sigh, as though it were not strange that I should have no hesitation as to my choice. But I have given my reasons, and conclusive reasons, and I should be very glad if some hon. members opposite would endeavour to controvert the arguments I have

offered and present some arguments to show that they are right in their action. I heard some legal arguments last night. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries endeavoured to show that Germany and Belgium did not come within the scope of this arrangement. But there have been no arguments offered to this House yet to show that this proposed policy of the Government is a policy which will tend to build up this country. On the contrary, Sir, I think I have shown that it is a policy which will be injurious to Canada. I pity hon. gentlemen opposite who have got themselves into painful positions and I feel that if the Government could retrace their steps and entirely blot out their action in this matter they would be very glad to do so. It is true that they have obtained a little temporary applause from the country, and have received the commendation of the London "Times" and other English papers. That, no doubt, is a great gratification to them, but when the people of the country thoroughly understand this question, the Government will find that instead of that being a help to them, it will be greatly to their disadvantage. I congratulate the Conservative party on their consistency with reference to preferential trade. They have now maintained the same position they did years ago, and they have continued to advocate preferential trade to the present hour. I am confident, Sir, that when the people of Canada understand the position of the Conservative party on this question, they will give them their cordial and warm support.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the consideration of the new tariff which was to a certain extent shortened during the debate before going into committee, may, I presume, be now conducted with more particular application to certain of its provisions. The consideration of this resolution and the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition seems to afford an excellent opportunity of considering the tariff as a whole. It will be remembered that the Finance Minister, during the delivery of his Budget speech, continually reminded hon. members that they should not prejudge, nor come to any conclusion on the general tariff, but that they should wait until the preferential clauses were reached in order to form a true idea of its character. The result of his tariff construction justifies the appeal he made, and showed it to be extremely proper that this House and the country should master the operations of this preferential clause, in order to determine whether the Government had fulfilled its promises of going in the direction of free trade or of a revenue tariff. In itself, the main tariff proposals of the present Government do not seem at all objectionable from the standpoint of protection. On the whole, it seems to be a tariff prepared by a Government who had the protectionist idea para-

mount. In its rates, in its arrangement, and in its protective features, it is almost identical with the tariff of the late Liberal-Conservative Government. It will be recollected that the people of this country were most anxious to know whether or not this Government would make a substantial move in the direction of freer trade, would endeavour to carry out their promise of a tariff for revenue only, or would decide to preserve those industries which have grown up in Canada under the system of protection inaugurated by the Conservative Government. I say, Sir, that regarding the main schedule of the tariff, while it is to a certain extent objectionable to those who look upon it from a protectionist standpoint, yet on the whole, I do not think I speak unfairly when I describe it as a tariff which embodies the protectionist character in a great many of its provisions. It might be open to a member speaking from this side of the House to reproach the Government for not carrying out their policy denouncing protection, which they laid down at Ottawa in 1893. The Liberal party then described the many evils which they said protection caused to the country, and it might lie within one's power to hold the Government up to reprobation because it did not carry out the promises it made to the country. That course I shall not adopt. Looking at the general tariff, the people of this country might be disposed to believe that very small changes had been made, and that the present Government was going to continue the protective fiscal system of the former Government, and which the former Opposition condemned very strongly. In this new tariff almost every protective feature which characterized the old tariff is retained. We know very well that those in favour of freer trade or a tariff for revenue, believe that the system of specific duties is the most vicious principle in protection. But we find that the present Government, in the tariff which it has submitted, has held on to that feature of protection. We find that whereas the old tariff had about 192 instances of specific duties in order to give efficient protection to the country, this tariff of the Liberal Government contains 122 instances of specific duties. That is somewhat of a reduction, but when you remember that there are 428 items in the tariff, and that 122, or more than one-quarter of the items in the tariff proposed by a Liberal Government, pledged to abolish every feature of a protectionist character, retain the specific duties, it tends to show that the present Government was very largely influenced, either by the spirit of the last Government or by the spirit of protection, which is so much alive in the country that sufficient pressure has been brought to bear upon this Government to practically compel them to continue the policy of the Liberal-Conservative Government in this respect. But that is not the only feature of protection

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

which characterizes this tariff. It goes a long way in the direction of maintaining the protective system, and the modifications of the tariff presented to the House yesterday by the Finance Minister showed very clearly that in almost every case where a protected industry had been attacked, those interested in the maintenance of that industry have been able, by presenting their claims to the Government, to so impress their views on the Government as to induce them to retrace the step they had taken, and to eliminate those features of the first draft which were injurious to the particular industry; and they are now protecting certain special industries as strongly as they can—might I say as strongly as they dare—and practically going in the teeth of the pledges they have given, and establishing and maintaining a system of protection in this country. It may not be for me, speaking from this side of the House, to condemn the Government for that, although they had framed a very strong indictment against the system of protection. The hon. Finance Minister, in introducing his tariff, after dwelling for a long time on the question of protection or freer trade, finally adopted, as the principle by which he was guided in offering this tariff to the country, the resolution passed by the Liberal party in convention in Ottawa in 1893. That resolution, referring to the tariff then in force, said:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain;

In these, and in many other ways, it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

This is the language used by the hon. Finance Minister in introducing his tariff resolutions, and naturally, after hearing such language used as an introduction, one would conclude that he would have taken care to live up to the spirit set forth in this passage. He says, speaking in the name of the Liberal party:

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

Having introduced his tariff resolutions with this language, it might naturally be supposed that in them none of the more objectionable features of protection would have been allowed to remain. Is it credible that a Government placed in power by a party which held the notions expressed in the language I have read, would deliberately continue in operation a system which in their opinion was injuring every interest in the country, oppressing the masses, interfering with the course of commerce, and discriminating against Great Britain? Is it credible that a Government which believed that protection was impeding the growth of our trade with Great Britain would continue such a system in force? And more strange than all, after reading the reciprocal resolution of this tariff, it seems almost inconceivable that the men who attended that convention in Ottawa and the members of the present Government can be the same individuals—a Government who have presented to this House a tariff which in all its main features is practically the tariff of the late Government. It is a tariff which retains the principle of protection, and applies that principle in all directions. For instance, what is the meaning of the extensive changes made in the direction of fostering the interests of the farmers of the North-west—giving them free binder twine, free barbed wire, and other advantages? changes not to the extent hoped for by gentlemen from the North-west, but still in the direction of protection, because they contain the essential features of protection, which I take to be the protection of certain interests at the expense of the body politic. As soon as the persons interested in the various interests of the country began to realize how the new tariff affected their particular interests, the consequence naturally was that the Government, instead of being able to go on at once with the consideration of the tariff resolutions, have had to delay the matter for five weeks; for, if I am not mistaken, it will be five weeks to-morrow since these resolutions were first introduced by the Finance Minister, and during those five weeks what has been going on? Have the masses of the people been represented by delegations to the Ministers? Have the farmers, whose properties we are told have been injured by the system of protection, been represented here? There have been delegations enough, but whom have they represented? Exactly the very interests which presented their views to the Government throughout the country; the very classes whose interests have been built up by the system of protection. And they have been here for what purpose? Not for the purpose of reproaching the Government for their failure to go as far as they should in the direction of free trade or their failure to introduce a tariff for revenue only; but to ask the Government to rectify errors and faults in the tariff they had brought down,

and they have been successful. The amendments to the tariff resolutions introduced by the Finance Minister yesterday show that in every instance those amendments are for the purpose of removing the burdens which were found to press too heavily upon the protected interests of the country. If it was possible to doubt that the first draft of the tariff was essentially protective in its character, the resolutions brought down yesterday prove that the influences at work to induce the Government to reconsider their conduct and to change the tariff, were altogether those of the protected manufacturers. From this side of the House we cannot find fault with the Government for that. We will leave that duty to their supporters, to those who placed them in power, if they see fit to reproach them for having failed to do away with the system of protection and to introduce a revenue tariff. We on this side of the House are only too glad to see this change of heart and purpose, because I believe the Opposition in this House, much more than any party success, are exceedingly anxious to see progress made in the direction of building up the industries of Canada; and far from reproaching the Government for the step they have taken in the direction of protection, we congratulate them upon that step. If the Government, in the larger and more complete knowledge which they must now have obtained of the great importance to Canada of those manufacturing industries which have been established under the influence of the National Policy, and of the general prosperity that is bound to flow from a greater diversity of those interests, had decided to go on in the direction of making more and more complete the protection to those interests, instead of proceeding, as they at one time threatened to do in the direction of a revenue tariff, we would have congratulated the Government on taking that course and have strengthened their hands.

But there is one objection to be taken by this side of the House to the changes that have been made. It is true that, to a certain extent, the Government have made good the defects of the first draft of their tariff; but I must say, looking at the matter from the standpoint of a representative of Nova Scotia, and particularly of that part of Nova Scotia in which the great coal and iron interests are paramount, I view with regret the manner in which the Government have thought fit to hamper those interests in order to benefit some industries in the province of Ontario. Instead of doing, as I hoped they would have done, instead of making safe these threatened industries in Ontario by increasing the duties and thus giving them sufficient protection against outside competition, the Government have gone in another direction, and to a great extent have assisted these industries by injuring ours. They have carried out, to a certain extent, the promise of the hon. First

Minister that he would regard iron and the products of iron as raw material and make them free, and have assisted the carriage-makers of Gananoque, and the manufacturers of wire and other metal products in Ontario, by removing, to a great extent, the protection which the iron producing interests in Nova Scotia had hitherto enjoyed. I regret that the Government did not take care to assist these interests in Ontario in such a way as would not imperil interests of a more important character to the country as a whole, and this they could easily have done by an increase of the duties on the imports.

But while, on the whole, we cannot find very much fault with this tariff in its present shape, leaving out of sight the preferential clause, when we come to consider that clause, the aspect changes, and we are reminded of the advice given us by the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), when he asked us not to make up our minds hastily but to wait until we knew the character of the preferential clause. Those who are in favour of perpetuating the system of protection are brought by this clause face to face with the fact, that if that preferential schedule is fairly and honestly applied and brought into effect, as we believe on this side it will be, and the products of all the great manufacturing countries in the world, which enjoy the favoured-nation clause, admitted at the preferential rates, then a tremendous cut in the duties protecting Canadian industries is bound to take place. In the first year, 12½ per cent will be taken off these duties and in the second year 25 per cent. The consequence will be that in the course of twelve months we will have a reduction of 25 per cent in that system of protection which we have hitherto enjoyed, and which we have reason to know, from our experience of the past five years, is barely adequate to maintain our manufacturing industries in the position to which they have attained under the operation of the National Policy. Therefore, when we regard the fact that the main schedule must be considered as subject to a reduction of 25 per cent, every one in favour of maintaining the system of protection is compelled to put himself on record against the present tariff, as a whole, because we know that when this reduction of 25 per cent comes into effect the tariff will prove an absolute failure as far as protection to our industries is concerned. There are some features of this preferential clause which have provoked a good deal of discussion and will probably provoke a good deal more. This preferential clause is of a peculiar character and introduced into this House in a peculiar way. It does not contain any reference to Great Britain, and yet this resolution which contains no reference to Great Britain is impressed on the people of Canada and of Great Britain as well, under the side light thrown upon it by the Finance Minister

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

as a tender of preferential trade to the mother country. It is in reality nothing of the kind, but very far from it, so far as I can gather from a careful consideration of the main tariff. None the less, that impression has been produced, and a great many members of the Opposition, who, if they looked at it merely as a question of protection or freer trade, would not hesitate for a moment to oppose the reduction of 25 per cent, are so hampered by the idea, which the hon. Finance Minister contrived to attach so artfully to this clause, that it is a preference given to the trade of Great Britain, that they are to a certain extent embarrassed and feel loath to place themselves in opposition to a tender of preferential treatment to our fellow-subjects in the motherland. But that is not a fair way of submitting this clause. It is not a tender of preferential trade to Great Britain, but, under the vague language used, it may apply to any or every country in the world. In this respect it strikes me that the Government are not acting ingeniously in this matter. Several members of the Government have told us, and their words have gone to the country, that this resolution is not intended to apply to Belgium and Germany or to any country but Great Britain. If that be the case, if it is not intended by the Government to allow this clause to apply to any other country but Great Britain, then the clause itself is deceptive and dishonest. If that were the intention of the Government, why did they draft the clause in such a way that it apparently applies to the whole world, instead of taking the more honest and more definite course of stating expressly that it was intended to apply to Great Britain alone. Why did they not say: This is a tender of preferential trade to Great Britain, and under it we propose to admit the manufactures and products of Great Britain at a reduction of 12½ per cent and 25 per cent on our main schedules. But the Government have not done that. If their intention were to confine the clause to Great Britain, they took a very roundabout course to arrive at what they might have accomplished directly without any danger of exposing the industries of Canada to competition with the products of the most highly organized labour and protective countries in the world. It is quite evident, from the clause introduced by the Minister of Finance in his amended resolutions, that this view has come home to the Government itself. It is evident by the wording of clause "B" that the Government have contemplated that, in all probability, the interpretation which will be put upon this clause by the British Government will be such that the home Government will require Canada to extend the same privileges to the other countries which enjoy the most-favoured-nation treatment. And that being the case, the Government, having, as is apparent by clause "B" which

they have introduced, found themselves face to face with that contingency, it strikes me that the country may reasonably anticipate the result that will follow, and that the industries of Canada, instead of having to contend with the industries of Great Britain alone will have to contend with the industries of at least Germany, Belgium, France and some other twenty nations that have these treaties, in addition to the industries of Great Britain. Looking at it, then, from that standpoint—and I think that it is only fair in view of the confession made by the Government by introducing their clause "B"—it becomes more than ever incumbent upon those who are opposed to a relaxation of the system of protection, who are not willing to see our industries exposed to severe competition, who are very much averse to seeing these industries destroyed, to set themselves squarely in opposition to the tariff; because, if it comes into operation, favourable as may be the main schedule to many of the industries of the country as a whole, with the preferential clause in full operation, I think it is not open to doubt nearly all the industries built up in Canada by the National Policy will be destroyed. And if this be the result, a state of affairs will arise in this country that will not be one of progress. For, if the Government destroy these industries, what are they going to give us in place of them? The Government will do away with the completeness of the protection. The protective system is to be the nominal system, retaining, substantially, the form of the protection under the old tariff; but it is not a living tariff, and, while apparently and nominally protective, it is not really so. If the Government, by such a tariff, destroy the industries built up under the old tariff, what are they going to give us in exchange for them? Nothing. There can be no question that this country will go backward, and even if a change of Government takes place five years from the last election, the history of the five years will have been one of a stationary or worse, a retrograde condition of affairs. Such a state of affairs is not pleasant to contemplate, and I would hope that the sober second thought of the Government, by the time we meet again, will have induced them to reverse their policy and to go back to the main schedule and drop out of use this preferential clause.

Now, there is one feature of this preferential or reciprocal schedule, which has already been adverted to, that makes it a peculiar thing to deal with. Those of us who wish to see the protective system maintained, see ground for opposing it strongly and fairly. Still, there is no doubt that a certain amount of kudos has come to the Government, that they have acquired a certain amount of glory because they have by skillful use of words, imported into their tariff

something which is not there at all, by reason of which they pose at this moment as very strong lovers and friends of Great Britain, anxious to develop preferential trade. In this, as in so many cases before, they have assumed the position that was for a long time and is still occupied by the Conservatives of this country. They are now strongly pro-British. It was not always so. Their faces were not always turned towards London and towards Downing Street, but their faces and their feet as well were turned towards Washington. They were seen in Washington, they were received kindly there, and rubbed shoulders with the prominent men there. One of them in fact was referred to as the senator from Ontario. But now they have given the cold shoulder, apparently, to Washington, and their hearts are set upon binding closer the bonds that unite us to our British cousins. While that is apparently a desirable change of heart, we have reason to suspect these gentlemen who have so suddenly made this right-about-face movement. When carefully looked into, this tariff, which they proclaimed to the world as intended to open up preferential trade with Great Britain—they claim that in this they have taken the first step without waiting for Great Britain; they are going to teach the mother of nations her duty, and they have received a great deal of credit for taking this attitude—does not go nearly as far in this direction as these gentlemen would imply. It has been pointed out by one of the speakers in this House, in reference to many of the articles in which our principal trade is with Great Britain, and in which we might look for an extended trade under this preferential clause, that in anticipation of the 12½ per cent reduction, these hon. gentlemen have made a 16½ per cent increase. They have increased duties of 25 per cent to 30 per cent and duties of 30 per cent to 35 per cent on the principal items with which Great Britain supplies us. This leaves the duty against the British manufacturers even higher than under the old tariff. So that, in this case, the kindness of the reciprocal schedule, which, while professing to extend its provisions to the old country alone, is deceptive.

But there is another matter in respect of which it will be seen that Great Britain is not the country which will profit most largely by the changes made. There are certain goods in which England can supply us with advantage, but there are other goods in which the United States practically control the market and will control it more and more in the future. And above all that is contained in the tariff and in the tariff resolution and in the speech by which they were introduced, is the offer of reciprocity to the United States which is intended to make our American cousins understand that there is no hostility felt for them, that the

old liking for Washington and the people represented at Washington is still alive and active in the hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, we will take one particular industry, and that, perhaps, the most important of all the great industries that have grown up in Canada under the operation of a protective system. I refer to that greatest of all, that foundation industry, the production of iron and steel. It was seen at once when the main tariff was introduced, that the protection upon iron and steel had been very largely reduced, and that a severe blow, perhaps a blow that would be fatal, had been given to the great iron producing industries in Nova Scotia. But what is the case now when we come to consider the amended resolutions brought down yesterday by the Finance Minister? What industries have been selected to be struck at now? Why, Sir, wherever an industry in Ontario required to be strengthened, that has been strengthened by striking another blow at this great iron producing interest in the province of Nova Scotia. On steel billets there was a duty of \$5, that was first of all reduced to \$4; and now, in order to help certain interests in the province of Ontario, that duty has been cut in two, and a reduction has been made from \$4 to \$2; 60 per cent has been taken away from the protection that these interests at one time enjoyed. Now, then, the Government having done all that they possibly can, or nearly all, to destroy these great iron and steel interests in Canada, what country is going to profit by that? Is it Great Britain, that country which we are told is the very apple of the eye of our friends opposite? No, that is not the country which will benefit. The country which is already largely driving Great Britain out of the markets of the world in the production of iron and steel, which has completely secured their own home market, and is now practically in charge of the market of Canada—that is the country which is going to get the advantage of this reduction. Having weakened Canada's interests in iron, there can be no question that the advantage which is going to accrue from that will not go to Great Britain, but will go to the United States. Now, I will read a few items taken from the tariff return for 1896, to show how the trade in metals and manufacturers of metals, has been proceeding in the past. Of bar iron, Great Britain sent us \$52,000 worth; but the United States sent us \$66,000 worth, in round numbers. Engines and parts of engines, Great Britain sent us not one dollar's worth; the United States sent \$80,000 worth. In iron products Great Britain sent us \$1,758; the United States \$66,000. In hardware, Great Britain sent us \$23,000; the United States sent us \$261,000. In pig iron, Great Britain shipped to Canada \$74,000 worth; the United States sent \$332,000 worth. I may

Mr. BILL (Pictou).

say that this list, which is an extensive one, shows from beginning to end exactly the same character, shows that the United States has already practically captured the market of Canada for those products, and that any advantage to result to any outside country from the operations of the tariff and the injury inflicted upon the Canadian products, is going to revert to the people of the United States. There are some other considerations in connection with this clause, but they have been dealt with already so fully, that it is not necessary perhaps for me to say any more about it. One point that has been very strongly objected to is in respect to this schedule. The Government practically takes away the power of Parliament to control treaties, and intrusts what is really a treaty-making power to a member of the Government—not even a member of the Government, for I regret to say that our hon. friend the Controller of Customs has not yet attained to a position which I had hoped to see him occupy before now; but one who is not even a member of the Government is intrusted with this treaty-making power. It has been well enforced by several speakers that this is not a move in the right direction. Ordinary treaty-making is one of the most sacred and solemn functions that devolves upon any Government; the making of a treaty is carried out with the greatest care, and every solemnity, to give it security. Yet here we have the people of Canada trusting this power to one individual—who in this case is a gentleman whom we all could trust with great satisfaction; but the character of the man who would for the time being occupy that position would not always perhaps inspire the same confidence. But the principle is the same, and you find the Parliament of Canada divesting itself of the power of controlling the making of what are practically treaties, and devolving it upon one gentleman who, during the long period that elapses between one session of Parliament and another, is practically in a position to do as he pleases in this most important matter. This certainly is objectionable; it must necessarily be objectionable to any person who regards with the care, the interest and the importance that we should attach to them, what are the functions of the Parliament of a free people. If Parliament have any duties at all, they are to control, and to keep within their own hands, the control over all the revenue-raising powers of the country. It was about these very questions of finances, of money, and of revenue, that the battle raged through many years which resulted in giving us responsible Government. It is entirely through our control of the finances of the country that we do in the end control an executive, and compel it to bow to the will of the people. And if those who represent the people here in Parliament divest themselves of that power and give it in this large-hearted and large-handed fashion

into the hands of a single member of the Government to be used by him as he pleases during a long portion of the year, it would seem to me to show a lack of appreciation of their rights and privileges which is a dangerous symptom when it is found to exist among the representatives of the people. But I think there is another feature about this reciprocal schedule which we ought to oppose. As I have already said, this pill has been sweetened very much, it has been sugared off, I may say, by the idea that it is a concession to Great Britain, that it is the way in which we, in the most practical fashion, express our love of the Empire, our gratitude to the Empire, and our good will. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the people of the country, when they come to understand this matter, will be altogether delighted with the very generous manner in which the Government of Canada is really giving away the money and impairing the welfare of our Canadian people. It may be held perhaps, and it has been said indeed, that it smacks of disloyalty for a member of the Opposition in this House to oppose this reciprocal schedule. I do not think that it does anything of the kind, I do not think it involves the slightest change of front or change of plans, so far as the Opposition is concerned. Ever since the Government of Canada introduced the National Policy, it has been assailed on the very ground that it was attacking the interests of the mother country. That question was fought out and settled long ago. But practically the right we have of making our own fiscal arrangements, of providing for our own wants, of doing our own business, was asserted against last night, not on this side of the House, but by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, in dealing with this matter, and with the interpretation of a treaty, argued that the power of dealing with these fiscal questions was entirely within the competence of this House. From the very moment the Conservative Government of Canada entered upon the course of building up our industries, and entered upon the protective system, from that moment we were open to the charge, and the charge was made against us, of antagonising British interests. Every one knows how dear to the British is their trade, how proud they are of extending their commerce, how they welcome any concession on the part of any country which will tend to still further extend that great commerce, which is the most distinguishing characteristic of the greatest of all Empires. But the people of Canada have never for one moment conceded that they are prepared, in order to please the British public or the British Government, or to gratify the desire of the people to see their commerce still more enlarged, to admit that it was proper on the part of the Government of Canada to adopt any measure that might

injure the Dominion. To that extent we cannot go. We maintain that we best strengthen the Empire and the hands of the mother country when we build up this Dominion and strengthen the Government of Canada. It must be borne in mind that while there is a certain amount of generosity in making this large concession, it is really being made by people who cannot afford to make it. Does it not seem a very foolish act for a people so small and so much burdened, for this comparatively small population in occupation of an enormous area, with the responsibility of governing a country constituting one-fourth of the whole British Empire, to weaken its hands and impair its property in order to add to the already enormously great wealth of the great British people? I maintain that those upon whom the burden of this concession will fall, the poor men of the country, the workmen in factories, farmers on their farms, many of whom are eking out a livelihood, would say, if this question were submitted to them—while they might be exceedingly glad to do everything possible to establish and make greater the empire of Greater Britain—that they were not in a position, in view of their stringent circumstances, to assume greater burdens than they now bear in order to increase to a certain extent the output of the manufacturers of Great Britain, to add a few days' work for the benefit of those employed in the factories there, and to add an infinitesimal amount to the percentage of receipts of the workmen. These are the classes of people who suffer from this change, because if carried to its full extent, it means an injury to the protective system, and the workmen and farmers would not for one moment consent to any such arrangement as is now proposed by the Government if it were submitted to them. One further remark and I have done. There is a very significant feature about the discussion in the press, more particularly that resulting from the speech made by the Finance Minister. It does not appear to me that a preference for British trade is altogether inherent in the resolution; I believe the hon. gentleman produced that impression by the speech he delivered. No doubt it was received with a great burst of loyalty on that side of the House. How agreeable it was to hear hon. gentlemen opposite bursting forth into the inspiring strains of "God save the Queen." We were delighted to hear it. If there was one thing unpleasant and disagreeable to the people of Canada and to the Conservatives it was the fact that now and again some incident cropped up or came to light which made it possible to suspect that there was not that deep and strong love of British institutions possessed by the Liberals which was held by the Conservative party. It was always an unpleasant reflection to any good citizen to think that a part, and a large part of the

people were not so intensely devoted to British institutions and to the Crown as were the Conservatives of Canada. I have always felt that the Liberals were just as loyal as the Conservatives, that it was only necessary to give them an opportunity and they would prove it. How history has repeated itself within a comparatively short time. I remember in 1867, when confederation had become an accomplished fact, there were in Nova Scotia a large number of anti-confederates. Finding themselves in Opposition they were not so outspokenly loyal as we might have wished, but I believe they were loyal at heart. In my town, one of the most disagreeable features on holidays was that some of the people would persist in flying, not the Union Jack, not the British flag, but the Stars and Stripes. Six or seven of these flags would invariably decorate the town on those occasions. When the Governor General passed through New Glasgow at that time he was welcomed by a rather profuse display of the stars and stripes. This circumstance would lead people to think that the people in that old country were not loyal. But all that was necessary to make them as loyal as any one could wish was to place them in power, and from the moment when the Government of Sir John Macdonald was defeated and Hon. Alexander Mackenzie succeeded him, we never had the mortification or pain of seeing one flag or one rag of that bunting flying in the good old county of Pictou. Our friends became as loyal as could be desired and as loyal as they are now, although when they were in Opposition they did at times allow themselves to be carried away by their own eloquence and made somewhat disloyal utterances. No sooner did they come into power last year under the present Liberal Premier than they are effusively loyal, and we are delighted to see it. It simply means that as soon as an opportunity is given they make haste to show that they are strongly and devotedly attached to British institutions. Let us congratulate them on this change of heart. I hope it may continue not only through good report, when they are basking in the sunshine of prosperity and power, but through evil report, when in the course of time they pass into the cold shades of Opposition, and that then they will carry with them the principles of attachment to the British Crown and British institutions and that they will be at heart as loyal as they are to-day. There is one little occurrence, not in this House, but in the press, that attracted my attention, and I may say elicited my regret, and that was the manner in which the greatest of all organs of public opinion in Great Britain received the announcement of this favour as regards trade matters which is to be extended to the mother country. I was not surprised that this journal welcomed the concessions made by the Finance Minister, but I was surpris-

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

ed, disappointed and pained when I found that the London "Times" was not contented with praising those who seemed to be acting in British interests, but went the length of condemning even by name the ex-Finance Minister, because he had questioned the propriety and wisdom of the change proposed by the Finance Minister. In that respect the "Times" spoke too hastily and without sufficient knowledge. Can it be possible that such a great organ of public opinion can condemn, practically unheard and on insufficient knowledge, a prominent member of a Government who, during eighteen years and under the stress of all difficulties, constantly worked for the maintaining and still further strengthening the connection between Canada and the mother country and for the purpose of extending trade between them. I am sure that as soon as time has given these organs of public opinion an opportunity to know more accurately the true state of affairs in this country, they will not, no matter how much they may praise and extol the members of the Government, be prepared without due reason and consideration to condemn a body of loyal men who, during all these years, practically during the long history of confederation, have been pillars of the party which has maintained the cause of British connection in this country.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I had some remarks to make on this matter, but as the House seems anxious to vote, I shall defer them to another time. I wish to say, as regards the preferential clauses of the tariff, that if there is nothing in them, then there is very little indeed in the changes proposed by the present Government which will benefit the farmers of this country. But, Sir, I have very great hope that some good will accrue to us from these preferential clauses, and I therefore heartily endorse the proposition of the Government in that respect, and intend to vote in favour of it.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to make one remark on this question. As hon. gentlemen seem anxious that a vote should be taken now, I shall not occupy the time of the committee by making a speech. I simply wish to say that as between this resolution and the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the amendment. But, as the amendment does not adequately express my views on this subject, I shall take the opportunity at a later stage of placing my views on record.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 42; nays, 76.

Mr. TAYLOR. I draw your attention, Mr. Chairman to the fact that the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) were not in the House when the question was put, and yet they voted.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Was the hon. member for Lisgar in the House when the question was read?

**Mr. RICHARDSON.** I was not present when the question was read, but I thoroughly understood it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

**Mr. RICHARDSON.** I heard it read in the first case.

**Mr. BERGERON.** That won't do.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Your memory would not carry you that far back.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Was the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley) in the House when the question was put?

**Mr. HALEY.** I was not, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 42; nays, 74.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Shall resolution 16 be adopted?

**Mr. FOSTER.** No, Mr. Chairman. As one member of this House who for the last five weeks has been groping in the dark, asking for light, and seeking information and finding it impossible to get it, I propose now before I vote on this resolution to ask the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to give us an explanation of this 16th clause. I myself do not know what it means. I do not see that it sets up any standard, that it gives any definiteness or certainty, and I certainly do not want to vote for a thing which I do not fully understand. I do not occupy the happy position of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who says he understands and knows all about it.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Shall this resolution be adopted?

**Mr. FOSTER.** No, Mr. Chairman, I have asked a question and I expect an answer.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** Those in favour of the resolution will say "aye."

**Mr. FOSTER.** Surely we have not been reduced to this pass in this House, that when a gentleman on the Opposition side, a gentleman who is a representative of a constituency and has been sent here to look after the affairs of his constituency and not to vote in the dark, asks a fair question of the gentleman who has a measure in charge, surely we have not been reduced to the pass that he is not to get an answer. If we have, I most certainly give warning to my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) that he will not get a vote at this present time.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson).** I would be very sorry if the hon. gentleman took it in that way. I really thought he was asking the question in order to emphasize the position he had taken before. I did not think he was really in earnest.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I must say I am in dead earnest. I did not find English words strong enough to mark the ignorance I am labouring under in reference to this clause.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** It was the very fact that the hon. gentleman expressed himself as unable to understand the clause which led me to believe that he was not in earnest, and I cannot think yet that he is, for the clause reads so plainly. The particular part of the clause to which the hon. gentleman refers says:

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

I noticed, when the hon. gentleman was speaking that he emphasized the statement, as he has done on other occasions, that this power was placed wholly in the hands of a member of the Government who was not a member of the Cabinet. I suppose that if the Controller of Customs should happen to be a member of the Cabinet, the hon. gentleman's objection would be removed to a very great degree. But he need not fear so much from that, because the decision of the Controller is subject to the authority of the Governor in Council. He will notice that the question must first arise, and when it arises it will be my duty under the law to examine into it, to ascertain the facts that require to be known by the Government before an order is given for the admission of articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of the country in question. I had no difficulty whatever in determining, from what I know, from what the hon. gentleman knew, from what every one knew, that under the wording of the clause articles which were the growth, produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom would be admitted free into this country, and I so decided; and to-day goods are being admitted from that country at one-eighth reduction. The question has been asked me on behalf of other countries whether they are entitled to this reduction under the treaties which exist between them and the United Kingdom. I have not considered, nor do the Government consider, that these treaties bear upon this subject at all, and the parties have been so communicated with. If any Government make any representation on behalf of a country that it comes within the meaning of this section, then it will be my duty, as I understand it, to possess myself of full knowledge as to its tariff and the working of its tariff, and to decide as far as I am able whether on the whole the tariff of that country is as favourable to Canada as our reciprocal tariff would be to it. The question with reference to the treaties I do not discuss; that has been debated and is a legal question. I can only mention this fact, that while the hon. gentleman has constituted himself, as he

has done by his speech this afternoon, if I understood it aright, a special agent, almost, to plead and argue, as far as was within his power, the right of Germany and Belgium to have their goods admitted under the reciprocal clause, I have not decided that they are entitled to that privilege. I have not decided that the tariffs of those countries are such as to warrant me in bringing them within the meaning of this section. The hon. gentleman has gone further. He has determined, if I understood him aright this afternoon, that the tariff of China would bring China—I do not know whether he mentioned Japan also—within the operation of the clause. And yet the hon. gentleman says that he does not understand the clause, that he is in the utmost ignorance about it. In the same breath he has told us that by this reciprocal clause we are destroying the industries of this country, because under it we are bringing in the products of Belgium and Germany and twenty other countries. Sir, the Government deny that; they say those countries will not come in; but they say there may be a possible doubt, and provision is made for that. If there be any strength in the argument that these countries come within the operation of this clause, the hon. gentleman has lent the aid of all his power and all his influence to have the goods of Germany and Belgium included. But the Government have not taken that position; and my duty will be—and I will endeavour to discharge it as honestly as I can—to ascertain whether, when applications are made on behalf of these countries, whether their tariffs warrant us in admitting them, and then the question will be dealt with by the Governor in Council in the manner I have indicated. If I have been the instrument in removing the dense cloud which the hon. gentleman says is on his brain, though I do not charge him with this, I shall be delighted to find that he is able on this question, as he is upon so many others, to exercise a very clear and very good judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has succeeded in doing one thing. For several hours this afternoon I was cudgelling my brain to know why respectable, intelligent, well-trained gentlemen on the other side of the House had no answer to the splendid and convincing argument that was made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. There are laymen on that side of the House who know nothing about law; there are lawyers who are partisans above anything else; but there are also gentlemen on that side who are legal men, and well-trained, and I venture to say that they did not sneer when I made that statement, and that they believe much the same as I do with reference to the argument that was made by the hon. member for Halifax

Mr. PATERSON.

(Mr. Borden) to-day. I wondered why nothing was said. Well, Sir, the least said the soonest mended with reference to some causes. I said my hon. friend had made one thing clear; he made this clear to me and to all other members on this side, that discretion is the best part of valour for hon. gentlemen opposite. When he broke this rule of discretion, the discretion of silence, goaded by some remarks of my own, he furnished incontestable proof that the adage "the least said is the soonest mended," is particularly applicable to the advocacy by hon. gentlemen opposite of this measure. Did the hon. gentleman attempt to give us information? No, but he attempted to say that I had answered myself, and that I had declared this afternoon what might be done under that clause; but he said: I have not so decided. That is proof positive to me that the great "I" sitting yonder has different views as to the meaning of that tariff to what I have. But as my views do not count with the Government. I should like to know what my hon. friend's views are. I should like to know what he, the interpreter of the Government's policy, has to say with reference to this clause. The very fact that I was so wild in my statements, the fact that I intimated that China and Japan and Belgium and Germany might come in under this clause, should engage my hon. friend to give us something more definite than the "no, I have so decided." The hon. gentleman sounded his "no" very loudly, but I could not tell the direction in which to steer my little vessel from the sound of his horn.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a fog-horn.

Mr. FOSTER. We are still in the fog. My hon. friend skipped from the main section to sub-clause "A" to find what he ought to do, but it was an explanation of the main resolution that I wanted. If there is anything in the world which shows that this clause is one which we ought not to pass to-night, it is the assumption of my hon. friend repeated over and over again, that its application rests entirely with him. I have decided, he tells us, that Australia does not come in and that New South Wales come in, but not that Germany or any other country comes in. But my hon. friend is bound to decide, not by what his views and predilections are, but by a standard; and this House is entitled to know what that standard is. The hon. gentleman is in the position of a judge who takes the bench to try a case, but who declares beforehand that he has no precedents, no principles, no standard of law, and who decides, not upon the argument or the evidence or the law, but upon his own predilections. No canons of law, no precedents, none of the grounds on which justice is ordinarily administered, have

any weight with the hon. gentleman, but he simply decides the matter according to his own predilections and says: I am to give the decision. My hon. friend will not find in the lowest walks of life, much less in legal or parliamentary circles, anyone attempting to bamboozle the people on the line he has adopted. He must give us his standard of judgment. Any one could easily see that, even under such an involved and vague clause, a free trade country could come in. But the question may become a little more difficult. On what ground was it he decided that Great Britain should come in? Was it on the ground that the tariff of Great Britain is, on an average, lower than the tariff of Canada as regards that reciprocal schedule? Will my hon. friend answer?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.**  
When you get through.

Mr. **FOSTER.** I would like to have the answer now. It is a very simple question. My hon. friend need not be afraid that he will put his foot in it again if he gets up. He must have come to his decision upon some grounds, and I ask him again.

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** I! I!

Mr. **FOSTER.** Yes, but I do not decide the question. There are big I's and little I's and some very small I's. But the hon. gentleman has decided the question, and I ask him his standard. He must have decided it upon some certain principle or he is not fit to be where he is and make a decision. Did he decide it on the principle that the tariff of Great Britain, on the whole, was favourable to Canada because the average of that tariff, as applied to Canadian products, going into Great Britain, was lower than the average of the Canadian tariff would be as applied to goods coming into Canada from Great Britain under that schedule. Was that the principle? Can my hon. friend not reply by a straight answer, yes or no. The hon. gentleman cannot answer because he knows the logical sequence. I will take it for granted that he did because I have to argue, since the hon. gentleman will not reply, upon what I must take for granted. I cannot find any Minister who will answer a simple question. Do the Ministers know themselves? No? What is the first duty of a Privy Councillor and a Minister if not to give his knowledge to those who have not such good grounds for knowing as he has. Did the hon. gentleman then make his decision on the ground that the tariff of Great Britain was lower than the tariff of Canada on goods under the reciprocal schedule? If he did, what principle naturally followed from such decision? It must follow that every country whose average tariff on the goods that come into it from our country is lower than the average tariff on goods coming into Canada from

that country, under the reciprocal schedule, has a right to have its goods admitted into Canada under the one-eighth and one-quarter reduction. My hon. friend knows that that would be the logical consequence of his reply, if he had answered my question, and he takes refuge in an undignified silence, unworthy of a Cabinet Minister. It is an undignified and unworthy shuffling by a man who stands in a position given to him by his chief, and at the behest of the people, in which he is supposed to guide the legislation of Parliament and enlighten the benighted minds of members of Parliament. Yet, although occupying that position, he has not the courage to rise and answer the question I have put him. If he has, let him answer that simple question. Was that the principle upon which he proceeded or not? Admitting for argument sake that he did proceed on that principle, will he answer me another question? Is to-day the tariff of Belgium, on an average, lower than the tariff of Canada, taking into account the goods that Canada has to send to Belgium and those which Belgium would send to Canada under the schedule? My hon. friend should know. What has he been doing in his office, if he does not know. Has he put an article into his tariff which is to affect the law of this country without looking into the tariff conditions of the countries which are likely to come in under it? Has he sent out his invitations first before waiting to see whether his guests are desirable or not. Will he answer the question whether the Belgian tariff is lower than the Canadian tariff? Did he let Britain's goods in here because Britain's tariff was lower than Canada's? Was that the principle he established? If so, then he has to let Belgium's goods in. If Belgium's tariff is lower than ours—is it the hon. gentleman's opinion or is it not?—will he tell us? Will he tell us whether the tariff of Japan is lower on an average than the tariff of Canada as applied to those goods? If it is, if he has any principle, and if the principle is such as I have taken for granted it was, and he lets Great Britain in, will he not have to apply the same to Japan and allow the goods of Japan to come into this country at one-eighth and one-quarter reduction? Will he not have to allow the cheap labour of two or three cents a day to enter into competition with the labour of a country whose inhabitants, whose workmen are educated, who have a high scale of civilization and life to keep up, who have Christian families to support, and who cannot live on two cents a day. Will my hon. friend answer me another question? Is the tariff of Germany lower than the tariff of Canada on the average? If that is his principle, will he allow in German goods whether treaties exist or not on the lines of the principle of his tariff? Have the Chinese to-day a lower tariff than

Canada, and will their goods come in, and will that 400,000,000 of people who live cheaply, whose standard of civilization and expense of family life is nothing as compared with ours; will that immense mass of people be injected into Canada with their efficient labour, their untiring adaptation of themselves to manufacturing processes, which would place them as successful competitors with others in the industrial world. Will they be allowed to come in as well? They will, if that is the principle upon which my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) goes. But he says to himself: I sit here in state and I do not move this great eye of mine until somebody raises the question. Who is to raise the question; and my hon. friend unworthily, I think, tried to create a prejudice against me, as though I now appeared here in the role of the special agent of Belgium or Germany. He can try that on just as long as he likes. It is unworthy of the argument that we are conducting to-day. I am here, Sir, to carry out my duty as a legislator, and I intend to do it, and nothing of that kind will keep me from doing it. I am here in the interests of the Canadian labouring man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to see that for once I have evoked the approval of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I like to see him approve. I like to see his countenance lighten up with a benign smile and gradually broaden from side to side until he goes off in a great flash of jubilant delight. If I can say something more that will delight my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) I would like to do it.

But, Sir, I am here to-day in the interests of the Canadian workingmen, and I want to know in the interests of the Canadian workingmen, whether the labour of Germany, of Belgium, of South America, of China, and of Japan, is to be put in competition, by a reduction of one-fourth in the duties, with the work of the labouring men of Canada. There is where I stand, and I propose to get an answer to my question in the interests of the workingmen. Hon. members opposite who sit in silken seats, and who rustle in the trappings of office; new to them and all the more beautiful because of their novelty, what care they for the poor labouring men of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. And now I have touched the risible chords of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and he agrees with me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). How very angry you are.

Mr. FOSTER. Very sympathetic for the labouring men of Canada is the Minister of Public Works. What cares he, in office, with his private car and his coloured porter,

Mr. FOSTER.

riding away over the two spans of steel across the continent, eating like a bird. What cares he for the labouring men? And the Government sit in conclave, and they make a political tariff to spite their enemies and to help their friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it denied? We will thresh that out when we come to discuss the items. And what care these gentlemen in office, that industry after industry has already closed up, and the workingman finds no work. What care they, Sir, that the lower labour of Belgium and Germany comes in here to compete with our labour in Canada. These gentlemen are oblivious to that. They do not know that it occurs, they do not know that it is imminent? The last three weeks of deputations, disturbing almost the midnight hours of the Minister of Finance—

Mr. GIBSON. You know all about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I not? The last three weeks of deputations to the Minister of Finance, breaking his sweetest dreams, having on the one side the worries of the past day and projected on the other side the worries of the coming day, have they not told him of industries that were threatened with extinction, and of workingmen that would go with less wage or with no wage at all. The Government have reconsidered their tariff and to some extent, the representations have been so strong and so cogent, that they have put a specific duty in the place of an ad valorem, and a higher ad valorem in the place of a lower. These workingmen through and through Canada are after all, the men whose cause has to be threshed out here and whose cause has to be canvassed and discussed here, and I stand in Parliament, not as the agent of Belgium or of Germany, but as the agent of the industries and the industrial workers of Canada.

Now, I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) whether or not he will answer the question as to his policy. But he may say: You have been guessing at the policy. What else can a mortal man do? I cannot get him to say what the policy is, and then I must guess, and I guess that that probably is the standard, and that ought to be the standard. But suppose it is not, what other is the standard? Is the standard as to "advantage on the whole" to be something else than average of tariff? What else can it be? Surely not mere sentiment, surely not mere relationship, surely not mere predeliction. What is it that can be the standard, other than the cold facts as to the rates of duty, and the corresponding rates of duty and how they stand in proportion to each other? I will not insult my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) by attempting to argue, that there can be any other standards, than, taking the rates of duty, the tariffs of two countries, and

comparing these to give the benefit of that clause to that country which can show that its average tariff is lower than or equal to the average tariff of Canada. Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) will tell us what his standard is I will sit down, and I will listen to him; yes, listen to him as those learners of old listened to the prophets and lawyers, sitting lowly at their feet and waiting for wisdom.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I did say that I would answer the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). If I did not say so, I think the House would agree with me, that because of the manner in which he has spoken, and the terms he used I would be justified in not noticing the remarks he made. If I used the word "I"—

**Mr. LISTER.** He is insolent and impertinent.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman says that I am impertinent.

**Mr. LISTER.** And insolent.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I ask your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is a thing unheard of in this House that an hon. gentleman should sit in his seat opposite with his hat on, and call one insolent, and call one impertinent. Am I to be insulted in that way?

**Mr. LISTER.** I take my hat off and I stand up, and I call you insolent and impertinent.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I move that those words be taken down.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order, order.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** Hon. gentlemen opposite will make no progress to-night if this is to be their conduct. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** I rule that the words should be taken down.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Now, I ask you to carry out the other constitutional practice.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** What are the words?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman said, with his hat on, and he said with his hat off, that I was both insolent and impertinent.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** I find that according to the rules of debate, when some words have been ordered to be taken down, as in this case, the member who used those expressions has a right to withdraw them before appealing to the House.

**Mr. LISTER.** Under the rules of the House I withdraw the expression. If I was outside, I would not.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Mr. Chairman, being of slight build and of light weight, I rise to ask the protection of the Chair again. When a gentleman of the height and avoirdupois of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), with eyes full of fire, looks over at me and declares that if we were outside he would not take them back, but that he would still call me insolent and impertinent, I want to know if I can ask for your sphere of protection to be thrown around me outside of this Chamber.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** I think when an hon. member withdraws expressions complained of, they should be withdrawn unreservedly.

**Mr. LISTER.** I will promise, Mr. Chairman, that I won't say this to the hon. gentleman outside. Small as he is, small as the hon. gentleman is in every way, he need not be the least alarmed.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** I said, and I repeat again, that I did say to the hon. gentleman that I would attempt to reply to his speech; but if I had not said that I should have felt myself justified, from the tone of the debate and the words that he used, and his manner, in remaining silent, without wishing in the slightest degree to be discourteous. But I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that while I recognize his position in the House, and while he states that he thinks I emphasize the "I" and magnify my own importance, the members with whom I have been associated in this House for many years will not, I think, attribute that to me. I will, however, say this to him, that I have sufficient self-esteem and self-respect that I will not allow, so far as I am in the rights and privileges of the House—I will not allow a gentleman even of his standing in the House, to use towards me words that are insulting in their nature. Now, what has the hon. gentleman done? He simply repeated his question again and again. The hon. gentleman apparently was stung by what I pointed out to him, and which I again point out to him, and if I used the word "I" I was forced so to speak when called upon personally to do so. If I used it, I did not, at any rate, mean to emphasize it, for I did not feel that I was in an exalted position, and placed there by this resolution. I considered myself as a member of the Government having this duty imposed upon me by the law, if it becomes law, and I spoke of it in the personal sense in the discharge of my duty, because the duty devolved upon me personally. But I will endeavour now to say the Controller of Customs. The Controller of Customs finds that he is under the impression that if this section becomes law, and a question arises as to whether the products of a country may be admitted under the lower schedule than is contained in this Act, the Controller of Customs then

will find it his duty to take the question into consideration and to judge by the standard which is set down in the law, as to whether the products of that country shall be admitted or not. The hon. gentleman asks me for the standard. He knows the standard is set for me in the law :

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

I understand it will be the duty of the Controller of Customs to examine that tariff, to examine it in its details. He would have to examine the course of trade between that country and Canada, and have regard to the products of that country, in a measure. He would look at the trade of that country, and at the subject in all its bearings, and, in the terms of the resolution, endeavour to arrive at a decision based upon the information that he had thus gained. He would report to the Governor in Council, to whose authority the Controller of Customs under this section is subject. The Governor in Council would then approve or disapprove of the action of the Controller of Customs. According as that decision might be, so would effect be given to the clause, or so would effect be given to the introduction of the products of that country, or so would admission under the minimum schedule of the products of that country be denied. I have endeavoured to answer the hon. gentleman, I think I have made it plain, and that he can now have no difficulty. I again allude to the fact that the hon. gentleman this afternoon declared, if I understood him aright, on another point, not bearing on the reciprocal tariff, but on the subject of the treaty, which is a legal question on which it is admitted there is doubt. He declared his opinion. It was the great "I" with him, in the face of the fact that members possessing legal and constitutional knowledge had declared their opinion in favour of our proposition, and while he knew that others, perhaps not taking as strong ground, thought there was a doubt ; but the hon. gentleman decided, and so announced his opinion, that under the operation of this section we must admit the products of Germany and of Belgium, and so far as it was in his power, and so far as his influence and his views may be able to mould, if they should be able to mould, to any degree, the action of those countries which will apply for admission under the most-favoured-nation treaties, he has lent all the aid of his power in order to bring about that result. The workmen of this country, to whom he has alluded, and the manufacturers of this country, whose cause

Mr. PATERSON.

he pretends to plead, whom he says we are ruining, will note the fact that so far as that hon. gentleman's words can have any weight on this question when it comes to be argued, all the influence of the ex-Finance Minister of Canada was given to strengthen the hands of those who were trying to gain admission to our markets under the preferential clause. When China and Japan ask for a remission under this clause, should they do so, they will be able to point to the fact that the ex-Finance Minister of Canada, in his place in Parliament, declared they were entitled under the operation of this tariff to secure the introduction of their goods under the preferential clause. I simply said this : While the ex-Finance Minister had decided that under the tariff Belgium and Germany and twenty countries might come in under the reciprocal clause, and that China and Japan might come in under that clause, the Controller of Customs had not so decided.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask the hon. Controller of Customs one question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen might just as well keep quiet. I assure hon. gentlemen they will not facilitate business by interrupting me, and I will stand in my place until order is maintained. For fear I shall have too much prominence and greatness thrust on me, I wish to ask the Controller : Is it a fact that weeks ago Belgian and German consuls in Canada raised the question, and that they have taken the question raised here before the hon. gentleman's own department to their own governments, and through their own governments presumably to the Government of Great Britain ? If there were any moral turpitude about it, which I do not admit for one moment, the question seems to have been raised weeks before I made any inquiry in regard to it in this House.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The subject was brought before me, as the hon. gentleman knows ; and I think I gave some papers to the leader of the Opposition or to the hon. gentleman himself. But he will remember the subject was not raised on the basis of the reciprocal tariff, but on the question of the treaty. I think that is the only way in which it has been brought up.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to ask the Controller of Customs a question. On both occasions when he replied to the ex-Finance Minister, the hon. gentleman made a point that in case Germany or China or Japan should ask for admission under this preferential or reciprocal clause it would be able to quote what the ex-Finance Minister has stated here. I wish to ask the Controller whether, under this clause, he would not have to judge by some rule of proportion, and that, having arrived at what the

rule of proportion was, would he not be bound to act according to the dictates of justice under that rule? And then as a second question, I would ask, if he is bound so to act, how will the statements of the ex-Finance Minister weigh one way or the other? I should like the hon. Controller to answer these questions.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** If there be any doubt as the hon. gentleman admits there is a doubt in regard to this matter, why should those nations not use as an argument to strengthen their case, if need be, statements made by so distinguished a gentleman as the ex-Finance Minister, an hon. gentleman who, according to his own estimation of himself, is able to pronounce authoritatively on subjects of constitutional law, in regard to which doubt exists.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I am not surprised at the spectacle we have had here for the entire day. I am not surprised at the silence, which will surprise the country outside, because the position in this House is this, that we are face to face with a bewildered party and a distracted Government. The Controller of Customs, when replying to the ex-Finance Minister, pointed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and said that the ex-Finance Minister was immodest to offer opinions when an hon. gentleman occupying a high legal position had spoken as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had spoken. What did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say? He told us that if certain things took place, then the Government were in this proud position, and again, that if by and by certain other things took place the Government would be in a different position, and so the Government were in the proud position of being supported on the spike of an "if," as described by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is in a state of most unstable equilibrium. So, I am not surprised at the spectacle we have had, because in the two speeches of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), who has this matter under control, we have received no light whatever. My hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) very properly asked for light, but the Controller of Customs, who will be in the position of making treaties under this legislation, in reply made such a speech which I have often heard him make from a public platform, a speech full of vigour and energy, but with due respect to him, it was not that kind of statesmanlike utterance that would give us light and leading on a question like this. The only advocate we have had defending the Government was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and when I heard him last night balance himself and go from one thing to the other, I could not help but think of the Yankee who went into one of our courts and saw a man defending a prisoner; he asked who it was, and when

told that it was a Queen's counsel: Well, he said, if that is a Queen's counsel I pity Her Majesty.

**Mr. MCGREGOR.** There are no Queen's counsel in the United States.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Did I say it was in the United States?

**Mr. MCGREGOR.** Yes.

**Mr. DAVIN.** I said a court of justice into which a Yankee went, and I suppose there are Yankees to be found in Canada. I listened to the speech of the Minister of Marine, and I listened to the masterly refutation of that speech by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). Sir, there are distinguished lawyers on the other side of the House. There is my hon. friend (Mr. Lount) an able lawyer; there are other able lawyers on that side, and these gentlemen know well that the argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) is irrefutable. No doubt the reason that no member of the Government has spoken, is, because they are in this position before the country, that either a month ago they were incompetent, or were deceiving the people. An hon. gentleman reminds me that I should have referred to the other hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who is also a distinguished lawyer. He, too, is silent. His colleague from Halifax (Mr. Borden) has made an able argument, and that argument stands like a great pillar unshaken and unimpaired. No man on the other side of the House has dared to answer it. This then is the position, either a month ago the Government were incompetent, or a month ago they were in for a fake policy.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** Carried.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Carried. Nonsense. No, Mr. Chairman, it is not carried. There is no power on the other side of the House to carry it until I picture to hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches the miserable position into which they have descended. We have there a Government with a large majority that is afraid to show its hand. We have a Government with an immense majority that is afraid of its life to defend its own measure. Why, Sir, such a spectacle has never been known in parliamentary history. There never was a more important measure placed before this Parliament. It goes to the very root of our fiscal system. It raises international questions of the first importance, and yet we have not had an exposition of what the meaning of the added sub-clause "B" is, and how it will work. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) says he will decide. I suppose that in case certain questions come before him on behalf of Germany, or on behalf of Japan, or on behalf of France, or on behalf of Austria, and certain functionaries make a proposal, he will decide. But if there is a dispute be-

tween him and any particular country, is he going to law about it, and if he goes to law, is there not a prospect, not only that he will have to give back the money collected as duty on goods from these countries, but that these countries may have a claim for damages against this Government? This is a matter that may actually touch seriously the relationship between England and her chief colony, and yet hon. gentlemen in the Government, after having first placed before the country what they call a preferential clause in favour of England, come down here a month afterwards and take it all back, and have not a word to say in defence or in explanation of their conduct. Why is that? It is because they are ashamed of the position they occupy before the House of Commons to-day. When it goes across the Atlantic, as across the Atlantic it has gone; for it is known to-day in London that the Ministers of the Empire's first colony, a month ago made professions in regard to England that had no foundation whatever, and that they now have to go back on these professions. These hon. gentlemen came forward a month ago and they told us they did great things for Great Britain by arranging to allow her goods into this country, up to the 1st of January at a one-eighth reduction, and after that at a one-fourth reduction. They know now that they are allowing the products of twenty-two nations that have high protective tariffs to come in here on the same terms as the products of England. A fortiori if the Government were doing something for England a month ago, they are now doing a great deal more for those protective countries. Therefore, the tariff as it stands now, from the standpoint of this clause, is not a preferential tariff for England, but is a preferential tariff for the countries that compete with Great Britain.

Mr. ETHIER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Not carried until I have said what I want to say, and not until this side of the House have offered their criticisms. If hon. gentlemen opposite will not defend their own work, they need not suppose for one minute that Her Majesty's loyal Opposition will be false to their duty and fail to criticise it.

I have to say now, speaking generally, for the part of the country whence I come, in regard to this tariff which has been brought down, I suppose, in its final form, I am sorry to find on analysing the changes that have been made, that these changes have been made, not in the interests of the farmer, not in the interests of the workingman, but in the interests of the manufacturers who have come to the Government and pleaded before them. The manufacturer came to the Government, but where was the farmer, and where was the workingman, and where were the professed friends of the farmer? When I look at the

Mr. DAVIN.

changes made in the tariff, I find no evidences whatever that the farmers of Canada were considered, or that any of the former clients of these gentlemen were considered. As a member of Parliament, and as a citizen of Canada, I am sorry to stand face to face here with such a tariff, and I am sorry to see the Parliament of Canada placed in the position, that we have a Government with some of the first men in the country, some of the men who come into this Parliament with great reputations, men who it was supposed would do great things; yet now, in this second session of this Parliament, when a great question like this is before Parliament, they are utterly unequal to the task of vindicating their dignity and their measures. I said that we were in face of a bewildered party and a distracted Government. I may add that we have a rattled Treasury bench and great places with little dignity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to draw the attention of the Controller of Customs for a moment to this law, as I am inclined to think from the statements the hon. gentleman has made here to-night that he entirely misapprehends the nature of the Act, and the duties which devolve upon him under it. The hon. gentleman says that the duty devolves upon him of deciding what countries shall come under this law. Now, I want to draw his attention to the fact that he was bound to deal with this question a month ago, and that he has failed altogether in his duty in that respect. I want to show my hon. friend that under this law he was bound, as the officer of the Government specially charged with the duty, and the Government were bound to settle the question as to what countries could and what countries could not enter their goods under this law. The hon. gentleman informed the House that on the night these resolutions had passed, instructions had been given to the officers in his department throughout Canada to admit goods from Great Britain with the reduction of one-eighth. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend to read this clause over, and to ask himself the question whether he was not clearly bound to have informed the officers of the Customs Department throughout Canada at the same time on what terms they should admit the goods of other countries. There is not a word in this clause that says that any application shall be made to the Customs Department to know whether the goods of any country come within the terms of this clause or not; but there is an absolute declaration that every country that comes within the scope of this Act shall be treated in the same manner. If that be the case, then I say my hon. friend has failed entirely in his duty, that he did not a month ago, when this Act was put in operation, give instructions to his collectors as to what countries were in a position to

have their goods admitted on the same terms. I venture to say that, in my judgment, there was a good deal of doubt and misapprehension as to what the scope of this law was. I have noticed in several of the English papers the declaration that only countries that admit the goods of Canada on the same terms as those on which they are admitted into Great Britain can have the advantage of this clause. The hon. gentleman does not place that construction upon it, but the very fact that English journals have made this statement shows that it is open to misconception. I draw my hon. friend's attention, further, to the fact that there is not a word in the clause that intimates the necessity of any person making application, except to go in the ordinary way to the custom-house and present his entry for admission and that the officers of his department were bound, from the hour this became law, to state to parties making entries, whether they came within the operation of this clause or not. Now, Sir, there is no difficulty in this matter. The hon. gentleman knows that Canada has taken part, as a member of the Customs Union of Europe and America. He knows that Canada has sent her representatives to the Customs Conference at Brussels, and that the Customs Union furnishes every Government that is in association with it with a statement of the tariffs of all the countries included in it. Therefore, I hold that the hon. gentleman has entirely failed in his duty in not dealing with this subject the moment it was determined by the Government to put this law upon the Statute-book. The question as to what countries could come in under this law was not a question to be raised by any person. That question is raised by every person who enters a customs office, and asks for the entry of his goods. He is not bound to furnish any information or make any plea or to establish any claim other than the right to come within the terms of this Act. There is no reference to England in this clause; why, then, was she admitted? Because, the hon. gentleman says, she comes within the law that is laid down here; and if without any application on the part of England the customs officers were instructed to admit goods from England, in the same way the hon. gentleman was bound to give information to his officers everywhere as to what other countries could come within the operation of the law. I am of opinion that that matter has escaped the attention of my hon. friend and I draw his attention to it at once as a very important matter, because he knows that it is of the utmost importance to a country to so administer its laws that no person shall be in a position to declare that he has not been dealt equal and even-handed justice.

Now, I want, before I sit down, to say one word, and only one, upon another remark which the hon. gentleman made, and which

I think was not worthy of him. When the hon. gentleman undertook to inflame the public mind in reference to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and other gentlemen who raised this question as to the true construction of the German and Belgian treaties, by representing them as being the advocates of Belgium, Germany or any other country, the hon. gentleman took a course that was unworthy of himself and unworthy of the Government of which he is a member. The hon. gentleman will not deny that it is of the first importance that laws enacted by this Parliament should be capable of being maintained and being carried out, and he knows, and will recognize, as every hon. gentleman on this side of the House knows and recognizes, that it is the duty of any member of this House, whether he sits on one side or on the other, to point out any matter in regard to which he supposes that an Act is being passed which is incapable of execution and is going to lead to trouble and difficulty. My hon. friend has said that there are high legal authorities who maintain that these Belgian and German treaties have no relation to this case, and do not apply to Canada. I defy the hon. gentleman to name one high authority in the world who has ventured to express such an opinion. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have not hesitated to give the authorities upon which they based their opinions. They gave the authority of Lord Knutsford, who was charged with the duty of administering the whole Colonial Empire of Great Britain, and who laid it down in the clearest and most emphatic terms that in the British colonies no preference could be given to British goods, that under the terms of the treaties made by England with Belgium and Germany the colonies were included, and that German and Belgian goods were entitled to receive entry in those colonies on precisely the same terms as the goods of Great Britain. As a matter of course, not only were German and Belgian goods entitled to enter on precisely the same terms as the goods of Great Britain, but all the countries enjoying the most-favoured-nation treatment with England are entitled, on like ground, to have their goods admitted to all the colonies on precisely the same terms as the goods of Great Britain. That I gave as one high authority, but I gave the hon. gentleman another. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, one of the most distinguished statesmen in the House of Commons of England, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared on the floor of Parliament, in the presence of the Crown officers of England and of the great lawyers of both the great parties, in the most emphatic terms precisely the same doctrine. He said that in no colony could the goods of Great Britain be received on more favourable terms than the goods of Belgium and Germany and all the other countries

that had the most-favoured-nation treatment. Then, I showed that the great conference that sat in Ottawa, at which the representatives of all these great outlying portions of the Empire, had joined in an application to Great Britain to remove these Belgian and German treaties, which prevented the goods of the United Kingdom being received in any particular colony except on the same terms as the goods of Belgium and Germany and these other countries. I gave the hon. gentleman the fact that the Marquis of Ripon sent a despatch to the Governor General of Canada, and that only two years ago, in which the Marquis of Ripon declared in the most emphatic terms that having examined that question in the light of all the information obtainable, there was no doubt whatever that the goods of the United Kingdom could not be admitted into Canada or any other British territory except on the same terms as were granted to Belgium and Germany. I gave him more. I gave him the authority of probably the greatest lawyer in the Empire, Sir Charles Russell, now Lord Russell of Killowen, as a Crown officer, furnished to the Government and read on the floor of Parliament, that under the treaty made by Great Britain with Belgium and Germany, no colony could admit the goods of Great Britain on more favourable terms than those of Germany and Belgium and the other countries entitled to the most-favoured-nation treatment. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what authority he has to oppose to that long list of distinguished authorities, who, for the last ten years, have given this opinion on the floor of the Imperial Parliament. In the presence of the greatest jurists of the Empire, in the presence of men who would have speedily called attention to any defect in these declarations; and it passes my comprehension how any intelligent man can be found in this country, who will say, in the face of these exalted authorities, that he entertains a single doubt on the question. It is not as if it were a new question or one which had not been threshed out in the most thorough manner. My hon. friend knows that this Parliament passed a law to approve the treaty with France, and he knows that that law was not accepted by the Imperial Government, but that the Imperial Government called upon Canada to supplement that Act by another one declaring that although these privileges were given to France by virtue of the reciprocity treaty in return for privileges conferred by France, that treaty should not go into operation unless the Dominion Parliament passed a law to provide that similar goods from Belgium and other countries should be admitted on the same terms, and that law was passed two years ago by this Parliament. This question is one that does not admit of doubt, because, whether lawyers or laymen, we

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

must look to the highest authorities of the Empire on a question of international law which turns upon an Imperial treaty. With these great authorities all on one side and nobody on the other, there is no room for doubt. Why, Sir, we spent sixteen years in imploring the British Government to remove these treaties. What for? If they had no bearing on a matter like this, what matter to us whether they existed or not. The hon. gentleman knows that the Dominion Parliament has been unanimous in imploring the British Government to remove those treaties because they prevented the adoption of a preferential policy between the mother country and the Dominion. It is too late now to say that any doubt exists, and if none does exist, I ask whether I am chargeable with attempting to advocate the cause of Belgium or Germany when I point out the position in which we are, when I point to the fact that the law which the Government asked us to pass would not receive the assent of the Governor General unless we made provision to admit the goods of these other countries. I pointed out that the instructions to the Governor General would compel him to reserve this Act, and the Government having found that out, got over the difficulty by putting in this clause which enables them to admit goods from Belgium and Germany and other countries enjoying the most-favoured-nation treatment, on the same basis as goods from Great Britain. Under these circumstances, it is not worthy of the hon. gentleman to attempt for a single moment to say that when I point out that which is known and recognized by the highest legal authorities in the Empire, I am advocating the claims of Belgium and Germany. Sir, the hon. gentleman read a speech of mine, and I thank him for having done so. I had no idea that I had made so good a speech until I heard my hon. friend give utterance to passages from it in the eloquent and sonorous manner with which we are so familiar. I thank him for having read that speech, because he will find in it the strongest arguments I could use before the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, to endeavour to convince the Imperial Government of their duty to remove these Belgian and German treaties that stand in the way of preferential trade between England and Canada. The hon. gentleman will find, if he reads over what he has been good enough to place in "Hansard," this argument which I used on that occasion to the Chambers of Commerce, at which members of the Imperial Parliament were present. I pointed to the fact that although these treaties might be valuable to England, yet they were doubly important to Belgium and Germany. I pointed out that as Belgium and Germany send into England 50 per cent more of their products than England sent into

Belgium and Germany, I felt sure, that if Her Majesty's Government took a firm stand and said to these two countries: You must eliminate this colonial clause which found its way into these treaties long ago, but which could not find a place in them under the present enlightened policy of Great Britain; you must remove this obstruction that prevents England and her colonies reciprocating with each other, or else we will be compelled to denounce the treaties; then I believed that this clause would have been eliminated. I said then and I say now, and I believe it, that if England should take that position, these treaties are so much more valuable to Belgium and Germany than they are to England, that the clause would be at once eliminated and the difficulty removed. In conjunction with the Parliament of Canada I used every argument in favour of that contention. On one occasion, at all events, this Parliament, by a unanimous vote, appealed to Her Majesty's Government asking for the elimination of these colonial clauses, or else that the treaties should be denounced. Under these circumstances it is too late for the hon. gentleman to insinuate that the members of the Opposition are discharging anything but a solemn duty, which they owe to Parliament and to Canada, in pointing out as they did to the Government the absolute necessity of changing this clause in order to make a legal and constitutional Act that would not infringe on any British treaty. I rose for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to the fact, that if they will carefully read that clause, they will find it is their imperative duty without a moment's delay, to determine to what countries this reduction in the general tariff should be extended, and to instruct their officers to carry out this clause which declares itself to be the law of the land.

Mr. IVES. I rise to ask the Minister of Finance one question. From reading these resolutions I have arrived at the conclusion that this matter is the subject of executive action, but I notice that executive action is provided for only in the direction of admitting other countries, from time to time, into the enjoyment of the reciprocal arrangements, while there seems to be no provision for withdrawing from that arrangement. Now, it is quite conceivable that the Controller of Customs in looking over the tariff of a third country, for instance New South Wales, might find that at the time at which he renders his decision, the tariff of New South Wales was, on the whole, as favourable to the admission of Canadian products as the tariff of Canada is to the admission of the products of New South Wales. But, New South Wales has a legislature which year after year modifies its tariff. Suppose New South Wales, after having been admitted to this privilege in Canada, were to largely increase her duties, were to, in fact, discriminate against Canada, will the Min-

ister of Finance tell me what machinery he has provided for the withdrawal of the preferential arrangement which he may have given to New South Wales, or, for that matter, to any other country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think we might safely assume that any country that would come within the provisions of that clause would be sensible enough to desire to continue, and therefore, we need not be very much alarmed in reference to that. Nevertheless, the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) is a fair one. It is rather a legal question than otherwise. Speaking off-hand, my impression is that there is authority enough within the resolution to warrant us in cancelling such an Order in Council. However, I would not wish to speak very definitely on that point; it is a legal question, and I would much prefer that hon. gentlemen of the legal profession would answer it. If there is a doubt, it may be a matter worthy of consideration. I do not anticipate that any necessity for it would arise, but in matters of this sort it might be well that we should anticipate every possible state of circumstances, and whether or not this resolution does cover as much ground as I personally think it does, it is fairly open to discussion and to the judgment of legal gentlemen.

Mr. IVES. I have given that question what little consideration I was able to give it, and I do not find within the resolution any power of retracting the privilege. Of course, it could be done by Parliament at the succeeding session, but, in the meantime, I do not find any power for executive action in that direction, and I would suggest very seriously to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) and to his leader (Mr. Laurier) whether it would not be better, in drafting this to provide for executive action in the direction of withdrawing the preferential privilege, if it should be found necessary to do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If such a condition should arise it would only last for a few months, and it could undoubtedly be remedied at the ensuing session of Parliament.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it the intention of the Prime Minister to sit after 12 o'clock? I wish to know as some other gentlemen as well as myself have remarks to make on this question. If it is his intention to sit after twelve we will go on, but if not, I beg leave to suggest that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

The PRIME MINISTER. As it is a holiday we will have to adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

## REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. Davies.)

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the leader of the House state what business he will proceed with on Friday?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will continue these resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th May, 1897

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Yukon Mining and Trading Transportation Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 119) respecting La Compagnie Mutuelle et Générale Canadienne.—(Mr. Madore.)

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That Government Orders have precedence after questions on Monday next, and on all Mondays to the end of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that it would probably be better for him to consent to leave this over for another day. It will only be giving one more private day that I think the House ought to have. The leader of the Opposition is not present here to-day. That will leave next Monday to private members, and on Monday we can take into consideration the necessities of the Government for taking all the days after that. There are some few things that probably the House would like to get at on private members' day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am anxious to meet the wishes of the House, of course. I would remind my hon. friend, however, that there is not much on the Order paper with regard to private members' business, and I think ample opportunity has been

Mr. FIELDING.

given to all members who have business, to proceed with it. I would remind my hon. friend that, for reasons which he knows, it will be my duty to leave at an early date for England, and the Government is very anxious to take advantage of every possible day that now remains to push their business to completion.

Mr. FOSTER. I entirely sympathize with the object of the Government. Personally, I would have very little objection, but it is a strenuous thing to take away, quite a long time before there is any possibility of Parliament adjourning, every opportunity for private members' work at all. I think my hon. friend would not go far astray if he would allow the House to have Monday; thereafter it would probably be best to give the Government every day. We are very anxious to see the Government get through their business: none of us wish to stay here any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that several motions are standing on the Order paper at the hon. gentleman's own request. He suggested a moment ago that we had had ample opportunity of clearing off the Order paper. The hon. gentleman will be able to remember that I have four or five motions standing there at the request of the Government, and I should like an opportunity of at least clearing them off the paper, if not for discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps it would please hon. gentlemen just as well if we gave Monday week, June 7, as private members' day.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with that, and that would enable my hon. friend to be with the House next Monday.

Mr. McNEILL. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope that everything will be done that can reasonably be expected, in order to give effect to the desire of the country, and of the Government, and I believe of the overwhelming majority of the members of this House, to enable the hon. gentleman to go over to England in such a way as will mark to the people of England our desire that he should go there as our representative in this year. I believe that it will have a most excellent effect in the mother country, and I am sure that it would meet with the approval of the people of this country if Parliament were to make a special effort to allow the hon. gentleman to go in such a way as would mark, as I have said, the strong wish of the people of this country to recognize in a fitting manner what is this year going on on the other side of the ocean. For my part, I hope our friends on this side of the House will do all that in them lies to enable the hon. gentleman to go away in that marked manner.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the acting Minister of Militia whether the return ordered in connection with the changes in the Royal Military College, Kingston, have been brought down. I am receiving communications daily from persons interested in that institution asking for information as to those changes, which will materially affect the institution, prejudicially or otherwise.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). To the best of my recollection, the changes made were published in several of the newspapers of the country. The gist of them lies in this, that the term was reduced from four years to three years, and that the expense to the parents was also considerably reduced, to something like one-third. It is estimated that whereas under the former arrangement the average cost of each pupil to the parents might be placed at \$1,400, it would now be very little over \$700, if over that amount at all. If there are any other points on which the hon. gentleman desires any information, I will give orders to have the details prepared and submitted to Parliament. It had escaped my recollection that the hon. gentleman had made a motion on the subject.

Mr. TYRWHITT. Am I to understand from what the acting Minister of Militia has said that the information published in the public press was official, or if not, whether it may be considered as official?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Substantially so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he will be able to lay certain returns ordered last session, to which I have already drawn his attention, on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am as much surprised as the hon. gentleman that they have not yet been brought down. I wrote a special letter to my deputy asking that they be prepared at once. I will attend to the matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Minister kindly take a note of the additional papers ordered this session, so that they may be brought down in one return.

Mr. FOSTER. I should be very much pleased to know that other members of the Cabinet are surprised that returns have not been brought down as ordered, and especially one promised by the Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman, I know, refers to a

special return. It will be brought down at an early day, long before the Committee of Supply meets again.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to inquire respecting the evidence in the case of the postmaster of Northfield, B.C.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will bring it down to-day or Monday.

### REPORT.

Annual report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1896.—(Mr. Mulock.)

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On section 16,

Mr. FOSTER. Before I proceed to make any further remarks on this section, I wish to premise one word. I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to think for a single moment that I or any hon. member on this side of the House are speaking on this section merely for the sake of wasting time or obstructing business. I am not sure when I say this that I will be credited as being sincere in that expression or not. I run that risk however, and take that contingency, but merely wish to preface my remarks by that statement. We on this side of the House believe, and our feeling will find sympathy on the other side of the House, and will find sympathy in the country most certainly, that the forcing of this clause through the House means such a change, and such a change for the worse in many important respects, that we should not be doing our duty as members of Parliament and not be performing what ought to be performed by an Opposition in a Parliament unless we called attention to the very utmost, the attention first of the Government and the members who support the Government, and next of this House and the country, to the extraordinary nature of this resolution which the Government has imported into this tariff. We protest against this as being in its most important subject matter something which ought not to have been placed in a resolution which is proposed as a part of the customs law. There are principles involved and methods of action and a policy outlined which should have asked and should have obtained for themselves independent thought and independent discussion in a measure devoted to themselves, where Parliament would not be hampered as Parliament is hampered to-day by considering these propositions in a customs law. But I am not going to dwell longer on that point. I am going to emphasize the points we have al-

ready presented. I am sorry the Controller of Customs is not present. I hope he will be present, for I do not think we can make much progress unless we have the Controller to explain what we want to know and to discuss what we are bound to discuss, and what we feel able to discuss, the details of this measure; and I do not think it is fair, nor do I think it is extremely courteous to proceed with the discussion without the responsible head of the Customs Department being in his seat. I also want to ask him and members of the Government to do us the courtesy to listen to what we say, and to stay in the House while we are saying it. We are not speaking for the fun of speaking, and it is a matter grave enough to entitle us to ask at least patient consideration and discussion, a reciprocal discussion engaged in by both sides of this House. However, I shall go on now to some of the points emphasized and will emphasize them again. I am aware I have stated them before, but they are so important I wish to state them again. First, as to the indefiniteness of this resolution. The leader of the House was not here when, on Thursday, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House tried to impress on members of the Government the exceedingly indefinite nature of the conditions, if we may call them conditions at all, outlined in this resolution. In fact it resolves itself simply into this: that the Controller of Customs and twelve men forming the Cabinet for the time being, simply sit down and make up their minds as to whether it would be wise to let a certain country, with its industries and products, into this country on the level of a one-eighth or a one-fourth reduction in the tariff rates. They are bound by no standard. They have not placed in that resolution, nor have they given us in any remarks they have made, the least idea as to what shall be the principles which shall guide them in arriving at their decisions. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in a chance expression which fell from him in the late hours of Wednesday night, made an admission. My hon. friend (Mr. Ives) raised this point: That although the Government had provided machinery by which this clause could be put into operation it provided no machinery by which the privilege could be withdrawn, if a country with which such an arrangement had been concluded, afterwards changed its tariff so as to make a generic difference in the conditions under which the reciprocal privilege was in the first place accorded. And, in reply to that, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance suggested, that possibly it could be done by Order in Council; he thought it could; but if it could not be done by Order in Council at least it would not hurt this country much to let it run along in the interim during the recess of Parliament. Just one point occurs to me

Mr. FOSTER.

in connection with that. If it would not hurt this country much, to allow an unequal condition imported by another country into this matter; to remain with the advantages which it had not paid for between the sessions of Parliament; it would not hurt this country much, if, in the case of every individual country with whom an arrangement was proposed to be made, Parliament were awaited to sanction that arrangement. But yet, they take away the power of Parliament on wide ranges of tariff items, while they are quite willing, if we take the saying of the Minister of Finance for it, to allow Canada to battle between the two sessions of Parliament with the unequal condition of things which may be imported by one of the countries to the bargain. The Minister of Finance suggested then, that by Order in Council you could do away with that preferential under-rate. Government surely has not gone so far as to ask to be allowed by Order in Council to raise duties upon articles. The Government is asking sufficient authority to reduce duties according to its own will and wish, by Order in Council; but the Minister of Finance gravely suggested to this Parliament, that if at any time it is thought well to withdraw the privilege from any nation, the consequent increase of 25 per cent in the duties could probably be done by Order in Council. Is that a foreshadowing that the Government is bound, not only to take from Parliament the right of lowering its duties in detail; but that as the next step agreed to by a subservient majority, we should be asked to give them the whole power of raising by Order in Council the tariff on articles that are imported into this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. Why should hon. gentlemen smile and think this such great fun.

Mr. TALBOT. We are laughing at the expression "subservient majority."

Mr. FOSTER. In the name of all that is constitutional in Government, dare a Liberal, or can a Liberal smile at the thought, that a Liberal Government suggests that we should give to a Cabinet council, the right to raise the duties and lower the duties on as extensive a scale as they like, and to do it simply by Order in Council. I cannot understand it. I fail to understand it, and I say, that the majority behind the Government will merit in history the title of subservient, if it so degrades the power of Parliament, as to take away from Parliament the right to say what the duties shall be, and what its revenues shall be, and what commercial treaties shall be in each individual instance made with countries with which Canada has trade relations. I am sorry, Sir, that it has fallen to the lot of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), a Liberal of the old Liberal school, as he plumes himself upon being, to place into one single

article of the tariff, three principles which are subversive of all the rights of Parliament and which principles have been contended for by Reformers and Liberals through four or five hundred years of British history. Well, Sir, we shall dismiss as utterly absurd, the idea, that even this Cabinet is going to raise the duties by Order in Council, after they have once lowered them by 25 per cent. The Minister of Finance cannot have thought of what he was saying, and could not have had the least glimmer of the principle underlying that suggestion, or he certainly would not have made it. I was speaking of the first thing that we object to, and I want the close attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) to this: Is it right that any Cabinet should have the power given it of simply, without basis or standard, being able to conclude commercial treaties with any country in the world, and every country in the world, involving an aggregate reduction in the revenue of the country from that trade of 25 per cent ultimately. Is it right that they should have the power to do that, without at least giving Parliament to understand what shall be the basis of their judgment when they come to the conclusion, and what shall be the standard of their judgment with reference to their arrangement with another country. Now, Sir, I tried to get from the Controller of Customs a single definite idea of what his standard was. How is he to judge? Take a concrete instance; take China, take Japan, take Germany, or take any country that you like; and suppose that the point is raised as to whether in the case of Germany—to argue out the concrete instance—Canada shall allow German goods to come into this country at an ultimate reduction of one-fourth of the present duties. There is the Controller of Customs sitting at the head of an important department; he is the first man to move. I do not know whether he has to report to Council by document, and give the Council something upon which they can deliberate so as to ultimately pass the Order in Council; but in some way or other he is to form his judgment as to whether he is to recommend to the Cabinet that they shall place Germany upon the favoured list, and give to German products a reduction of 25 per cent. Now, when he sits down to think that out, and to make his decision, and then to give his decision to the Government, what are the rules by which he limits himself? What are the bases upon which he is to make his deductions and come to his conclusion? Is he to say: "The Germans are of an old stock, somewhat nearly related to us; it would be rather a good thing on the ground of old and remote family relationship, that we should allow them to trade with us, and so promote the era of goodwill and the like of that." My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte)

smiles, because he sees that that would be utterly absurd. So it would be, but I submit this to my hon. friend, that as far as any conditions in the resolution before us restrain him, he can make up his mind on such a basis as that, and recommend to the Cabinet that Germany should be put on the favoured list. Or, does he say: "Now, Germany is a good country for us to look to as a future outlet for our trade; we may not expect very much there now; we may import from that country very much more than we may export to it; I do not know that we have any advantage at present, but the future, if we cultivate these people, may have great advantages for us in this trade; I think I will risk the chance anyway and recommend this to the Cabinet." Would that be satisfactory? Evidently not. Then, I ask you, in the light of those two considerations, which show the absurdity of having no conditions, what has the Controller of Customs to guide him when he looks into that matter? What is the wording of the resolution? "That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to that country," then he can make his decision, and can bring in that country. Now, what is the canon or rule by which he is to be guided as to whether those terms are as favourable on the whole or not? What is he going to do, what can he do, except simply this, if he is going to have any rule or consistency at all: compare the tariffs of the two countries on the products which are likely to be interchanged, and if he finds that the tariff of Germany, for instance, upon Canadian goods which are likely to be sent to Germany is no greater or is less than the Canadian tariff on goods which are likely to come from Germany into Canada, then he can say: I will recommend that German goods be allowed in at the eighth or fourth reduction."

Now, what this House wants to know, and what we could not get the Minister to say, is whether that is to be the rule that will guide him or not. Evidently you must have some rule; you cannot deal with nations except on a ground of strict and absolute justice, and in accordance with certain rules. You cannot, just by whim or caprice, say: "We will let in one country, and we will not let in another." Every commercial country in the world has a right to knock at the door of the Controller of Customs and say: "I want the rule on which you admit to your favours, and I will see whether or not I can conform to that rule." What other rule can be given? And if that consideration makes an arrangement with one country, say Germany, possible, it might make an arrangement with many other countries possible as well. Now, here is Parliament, and there is that resolution: we do not know to-day whether that is to be

the rule that will guide or not; and we are asked to give this carte-blanche undefined power into the hands of the Government, under which if this power is given almost every great manufacturing country under the sun can apply to Canada, and can have its products placed on the basis of the 25 per cent reduction. Japan can, China can, Switzerland can—even if Switzerland does not, as we believe it does, come under the most-favoured-nation clause. And so you can take that clause, and the denial of my hon. friend the Prime Minister, that he is not going to let the “favoured-nation” treaty clauses have any force so far as the Canadian customs are concerned. Waive the treaty aside for a moment, and take the simple clause as it stands, and Belgium, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Japan and China—in fact, nine-tenths of the countries of the world can show you that their average tariff against goods coming from Canada is less than the average tariff of Canada against goods coming from those countries into Canada. So Parliament is face to face with this eventuality, that it is probably putting into the hands of this Government a power which may open Canada to the competition on that lower basis of almost every country in the world, if a comparison and average of tariffs is to be the rule upon which the Government are to make their ultimate decision. Now, what is fairer than for Parliament to ask that at least the Government shall take the House into their confidence, and explain exactly what the principle is upon which they shall base their action in making these arrangements with commercial countries? That is the first thing we urge. We ask the Government to give us and the country the basis upon which they propose to make up their minds; after the basis is given, it may be found to be such as would exclude a great deal of these contingent and possible arrangements, but the House ought certainly to know how wide the conditions are, and consequently how wide would be the possible scope of arrangements to be made with commercial countries. Now, am I insisting upon more than the right of the House when I insist upon having that explanation? Is the Opposition or any member of Parliament asking more than his fair right when he asks to have that point made clear before being called to vote on this question?

So much with reference to that. The next in point is the possible effect upon the industries of this country; and now I appeal to my hon. friend the leader of this Government. He himself, by word of mouth, and his followers all over this country, kept Liberal manufacturers in line by assuring them that the industries of this country would not be injuriously affected by the tariff that would be introduced. Now, I am not making a statement outside of the fact, and my hon. friend will not deny it.

Mr. FOSTER.

and my hon. friend's friends will not deny it. Well, Sir, with this indefiniteness in the clause of which I have just spoken, with the possible dropping down to a 25 per cent reduction, and with all these different countries injected into competition with Canadian labour and the industries of Canadians, I look with fear and trembling to the industrial interests of this country under such a competition as that. I unhesitatingly assert that Canadian industries cannot possibly maintain themselves under a competition as wide as is proposed by this resolution. I say that it cannot be done. In a country where capital costs so much more than in most of these countries, in a country where labour costs so much more, in a country where climatic conditions are harder for many of our textile and other industries by far than in many of these other countries which could compete with us—on all these and other considerations which might be stated, we declare that if, under the loose conditions which are laid down, the Government go so far as it is possible for them to go and grant this 25 per cent reduction, the industries of this country cannot be maintained in the face of that competition. Is it a light thing to disturb all the growing industries of the country, is it a light thing to disturb the young life and energy and capital and enterprise which have been at work for the last fifteen or twenty years building up these Canadian interests, in the midst of a commercial war in which every country in the world aroused its battalions against us with the exception of Great Britain alone? Is it right, is it fair, is it statesmanlike, to allow this young and growing industrial life and development to be hampered and shackled, if not totally destroyed, by the invoking of competition on the basis of a reduction of duties to the extent of 25 per cent in favour of these countries that may come in, if the standard is as I have said, and we have no word to the contrary from the Government. So that on behalf of the industries of Canada, which do not mean simply a few monopolists or a few capitalists, but which mean the working people of this country and the agricultural producers of this country, we on this side are opposed to this resolution, and we ask the Government to stay its hand in opening up the industrial life and production of Canada to a competition which seems to be so world-wide and in which the conditions of the parties are so unequal. That is the second point; we have had no answer to it at all. The Ministers have simply sat in their places, they have heard what we have urged, the only attempt at reply that has been made was made by one gentleman of the Ministry, who tried to make a legal argument, which was torn into utter shreds by the legal argument of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden).

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That I am willing to leave, not to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), because he is not an unbiassed judge. The time was when I thought my hon. friend had a straight back and was thoroughly independent. That was when I used to hear him declare in favour of independence, in favour of the rights of Parliament, and I thought then, there stands a man who, if he only had a legal training, would make a distinguished judge. I said to myself: there is a man who, if he is ever successful in getting into the Cabinet, and he ought to be, for he works hard and is diligent, will steer that Cabinet clear of all the shoals which threaten the ship of state. But I have since changed my opinion. I would not allow a matter like this to be decided by my hon. friend from North Wellington, but I am willing to leave it to legal minds to say which of those two arguments is the stronger, and at least I am not going beyond the book when I say that in an argument on the vital question raised by this resolution, surely amongst some of the lawyers on the other side there should be one to meet our contention. Some of my hon. friends opposite have legal talents. Why, I see before me the late Premier of the province of New Brunswick (Mr. Blair), a lawyer in his own province of reputation and ability; I see before me the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Lount), a lawyer of standing and eminence; just behind is a lawyer from the city of Halifax (Mr. Russell), breathing that saline air and living upon that phosphoric essence which tends to make brains, but he too says nothing. None of these legal luminaries have anything to say. Not one of them has ventured to stand up to defend the legal position of the Government.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The Government was right.

Mr. FOSTER. Last but not least, there is an eminent man on the front benches, a lawyer as well, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to wit, who has not felt that in this matter he would like to cross swords in a legal argument on this constitutional point with my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden). Where are all these lawyers? If there is any class of men always ready to talk, it is that class. When they were on this side, how they did talk. But on that side they are still as mice and will remain so, so far as this legal argument is concerned. And my hon. friend who just interrupted me (Mr. McGregor)—if I could take out that hon. gentleman's heart, leaving him all his animation, and just lay it bare, I believe I could see imprinted on it this sentiment: Well, the Government have got us into a bad fix, but we have to put them through. No, Sir, we have not had a single member of the Government meet our arguments. We have not had one to quiet our fears, to remove our apprehensions. Not one of them has attempt-

ed to do it. Now, I leave that matter of the industries of the country with the simple remark, that if there is any one thing that hon. gentlemen cannot fool with, it is the business interests of this country. You may fool with political partisans, you may fool with the civil service, you may fool with a great many interests in this country, but the Government that fools with the great, broad business interests of this country, its industrial and productive life, will have to pay the reckoning, and regard for those interests is the one thing which every Government should have foremost in its view, in every measure they bring down. So much with regard to the business side of the question.

Now, as to the powers of Parliament, I am going to address myself to the leader of the Government, who is the man to whom every such argument ought to be addressed, because he is the keeper of the rights of Parliament, being at the head of a victorious majority and able to carry out whatever he pleases to propose. I ask my hon. friend if it is in accordance with the struggles or the traditions of Liberalism that he shall take power for the Cabinet to make commercial treaties of this wide kind, for it means that, and to disturb the finances of the country to the extent of a quarter of the revenue on imports from any country with whom this Government may choose to make an arrangement? Is it in accord with the principles of Liberalism to take this power from Parliament and relegate it to his Cabinet to arrange by Order in Council? I ask him if he thinks that is in accordance with the history, the struggles and the traditions of Liberalism in any English or constitutionally-governed country. That it is which we feel this Parliament is giving up—its right of supervision over the finances of the country. Let me put this consideration. What are we brought here for? For what does this Government ask us to come here once a year? Aside from all other things, the two most important are these: To fix what shall be the revenues of the country, first; then to say what, based upon that fixture of revenue, shall be the expenditures of the country, and whether they shall or shall not exceed the revenue. Can there be any denial that that is the most important function of Parliament? And now my appeal to Liberals is stronger even than to Liberal-Conservatives. Liberal-Conservatives say that a tariff is made with two objects in view, one to raise a revenue and the other to subserve the industrial life of the country by furnishing some protection adequate to preserve it. But Liberals have only one branch of that to stand upon. They declare that the only thing to be looked to in fixing the tariff of a country is the revenue to be obtained. Very well. Parliament is called together; it takes the whole field into survey; it declares that it is best to raise our revenues for the succeeding year by certain rates on certain articles; and un-

til Parliament revises its opinion the revenues must be raised by certain rates of duty upon certain imports and gathered into the public chest in that way. After these rates are fixed, Parliament debates the estimates and decides what shall be voted, based upon the revenue fixed. So, the revenue fixed first, and the expenditure fixed next are arranged by Parliament, and are not to be disarranged until Parliament expresses its change of mind. That is why my hon. friend cannot expend a single dollar, except it has been voted by Parliament. There is only one exception to that, and that is in the extraordinary method of a Governor General's warrant, for which the conditions are laid down and in which some little elasticity is necessary in order that things of great moment shall not be allowed to lapse, be destroyed, be wasted, or be wanting for absolute emergencies.

Well, Sir, what is the proposition here? The proposition is that when Parliament has fixed a revenue after carefully looking over the advantages and disadvantages, when Parliament has fixed the rates of duty and then fixed the expenditures, a Cabinet of thirteen men shall have the power placed in its hands—it asks for it and proposes to get it through its majority—to diminish these revenues, so far as the imports go, by 25 per cent of the whole, which totally disarranges the financial basis, turns a surplus into a deficit or adds to a possible deficit many thousands of dollars, maybe many millions of dollars. Now, I say that no Finance Minister, no Parliament, can see its way clear and take its steps carefully and prudently under such conditions, such unknown and contingent conditions as these. This disarranges the whole basis of the finances of the country by giving up to the Cabinet what Parliament always keeps in its own hands and jealously guards.

But the other point is stronger still. In so unimportant matter as the French treaty—and let me say in what sense I use the word "unimportant." It was unimportant in the extremely small list of articles which were allowed, under that treaty, to come in at lower rates. I ask my hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) whether he would, for a single moment, have agreed that before we went into the negotiations of that treaty, we should have carte-blanche from this Parliament to arrange a treaty with France and put it into operation without coming to Parliament and asking for its sanction? Would he have allowed that; would he have given it his sanction? Take the list of articles covered by the treaty. What does it include? Some kinds of fish, some kinds of nuts and fruits—a, comparatively speaking, unimportant range of articles. And yet, Sir, all the power the Government had—and rightly so—was to arrange a treaty and bring it dutifully to Parliament and ask Parliament whether it would accept it or whether it would not. But, un-

der this clause, what do you ask the right to do? You ask the right—and you wish to get it—by which you can make a treaty with any large or small power over nearly the whole range of items of the tariff, limited only by the condition that your reduction shall not be greater than 25 per cent of the current rate. Take an instance. Government have gone down to Washington by delegation to make a treaty of reciprocity with the United States. They never asked us for, they never got—and it is right that they never should get—the authority to go down to Washington and negotiate a treaty and put it into operation without first asking the sanction of this Parliament. No one ever thought of asking that power; no one, I believe, in the olden times, would have been willing to grant that power. But what may happen now? Suppose that this power is granted. Then, as soon as this Parliament is prorogued you can send a delegation to Washington with instructions: Get free lumber, get free fish, get free access for this and that, and if you get these things you may promise a reduction of one-eighth and, ultimately, of one-quarter of our duties. That Congress exists through August and September, maybe through October and November. That arrangement might be made, Congress there might agree to it, and it might be put into operation in this country before Parliament could have a chance to say whether it was in favour of the arrangement or not, to the extent of 25 per cent reduction on the present rates. I ask you if this is a power which any Government ought to ask from Parliament, a power which any Parliament ought to give up? Now, there is no need of multiplying instances; but the Government could do the same with China, with Japan, with any country under the sun.

More, Sir, and this is the last point I propose to urge again, for it has been urged before, when you do what I have shown you have power to do, you exercise the right of making a commercial treaty, limited to a range of 25 per cent reduction, with any power, and that without reference to this Parliament and without reference to the Imperial Parliament. Has that power ever been given to any colony by Great Britain? Never. That power has not only not been given to any colony, but it never can be given to any colony so long as the Empire is an Empire, and the British Government is the Imperial Government and holds the power of empire in its hands. Sir, within the clauses of a Tariff Act, you bring into this Parliament the whole question of commercial treaties. You propose to get a power, in a clause of a Customs Act, which will enable you to make a commercial treaty with any country in the world without submitting the details of this treaty to this Parliament, and without any reference to the Imperial Parliament.

Is not that a power that never has been asked, never has been thought of being asked, in this Parliament? Never a Government sitting in the Parliament of Canada have proposed to do that sort of thing, or to ask that power. Britain has Imperial obligations. In the despatches with the Australian colonies, with Canada, with the other colonies, with Newfoundland, with the British West Indies, how often has it been brought out in the correspondence that Great Britain has obligations entered into under treaty with other powers, that oblige her to see that certain things are done, and that if the colony has the unrevised power of making a commercial treaty, it may bring Great Britain at once into collision with any of the great powers with whom she has made and is loyally carrying out a solemn, and an absolute, and a definite treaty. So that on all these grounds the Opposition oppose this; they think that it is prejudicial to the best interests of Canada, they think it is derogatory to the powers of Parliament, they think it bodes trouble, and asks for a status as regards Imperial powers which no colony has a right to ask for itself, or has a right to take upon itself. On these grounds, knowing well that this Parliament is anxious to get through, knowing well that we will be styled obstructors if we raise our voices again and again upon this clause, knowing well that we are troublesome when we ask for explanations or arguments to convince us why such an extraordinary set of powers should be given, we still think that it is our duty to press our objections, and to ask for this discussion, and to make our voices and our opinions as strongly felt before the country as we can, against demands which are derogatory to the independence of Parliament, and which are dangerous to give into the hands of any Government. I forgot one thing, I will mention it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am surprised at that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does me great credit. I try to remember everything, but I often fail. I ask my hon. friend to put himself into the shoes of a business man, if he can do that now, for a single moment.

Mr. TALBOT. The shoes are too small.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some pretty strong business men in this country, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is modest enough to acknowledge at once, as any man in this Parliament will do, that his Government are not the peers of Canada's princely and successful business men in matters of business. Now let him put himself in the shoes of a business man. There is his capital, it is his all. A man does not find capital showered down from heaven upon him; he has to earn it, it is his stock in trade. He looks at the business conditions of a country, at its tariff

conditions, and he makes his investment in an industry on the strength of those conditions. He finds here that there is a certain line of duties upon certain articles. On the strength of that, he puts in his half million dollars, he goes to manufacturing that line of articles, and he says: Now, to the extent of that tariff duty, I will have a compensating advantage, and on the strength of it I put my money in. It happens at the best that he is subject to contingency; Parliament may at any session revise its opinion and leave him in a position not as good as he was. But he trusts Parliament, because Parliament is made up of a large number of business men with interests from all over this Dominion, and many of them first-class business men. He trusts Parliament, and he puts in his money. But, Sir, where is he if, at any time after he puts his capital in and commences his work, the Cabinet, by the extraordinary power it may have, reduces the duty on the very article that he is manufacturing by 25 per cent of its rate, and lets German competition in upon him in that line? Where is he? His investment is not worth anything to him. I tell my hon. friend, and I want him to try to believe it if he can, that there is a long line of industries in this country which, under your present general tariff, may be kept in this country, but if you let Germany and Belgium into the competition you cannot keep them in this country. German labour, perseverance, attention to detail, untiring patience to suit the foreign market, whatever its foibles, makes the German and the Belgium competitor the most formidable competitor in this and in every other country of the world. Now what becomes of the stable condition which capital ought to have as far as it can have? But you say Parliament might change its mind. No, Parliament cannot change its mind, or won't change its mind without a full discussion of the subject, and without its being possible for the manufacturer to make known his side of the case before Parliament, and that is everything. As my hon. friend the Finance Minister knows, it is everything. There are industries in Canada to-day which would have been wiped out utterly if my hon. friend's first views as regards his tariff, had gone into law.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. "No," then why have the changes been made? Is the Finance Minister so fickle that he changes just for the sake of change? The Finance Minister changed because business men gave him facts and figures, and he did not dare to face them, and he raised the duty, or lowered the duty on the raw material, which is the same thing so far as principle is concerned. So that the reason why that has not been done with reference to those particular industries, is that the business men interested were advertised that the proposition was before

the House. They came to the fountain head, they worked upon the Government, and they worked upon members, they made their case good, and they prevented the destruction. Your Cabinet of 13 sit in the Star Chamber, they deliberate amongst themselves, they go to work with this power in their hands, and they take that duty off, and the first thing the capitalist knows about it is when he finds goods from the competing countries coming in where they did not before, at a reduction of 25 per cent. The evil is done, there is no advertisement to the country, the mischief is all completed before the business man knows that it is even contemplated.

Mr. DAVIS. What about the consumer ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend what about the consumer. There is a certain class of agricultural implements—and I want him to listen—that are sold for something like \$2.40 a dozen ; when they get to Winnipeg and are resold, they are about \$4 a dozen, and when they get to his place of business and are sold by him, they are \$6.60 a dozen. “ What about the consumer ? ” I had some experience of this solicitude for the consumer. I met men in Winnipeg, when I was on that commission looking into tariff conditions, who wept hot tears over the extraordinary prices that the poor farmer paid for coal oil ; but when the investigation got at what happened, we found out that the Petrolia men sent their oil in tanks at a charge of ten cents per gallon, that the charge of conveying it to Winnipeg did not add more than a few cents to that, but that this man put it into his great big can, and when he turned the spigot to let the gallon out for the poor consumer, he got a price a little more than double what it had cost him. Still he cried over the consumer. Now, Sir, that, I say, is the chief difficulty with reference to this matter of Star Chamber work, of Star Chamber change, of Cabinet change, if you don't like the other term. I say that once this is passed you will import a contingency, a doubt, and an uncertainty into the business which will make it impossible for prudent men to invest large capital in staple businesses, and will consequently derange for the worse the business and trade of this country. Now I have put carefully and honestly and with my best force what I believe to be some of the objections to this section—I have not stated half of them—and they are such as to merit the attention of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I protest against the assertion, or rather the insinuation with which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) prefaced his remarks, that the Ministers have shown scant courtesy towards the Opposition and have not always been in their seats to listen to the arguments offered from the other side of the House. So far as concerns myself, it is my regret that I have not been able during the

Mr. FOSTER

last few days to be as often in my seat as I would have wished to be. If I were absent, it was not a matter of choice, because if the choice had rested with me, I would have preferred to be here ; but I was called away by other business. I may say, however, without being offensive I suppose, that the time of the House and the time of Ministers might be as well, and perhaps more profitably spent elsewhere than here listening to arguments which we have heard not once but over and over again. I have no objection at all that the Opposition should place their views on record—it is their right ; but I have this remark to offer, that it is hardly fair that the Government and Parliament should be called upon to answer arguments which have been answered not once but several times over.

I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speech of my hon. friend, and I may say that although he put his whole soul and heart into it, no very strong argument but simply a few words are required to show that the whole argument and objection set up have no foundation whatever. I take the very words of my hon. friend himself. He has put forward, as he stated, an absurd proposition against the resolution now before the House, and having put forward that absurd proposition he answered it, and he now wants hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to take those arguments as serious arguments and answer them. That is not a fair way of arguing. I am willing to take the position assumed by my hon. friend and meet him on every point. What was his first point ? It was that the clause itself—he did not go into the merits of the clause—might create serious complications, that it might open the door to the admission of the goods of more than one nation to our markets under this clause. He did not attack the resolution on its merits ; he did not say it was wise or unwise in its terms, but he attacked it on account of the consequences to which he said it might lead. The fear in his mind is, that under this resolution the markets of Canada will be opened not only to Great Britain, as at the present time they are, but that they may be opened to many other countries as well. My hon. friend has abandoned the argument which was set up the other day—that possibly the commercial treaties which Great Britain has with Belgium and Germany, might admit Belgian and German goods ; but the basis of the hon. gentleman's argument to-day was that one, two, four or five nations, including Japan and China, might on account of their low tariffs be entitled to the same advantage as is given to Great Britain. In regard to this point I may tell the hon. gentleman that the institution which he characterized in more or less happy language as a “ star chamber,” the Cabinet of Canada, had to take this matter into consideration. The hon. gentleman

surely cannot suppose that we propose to place upon the Statute-book that law without looking in advance as to where it will lead us. We had to look around in the world as to see what countries would be admitted under this preferential tariff, and having looked over the world, from the one pole to the other, we saw only one nation in a position to take advantage of that tariff, and it was Great Britain. We have so acted, and having acted on that condition, it remains to be seen whether there is any other country occupying the same position. I do not see any other country occupying that position—possibly there are others, but I do not see them. That, however, is the position we take, and it is the position on which we are acting. The hon. gentleman—as he has done more than once this session and in previous sessions, and especially since the present Government came into office—has become very much afraid less, forsooth, Liberal principles might be deviated from. I may tell my hon. friend that on this ground he may hold his scull in peace. The Liberal party will look after the interests of the Liberal party, and when the hon. gentleman comes forward to look after the interests of the Liberal party, I suggest it will be well for the hon. gentleman and his friends to look after the interests of their own party.

Mr. MILLS. The Liberal-Conservative party look not only after the interests of their party, but also after the interests of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman says the Liberal-Conservatives look after the interests of the country. The people did not think so on 23rd June. If they did look after the interests of the country, they showed poor judgment in their efforts. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) came to the conclusion that we were making a new departure from Liberal principles by giving to the Governor in Council power to make treaties. I say at once to my hon. friend that if we were giving the Governor in Council power to make treaties, it would indeed be a departure from Liberal principles. We do not recognize that, however, great the power of the Governor in Council may be, it would be in accordance with Liberal traditions, and still less with Liberal principles, that the Governor in Council should be possessed of powers which should be exclusively possessed by Parliament. I deny the hon. gentleman's proposition as a matter of fact. The hon. gentleman contends that section 16 of the tariff places in the hands of the Governor in Council power to make treaties. I take issue with him in toto, and I place myself in the judgment of this House, not only of hon. members on this side of the House but of hon. gentlemen opposite as well, and I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Governor in Council will have no power

except the power which is on the Statute-book and which has remained there for more than a year and for more than one Parliament, as I shall show presently. My hon. friend shakes his head. He is a doubting Thomas, and I shall put his finger in the wound by-and-by. The Governor in Council is asking no special power in regard to discretion to be exercised, but it is simply applying the law which is already on the Statute-book. Here is the law such as it is at the present time, and in regard to this law and in regard to all such laws, it is for the Government to apply it, and we shall apply it. What is it? But before I proceed further, I wish to show to my hon. friend that the power we have taken to ourselves is not a new power. If I understood the argument as framed in the hon. gentleman's own mind, it is, that the Governor in Council is clothed with the power of determining whether such and such products of a country are as regards duty on an average on a similar level.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). It is a question of fact.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that this is a power which should not be vested in any Government, but let me call his attention to a section which was placed in the Statute-books of Canada when he sat upon this side of the House, and which was placed there with his concurrence and endorsement. Section 6 of the Customs Act of the late Conservative Government reads as follows:—

Any or all of the following articles,—that is to say:—animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

Now, Sir, here is the power vested in the Governor General in Council to issue a proclamation to reduce the rate of duty. It is not only a power given to the Governor in Council to make an article free of duty, but it is power to reduce the rate of duty, whenever, in the judgment of the Governor in Council a corresponding reduction has taken place in the duties on similar goods in the United States. I ask, Sir, what difference is there between this section in the Conservative Tariff Act, and the section we

now propose in this tariff. Let me read the section which we are now discussing :

That when the customs tariff of any country—

Mr. FOSTER. "Any country."

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, any country.

Mr. TAYLOR. The other only applied to the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, then, if that is all the difference my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is perfectly welcome to that shade of difference, because it is only a shade. In the old Customs Act, the power was only given with reference to one country, and under the present Act the power is given, so that the privilege may be extended to more than one country. Where, I ask, is the difference between the two? This section which we are now considering reads :

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff.

The same principle is laid down here as was laid down in the former Tariff Act. Here the principle is a little broader in its application than it was in the old Act, but the principle itself is exactly the same. And now let us see as to the modus operandi of carrying out this section. It is stated that the Governor in Council may issue a proclamation, and that means that the Cabinet may inform His Excellency. Here is the modus operandi as set forth in the resolution :

(a.) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

We have, therefore, provided some better machinery in this resolution than was provided under the old. The machinery set forth in this resolution is more perfect than it was formerly, because, instead of saying that the reduction of duty may be made by the proclamation of the Governor in Council, we have provided that it shall be done upon the report of the Controller of Customs, but subject, of course, to the approval of the Governor in Council. That is all the difference there is. The principle is absolutely the same and in the face of such a Tariff Act as the late Act for which he (Mr. Foster) himself was responsible, I am surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should raise such an objection as he and his friends have been insisting upon since this resolution has come before us. The hon. gentleman understands—at least I hope he now under-

Mr. LAURIER.

stands—the nature of the resolution that we have before us, but he wants to have the canon of construction on which the Controller of Customs is to use his report. Well, Sir, the canon of construction is to be found in the resolution itself. The Controller of Customs has only to take the resolution, and to see whether or not the tariff of a country is, on the whole, as favourable as ours is. That is all.

Mr. FOSTER. Give us a concrete instance, and show us how it will work out.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I will give you a concrete instance. Suppose, for instance, in the language of the old tariff law, a reduction of 50 per cent or 10 per cent duty had been made in the United States. Then the Governor in Council would have to exercise his powers of arithmetic to see whether or not that would come to the level of our tariff. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants to have a concrete instance. There is one little difficulty why I cannot, in a sense, give him a concrete instance, and that is, that I do not know of any instance, with the exception I have given. I told him a moment ago that the only country in the world which is entitled to this is Great Britain, and possibly New South Wales. Then, with the exception of Great Britain, and possibly New South Wales, the Government of Canada is not aware of any country in the world which is entitled to the benefits of this reciprocal clause.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has also raised another point. He has told us that the question was raised by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) : If you apply this tariff, how are you going to repeal it if afterwards the country which you extend it were to change its tariff? Well, that is a very hypothetical case. But, let us take a suppositious case, and we will say, for example, that New South Wales might come under the terms of this preferential clause. Suppose New South Wales has a tariff which, on the whole, is as favourable to Canada as our reciprocal tariff is to them, then it would come under this tariff. But suppose that, later on, New South Wales should raise its tariff, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asks, and it is a fair question : How are you going to withdraw the privilege which you had already given to New South Wales ; should it be done by Act of Parliament, or by Order in Council? My opinion is that you have in the resolution itself the very condition which solves the difficulty. The resolution reads :

1. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be imported direct into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff.

Now, what would be the consequence? Suppose that to-morrow the Government came to the conclusion that New South Wales, under its existing tariff is entitled to this preferential tariff, and suppose that at some period after this, New South Wales raised her tariff so as to make it no longer on a level with this tariff, the condition works out automatically, and thereupon New South Wales would be no longer entitled to the benefit of this tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me that in that case the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) is driven to this: Say that a certain article comes in from New South Wales and you make a provision by which it can be admitted, and the moment that arrangement is made, the tariff, as regards that article from New South Wales is, say, 20 per cent. Now, New South Wales goes to work and it puts a duty upon some article of Canadian import, then you say that our duty goes up because of the enactment of the legislature of New South Wales. No power on earth can raise our duty except our own Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say nothing of the kind. I say that the moment the tariff of New South Wales is changed, then the Controller of Customs has to see whether or not these articles are, on the whole, upon the same level as our own tariff, and if they are not, upon the whole, upon the same level as our own tariff, then they can be no longer entered under the reciprocal tariff. That is the condition of things. The provision works mechanically. The Controller of Customs has simply to make a report, that report is confirmed by the Governor in Council, and there the matter ends. Sir, I am surprised at one thing: I am surprised at the objection which has been raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to a tariff, which I do not hesitate to say has received the sanction not only of the people of Canada, but of the people of the whole British Empire. My hon. friend told us a moment ago that he was taking issue with us to-day. I take him at his word. There is no issue now existing between the Government and the Opposition on which I would have greater pleasure to go to the country than this issue, by which I claim we have lifted the politics of this country to a higher plane, and placed them on an Imperial basis; and I believe that, with the concurrence of the Canadian people—nay, with the concurrence of the British people as well—that policy is there to stay.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, in the eloquent and interesting last thirty seconds of the Prime Minister's speech, I think there was almost a confession that on these dry matters of fact he did not feel altogether happy, and that he would retire from the discussion with the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) by

a draft upon that eloquence for which he is so famous. Now, one looking over the discussions which have taken place in this Parliament, will, I think, admit this much, that while the Liberal party have changed their position on many things, and have shown great celerity in doing so, there is nothing on which their change has been so remarkable as on the principle of parliamentary control. The appeal which the hon. gentleman has made to the statutory offer as affording a precedent for this extraordinary and unprecedented legislation, so far as British parliaments are concerned, will be found, when examined, to avail him not to the slightest extent. But I desire if permitted, to remind the committee of the position the Liberal party have taken on this question of parliamentary control, and the necessity and constitutional right of Parliament to be consulted at all times on all matters of public concern; and there is nothing on which they have exhibited more jealousy than on matters of fiscal concern. Hon. members will remember that in the last Parliament there were two questions on which this point was raised. In regard to the negotiations that took place between the executive of Canada and the province of Newfoundland concerning the question of the entrance of that province into the Dominion of Canada—a case to this extent not wholly on a par with the matter now under consideration, that it was obviously necessary for the Government to consult Parliament in the end—the late Government were embarrassed and harassed from day to day by the then leader of the Opposition, now the leader of the Government, and by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), his co-adjutor and ally in the House at that time. They claimed that they had a right to be informed of every movement, every proposition, and every counter-proposition, and that by any other course on the part of the Government this Parliament was being treated in an undignified and improper manner. Their language on that occasion is under my hand, and I will remind the Premier of it. Speaking in Parliament, even in a case where I say it was understood that it would be necessary to consult Parliament before any final action could be taken, or before any consequence could occur to this country, Mr. Mills, now a member of the Senate, said:

This House is entitled to know what these negotiations are, and we are entitled to know whether the propositions are of such a character that under no circumstances this House could, in the interests of the people of this country, for a moment entertain them.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, then sitting in Opposition, rebuked the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), then Finance Minister, for preserving secrecy at that stage in regard to those negotiations, and

felt warranted in using towards him this language :

He should remember, Sir, that he is not simply a party leader talking party clap-trap, but he stands here as the representative of the committee of Government to tell his masters, this House—not alone his party behind him—to what responsibilities he is committing this country.

And again :

Who is this Committee of Council that arrogate to themselves the right to determine, before consultation with the people, what these terms shall be. My hon. friend the leader has put it in a nutshell. The leader of the House wants to submit the terms to us at a period when we cannot judge or modify one of them. We will have to take the terms as a whole, and either accept them holus bolus, or reject them holus bolus.

In that matter, in which the Government had a well known excuse for reticence for delay in laying information before the House, they were upbraided and charged with treating this House in an arrogant manner in not taking the House into full confidence, the reason being that the proposition which concerned this country in an important degree, when it should finally be submitted, had to be accepted as a whole or rejected as a whole. The arguments used in that case apply to this. The Prime Minister has to my mind placed this House in an embarrassing position. He has shown that this matter has not received at the hands of the executive that calm and careful examination which it should have received before being submitted to this House ; for in one breath he tells us, though every line of the resolution contradicts him, that the Government had looked abroad over the face of the globe, and, finding that only one country could take advantage of it, they came to the House with a proposition covering the whole globe ; and before taking his seat he had to admit that the investigation of every country on the globe was not very complete, for he said that most likely New South Wales would be in a position to take advantage of the terms of the resolution. These two important statements coming from the leader of the Government fill us all with alarm in regard to the lack of consideration which the Government are guilty of in connection with this most important and extraordinary proposition. Again I wish to remind hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that so jealous were they of parliamentary control, that when it was proposed that the Governor in Council should take power by Order in Council to make regulations for the preservation of the fisheries, the Opposition of that day resisted that demand, claiming that it was interfering with the powers and rights and duties of this House.

When the hon. leader of the Government rose, he said he would meet the difficulties presented by the hon. member for York and deal with them seriatim and conclusively. Now, he did not tell us a very important

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

matter. It is quite clear, from the reference he made to New South Wales—and if I am wrong in that I ask to be corrected—that the Government are not able now to state to this House what the average rate of duties is in the different countries in the globe to-day. Evidently they do not know the position of New South Wales. While they think that the average rate there will bring New South Wales within the terms of article 16, we must take it for granted, judging by the ambiguous statement of the First Minister, that he cannot now tell us what the average rate of duty is at the present moment in New South Wales. Neither can he tell what is the average rate of duty in Germany and Belgium and other continental countries. It is evident that these hon. gentlemen have not judged it necessary to make that careful and close examination which the business men of the country expected, and which they should have made, because it is certainly of vital importance that the business men of the country, the farmers, the merchants and men in all mercantile pursuits, should, before sharing responsibility with the Government in connection with the operation of a clause like this or a power such as is here claimed, know what the real position is, and what their chances are as regards possible competition from foreign countries. They should know, at any rate, from the Treasury benches how other countries, whether colonies or not, stand relatively with us in connection with our tariff.

But there is another obvious difficulty. If, for instance, the First Minister had told me what the average rate of customs duties was in New South Wales—and evidently he cannot do it, for I have asked him repeatedly—I would ask him if he can even tell us what the average rate of duty is in Canada to-day. Did he ever take sufficient pains to ascertain what the average rate of duties was under the tariff resolutions as first brought down, and if he did, what is the average rate of duty under the tariff resolutions as now brought down and before this House? There has been a very serious change. For instance, a case painfully comes to my mind at the moment. Under the first tariff, there was an opportunity for a great interest in the county I represent to live, at any rate, for a few years. Men who were experts in that business believed that they had an opportunity of eking out an existence under the first resolutions. But under the resolution now before the committee, I fear that, to a large extent, a very important industry, has been vitally affected, and these hon. gentlemen are in this unfortunate position, that they cannot tell us how, on the whole, the tariff now stands. They cannot tell us how, for instance, our average rate on articles that would probably come into this market were an opportunity afforded, from any other country in the world, would com-

pare with the average rate of that country on an article we would be likely to send it, or how the selected list there would compare with the selected list here. And although I fear the Treasury benches are lapsing into that condition of indifference with which they have as a rule treated observations from this side during the consideration of this resolution, I must repeat that I have been unable to ascertain what interpretation the Government put on these words in the resolution "on the whole." Do they contemplate the average rate on selected lists in each country, or a tariff such as this, that while on certain articles in a foreign country, which do not particularly concern us, the duties were inordinately high and out of all comparison with the duties on similar articles in Canada, yet on articles that we do buy largely from it, the duties are lower. In the latter case, would the high duties on articles not concerning us be considered by the Government in their interpretation of these words, "on the whole"? This is to me an important consideration. It is a question we ought to ask, nay, that we are bound to ask, and I think the Government are in duty bound to give a clear statement of their opinion. Surely no member on the Treasury benches will contend that either the explanation from the Prime Minister or the Controller of Customs can be considered satisfactory on that point. Let any one of his friends in business, in or out of the House, take up this resolution:

When the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada, and so forth.

Let him put this question, whether that contemplates an average on the whole range of items in a foreign tariff, or a partial list possibly, and surely it is not a satisfactory answer to say: Why, it is clear, it means on the whole? What we want these hon. gentlemen to do, if they are able to do it, is to give us a more definite statement with regard to the meaning of those words, and we suggest, to show the object of our question the difficulties I have already mentioned, and which must be met sooner or later. Instead of having that interpretation after Parliament is over, in the office of the Controller of Customs, when the question arises, would it not be more fitting and more in keeping with a proper treatment by the executive of the people's interests, to have these definitions given here and now, and have these difficulties removed here and now, before the Government are embarrassed in any degree by their consideration.

Then, again, the hon. gentleman seems to think that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), in his indignation, and I think well-founded indignation, in fighting, not merely for parliamentary control, as it has been heretofore understood, but for the retention of

good, sound principles of British legislation in regard to fiscal matters, overlooked the statute which the hon. gentleman considered was a precedent for the resolution now before the House. Let me put in contrast the statutory offer to which the hon. gentleman refers and the resolution which he claims is founded upon it. This is the statutory offer:

Any or all of the following things, that is to say:—green or dried apples, beans, buckwheat, peas, potatoes, rye, rye flour, hay, vegetables, specified in item 41, Schedule "A," of this Act, shall be free of duty when imported into Canada from the country of production upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that such country imposes no duty on the like product or products imported into it from Canada.

Now let me read the resolution which the hon. gentleman says is modelled upon that and warranted by it:

Resolution 16, now before this committee, reads:

16. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

(a.) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b.) That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

(c.) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

I do not know that a stronger argument is required from me, to show that the hon. gentleman is not warranted in making the statement he did, than to leave these two clauses side by side. However, perhaps I may be permitted to call attention to the well-known history of the statutory offer. That offer was made practically by consent of this Parliament, at the unanimous desire of this Parliament, after the subject had been considered from year to year and over a great space of years. It applied to one country and one country only, between which and this country there had been a tariff contemplated by that eleventh section which I have read worked out into a treaty between these two countries. Thus the people had the experience of a free exchange of these articles; they knew exactly where to find them in the list, and whether they were free or at the present rate of duty. Having regard to all the people's experience then in actual exchange, having regard to the facts that these articles were known and

determined, and named in the statute, how in the name of reason can one say that is a case which warrants us in clothing the Government under this resolution with such general, such wide powers, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) claimed, if I recollect aright, in the debate on the Budget, that it had in it germs for resurrecting his old policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States of America, and that possibly the goods of Germany and the goods of Belgium, would, under its operation, come into this country on favoured-nation treatment. This is a policy having the widest possible consequences to this country. Aye, Mr. Chairman, we must not forget what the Prime Minister said and what his colleagues said, that it is to be their policy not to make one fell swoop at the industries of the country, but to extinguish them gradually and to bring about free trade at a moderate rate. Under this very resolution, should conditions obtain, as in New South Wales, for instance, or in any other country, Canada would have to meet the most terrific competition under present conditions and present prices, that we ever had to meet in this country before. A resolution in terms so wide-reaching, a resolution so indefinite containing these embarrassing words to which I have referred, can in no sense be considered to be based upon or justified by the statutory offer, limited and definite in that section 11 of the Customs Act. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) raised our hopes in regard to a canon of construction for resolution 16. He admitted that he should give a canon of construction; and, I confess, having listened to him attentively for a canon, I could not but notice that his "cannon" did not go off. So far as I was able to observe, the hon. gentleman left the "cannon" and retreated under a cover of eloquence to which I have already made reference. But the questions I have suggested require some canon of construction in order to have them answered, or answered satisfactorily. The hon. gentleman said, in closing his observations, that this tariff has been sanctioned practically by the whole Empire. The warrant for that, I suppose, is in the press references made by some of the London papers, based, as any one can see on examination, upon fallacious and erroneous information, and upon a misunderstanding of the Imperial treaties. I am not aware—the hon. gentleman may correct me if necessary, or if he will—that this tariff which, as amended, carries with it so many revolutionary changes, has been endorsed by any appreciable portion of the press in London or in any other part of the Empire. I do not think, therefore, that this tariff as it now stands, these resolutions before us, have received the approbation of any of our competitors, whether those under, or those beyond, the flag. Having touched upon that, I take the responsibility—though

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

it may not be germane to the resolution or to the discussion which has incurred—of saying from my place in Parliament that I am not particularly pleased or charmed by the fact that legislation concerning the interests and industries of Canada should meet with such intense favour in any portion of the Empire, so long as that favour is based upon the belief that an opportunity is afforded for dangerous and disastrous competition with Canadian interests and Canadian labour; and I think I can say that not only as loyal to my own country, Canada, but as loyal to the Empire itself; for experience has shown that any policy that weakens Canada, that prostrates her labour and her industries, is a policy that, in the end, will react to the injury and detriment of every portion and parcel of the Empire to which we belong. It is, therefore, to the Canadian people that this Parliament must look for applause for their policy, and I am satisfied that no mercantile body in Canada that has looked into this resolution will regard the Opposition as unreasonable in pressing, as they have done, and as, I think, they will have to do so long as no explanation is given, for a clear and succinct definition and understanding of what the Government really mean by section 16 and in what way it will be administered by the Controller of Customs.

Before I take my seat, I should like to point out the very serious difference between the statutory offer and this resolution in another particular, and that is in the extraordinary power proposed to be vested in the Controller of Customs. But more than that. As I read this resolution, it seems to me automatic to this extent—that it is acted upon by the collector of customs even before any action is taken by the Controller of Customs. The main section, without the subsections, I think, is complete in itself and under it the collector of customs is first of all to settle what nation is to trade with Canada on that so-called preferential basis. It goes then from the lower officer to the higher, it goes then, forsooth, to the Controller of Customs. When any dispute arises between the collector of customs and the importer, the matter is to be decided by the Controller of Customs. That is an extraordinary departure, because, as we know now, the Controller of Customs is, strictly speaking, so far as his status goes, I think, not even a member of the Government. He is a parliamentary officer, given certain duties pointed out by the Customs Act and by the Act constituting his office. But I take it that, not being a member of the Council, and holding his office solely by virtue of that statute, he is not a member of the Government; whether he be so or not, he is not a Minister, he is not a member of the Cabinet, but he is to exercise these extraordinary powers. All these observations, of course, are made without any reference to the individual who now

holds that office, but to the office itself, or to the ideas that surround the legislation that brought it into being. There are those considerations, among others, that make it necessary for us to persist, at any rate up to this time, and possibly longer, in pressing upon the Government not only the gravity of the step that they have taken, the departure from sound traditions and sound rules they are proposing to make, but to give us as the people's representatives, or as the representatives of a large body of people, at least—to give us their interpretation now at this stage, without shifting that liability and responsibility upon the shoulders of the Controller of Customs, or the collectors of customs at the different ports of Canada after this Parliament shall have risen.

Mr. FROST. I desire to make a few remarks on this preferential clause of the tariff, because it is said that it is going to affect very prejudicially the business interests of Canada. We are told by one of the speakers that the lowering of the duties one-eighth at the present time, and 25 per cent later on, will be the means of admitting manufactured goods from a great many countries throughout the world; that the whole of the goods that will come in under the present tariff will not be from Great Britain alone, but from China, Japan and South America, as well as those having favoured-nation treaties, such as Belgium and Germany. Now, it seems to me that the great objection which our friends in the Opposition have to this preferential tariff is not so much that these goods will come in from those countries, as it is the Liberal Government have been enabled at one stroke to bind closer the union between Canada and the mother country than has ever been attempted or accomplished by our friends opposite during the whole eighteen years they were in office. It is not possible that any goods coming in from China, or Japan, or South America can in any way affect the manufacturing industries of Canada, for we know very well that those countries are not manufacturing countries, there is nothing that we get from them along the line of manufactures that will interfere in any way with the industries of Canada. It has been said that the Government have had no care for the labouring men; the statement was made here on Wednesday night by the ex-Finance Minister.

Mr. PRIOR. Will the hon. gentleman kindly tell me if he said that we need not fear competition from either China or Japan?

Mr. FROST. Yes, we need not fear competition from either China or Japan. If you will look at the trade returns you will find very few goods such as we manufacture in this country, that we would get from those countries under the lower tariff, "and what we would get" would be a de-

cidéd benefit to the consumers of Canada. Now, it has been said that this present Government had no care for the labouring men, and we saw one hon. gentleman pose as the particular guardian of the labouring classes of Canada, and we have heard another hon. gentleman ask, what does the Government at present in office care for the labouring man of Canada? Now, I have this to say, so far as the labouring men of Canada are concerned, that there never has been a more depressed condition existing among our manufacturing industries than during the existence of the so-called National Policy. We have seen thousands of men, workingmen, honest, upright men, driven out of this country through the action of the so-called National Policy. In 1894 we saw in one line of goods, and the seventh largest industry in Canada, the agricultural implement business, we saw the duties reduced from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, and it threw out of work one thousand men in that industry alone, and they either had to go into other lines and trades to make a living, or to leave the country altogether. We also saw, lately, a number of men on the Opposition side voting to reduce still further that duty, and send the remaining 4,000 men that are in that trade out of the country altogether. And still these gentlemen stand up and claim to be par excellence the defenders and supporters of the workingmen of Canada. Now, what will this preferential clause do for this country? It will simply do this, it will transfer, and that is the object of the clause, it will simply transfer our purchase of some twenty million dollars' worth of goods that we now get from the United States over to Great Britain, we will bring those goods into this country from Great Britain, and consequently increase the tonnage of our ports; and if the work is to be given out of this country, it will be given to our kith and kin in the mother country rather than to the people of the United States. This will be the main thing that the preferential clause of the tariff will effect. It has been said that every dollar's worth of goods that will be brought in under preferential clause will displace one dollar's worth of goods in Canada. But hon. gentlemen opposite know very well that we import over two-thirds of our manufactured goods to-day from the United States, as against one-third from Great Britain. Now, if we are ever to show that we prefer British trade to American trade, something must be done to bring that trade to our shores, and for this reason this preferential clause has been introduced, and at one stroke this Government has accomplished more by that clause than has ever been accomplished before in the history of this country towards binding together the Empire of which we all are so proud, particularly in this jubilee year, when we are celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. Now, it has been said that

other countries will have the same right to come in and get the same favours. But this cannot be possible in view of the fact that we are an autonomous country, that at confederation we were allowed the privilege of making just such tariffs as we chose to make, and that we have a perfect right to make, under all the rules and all the advice which we can possibly get from all the authorities upon the subject, both here and in Great Britain. It has been pointed out that our industries cannot maintain themselves against the foreign competition which will take place. In one breath we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have simply copied their tariff, that we have stolen their clothes, and that consequently our tariff is strongly protective in its character and in its principle; then, in another breath we are told by our friends opposite that we are destroying this country through the tariff which has been brought down by the present Government. Now, either one or the other of these positions must be wrong, and I take it for granted that our Government, proceeding along the straight lines of constitutional practice, have been endeavouring to bring their tariff to a point where it will be on a purely revenue basis. We have to consider the condition of many industries which have been brought into being during the past eighteen years, and the Government, in taking hold of the tariff, had to pay a certain amount of attention to those industries. But, looking at the tariff as a whole, looking at the reductions that have been made all along the line of raw material, looking at many things that have been put on the free list. I can fairly say, as a manufacturer, that the Government have done their duty, not only by the manufacturers of the country, but by the consuming classes, which, after all said and done, constituting, as they do, 75 or 80 per cent of the people, was the great desideratum, and for that reason I think this tariff will go down to history as one of the best tariffs that Canada has ever seen.

**Mr. BENNETT.** I desire to ask the hon. gentleman a question. In view of the reduced duty on iron, at what price is the firm to which the hon. gentleman belongs listing binders?

**Mr. FROST.** We are not discussing the details of local business at this time. I do not propose to come to this Parliament and take up the time of the House by discussing such a question, even if the hon. gentleman desires it.

**Mr. BENNETT.** The hon. gentleman is taking me altogether wrongly.

**Mr. FROST.** I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that one of his own leaders stated that a business man puts his money into one industry on the basis of the tariff duty, trusting that Parliament will allow that duty to remain and not be removed. How did that hon. gentleman

**Mr. FROST.**

deal with the duty on agricultural implements, to which reference has just been made. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me was one of those who supported the ex-Finance Minister in making a reduction when there was neither reason, rhyme nor necessity for it. I do not wish, however, to enter into that matter, but to deal with the question as it affects the general interests of the country. It has been stated time and again that the leader of the Government went through the country telling the manufacturers who supported his own party that they were all right, and this statement has been made in the House to-day. So far as this is concerned, speaking for myself, I never obtained any knowledge and never had one word with the leader of the Government as to what would be done in regard to the line of goods that I manufacture, and I do not believe there are Liberal manufacturers in Canada who have heard one word from that hon. gentleman or from any other member of the Government in regard to this matter. The Liberal party has always stood for a revenue tariff, and it is no part or parcel of the Liberal policy to destroy any interest in the country; but the policy of the party, as I understand it, has been to allow industries to thrive, so long as they can thrive under a reasonable tariff that will enable these industries to grow naturally. We have had some industries that were propagated and forced by a tariff framed especially for them. And these industries are those which have been giving this country trouble and are to-day causing depression in business, and it is in respect to them that the labouring men and workingmen are being thrown out of employment to a much greater extent than is the case in regard to other classes of industry to-day. Industries built up naturally under a revenue tariff, prior to days of the National Policy, are not being destroyed, and the labouring men are not suffering from them; but those industries that were propagated like hothouse plants, have caused all the trouble, and have injured many industries that were natural industries to this country. We know a number of such hothouse industries, but we need not go into them. The ex-Finance Minister stated that no government can fool with the business interests of the country. That is true. Our business interests are paramount, and in that term I include not only manufacturing industries, but all other industries, such as agriculture and mining; and, as regards these industries as a whole, I say that the present Government has brought down a tariff which, taken in connection with its other policy, constitutes a good, true and National Policy combined. Their agricultural policy could not be improved, and in future we will not be troubled with depressed agriculturists, nor with farmers finding fault with this and that duty because the bulk of the duty was levied on raw material, or leaving our manufacturers who have been

conducting natural industries, strained, as they have been. The policy, taken as a whole, from beginning to end, is one that commends itself to every business man in the country; it is one that commends itself to every farmer, and every farmer is recognizing the fact that he is going to have an opportunity of securing for his products, at the very lowest transportation rates, the best market in the world. This of itself will increase and revive our manufacturing industries, and I affirm that there will be such a revival of business under these natural conditions as has never been seen under the eighteen years of the National Policy, and cannot fail to bring about an era of prosperity never known before. Judging from my knowledge of business, I believe the policy of the Government will bring this result about. As the ex-Finance Minister stated, there can be no fooling with business interests. The Government are not fooling with them, but are very carefully handling them. Raw materials have either been reduced in duty or admitted free, and I can tell the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), that agricultural implements will be cheaper when manufacturers derive the full benefit of this policy. When a question is asked, and a Minister does not at once stand up and answer it, hon. gentlemen opposite declare that a reply cannot be made. It is, of course, necessary to wait until the effects of the tariff are felt, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to have patience and wait for a year and see what are the effects of this policy and of the preferential tariff. As regards the preferential tariff, I do not understand the legal points connected with it, and I am not able to argue it from a legal standpoint, but I believe, under the preferential tariff, greater favours are yet to come from Greater Britain to this country that will more than repay all the benefits which British manufacturers will obtain in our markets. More than that, I believe it will transfer from the United States to England an amount of business which will more than counteract the disparity that now exists between the trade of Great Britain and the United States with Canada. A large quantity of manufactured goods has been coming from the United States of late. A few years ago, the largest amount came from Great Britain, but now the largest quantity comes from the United States; and, if this preferential tariff shall bring us closer to our kith and kin in Great Britain and be the means of welding us together as an empire—and this is, after all, what I believe is the greatest fear entertained in the hearts of the Opposition, that a Liberal Government may be able, in spite of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have always declared themselves to be the party of loyalty, to bring about this result—Canada will be esteemed still more highly for its demonstration of loyalty and good-will. To-day, as the hon. the Premier has said,

this preferential tariff of ours is being eulogized from one end of the Empire to the other. That is what is troubling our friends of the Opposition, more than any legal point as to whether it can be carried out, or as to whether it conflicts with favoured-nation treaties or not. However, I suppose that the Opposition is bound to find fault with this Government at all hazards. They have been finding fault from the very beginning. Last session they made a fight about Governor General's warrants, and now they are fighting against this tariff, but their efforts will come to nothing in the end. The tariff will become law, and the result of it will be that business will revive throughout the length and breadth of the land; indeed business has already revived, bank stocks have increased, and the people of Canada are looking with renewed confidence to the welfare and prosperity of their country. Our friends in the Opposition had better recognize first at last, that this tariff is here to stay. The people of the country have already realized that the Liberal party is the party of loyalty, the party of progress, the party of the true National Policy, and the party that can rule Canada in accordance with constitutional and parliamentary practices. But I suppose that the force of habit drives the Opposition into complaining of everything. They remind me of the man who, when going into a church heard the minister give out the first lines of the hymn "Strike the loud resounding lyre," and the man, thinking that the remark was somewhat personal, ducked his head from the force of habit. No matter how good or how perfect any policy proposed by the Government may be, the force of habit leads the Opposition to oppose it. I must say, Sir, in conclusion, that the business interests of this country have been well looked after by the present Government, and while the manufacturers have been treated fairly, the consuming classes throughout the length and breadth of this land have not been forgotten. As a result of this tariff an era of prosperity and contentment has dawned upon Canada.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

#### GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 70) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—Mr. Richardson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I might explain that since last meeting of the committee an agreement has been reached between the parties interested as to the amendment to be substituted for the one

proposed last evening. I, therefore, beg leave to move to add the following section to the Bill:—

The company is hereby empowered to extend the main line of the railway from the point of commencement named in its act of incorporation, to a point on the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, at or near Brandon, as if such last mentioned point had been named in the said Act as the point of commencement of the railway instead of a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, provided that the company shall make and so prosecute the necessary applications to the railway committee of the Privy Council for power to cross the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to effect a junction and interchange of traffic with the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, that the extension and junction hereby authorized may be completed within the time named in this Act for the completion of the next twenty miles of the present chartered line of the said Great North-west Central Railway.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 86) respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

#### AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. BELCOURT moved third reading of Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before that Bill is read the third time, I desire to discuss the nature of it and the proposition it represents. It seems to me that this company, which it is proposed to bring into Canada, is the creature of the Government, and that the circumstances attending its proposed introduction into this country are such as to merit considerable attention. The proposition practically to subsidize this foreign company in connection with a business which has already assumed very great importance in Canada, is interesting at this particular time, because, unless I am altogether wrong in my information, it would be absolutely impossible for such a state of things to happen across the border. None of the citizens of this country, even were the Government of the United States favourably inclined, could hope to enjoy such favours and such aid in the carrying on of a business by Canadian capital in that country as by this Bill it is proposed to concede to this United States corporation. The intention of this company is not merely to execute in the city of Ottawa the contract which it has the good fortune to have been given by the special favour of the Government of this country, but to seek general powers to carry on its business of general engraving, printing and lithographing in all its departments, &c., in Ottawa and elsewhere in Canada. No one objects, of course, to the introduction of

Mr. MACDONNELL (Selkirk).

foreign capital into this country; no one objects to treating in the most generous way capitalists from any part of the world who are ready to embark in enterprises here; but the objection to the proposal before this House—and it seems to me a forcible and serious objection—is that it is proposed to encourage the introduction of this business and this capital into this country at the cost and to the detriment of Canadian capital, Canadian interests and Canadian labour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Does the Bill say that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Bill does not say that, but the Government says that. The Bill represents here the policy of the Government. Without this Bill being adopted, the unfortunate and mistaken policy of the Government could not very well be carried out; and this is an opportunity afforded to the House to consider whether we should act under the circumstances in such a spirit towards this foreign corporation. The circumstances have been already mentioned to the House, but they are to some extent so involved, they cover such an amount of correspondence and so many transactions and incidents, that it is impossible for me, without referring at some length to the correspondence and to the facts that have led up to the introduction of this Bill, to put properly before the House my idea of the mistaken and very detrimental policy the Government have adopted in this matter. We know that the British American Bank Note Company, which we may distinguish as the Burland Company, had heretofore enjoyed the business of this character required by the Government. It is not necessary for me to go into all the facts and figures to show the expenditures that became necessary on the part of that company to put themselves into a position to carry out a contract which had been entered into with them by the Canadian Government. Suffice it for me to say that in addition to their carrying out, and from all the Government say, satisfactorily carrying out a very heavy contract, involving the employment of skilled labour of the highest class, this company, not long ago, by order of the Government, under the terms of the existing contract, had to go to the further expense of erecting a magnificent structure in the city of Ottawa. That in a sense gave them no claims, under the terms of the contract, to special consideration. So far as my recollection of the contract goes, it was one of the original conditions of the bargain that if they were required to go to this extraordinary expense, and to transfer their business from the city of Montreal to the capital of Canada, they were bound to do so. But, knowing as we do the difference between the city of Ottawa and the city of Montreal, so far as a business of this kind is concerned, in re-

lation to private business, there is no comparison between the advantages to be enjoyed in Montreal as opposed to those in Ottawa; and I say that without any disparagement of this wonderfully growing and thriving community. But while under the contract the Burland Company had no right to special consideration, no one acquainted with that phase of the transaction will deny that they were entitled at least to fair-play, and were warranted in relying upon this; that when fresh competition became necessary between them and another firm, whether foreign or domestic, no concessions or favours would be shown by the Government to their competitors which would be denied to them. But I complain that extraordinary concessions were granted to a foreign competitor as against the Canadian company, who had done their work not only satisfactorily but at a constantly diminishing cost to the Government and without any complaint being recorded against them in any particular; and, under the circumstances, it seems to me that we should have even more detailed and exact explanations how it came about that they were not treated, I do not say generously, but in that fair manner which they had every reason to expect. I may be wrong, but I am told that so extensive is this business, in the first place, that the dies, rollers, plates, machinery and plant cost no less than \$400,000, and that it cost the Burland Company some \$50,000 to provide special equipment for the carrying out of this work. Now, the history of the transaction—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman propose to discuss the history of the contract with the American Bank Note Company?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not like to interfere with the line of the hon. gentleman's argument, but this is an application to grant letters of incorporation to a company. I fail to see what the contract in question has to do with the question whether or not Parliament will incorporate this company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not disputing the fact; nor is it ever necessary, in order to obtain the ear of this House, to claim that a Bill proposed to be read a third time, to give corporate rights and privileges to a body of people in this country or to a corporation outside of it, is without the power of Parliament. In this case I admit that the Bill, so far as I have examined it, is within the powers of this Parliament, and that if no reason can be shown why these privileges should not be conferred, wholly outside of the legal difficulties, then, of course, the Bill would be read the third time. But I state, at the outset of my observations, that this Bill is before us simply because this foreign cor-

poration which is now knocking at our doors, has been given by the executive, and not by Parliament, special privileges and favours, and because further favours are contemplated to be given it as against our own Canadian interests and industries. The hon. gentleman knows that this Bill is simply here in connection with the contract for which the Government is responsible. He will be the last man to deny that the subject should receive the fullest possible discussion and consideration, and it is the consideration which I have given it which I desire to put before this House before the Bill is read a third time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has before him the blue-book dealing with the contract. That contract has been the subject of debate, and if the hon. gentleman proposes now to go into the merits or demerits of that contract, I submit that such discussion is quite outside the proposition that this Bill be now read the third time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite appreciate the force of the hon. gentleman's objection. I could imagine, for instance, a member of this House saying, I disapprove altogether of the act of the Government as being contrary to the interests of the country and as granting to a foreign corporation favours of a most suspicious and extraordinary character, but, nevertheless, this is simply a Bill to enable that corporation to do business in Canada, and that has nothing to do with the special privileges granted it. That argument might prevail, but it is only an argument and one opposed to the position I take. I would be, for instance, inclined to vote against granting this additional privilege to this company, in order to mark in the strongest way open to me my disapproval of bringing this subsidized competitor into our own country. And in order to strengthen that position, I cannot do better than refer to the very documents which the Government have placed before us, to show how this thing came about, and I think that a reference to these documents will prove to any impartial mind that the point I have submitted is well founded.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose a question of order has been raised, and I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman who has the floor has the right to adduce before the House any circumstances which he thinks sufficient to influence its judgment and prevent the passage of this Bill; but in doing so, he must be careful not to refer to a previous debate. He can, of course, refer to documents laid on the Table.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been in Parliament sufficiently long to know that is one of the elementary rules of debate, and I have no desire to refer to a previous debate. Nor would it be very be-

coming in me to do so, since I had not the good fortune to be present. But I desire to refer to the documents submitted to the House bearing on this very question, and which are the only information we have regarding this American Bank Note Company, what it was, how it comes before us, and why it is knocking at these doors and asking for these privileges. All that information is in this blue-book, and I can quite understand why the hon. Postmaster General does not desire that the facts contained therein should be continually dwelt upon. I quite understand why he should desire that that part of the consideration should be suppressed—I am not, however, imputing any motives—and I propose to show that the facts which I intend laying before the House—and which, perhaps, have been laid before it before, in my own way are very good reasons why we should mark with the strongest condemnation this whole transaction, from beginning to end. The irregularities in connection with the handling of these tenders, the irregularities and unfairness in the treatment of the old company, the extraordinary favours shown this American corporation, certainly deserve the gravest attention and consideration; and I think the country cannot be reminded too often of the facts as they appear in the official blue-books, before the last stage of the chapter is reached.

In this report of the Deputy Finance Minister (Mr. Courtney) there is evidence which at once puts the old company on the very best footing and furnishes a complete reply to the charge that it was a selfish, greedy combination and monopoly, and deserved the introduction of another competitor. On the 31st August, 1896, Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Finance Minister, reviewed the history of the bank note contract from 1868, giving the various figures and terms under the different contracts, and he concludes by saying :

It will be seen from the above that substantial reductions in the rates charged were effected; on the other hand, the power given by former contracts to the Minister of Finance, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Inland Revenue to make yearly revision of the rates for the supplies to their respective departments, was taken away. The post office and inland revenue rates were made schedules to the contract.

On page 55 of this blue-book, I find from the president of the company the statement—and I do not know that it is denied—in a communication which he addressed to the Minister of Finance :

The British American Bank Note Company was established to retain this work in Canada, large capital was invested by its citizens, and the best of protection was afforded, and for years past, I make bold to say, that the Finance Department and the banks of the Dominion have had the note circulation of the country supplied them at least 30 per cent less than the current rate for such work from New York.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

That is an important feature which appears through a great deal of this correspondence—that this foreign company have given, on the face of the contract, and in their correspondence, figures which seem to be in many senses most deceptive, at first glance, and without the calculation of an actuary, and which give rise to extraordinary suspicion as to the reasons that enabled them, in this connection, to make such an extraordinary departure from the prices which they usually charge.

In order—

Says Mr. Burland—

—In order to prevent such a calamity to the commercial interests of the country and to protect the large capital already invested, we, the British American Bank Note Company, are prepared to accept the terms of the tender submitted by the American Bank Note Company, and thereby preserve, if possible, the bank note business of the Dominion, which has been performed by us for the last thirty-five years in a satisfactory manner.

I refer to that in connection with a statement, which I think is one of importance, and that is that, so far, I am not aware that the Government has announced at any time that there was dissatisfaction in connection with the work done by this company.

Now, an important phase of the subject hinges upon the clause that was in the old (Burland) company's contract. At page 4 of this blue-book, is clause 6 of this contract which provides :

That all possible measures of precaution shall be taken by the company for the protection of the work and the security of the Government in the premises and to ensure the safety of the plates, dies and rolls, and all impressions taken therefrom, and all paper and other material used in connection therewith, whether in a complete or incomplete state, and the Minister of Finance of Canada for the time being may at any time during the continuance of this contract appoint any one or more officers of the Government, or properly qualified persons not in the service of the Government, to examine or supervise the premises occupied by the company, or the work done or being done by them under or by virtue of this agreement, and every facility shall be afforded by the company for any and every such examination or supervision.

The wisdom of that provision must be obvious to those who have looked into this question. The opportunities for counterfeiting, and the extraordinary feats of counterfeiting, a practice it has been found utterly impossible to stamp out, make it most necessary that the Government, in order to protect the currency, to protect the notes of the country, shall have under their immediate supervision the performance of the work from its beginning to its very end. And the old company, in that connection, had to go to very great expense in introducing that expert labour, which, by the way, I find that their competitors, their successful competitors under this Government were wholly ignorant of and which they ventured

to deny in an official communication to the Minister of Finance. It is in connection with that clause in the contract, the necessity for which is evidenced by all the contracts with the Government from the beginning down to the present, that the extraordinary phase of this question becomes apparent. Take, for instance, a few other references in that connection, as given to us in explaining this matter. I turn to page 14 of the blue-book, and, in connection with the "terms and conditions of tenders for engraving, &c., Dominion notes, postal and inland revenue supplies," it seems clear that when the Minister of Finance started the work for new tenders, he recognized what I venture to say the business men of the country recognize, the gravity of that clause and the importance of that condition to the Government. Condition 7 of the specification reads :

All work under the contract—

"All work," Mr. Speaker.

—shall be done at the city of Ottawa, in such building or buildings as are approved of by the Government of Canada, such building or buildings to be fire-proof and to contain all necessary fire-proof vaults to ensure the safety of the work, and the contractor shall not do or permit to be done in such building or buildings any work other than the work under the contract, except the work of engraving and preparing bank notes for the several chartered banks of Canada. No contract shall be entered into with any tenderer until he has satisfied the said Government of Canada that he has, or will have by the time he begins work under the contract, a proper building or buildings in Ottawa in which to carry on the work under the contract.

Clause 15 of the specifications taken in this connection reads :

No plates,—

I have already called attention to the words "All work" in the section I have just read, and this is as if to make it impossible that there shall be any uncertainty. This clause says :

No plates, rolls or dies shall be used in connection with the work to be done under the contract, or any part thereof, unless approved of on behalf of Her Majesty by the Minister at the head of the department by which such work is ordered, and all plates, dies and rolls not so approved of shall be destroyed or dealt with by the contractor in such manner as such Minister shall direct.

Let me just interject here that it is quite clear that such a supervision as is contemplated by the two clauses I have read, cannot be exercised when the dies are in the city of New York, cannot be exercised when the important part of the work is being managed or handled not only outside of the city of Ottawa, but in a foreign country, and beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do not many of the leading banks of Canada get their bank bills printed there ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not dealing with that. The hon. gentleman may use as an argument against me, the contract of some bank, some leading bank. I am saying that the policy of this country, which has obtained from 1867 to 1897, has been to regard it as of the most vital importance to the conditions connected with the making of the bank notes of the Dominion must be such as to allow of additional precautions being taken, precautions not taken elsewhere. But, adverting for a moment to the interruption of the Postmaster General, let me remind him that, whether this was a wise precaution or not, whether it was a precaution taken by the banks of Canada or not, that in no way concerns the point of my argument, because, as I shall develop it, it will be made clear that this, whether an important point or not, was a clause in the specifications, was a clause in all the old contracts, and that every tenderer was led to believe, that as the British American Bank Note Company was bound to believe, that it would be insisted upon to the letter ; and there can be no doubt that that belief affected their calculation as to the figures they should offer for doing the work on these terms. And, Mr. Speaker, there is another clause bearing upon this, clause 16, which reads as follows :—

All plates, dies and rolls specially used in connection with the said work, or any part thereof, and which are paid for by the Government of Canada, shall be reserved for the exclusive use of the said Government of Canada, as well as all plates from which the said work or any part thereof shall be printed, and shall be the property of the said Government, and the contractor shall, on demand, deliver to the Minister of Finance of Canada for the time being, or as he may direct, all said plates, dies and rolls, the contractor holding them after they have been prepared and paid for as aforesaid merely as the bailee of the Government of Canada, and the contractor shall agree that all designs or patterns made for the use of the Government in respect of the Government work shall not be used or duplicated by him for any one but the Government.

In this, also, it is apparent that the Government deem it necessary to take every possible precaution for the purpose I have mentioned ; and I have yet to learn that the Government of any country of importance in the world allows or would for a moment tolerate that a part of the machinery in connection with the manufacture of its notes and bills should be out of the jurisdiction, and, of course, beyond the supervision of the Government. For this clause, as you will see, contemplates that the Government, at a moment's notice—even without a moment's notice—can go into the building of the bank note company and lay its hands upon all the dies, acting in this matter promptly and immediately. That, under conceivable circumstances, is a most important and valuable privilege to be enjoyed by the Government. It is wholly denied them here, it is wholly lost sight of

as the sequence will show. Then there is clause 19 :

The contractor shall take all possible measures of precaution, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance, for the protection of the work and the security of the Government in the premises, and to ensure the safety of the plates, dies and rolls, and all impressions taken therefrom, and all paper and other material used in connection therewith, whether in a complete or incomplete state.

To that clause the observations that I have made in connection with clause 16, equally apply. Now, I have referred to some of the documents in their sequence, not in the order of the paging in this book, but I think that the order in which I am taking these references will make the matter as clear as it possibly can be made from the references before me. That was on page 15. I turn now to page 22 to show the manner in which the possible competitors in the United Kingdom were advised in connection with this contract. They had read these specifications, they understood how the tender contemplated a complete and absolute transference of the whole business, from beginning to end, to the city of Ottawa. They had no reason to expect that any of these clauses would be departed from, and as business men in putting in their tenders, they expected to be fairly and justly dealt with, and they of course would have to be prepared for that clause and the different clauses to which I have referred. On page 22 we find from the High Commissioner's office a letter from Mr. Colmer explaining to the Minister of Finance how this matter was affecting firms in England capable of tendering. He cabled :

Tenders for engraving. Firms point restrictions clause 7 manufacture Canada. Also state tenders impossible without specimens mentioned clause 14.

I now beg to acknowledge your reply of the 7th instant, for which I was much obliged :

"Tenders for engraving. Canada cannot abandon condition requiring manufacture at Ottawa. If responsible parties wish to tender, we will send specimens."

There was a proper tender, and it was maintained consistently with all the tenderers on the part of the Finance Department on the 11th of November, 1896. There was a reference to these conclusions that is easily understood, and there is an answer: You will be held to every clause, every line of the clause, and every letter in the clause; the manufacture at Ottawa, that is all the work, would be insisted upon by the Government. Consequently the English tenderers, or those in a position to tender, were out of the way. Now, there is another reference to this that I wish to advert to. I find, for instance, that Mr. Freeland, representing the United States company, was specially favoured in many things. There is evidence of courtesy, to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

say the least, on the part of the Minister of Finance with Mr. Freeland that is wanting between Mr. Burland and the Minister of Finance. That may have been explained, the reason for it is not apparent on the face of these papers. Mr. Freeland and the Minister of Finance apparently were in verbal communication as well as in immediate correspondence, letters were addressed to him and not to the deputy, although the deputy appears on the scene after Mr. Freeland has secured his concessions. There is in that matter a departure from the rules of departmental correspondence not explained so far as I know. But during all this critical time, all this time when Mr. Freeland was free, and when the Finance Minister was free, there are communications, both verbal and in writing, going on between those two parties. After Mr. Freeland's rights are secured, formal correspondence is carried on by direction with the Deputy Minister of Finance, and as I say all that cordial relation explainable in itself, becomes remarkable when we find it was entirely denied to the fellow-citizens of the Minister of Finance, to the old and faithful contractor. On page 45, the Minister of Finance writes to the representative of Mr. Freeland on the 14th of December, 1896, referring in the first place to a conversation which he had. From another telegram it appears that the Minister of Finance was in New York on the 6th of November, and on the 14th of December, while these matters were still under consideration, the Minister of Finance refers to the conversation and what he understood him to say. Then he goes on, and this is the beginning of the extraordinary actions of the Government in relation to this foreign tender. The Minister of Finance, recognizing, I have no doubt at the time, the importance of the provisions to which I have referred, and that are found in all the contracts on this subject and are contained in the specification, he calls Mr. Freeland's attention in the following manner to the paragraph. First of all, he takes from the tender of the American Bank Note Company a clause that vitiated that tender as a regular tender, destroyed its character as a tender, and in that clause there was a complete and radical departure from the terms of the specifications. So that it cannot be fairly argued that Mr. Burland was brushed aside, or that no correspondence or friendly relations were had with him by way of discussion because his tender was not satisfactory, when we find, as the history will show, that correspondence went on and cordial relations went on with one of the parties who had put in an incomplete and a irregular tender. This is the first friendly advice to this gentleman at a time when the only regular tender in the possession of the Government was from the British North America Bank Note Company :

I desire to call your attention to the following paragraph in your tender :—

"The American Bank Note Company understands, and makes it part of this tender, that it is not required by the specifications hereto attached to manufacture bank-note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of the trade, inks, colours, &c., in the city of Ottawa, but that such supplies necessary to a faithful fulfilment of the contract may be obtained elsewhere.

There can be no doubt about the correctness of my position that this destroyed that document as a tender. The Minister of Finance was of that opinion, so far as this correspondence goes he is of that opinion still, because, as references will show, the future transactions simply ended in a variation of the specimens, a variation and a change of the conditions, and a variation acceptable to the successful tendered; while all that time the Burland Company was denied any of the information that was being given, was not allowed to be privy to any of these negotiations, and never had the slightest reason to assume for a moment that they might have put in a tender such as this. The American Company assume to be entitled to special favours and to receive the special attention of the responsible Minister after sending in such tender. The Minister of Finance, after quoting this paragraph from the tender, said :

I think it would be well for you to offer some explanation of this clause. Our specifications were not intended to prevent the importation of paper, ink, colours, &c., or the ordinary tools of the engraving trade. Nor were they intended to prevent the importation of steel rolls or steel plates, where such rolls or plates are of a plain character, without any engraving impression or other such work.

The only point in which your condition seems to conflict with the terms of our specifications is in respect of the dies. If you attach importance to the making of these outside of the Dominion of Canada, I shall be obliged if you will furnish me with fuller information on the subject.

Mark that. If you, the representatives of a foreign corporation endeavouring to get a foothold in this country and shut out those engaged in this industry, by securing the advantage of a subsidy from Canada, attach importance to the making of these dies elsewhere, then fuller information will be furnished. Again, the Finance Minister said :

Our chief purpose in requiring the work of this contract to be done in Ottawa is, that it may be performed by workmen in an establishment coming immediately under the supervision of this department, with a view to the greatest possible security against loss or fraud. I shall be pleased to receive any information you may be able to furnish as to the circumstances which, in your judgment, require these dies to be made abroad.

I took advantage of an invitation from Mr. Burland to make a complete inspection of his establishment at Ottawa, and the inspection was of a most instructive and interesting character. Nothing could be made

more clear than the opportunities offered for fraud in connection with dies. They are small pieces of material, they can be put in the pocket, and any one connected with the trade is aware of the great opportunity for fraud that will prevail in New York as compared with their manufacture in a building under the shadow of the Parliament buildings here, fraud to which the company might be a party or fraud by any of its servants and against the company. On page 51 there is a further utterance of importance. In the recommendation that the Finance Minister made to the Governor in Council I do not think there was as full and complete information placed before his colleagues as should have been submitted. Any one reading the report of the Minister to the Governor in Council would come to this conclusion, if he read the records of the transaction to which I called particular attention. For instance, it would appear from the memorandum of the Finance Minister that a great concession had been obtained from the American Company. He said :

Correspondence being had with the American Bank Note Company, the company consented to the withdrawal of the stamped envelopes from the contract.

If my information be correct, the company would have been great fools if they had not consented to withdraw that part of the contract. The special plant required would have cost \$6,000, and all the profits would have been \$1,750 for the five years. That estimate may be right or wrong; but this I think is an admitted fact by the trade, that the demand for those stamped envelopes was so small that there was nothing but loss to be contemplated on the part of the company in carrying out that particular part of the bargain. Nevertheless it appears that the Minister of Finance thought he was obtaining a concession from the company. So I hold that the Governor in Council was not fully advised in that particular. The Minister goes on to say :

The company also submitted rates for the stamps in question if required in large quantities, and explanations were made with reference to the condition above quoted which are satisfactory to the undersigned in view of the large saving effected if the offer of the company is accepted.

The undersigned has the honour to recommend, in view of such saving, that he be authorized to accept the tender of the American Bank Note Company, provided that the details of the contract can be arranged with the company to his satisfaction.

It is true the Minister of Finance called attention in this cursory way to the departure from the specification and the irregularity of the tender. He says :

The prices given by the American Bank Note Company for certain of the inland revenue stamps, while small, taking into consideration the quantity required as stated in the schedule to the terms and conditions, would be very great if any large quantity of such stamps should be required,

and the tender of the company also contained the following condition :—

He recites the condition, which I have quoted more than once this evening. He goes on then to say, not that this is a departure at all from the tender, but that correspondence having been had with the American Bank Note Company, they consented to the withdrawal of the stamped envelopes from the contract. No attention was called to the fact that in every contract made by the Government the greatest possible care had been taken and the greatest wisdom shown in having the whole work and business performed under the supervision of the department and in the Dominion of Canada. We find that after correspondence, an indenture was entered into on March 9, 1897. Clause 2 reads :

That the original dies of portraits, vignettes, lathe-work, borders and other patterns or designs, and the matrix dies used in connection with any work under this agreement may be engraved at the establishment of the contractors in the city of New York, in the state of New York, one of the United States of America, which dies, on being so engraved, shall be forthwith taken to the city of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario, in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hour for Private Bills having expired, the Committee of Ways and Means will now resume its sitting.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CLANCY. I did not take part in this debate before because I indulged the hope, as did many hon. members on both sides of the House, that some modifications would be made in the resolutions now before the committee in order that hon. members on both sides might meet on a common ground on so important a question as the one now under discussion. I shall not devote any time to a discussion of the question in its wider sense, as to the effect of the tariff generally, but I shall confine myself entirely to the effects of the resolution now before the House ; but before doing so I shall have to give attention for a few moments to some of the observations made by the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) before recess. The hon. member (Mr. Frost) said that the manufacturers, of course including himself, were entirely satisfied with the new tariff, but I am afraid that the hon. gentleman was speaking entirely for his own case, and with reference to articles exclusively in his own line of manufacture. I am inclined to think that he took some liberties when he undertook to speak for the manufacturers generally of this country, and to say they were all satisfied and had no ground of complaint. I can quite understand that the

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

hon. gentleman himself is satisfied, because I am sure he knows a good thing when he gets it. It will be present to the mind of every hon. gentleman in this House that the class of manufacturing in which he is engaged has received additional protection, and is in a better position than it was before.

Mr. TISDALE. What does he make ?

Mr. CLANCY. He is engaged in the manufacturing of farming implements. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) has had a very substantial addition to his protection, but that increase in his protection was at the expense of the consumers of this country—not exclusively the farmers, but others as well. It will be conceded that by reason of the reduction of duties on iron, there has been a loss of revenue to the extent of about \$200,000, and that must be made up in some way, and paid by the people of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) said further, that there was neither rhyme nor reason in the reduction that was formerly made in the tariff on that class of goods. But that statement conflicts with his argument used on former occasions and repeated to-night, that the National Policy had driven thousands of men out of the country. If the allegations of he and his friends be true, they were driven out because of combines, and combines were said to be encouraged and perpetuated by the system of high protection. I leave the hon. gentleman to settle that question with himself and with his friends. Why, the Liberals are now claiming that there has been a substantial reduction under the new tariff is difficult to understand, but I congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) in knowing that he has been well protected. No doubt he himself is satisfied, but I object to his speaking for any other class. He told us that the agriculturists of the country were fairly dealt with and were satisfied, but the hon. gentleman has no doubt been paying more attention to his own business than the farmers, and he knows more about it than he does about agricultural matters. It is a very easy thing for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) to make a bald statement of that kind, but it is entirely another matter for him to give proof of it.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that, like my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), I am still in the dark as to the meaning of the resolution now before the House, and I shall have to ask for further information. The hon. the First Minister said this afternoon, in a very feeble attempt to throw light upon the question, that the Government were not disposed to answer arguments that had already been answered, and he said further, that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) did not attack the resolution upon its merits, but upon its consequences. Now, Sir, the merits of this resolution must depend upon and be gauged by its conse-

quences, and if it has a bad effect upon the fiscal policy of the country, then the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has a perfect right to point that out to the Government. The power asked by the Government to make treaties and to change the whole fiscal system of Canada at the mere will and wish of the Controller of Customs, is a very serious matter, and is well worthy the careful consideration of this House. When the First Minister was making an attempt at argument this afternoon—and I confess it would be paying it a compliment to say it was an argument—his proposition was, that the Government were not making treaties but were simply carrying out the law, and in support of the course of the Government as set forth in this resolution he quoted the statutory offer of the United States which was in the old tariff Act. Well, Sir, any powers that Parliament may grant to Government of such an extraordinary character as are sought for in this resolution, are opposed to the principles of parliamentary government, whether they be great or small. Of course if it is granted in small matters, the evils are not so far-reaching; but in any case the principle is bad and should be avoided. The First Minister seemed to forget that in the statutory offer which he quoted the articles were limited to those mentioned in the statute, and while the principle might be the same, yet under this resolution now proposed by the Government, the articles are entirely unlimited, and it is possible that great wrong might be inflicted upon Canada. If the hon. the First Minister or the Controller of Customs are willing to rest their case upon the fact that this Parliament has powers of a most limited character beyond which it is impossible to go to the extent of one line or one letter, that they on the other hand are justified in asking Parliament now to grant them powers which are absolutely unlimited. Parliament is asked to give up, not part of its powers, but absolutely every power it possesses into the hands of the Ministry of the day, for the purpose of dealing with this reciprocal tariff. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House and ask them if the cases are parallel, if the consequences are the same, or if they are to be offset one against the other. If hon. gentlemen rest their case on that ground, I think I may be excused if I say that they are destitute of argument.

There is another feature of the question to which I now desire to call the attention of the Controller of Customs, and with regard to which I will ask him a question to which I hope he will do me the honour of giving an answer. I desire to ask him a question, not for the purpose of prolonging this debate, but for the purpose of getting light on what seems to me to be a very important matter. It is true, the hon. the First Minister told us to-day that he thought the time of Ministers might be better occu-

pled than in answering questions and arguments that had already been answered. But I do not think this question has yet been answered, and we had the evidence of one of the hon. gentleman's followers this afternoon that he was still in the dark. The First Minister said this afternoon that the Government had carefully considered the whole question, before placing this resolution on the Table, and had come to the conclusion that it applied to but one country, with the bare possibility of another country being included. Having done that, they placed before the House and the country—what? Why, a resolution intended to open the doors, not to England alone, but to every other country in the world which brought itself within the conditions of the resolution. The hon. Controller of Customs probably from a little heat of temper—I will not say from provocation, because sometimes we feel strongly over matters, not because they are untrue, but because they really contain within them the sting of truth—said the other evening to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster)—and I would like to know now whether he still adheres to the proposition he then laid down, or is now prepared to modify it, and take a different view:

The workmen of this country, to whom he has alluded, and the manufacturers of this country, whose cause he pretends to plead, whom he says we are ruining, will note the fact that so far as that hon. gentleman's words can have any weight on this question when it comes to be argued, all the influence of the ex-Finance Minister of Canada was given to strengthen the hands of those who were trying to gain admission to our markets under the preferential clause. When China and Japan ask for a remission under this clause, should they do so, they will be able to point to the fact that the ex-Finance Minister of Canada, in his place in Parliament, declared they were entitled, under the operation of this tariff, to secure the introduction of their goods under the preferential clause.

If that means anything, it means that the hon. gentleman was shrinking from the consequences of his own resolution. It means that he was first inviting every country in the world, if it changed its tariff to bring it within the meaning of the resolution, to take him at his word, and come in. If they were entitled to come within the terms of the resolution, and if he refused to admit them, he would be doing them an injustice. If the hon. gentleman invited the whole world to come in, let me ask him if it was an improper thing on the part of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) to say to China, "The Government of Canada have made an offer to you, and I think you have a right to come in." Would that be an improper thing on the hon. gentleman's part, or has the hon. gentleman himself come to the conclusion that it would be a dangerous thing if to-morrow he found that China and Japan came within the terms of the

resolution, and could come in? There seems no way out of the difficulty, except to assume that when hon. gentlemen opposite are brought face to face with the consequences of carrying out that resolution, they shrink from those consequences, and are ready to say very unpleasant things against hon. gentlemen who are following precisely in the line the hon. Controller of Customs himself proposed.

There is another question which I wish to ask the hon. gentleman. The resolution has been read often, but the hon. gentleman will permit me to read it once more :

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule D.

Take the case of England. The products of one country may be its growth, or they may be partly its growth and partly its manufacture. These products are exported to England. I will give the hon. Controller of Customs an instance in the class of goods which he is engaged in manufacturing. The hon. gentleman knows that a certain class of biscuits are largely imported from England. The wheat is grown in the United States, the flour is manufactured in the United States, it is exported to England and is there manufactured into biscuits, which are exported to Canada. The hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) this evening said very boastfully that the consequences of a policy of this kind would be that England would be the road by which the products of the United States would reach Canada; they would go from the United States to England in a partly finished condition, and would finally be imported into Canada. Now, England does not produce raw material. England imports raw material, some of it in a raw state, some of it in a greatly advanced stage of manufacture, and I desire to ask whether the meaning of this resolution is that no matter in how advanced a state of manufacture material may be brought into England, it may come into this country under the preferential clause. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer me that question?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). We shall have to be guided by the law—articles of growth, produce or manufacture of the country.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I have pointed to a case in which an article might be the growth of the United States and have been in part manufactured in the United States and then have been sent to England and finished there, and from England sent to Canada.

**Mr. CLANCY.**

Would such a case come within the clause, or does the hon. gentleman intend to place any limit? The reason I ask is this: Goods may be made in part in Germany, and England may be made the back-door through which the manufactures of Germany and France and every other country may be sent to Canada. Business men will be shrewd enough to take advantage of a clause open to a construction of that kind, and the consequence will be that any country in the world may send its goods to England in an advanced stage of manufacture, have them finished in England, and stamped as English goods, and then send them into Canada at the reduced rate. I ask the hon. Minister again if he proposes to put any limit to meet such cases?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** Regulations will have to be made under which these goods will be imported, and the exporter will have to conform to those regulations. The hon. gentleman is supposing a case. He thinks the goods will be partly manufactured in the United States and then completed in England and stamped in England and then shipped to Canada. I do not expect that at all, nor do I think the hon. gentleman expects it.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I will leave out the trade mark, if the hon. gentleman puts any stress upon that. The question is simple enough. Will Belgium and Germany and France be free to have their goods finished in England and then admitted into Canada on the same terms as English goods? The hon. gentleman must see what a strong incentive there will be for foreign manufacturers to adopt that expedient, and I ask him, in all fairness, whether he thinks regulations can be made to meet it. If the resolution simply said, "goods the growth of the country," one could understand it; or if the resolution drew the line at such goods as were brought into England and manufactured there, one could understand that. But when it may include all the stages of manufacture and when the last stage might simply be a little lever to bring the goods within the clause, then the case is surrounded with a great deal of difficulty. But there is another difficulty. I fear the hon. gentleman's regulations will not be sufficient.

**Mr. FOSTER.** He cannot make any regulations that the law does not authorize.

**Mr. CLANCY.** No, that reminds me that the hon. gentleman has not asked power to make regulations, and the resolutions are bound, if applied, to give rise to many serious difficulties. Now, I desire to ask the hon. gentleman's attention to another phase of the case. Suppose China and Japan were to ask for admission under this clause, they would be able to point out that the goods imported by Canada from these countries were charged at a higher average rate than those which these countries imported from Canada, and what reply would the hon. gen-

tleman have to make. Now, we are not making the exchange of similar kinds of goods. It would not be at all a difficult matter if we were making the exchange of similar kinds of goods, as was proposed by the statutory offer to the United States, but the difficulty is that we are exchanging our goods for goods that are entirely dissimilar and not produced in Canada, as a rule, and what are we to consider? The hon. gentleman says we are to consider their tariff as a whole. But we are not concerned with the tariff of China or Belgium or France or Germany affecting classes of goods not produced in Canada. We are not concerned, for instance, in the manufacture or the growth of silks, and when the hon. gentleman uses the words "on the whole," I take it he means the whole of the goods exported from Canada to the particular country in question and to the whole of the goods imported from that country into Canada, and that he is bound to see whether the duties are uniformly the same or whether the one tariff is, on the whole, as low as the other. If the hon. gentleman takes that view, China and Japan will clearly come in, because no doubt the duties imposed by China and Japan are very much lower than those imposed by us. But so far we have no explanation beyond the broad statement "upon the whole." Three-fourths, perhaps nine-tenths, of the tariff of Japan and China, does not concern us in the least. What do we export? Probably half a dozen classes of goods. Our exports are largely confined to the mines, fisheries, agriculture and the forests, and beyond these we are not greatly concerned about the tariff of any country. We export lumber and flour and so on, so that we have not had, up to this moment, an explanation of what the hon. gentleman means by the words, "on the whole." We do not know whether he means the whole tariff of any country or that part of the tariff which embraces the goods exported by Canada and the goods imported from the country applying the rates that are charged on both sides. The committee are yet in the dark as to that, and the country must be in the dark, except for the broad statement that hon. gentlemen opposite have made with regard to it.

There is just one other point I wish to refer to. It has already been referred to by other speakers, but I think it cannot be emphasized too strongly. If there is anything the business men of this country desire—and I don't care what their calling in life may be—if there is anything needed more than another for the prosperity and advancement of the country, it is that the people may have some security in the fiscal policy, that there may be some permanency, so that capital may not be discouraged. It is therefore most undesirable that there should be any power for change of our fiscal policy other than the power which necessarily ex-

ists in Parliament to change from time to time. But, under this resolution our fiscal policy may be changed by hon. gentlemen opposite exercising the powers which they are now asking from Parliament. But, more than that, it may be that our whole condition will be changed through the action of other countries, under the proposals that are made by the Government. Suppose that half a dozen countries at once lower their tariff and thus become entitled to come in under this preferential clause, what would be the consequence to our business men? The consequence would be that our whole business industries in Canada would be imperilled, and that by changes of tariff policy in foreign countries against which we would have given up our right to protect ourselves. I have no difficulty whatever in voting against the resolution before this House. We on this side cannot hope to convince hon. gentlemen opposite. When these hon. gentlemen wilfully close their eyes and their ears it is not easy for us to make them see or hear. But there is a court to which we must appeal later on, and we are willing to abide that time. But, while we feel that we are being strengthened before the people by this extraordinary action of the Government, I am sure we shall be glad, for the sake of the country, to have the Government retrace its steps. But we know what courage is necessary for a man of a party to admit that he or it has made a mistake. If hon. gentlemen opposite feel that it is too late now that they are committed to their policy and must go on with it, we can well afford to wait for the verdict of the people, who will decide with rectitude and sound judgment and with an appreciation of their own public interest. Hon. gentlemen must face a larger division, in which members cannot be whipped into line, as we have seen the majority whipped into line, in this House, and the result, I believe, will be to administer a deserved and sound rebuke not only to the Government for asking such dangerous powers, but to the majority behind them for giving them such power. We find a majority composed of men calling themselves Liberals giving these extraordinary powers to the executive for the first time not only in the history of this Parliament, but in the history of parliamentary institutions under British rule. Hon. gentlemen opposite must go back to the people and say: We did not care if we violated principle; we were quite willing to trust to the honesty and judgment of our leaders and thought that instead of sitting in Parliament and keeping control of legislation, even in so serious a matter as the fiscal policy of Canada, we preferred to hand it over to the executive. I have put this point particularly to these gentlemen calling themselves independent members. I see here the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). He is a farmer like myself, and, no doubt, deeply interested in the class to

which we both belong. I ask him, as an independent member of this House, whether, before coming to this Parliament, before becoming enslaved with his present associations, he would have proposed to the people such a proceeding as this. He finds it difficult, no doubt, to assert its independence; he may be told that he can get more out of supporting the Government—I do not say that such a proposition was made, but I am sure he will agree with me that the associations of everyday life, the attempts of friends to reason with him against his reason, tend to overcome a man. I believe, however, he will give an honest judgment; and I would like to ask him, as an independent member of the House, if he thinks that in this session of the first Parliament he ever sat in he should commit himself to a new rule of such an extraordinary character as that which is proposed by the Government. This must appear a most extraordinary thing even to the most ardent member of this House, a most extraordinary thing for any gentleman to commit himself to, however strong may be his party associations. If there is one thing for which the people have struggled harder than for any others, it is for the assertion of their own independence against the executive power. There was a time when there was a struggle between the people and the Crown because the Crown controlled the executive power. We never had parliamentary freedom until we struck off one after another the shackles from the people of this country. Why, Sir, give a party power, and they will always use it. Hon. gentlemen may now be prepared to ask any power from their followers. If this resolution is passed the Government would be perfectly consistent in saying: Give us power to carry on the affairs of this country for the next five years, and you gentlemen go home. I think one is almost as consistent as the other, in practice one principle is quite as sound as the other. I hope yet that hon. gentlemen opposite will modify this resolution and not ask Parliament to assent to it in its present shape. No party advantage can be weighed against it. I am not going to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with any desire to injure the country; but we owe a greater duty to our country than to our party. I still hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will insist upon their leaders withdrawing this proposition so extraordinary in itself, so unheard of in Canada, and I hope it will be unheard of in the future.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to say a few words on this matter, and would have done so sooner were it not that my natural diffidence restrained me. But I feel it my duty to say something, although I am only able to do so in a very imperfect manner. I wish that the duty of discussing this question from a farmer's standpoint had fallen upon some one more able and with greater parliamentary experience. I am proud to say

Mr. CLANCY.

that I represent in my feeble way the agriculturists of this country; I am glad to say that I belong to the Patrons of Industry whose principles are embodied in the planks of the platform which have been read in this House, and which over 200,000 farmers of this country have subscribed to. No other movement was ever started in this country that took such a hold upon the farmers as the organization known as the Patrons of Industry, and the platform which was submitted to them. It is true also that the party press on both sides of politics left the organization alone, or did not criticise it severely; in fact they hardly ever alluded to it. It took them by surprise, so to speak, and the party politicians seldom assailed the principles laid down in that platform. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Clancy) asked me some question about the stand I was taking in this matter. Well, Sir, one of the planks in our platform is reciprocal trade on fair and equal terms between Canada and the world. That is the ninth plank of the platform. That was put before the farmers of this country, and they accepted it with hardly a dissenting voice. I think the hon. gentleman himself subscribed to that platform; though I may be wrong. I represent the county of Frontenac, which was at one time as strong a Conservative county as there was in the whole province. It has been represented by Conservatives for years. The Patron organization started in my county, and it came into my neighbourhood, in fact, by my solicitation. In my neighbourhood we had always been strong Conservatives, and when the platform was laid before our meeting one of the strongest Conservatives in the county read over the platform and said: Yes, that is a good thing, that is right. The chairman of the Conservative Association in my county asked me one day about the Patrons; I gave him a little history of the matter and showed him the platform. He read it over and said: It is a good thing, the best thing that ever came into our country, and I will help it along all I can. The farmers know what is best for this country, and what is best in their own interests, and it is only party bigotry and party strife that prevent them from voting in favour of their own interests. There is no class of the community who are as true patriots as the farmers. When the National Policy was inaugurated, times were dull and business was at a low ebb; and the farmers, being loyal to their country, accepted the National Policy for a time and were willing to give it a fair trial. I myself subscribed to it, stood by it, and fought for it, hoping that good results would come from it. But we never supposed that the National Policy was going to be maintained for so long a time, we supposed it was established to give our manufacturing industries a foothold, and so we stood by it for seventeen or eighteen years, and gave it a fair trial. I, like

many other farmers, looked into the matter and found that we were not realizing from it the results that we expected, and naturally we dropped it. I did not wait until the last minute to break away from it, but I told my Conservative friends, when we met in convention, that the National Policy was not producing the good we expected from it, that our interests were not considered as they should have been in framing the National Policy in the first place, and that it had had its day, and we must now have something better in the interests of the farmer, that in fact we must look out for number 1. Now I may ask: What has the National Policy done for the farmers? We have been told that it has done great things for us. Well, I fail to see it in any way. For a little while it did good for the manufacturing industries, it helped to give them a foothold in this country, and we farmers, in a loyal and patriotic spirit, supported it on that ground. But the time came when we wanted a change. We know from sad experience that the agricultural interests of Canada are in a depressed condition. I have been looking over the statistics for Ontario for 1895, and I see there are about ninety loan companies registered, who have made returns to the Ontario Government. I am sorry we have not similar returns from the other provinces, no doubt they would show a still worse state of affairs. These ninety loan companies have over \$100,000,000 on mortgages in Ontario alone, and private parties, it is said, hold twice as much. Over 6,000,000 of mortgaged lands for sale, over 2,000,000 on which compulsory proceedings have been taken. I am sorry to have to say this; I would rather these facts should be kept out of the press, for I dislike to raise the cry of blue ruin. But these facts are plain to all who desire to know them. But that is not the worst of it. We find that there are over \$11,000,000 held on chattel mortgages in Ontario alone, and over half the number is on the farmers. Every one knows that when a man is obliged to mortgage his chattels, he is reduced to pretty low ebb. Not all the farmers are in that condition, I am pleased to say. I will give you a few cases by counties, counties, I am surprised to find, which still send Conservatives to represent them in Parliament. The county of Northumberland and Durham has 557 chattel mortgages, amounting to \$212,358. Simcoe has 724 chattel mortgages, amounting to \$263,660. Grey, Norfolk, Kent have over 200,000. Is it any wonder the farmers cry out for a change.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman anxious to spread over the country chattel mortgages of the farmers?

Mr. ROGERS. I am sorry this should be done. When, however, we ask for freer trade relations we cannot shut our eyes to all the facts, and yet I do not like to cry,

"blue ruin." We must look at matters in their proper light. We all know how the value of land has decreased, and that there must be some cause for it. We do not think this preferential trade arrangement is just what it should be; we feel that the tariff changes are not what we wish, what we ask for and what we hope for; but we feel there is something in the preferential clause for the farmers. Throughout the whole of this discussion it has struck me forcibly that the agricultural interest has hardly been mentioned, that all attention has been given to the manufacturing and commercial interests, as if this country depended on them alone. What a mite they are in comparison with the farming interest. Are not our farmers the great manufacturers? What is the value of manufactured exports? Only eight or nine millions, and part of which is product, hides, grain, woollen, &c. The farmers who, I say, are the real manufacturers, export products to the value of sixty millions. I have not a word to say against the labouring men or the manufacturer, but I feel for myself and for my brother farmers. Even if we obtain special legislation for the farmers, cannot we truly say what cannot be said for any other class that when we prosper all the other classes must and do prosper. It is no use trying to fight against nature—the agriculturist must take first place in this country. If we made this a cheap country to live in, if we filled it up with a few millions more people, then we might look after manufacturing interests. It is not easy to make this a great manufacturing country when there are only five millions of consumers. These manufactures cannot have any material effect on the market. I should like any hon. member to show me how manufactures confer advantage to any extent by increasing the price on our home market. Our wheat, oats, barley, cheese, butter and other agricultural products are regulated as to price by the prices prevailing in other countries. As regards corn, I have of late become a convert to free corn, but to hold it as a whip over the heads of the Americans and let them, in return do something for us in barley, hay, &c., although I believe on the whole it would be better for our farmers to obtain cheaper feed of any kind, because the farmers of this country, especially in Ontario, cannot make money growing grain to sell but must feed more. When the Government brought in their policy of free corn, who asked them to do it? The farmers having been asking for this concession for years, and we cannot blame the Government for acceding to this request. But, I repeat, that I should like them to hold it in hand to make the Americans come to time; they may not think it best to do so, but that is my opinion of the matter. Now, who is the true labouring man? It is the farmer, who is assisted by his wife and family. They are

the true toilers, but they have never had that consideration which they deserve. It is often said that there is no work for the poor man, that there are so many men out of employment. Did any one ever hear of a farmer saying there was no work to be done on his farm? It is an acknowledged fact that farming does not pay unless a man has help within his own family, for he cannot afford to pay help. But it is never said that there is no work for the farmer. When it is necessary for the rising generation from nine or ten years of age to work from daylight to dark it is rather a poor state of affairs, and agricultural interests cannot be truly prospering so long as that is the case. Men have often said to me that they could make higher wages in other callings. I know that to be the case, and have told them to take the higher wages when they could get them; but, at the same time I have felt that there was something radically wrong when I could not pay them equal wages. The National Policy kept wages high as regards mechanics and labourers in towns and cities, and farmers could not pay such high wages, and very few men were employed for that reason. It is said that the manufacturer has to compete with the cheap labour of foreign countries as regards all manufactured articles. Have not the farmers to compete with the cheap labour of India, the Argentine Republic and other countries with their manufactured articles. A man who has invested \$20,000 in farm property has to be the leader of his men and has to work early and late to keep that capital. It will be no disadvantage to the farmers if they are able to buy goods a little cheaper, for there are a million and a half of them, and they have to compete with all other foreign countries. This question has been somewhat overlooked in the past, and I have felt indignant since I came to this House that so little has been said of the farming interests and so little consideration given them. All the discussion has been respecting the welfare of our manufacturing industries. They should be able to stand with 15, 20, or 25 per cent duties, which I say is still in some instances too high, and they should be able to live with less duties. So, I say, it is quite proper if we can get manufactured goods at reduced rates because the farmers constitute the great majority of the people. We should be considered, and we are not considered. The whole life of this country depends upon the farming community, and it is they who have made Canada what it is to-day. Suppose for an instant that the farmers were to hold up their hands and not work for six months, why, the prosperity of Canada would flatten out like a pancake. But in past years the Government has been grinding down the farmers, making it a dearer country to live in, and making it harder for the farmer and his family to

Mr. ROGERS.

eke out an existence. I am sorry to say that there are not more members in this House who have a fellow feeling with the toiling masses of Canada, and who know their wants; if there were more gentlemen of that description, there would be quite a different story to tell in Canada to-day. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) referred to the Germans as being an economical prudent and cheap living people. That may be all true, but I wonder if there are in the world to-day, a more intelligent and frugal people than are our Canadian farmers. Why, if they were not, bad as their lot is, it would be much worse to-day. We have to compete with cheap labour and with foreign markets, and our living expenses have necessarily to be cut down. It is true that our exports have increased during the last seven or eight years, but it was not the National Policy that did that. It was the fact that we worked harder, worked longer hours, and to some extent improved our style of farming to suit the foreign market to get the wherewithal to meet our increased demands. If the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) were in his seat to-night, I would have referred to the very unpleasant remarks which he made, and which I suppose if I characterized as ungentlemanly, I would be ruled out of order as I was before. I will defer my references to him until he is in the House. I have received letters from different parts of the country resenting the manner in which the Patron representatives have been spoken of here by certain gentlemen. The farmers of the country resent such language and they feel it as strongly as if the slur had been cast upon themselves. These attacks on the farmers' representatives will come home to roost on the men who made them. I regret that the honourable profession of the law should have in its ranks men who would use such language towards the farmers of this country. I am sorry that an Ontario member used the language, for it is in strong contrast with the courtesy of language and demeanour of hon. gentlemen who come from the provinces by the sea. I may say also that our late representative from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) would not stoop to use the language which has been used here. So far as I am myself concerned, I care nothing, for it falls on me like water on a duck's back, but the farmers of this country will resent the sneering manner in which they have been referred to. I cannot argue as to the legal point of this resolution which the House is discussing, but I do believe there is some good in the resolution, and I am willing to give it a fair trial. I know, at all events, that it will not make our condition any worse than it is now. The farmers of this country need have no fear because they will be able to buy English goods or any other at a lower price than at present, and our object

is, and the necessities of our condition compels us, to buy as cheap as we can and to sell as dear as possible.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is here now.

Mr. ROGERS. He came in in the wrong time, and I am very sorry he was not here a few minutes ago, but I will refer to him again.

Mr. BENNETT. I very much regret that I was not in the Chamber sooner, so that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) might have done himself the honour of pouring out some of his vials of wrath on my devoted head.

Mr. ROGERS. I would not think it worth my while.

Mr. BENNETT. I have only to say, that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) has anything to state in reference to myself, he has the opportunity of doing so at any time. Had it not been for the nature of his remarks the other night, I would not have made the pointed reference to him that I did, but as regards what I did say, I have nothing whatever to take back. I saw standing in the corridor a trunk with the hon. gentleman's name painted on it, and I have been assured by several hon. gentlemen that they also saw it. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) has taken the trunk or not, I do not know, and much less do I care. I regret, however, that the hon. gentleman is under instructions to sit down to-night.

Mr. ROGERS. Wait until you sit down.

Mr. BENNETT. My remarks were not directed against the Patron order. Nothing of the kind. My remarks were simply directed against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) and those associated with him in this House, and if it is not the opinion of the Patrons throughout the country that they are a lot of humbugs—I hope that is a parliamentary term—then I cannot interpret rightly the expressions which I have heard from Patron sources. Now, Sir, I do not propose to say anything further about the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers), but if at any time he wishes to throw anything across the floor of this House at me, although I may not be able to retaliate in kind, because my goods are not of such a trivial character as the hon. gentleman's, perhaps I may nevertheless be able to give him a Roland for his Oliver.

Now, Sir, in continuing the debate on this question, I feel that it is of vast importance to the country as a whole. It is true, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has stated that hon. gentlemen in the Government seem to attach but little importance to the resolution before us, but it must be patent to them that the whole of the business of Canada is deeply agitated by this proposed measure of the Government. I must confess I am disappointed in the

measure. At the first, when it was introduced, I assumed, and did honestly think, that it was only done in a spirit of bravado, and that when the hon. gentlemen became satisfied, as they are now apparently, that their position was not tenable, the resolution with regard to preferential trade would be withdrawn, the matter would go no further, and no harm would be done. But the hon. gentlemen have admitted frankly, by the introduction of subsection "B," that they do anticipate that the resolution is open to all who come within the terms of the treaties of some thirty years ago, and, as a consequence, if the Act ever does go into force, it will not be restricted to Great Britain, but will be extended to all those countries that come within the terms of those treaties. I listened the other night to the laboured argument of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who at one moment appeared to convince himself that the tariff was a British preferential tariff, and then, in the next breath, that it was open to the whole world—putting up one man of straw after another, and then knocking them down. It has been patent to the House and the country that the legal gentlemen on the Government side of the House have not put themselves on record on this question, knowing that the day must arrive when it will have to be decided, and they are fearful to place on record opinions which afterwards will have to go by the board, as that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to go as a legal opinion.

But I rose for the purpose of making some reference to a matter which concerns the riding I represent to a great extent; that is, the policy of this Government with regard to lumber. There was a time in the history of this country, within the last ten years, when the lumber question was a most perplexing one, by reason of the fact that the American Government had given a broad and comprehensive measure of trade in lumber between this country and the United States. However, since the American Government have announced that their policy is not as it was some years ago, but propose to place an import duty of \$2 a thousand on lumber, it behooves the Canadian Government to take some steps by way of retaliation to endeavour to balance matters between this country and the United States in that respect. At the outset I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that to-day there are being imported into the western parts of Ontario from the United States millions of feet of lumber, from Saginaw, Bay City, and other points on Lake Huron, while it is a matter of regret that the Canadian trade will be forced, if the Dingley Bill goes into effect, to pay \$2 a thousand on all the lumber passing from this country into the United States. But it is to be remembered that Canada holds the vantage point to-day in dealing with the American Government, in having the power

to impose an export duty. There was a time when the state of Michigan was practically one vast forest, and afforded an unlimited amount of white pine lumber for the United States market. But that day has gone by, and for the last ten years from 250 to 400 million feet of pine logs per year have passed from Canada to the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will probably dispute that statement, though I think he will admit that the quantity exported to the United States has been as high as 275 million feet in a single year. There is this difficulty at arriving at the proper quantity, that as no export duties were charged on white pine logs going out of this country, no close watch was kept upon them; but any hon. gentleman observing the customs ports on the shores of the Georgian Bay, will find that in nearly every case the quantity of logs entered as being towed over by any of the different tugs is uniformly the same, whereas, as a matter of fact, many of these tugs have a towing capacity three or four times as great as the smaller ones. It is also notorious, as the records of the Customs Department will prove, that the people exporting these logs have been caught from time to time in the act of making wrong returns, and, therefore, there is no proper means of arriving at the true quantity exported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I wish to call attention to the fact that my hon. friend is not speaking to the resolution before the House. The question is on resolution 16, the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to discussing resolution 16, which is the reciprocal tariff question.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very wide clause—"that when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada." Lumber is one of the products of Canada, and my hon. friend is framing an argument in regard to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman is making an argument, not concerning the clause in question, but concerning protection or the National Policy. I think he should confine himself as much as possible to the discussion of the item itself.

Mr. WILSON. Was not this reservation made when the resolutions were allowed to go through, that we could discuss them in committee?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not on this clause.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought that was understood between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. WILSON. I understood the leader of the Opposition to say that he had made that kind of an arrangement with the leader of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. What arrangement?

Mr. WILSON. That we might discuss the whole question on the resolutions, with the same liberty as if the Speaker were in the Chair.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the Speaker were in the Chair, we should not have this privilege now. My hon. friend is mistaken; he has not properly understood the agreement.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the agreement?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know of any agreement at all.

Mr. HUGHES. The agreement was made across the House, that the resolutions should be allowed to go through, and that in committee there would be great latitude allowed in debating these items.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is quite in error. There was no such agreement as that. There is no doubt that in the general discussion there should be some latitude, but if you take the items up clause by clause, you can never get through the business if you have a general discussion on each of them.

Mr. BENNETT. If you decide, Mr. Chairman, accordingly, I shall have to reserve my remarks on lumber until the lumber schedule is reached. Therefore, I must go back to the subject that is worn almost threadbare, and, at the risk of provoking some of the legal gentlemen on the other side of the House to give their legal opinions, I must deal with the question of the preferential tariff from the legal point of view. It was argued the other night by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with a great deal of force, that the resolution now before us is strictly within the rights of the Parliament of Canada to pass, and the first position he took was that what is known as the German Zollverein treaty was not binding on Canada. It is true that the hon. gentleman was rather rash because after he had quoted his opinion and given his views, he was rather withered by the argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) to which no hon. gentleman on that side has had the temerity up to the present to reply. Even when the first Minister himself this afternoon discussed the matter, not a word did he utter in answer to the argument adduced by the hon. member for Halifax. It is true that the wealth of opinion is on the one side at the present time. After the Australian conference was held here and correspondence was had with the Imperial

Government, there was a consensus of opinion that there was no right on the part of Canada to make a preferential treaty of which Great Britain alone should have the benefit, there was an acquiescence on both sides of this House in that particular, and until the introduction of this Bill, no word was heard in support of such a contention. The fact that no hon. gentleman opposite has seen fit to give his legal endorsement of the views taken by the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) is of itself evidence that hon. gentlemen opposite are not at all strong in their position, and if they have felt at any time stronger in their position, they have certainly admitted most frankly, by the insertion of clause "B," that the ground they first took has slid from under their feet and they have now substituted this clause :

That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

So that the ground which these hon. gentlemen took at the outset that the treaty was a preferential treaty with Great Britain alone has altogether passed away from view, and now they frankly admit, by the insertion of clause "B," that the anticipated instructions from the home Government which will force them to grant to all these other countries the preference that they at first said they were granting to Great Britain alone.

Mr. FOSTER. When the arrangement with regard to this debate was mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), I thought that my memory did not serve me wrong. There was an arrangement come to, which it will be found on page 1684 of "Hansard:"

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I move the first resolution pro forma, and without any intention of keeping the House longer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With that understanding, I now move that the committee do rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the Prime Minister to adopt the usual course under those circumstances, of allowing the same latitude of discussion of the resolutions in committee as there would be on the general question. A number of hon. gentlemen who were anxious to speak, have deferred their remarks in order to let the House go into committee to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That has always been understood.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would be sorry to go back on any understanding come to, but I submit to my hon. friend that I understood that when we went into committee that a general discussion would take place, and that that should limit the discussion. But if on every particular clause we go back to the general discussion, we will never finish. We are now at the sixteenth clause and there are 400 alto-

gether. Does my hon. friend expect that on every item there will be a general discussion?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot fix a limit to the agreement he made without limits, and besides that has been the rule in tariff discussions. You may try to limit discussion as much as you like, but the House will only give up when they have said all they want to say on the tariff. When the hon. leader of the Opposition asked my hon. friend to adopt the usual course of allowing the same latitude of discussion of the resolutions in committee as would be allowed on the general question, my hon. friend replied: "That has always been understood."

The PRIME MINISTER. I always understood it, certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. leader of the Government has misstated the agreement. The agreement was that on any item of the tariff there may be a general discussion, but the way the Prime Minister puts it is that on every item of the tariff there should be a general discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say "should." I understood the agreement to be that when we resumed in committee, the general discussion should go on, with the same range as if the debate were being re-opened and the Speaker in the Chair; but I did not understand that after we had passed sixteen items, a general discussion still might be had on every additional item until the 400 were exhausted. We are now on the sixteenth resolution regarding the reciprocal tariff, and the discussion so far has been confined to this question, but now at the eleventh hour an attempt is made to make the discussion general. I would be the last man to attempt to curtail the privileges of any member, but I submit, in all fairness, that if every resolution is to be opened to a general discussion, the debate will be endless.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has said just sufficient to make the position of my hon. friend perfectly sound. The hon. gentleman said he had given his consent to have a general freedom of discussion but he supposed that was to take place on one resolution and not on more. On what resolution has any general discussion taken place?

The PRIME MINISTER. When we went into committee.

Mr. FOSTER. No, that was merely a pro forma resolution, and no member of the committee took part in any general discussion until we came to clause 15. The clause we are on is the only one on which there is any desire for general discussion, and let the general discussion, consented to, have its way on this clause.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the hon. Premier's attention to the fact that he is not dealing fairly with hon. gentlemen on this side. If he wanted to raise an objection, he should have raised it earlier when the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) was travelling from Genesis to Exodus, and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) travelled all the way from Genesis to Revelations.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was not in the House at the time when these hon. gentlemen took such a wide circuit. If my hon. friend understood, when we came to an agreement, that on every resolution of the tariff the privilege should be given of a general debate, I must say that if I had so understood the agreement I would have objected to it. If, as is very often the case, one resolution was reserved upon which to have a general discussion, that is the way I understood it, and that is the way I want it carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. Take this resolution you have now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do you want to have the general debate on this resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Even take the limitation laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), take the restricted meaning he attaches to this, and we see that he means that there should be freedom of discussion upon one resolution. There is no resolution we have reached yet that one would be justified in starting a general discussion upon. We have not strained the discussion upon this resolution. An amendment was moved; and other amendments will be moved. We are still on this clause, and I think the hon. gentleman should not try to cut off the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not wish to seek an unfair advantage. If hon. gentlemen wish to have the general discussion, which, it was admitted should take place, upon this item, I would not object.

Mr. WALLACE. I would object to having a general discussion restricted to this particular resolution. You must have an opportunity for a general discussion as the items call for. One item in the tariff is so closely connected with many other items, that you cannot confine yourself to the discussion of one item.

Mr. FOSTER. These are simply the resolutions.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Prime Minister says there are 400 items in the tariff and you could not have a discussion upon each one.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the interpretation I put upon it.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it should be left to the good sense of the House. I do not think anybody wants to talk for talk's sake except our friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), who has recited the Postmaster General's campaign speech. I think the tendency of the House has been to confine the discussion to the real business before it. But the Prime Minister must recognize that he is in the hands of the House; because, when we are in committee, if we wished, we could move that the committee rise and then discuss many matters upon that motion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I believe there are precedents for that course.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hardly know what stage we have arrived at, but I submit that, apart from the legal phase of the question, there is a great deal to be said upon this question as a whole; and, after I have dealt with one or two matters in the speech of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), then, perhaps, even apart from the lumber industry, there may be matters which I may feel it my duty to discuss.

The next ground I understood the hon. gentleman was to take was that the treaty made by Great Britain was not binding inasmuch as it was made prior to the confederation of the provinces. However, that was so completely disposed of by the little said in favour of it by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the much said against it by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) that nothing further need be said. The third ground was that, the treaty did not bind Canada by reason of the fact that, there had never been any legislation passed in Canada acquiescing or assenting to it. That also went down with the other dead ducks that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries set up. So, I am quite of opinion that the gentlemen of the legal profession on the other side of the House saw that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries' position was not sufficiently strong for them to attempt to back him up, notwithstanding that there are among them lawyers of very great eminence, with whose names the daily press toys in connection with the vacancies or expected vacancies with the Superior Courts of the several provinces. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the only gentleman who took the legal side; no other lawyer on that side has seen fit to stand up and endorse the position taken by him. Even the hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) did not breathe fire on this subject. He may feel that he is here in a glass house, as you may say. He stands here under peculiar circumstances. On the Remedial Bill he has given a pledge which he says he is willing to act upon when that is demanded, and perhaps, he does not feel justified in wading into deep water and giving a legal

opinion, which may, as I fear it would, rise up in judgment against him. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not a prospective judge. I believe he cares more for the larger arena of politics. Anything he may say will not prejudice his standing or his claims for the ermine. It was argued here that this was simply an offer of preference to Great Britain, and the hon. gentleman's press all over the country took the cue from the announcement of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on this point. It was never dreamed by hon. gentlemen opposite that this would extend to the world as a whole. I believe the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) is not far from the truth when he divines the fact that the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was the gentleman who framed this whole project, and that he had an ulterior view in mind, and that was that when the whole question came out to be threshed out on its merits, when it came to be viewed on its legal standpoint, the ground would have to be shifted, and the hon. gentlemen would find themselves in exactly the same position as they find themselves to-day. Acquiescing, by the introduction of this clause, in the idea that the preference is not to Great Britain, hon. gentlemen opposite can hardly deny that it throws markets open at low rates of duty to nearly the whole world. It cannot be denied that when some days ago, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke after the tariff was announced he spoke in an exultant strain and referred to the fact that perhaps it would not be a bad thing for Canada if under this very treaty which has been made by Great Britain, German goods and goods of other continental countries should be brought in, and the hon. gentleman seemed to think that this would be the legal interpretation of the treaty. And, always going back to his old love—because he had always favoured reciprocity with the United States—he pointed out that, while there might be reason at the present time why the United States would not come in under this preferential policy, it was not outside the bounds of possibility that some time the United States might come in. To-day the position is admitted. Nobody pretends that Great Britain alone has the preference under this policy. And so we are brought face to face with the fact that the industries created in this country under the protective tariff must submit to the competition of the countries of the old world, and that means that the artisan of Canada may no longer expect the fair rate of wages he has been accustomed to in the past. His labour must not be brought down to the same price as that of a labourer of Belgium and Germany. I have seen it stated, and I believe the authority was a good one—the statement was in a speech by President Mc-

Kinley when he introduced his famous McKinley Bill as reported in the Congressional Record, that the wages of a Belgian were only about half that of an American citizen, those of the German were about the same, and that those of the British citizen were much lower than those of the American citizen. So it may be fairly argued that these would compare proportionately with the wages that are paid in Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman a short month ago announced a tariff policy for this country. After eighteen years of telling the people that they knew exactly what the country wanted, what did they do? When they came into power last year, after all their professions, they took nearly a year to look about what tariff changes the country wanted. Well, Sir, they were not satisfied with that. Time after time they had denounced the policy of the Conservative Administration in going about the country and getting the views and wishes of the people in reference to the manufacturing industries; and after these gentlemen had incubated on a tariff policy, so weak were they in their own opinions, in their own esteem, of their own ability to deal with the tariff question, that they started on a tour, going from one end of the Dominion to another, to ask these same people whom they had been telling for years that they knew exactly what they wanted—they went about asking these same people their wishes and their views. Now, it can not be even said to their credit that they actually took into account what the people did tell them, because one month ago they brought down their policy, and they were not even then prepared to stand by it, for the policy they brought down a month ago is so substantially changed and altered that they have introduced a second set of tariff announcements, in which there are the most wonderful changes. This afternoon one of the supporters had the temerity to rise—he did not take the advice of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) to sit still and keep quiet—but rose to his feet, and the burden of his song was that the Conservative Administration in past years had tampered with the tariff, to the great detriment of particular interests. The hon. gentleman at that time was referring to the agricultural implement industry. Now, what has this Government done? If there was an interest in the country that they always declaimed upon, it was the agricultural implement industry; and even those innocent and lamb-like Patrons used to speak about the same matter—and when I refer again to the Patrons, I hope I shall not be accused of saying anything, as I was the other night, in a brow-beating spirit; it is rather from a persuasive point of view that I now address my Patron friends. I address them with the idea that they may even yet, at this last hour—because there has been repentance even at a late hour—that they may

turn from the error of their ways and assert their independence. We have biblical lore for this, because we are told that those whom you love you should chasten; and it is my great love for the Patrons that induces me to endeavour to chasten them; it is only done in that spirit and with that idea. Now, where was the agricultural implement industry of this country? There was never an hon. gentleman on the Liberal side of the House who, if he had an opportunity, did not point to this industry. He said: Look at the manufacturers of this country engaged in that enterprise; look at the Massey people. From little they have risen to affluence and wealth. Look at Mr. Massey dying worth five million dollars, and all that money was wrung out of whose pockets? Out of the pockets of the farmers of this country. But what have the hon. gentlemen done to-day? They have not only kept the tariff exactly where it was, at 20 per cent, but, as if to add insult to injury to the farmers—because they must be presuming on the credulity and ignorance of the farmers—they have reduced the duty on the raw material of iron, which enters largely into the manufacture of those same implements. No wonder the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) felt safe in his position. He is a manufacturer of agricultural implements, and that hon. gentleman has had a preference given to him on the raw material, and he has the assurance that the duty is to be preserved and retained, because, I suppose, he does not fear any protests from the Patrons, and, furthermore, that if the Patrons did protest, he knows full well their protestations would go unheeded, because the Patrons in this House seem to be only the tail end of the whole organization, and unable to wag the body, so the tail must, as a consequence, wag with the body. As a result, the hon. member for North Leeds feels firm in his position and perfectly secure that he is to have the same high rate of duty—a high rate of duty, as they contended it was—kept on, while he is to have the preference on the raw material. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not only that interest as affecting the farmers, that these gentlemen, after all, are ignoring to-day. Take another industry, that of woollens. There is an industry that under this very treaty must be affected and to the very great detriment of the Canadian manufacturer, and, in turn, to the Canadian farmer. Hon. gentlemen must know that there is hardly a woollen industry in this country running as it was in the past year, and in the past ten or fifteen years. They must know this, and if inquiry has not been made, inquiry should be made, for it would show that there is not a woollen mill in this country running on full time, and that many of their hands are idle and walking about the streets. To-day, the Minister received a deputation from the city of Montreal in reference to the cotton duty. And yet these hon. gentlemen

Mr. BENNETT.

propose, if they are honest in their desire to place this law on the Statute-book, to place these industries in this country in competition with the greater and the older industries in the old world. Well, all I can say is, that, as hon. gentlemen, having taken such a long time, as they have spent a whole year in looking at the tariff and making the changes they have made, it would be better for the interests of the whole country that they should withdraw the Bill that is now before the House. What the country wants to-day is freedom from agitation, what the country wants to-day is rest and a chance to brace up its shattered energies, that have been so greatly depressed since the hon. gentlemen opposite took hold of the tariff. Now, it may be that hon. gentlemen opposite do not realize what interests they may be interfering with to-day; it may be that they expect that, after all said and done, their first Tariff Bill introduced will be the Bill that will go on the Statute-book, and that, consequently, the only trade with which we will have to compete will be the trade of the old world. But, in view of all the legal arguments that have been adduced in this House, in view of the fact that they have admitted, silently, that the contention is right, and that if this treaty goes into force, it will give full play to the whole world, then I say it is a matter of much greater interest and much deeper concern. I know that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who oppose these tariff resolutions, are at once charged, as the Controller of Customs, the other night, charged the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), with building up a case in favour of those other countries. Well, all I can say is, that surely the Controller of Customs, who affects so much disdain for opinions coming from this side, will not be guided merely by the fact that the hon. member for York has made some statements relative to his views of what countries will have the right and the privilege of coming in under this tariff resolution. I believe that the time has been reached in Canada, not only by the Conservative party, but also by the Liberal party, when they believe that any Government in this country, having regard to the great vested interests of the manufacturers, should not act in the manner that they are acting to-day. I call to witness this fact, that a man who is eminent in business circles in this country, a gentleman to whom I have already referred in this House in the person of Senator Cox, a man who is held as high in respect and esteem by the people of Canada as any Minister in the Cabinet from the province of Ontario, gave a fair expression of opinion in the Senate at the opening of this House, when he had the honour of seconding the Address. The hon. gentleman then, at the risk of offending his friends, stated frankly that he did not believe they were going to carry that policy out; that those statements were very well for the country, for the platform and

for the public press, but after men had won at the polls, the time arrived when they were bound to take a business-like view of the whole situation and deal with it accordingly.

I regret that the first Minister saw fit to seek to curtail the remarks I intended to make in respect to the lumber duties, and I cannot see what is to be gained by that course, for I can assure the hon. gentleman that the matter is one of such importance that before the session closes I shall find it necessary, even if it causes annoyance to some individuals, to make some very strong and pertinent remarks on the question. I must say that of all matters touched on in the tariff this is one of the highest importance, and the hon. gentlemen cannot show me any interest that is affected so largely and vitally as the lumber interest of this country. I ask the First Minister if he would take comfort if to-day we saw passing down the Ottawa millions of feet of saw-logs, at the same time our mills were standing idle and the labouring men were walking in our streets. The people of the whole city would stand in this square and would remonstrate with the Government for allowing such a policy to prevail. Yet what is the First Minister and this Government doing to-day? They are standing aside, and are seeing our lumber interests harassed and heckled, while an import duty is placed against our lumber, practically leading the people of the United States to bring their lumber into Ontario, and we are asked to admit it free of duty. That is what the hon. gentleman is doing, and he cannot deny it; and if the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) were present, he would bear out this statement, that a large firm of which he was the solicitor in Sarnia, and which failed about a year ago, had as its largest creditor American manufacturers of lumber who had sold lumber to this firm and brought into this country. What sense was there in allowing the Canadian manufacturers to be driven out of the American market by a hostile duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber, while at the same time the hon. gentleman and his Government by the present policy permit all American lumber that can be towed across Lake Huron to be dumped into western Ontario, and thus reduce the price of lumber produced in this country. If the Government had not had representations made to them by the lumbermen, there might be an excuse for their action, but they have had representations made to them. These have been published in the public press, hon. gentlemen have had deputations of lumbermen come here and asked that at least they should be placed on the same basis and footing as American manufacturers. To-day in Toronto, I am informed by credible authority, that all planks used for the sidewalks of the city are American lumber; and yet if a Canadian wants to sell a board in the United States, he is met with a hostile duty of \$2

per thousand feet. There is no reason why such a condition should exist, and they must know this is the case; and before the consideration of this tariff is concluded, I hope that not only will there be the imposition of an export duty on logs, but at all events the adoption of the common-sense policy of meeting the American hostile duty with an equivalent duty, so long as they maintain their hostile duty of \$2 per thousand on our lumber. As regards the export duty, I have stated that from 200,000,000 to 400,000,000 feet of pine pass from Canada to Michigan. Pulp wood is also of great importance, but I will not deal with it at the present time. If the people of the United States have come to see that they must have our Canadian white pine saw-logs, is it not time for the Government to take cognizance of what they are doing? The Americans come over here, and by their actions, which speak louder than their words, they say: We in Michigan have sawn up our supply, and we must have your white pine logs. They come over here and pay high prices, and take over to that country millions of feet. What is the result? Thousands of Canadians have been forced to follow the lumber interest to the other side of the line in order to obtain the employment there afforded them. Surely the Ministers remember receiving deputations. These included men who are cutting lumber on the shores of the Georgian Bay to-day, and these manufacturers of pine lumber came here and said: there is a duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber going into the United States, and there should be an import duty of the same amount on lumber coming here; further, we ask you in the interest of the trade, also to place an export duty on logs. Then you would have the satisfaction of securing one of two results—you would either compel the United States to take off the \$2 of duty on lumber, or you would conserve and keep in Canada for some years large quantities of our logs, and the result would be to promote the general interests of Canada in the long run. A few years ago that was a matter of great importance, and to-day it is a matter of even greater importance, because each year the quantity of our pine becomes more limited. But the reason that existed three, four, or five years ago against an export duty does not prevail to-day. Then the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) argued in this House, I admit with considerable force and good reason to back him up, in this sense: To-day we are having the free lumber market of the United States, and if there is an export duty on logs to be imposed, the result must be the imposition of a protective duty by the Americans to the amount of \$2 or \$3 per thousand. I am free to admit that under those circumstances it was a matter of deep interest and importance for the late Administration to weigh well whether they should impose an export duty or not, as the

result would have been the imposition of a high import duty on our lumber. But the time has passed for taking this ground. We have to-day a hostile duty of \$2 per thousand against us ; and the manufacturers of lumber in this country are asking for definite action to be taken. I read in this House a little while ago the minutes of a meeting held in Toronto, which was attended by Mr. Thompson, Mr. H. H. Cook, Mr. Shepherd, and other gentlemen, the largest operators on the north shore of Georgian Bay, who agreed that although the United States might increase the duty, that would be better than the position in which the matter stands to-day. There can be only one interest that hon. gentlemen are acceding to, and one interest whose wishes they are gratifying. That interest is the interest of the Michigan lumbering man, who like a good American, I suppose, wants to keep his own labour in his own country, and so long as he can find a Canadian Government practising such a shallow policy as is being practised to-day, he will take the Canadian logs across from this country, manufacture them in his own, and live up to the motto of "the United States for the people of the United States."

Then there may be another interest. There may be in the interest of the Canadian operator in saw logs, who not having a mill of his own, and knowing the requirements of the American people for saw-logs, is prepared to sell them on the other side. Against the American interest the Canadian Government should not weigh for a moment. The interests of the Canadian people generally should be paramount and should prevail, as against the interests of a few men who are engaged in selling white pine logs on the other side, and who are very few and whose labourers are very few as compared with the great saw-milling interests of all Canada. I do urge the Government, in the name of Canadian labourers, in the name of Canadian interests all round, to place an export duty on logs, and to meet the wishes of, not only the labouring classes on the north shore, but to meet the wishes of those very lumbermen themselves, who to-day are desirous of shipping their lumber to the states, and who are precluded by the high duty from doing so.

There are selfish interests in this, and I have no doubt it has been urged upon the Government on behalf of the Ottawa lumbermen, that they would prefer to pay \$2 on white lumber, rather than to pay \$2 plus the extra duty. I call the attention of the Ministry to the fact, that the Ottawa valley is not by any means the whole of Canada, and after all, the lumbering interests in this part of the country will only be affected to a like extent as the interests of the lumbermen on the north shores of the Georgian Bay. As has been before stated, and as is known to hon. gen-

Mr. BENNETT.

tleman, and as the press of the country will prove, men who are manufacturing lumber on the north shore, men who have large limits on the north shore, are asking the Government to place this prohibition by way of export duty upon logs, even at the risk of raising the import duty on their lumber into the United States. If the Government fail to accede to the just claims of the people on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, they are at the same time refusing to accede to the wish that is expressed by every man who has the interests of Canada as a whole at heart, and who wishes to see Canadian resources preserved as they should be, for Canadian labourers who are anxious to work in this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to offer a few remarks to the House to-night on one branch of the subject dwelt upon by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), namely, that pertaining to the lumber question. The time may be somewhat inopportune for dealing with this question, but as the subject has been broached, no better time, perhaps no other time, will offer for reference to the matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has often addressed the House of Commons on this subject. His views are well known, and I am free to confess that his views upon the subject are always presented forcibly. So far as his aspirations are concerned, I sympathize with him most fully. I would be glad to see all the lumber grown in Canada manufactured in this country. No Canadian would desire to have the manufacturing industries of this country injured by the deportation of raw material to be manufactured in another country, if we could manage the business ourselves. It is simply for the reason, that circumstances connected with this export trade render it inadvisable to take the course suggested by the hon. gentleman, that I have at times in this House opposed the imposition of an export duty. I must say, of course, that I believe that upon principle export duties are wrong. I believe that the founders of the American constitution never displayed their prescience more strikingly, then when they adopted as a constitutional provision, the prohibition of the imposition of all export duties. I see no reason for the imposition of an export duty upon sawlogs, that will not equally apply to an export duty upon wool, or an export duty upon wheat, or an export duty upon barley, or an export duty upon any raw material exported from the country and which is capable of being completed into a manufactured product here. We can spin wool into clothing, we can manufacture wheat into flour, we can make barley into malt and beer ; but we are glad to dispose of all these raw products, supplying ourselves with such woollen goods and such flour as we need, and selling the balance for export. It adds to the wealth of the country for us to do so, and I know from

experience that in the region of country where the export of sawlogs is carried on, that export has had a most beneficial effect upon the lumbering industry. Upon the north shore of the Georgian Bay, after the McKinley Bill made the offer that the American duties would be placed at \$1, if the export duties were removed, and after that offer was accepted by the Canadian Government; I know by experience that the results was the enhancing of the value of timber limits to the extent of, two-fold, and in some cases four-fold the price these limits were worth before the adoption of that policy. The last sale by the Government of Ontario of timber land, of a fraction over 600 square miles, commanded bonuses of \$2,300,000. Some of the bonuses paid for these lands amounted to about \$17,000 per square mile, and the effect of the policy was clearly beneficial to the lumber interests of Ontario, and has been beneficial all along.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) refers to the underestimating of sawlogs exported. Well, I do not know that I would claim that the statistics given in the Trade and Navigation Returns are strictly accurate. However, while exporters may not give an accurate estimate possibly, of every raft that is sent out, yet their clearances at the end of the season correspond with the amount of Crown dues they pay, and correspond with the total amount of logs that are cut, so that in the bulk, their clearances are correct, while in detailing raft after raft they may not have been strictly so. I think then that these statistics are fairly accurate; that is, the total of them at the close of the season. They may be somewhat under the mark, but if they are it is due to the fact that the measurement of the log is somewhat under the mark by "camp scale."

I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) with reference to bringing in American lumber. I think the Government ought to take power to deal with the question by Order in Council. Of course I do not think it is proper to take any action in putting on a duty while lumber is free, and I would predicate no action upon the assumption as to what the United States Legislature may do with regard to the tariff. But I think it would be well for the Government to take power, in the event of our lumber being put on the \$2 list, to put the same duty on American lumber. That would be strictly fair and I am quite in favour of it being done.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) expresses a hope that before this tariff is completed in this House, the Government will put an export duty on sawlogs. Well, if that export duty would produce the effect that my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) anticipates, I would join with him in that wish as heartily as I do in the wish to have lumber put on the dutiable list, if the Americans do the same

with our lumber. But unfortunately, the effect, in the case of an export duty on logs would be quite the reverse. We are deprecating the placing upon the dutiable list in the United States of lumber and shingles and the other products of the forest. Unfortunately the matter is in this position. While we, look with dissatisfaction and disfavour upon the probable imposition of a \$2 duty, we certainly could derive no satisfaction from the certainty of having that \$2 increased by the amount of the export duty we might impose upon logs. It would be simply aggravating the treatment we deprecate to put on an export duty, if the Americans are in the position to add the amount of that export duty to the amount of the import duty imposed on lumber sent by us into the United States. That is the difficulty. If our hands were free to impose an export duty without that action bringing back upon us like a boomerang evil consequences, I would say go on; but under the circumstances we must dismiss sentimentality, and look at this question from a practical standpoint, carefully weighing what the consequences of our action will be, and must govern ourselves like sensible business men.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman's doctrine not that the consumer pays the duty? In that case, he would be quite wrong in his argument.

Mr. CHARLTON. My position is that a \$2 duty is distasteful to Canadians, and a \$4 duty would be worse—that if we put an export duty of \$2 on logs, the effect of that is to double the American duty on lumber, and if we did not like it in the first instance, we would like it still less in the second. My hon. friend from East Simcoe says he is in favour of putting on this duty because it will bring Americans to their senses. I certainly wish it would. I certainly wish we were in a position to bring the Americans to their senses and dictate terms to them; it would be a very enviable position to be in. But unfortunately we are not in that position. Unfortunately, our lumber trade with the United States bears relatively an exceedingly small proportion to the total lumber trade of that country. We exported last year to the United States in round numbers some \$7,500,000 worth of sawn lumber. The saw-mill products of the United States for the year 1896 was \$403,667,000, and the product for 1896 may be safely estimated at \$450,000,000, or in board measurement, about 40,000,000,000 feet. So that our export of lumber to the United States for 1896 equalled about one and one-half per cent the production of that country. That trade, although considerable in itself, is so small compared with the enormous amount of their total lumber trade that whatever course we could take would produce no sensible impression upon it, and we are not in a posi-

tion to dictate terms to the United States or bring them to their senses. I am sorry it is so, but unquestionably that is the fact.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman say \$450,000,000 is the value of the lumber itself, and not its value when made into various articles ?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the report. By the census returns of 1890, the value was \$403,000,000, and the estimate for 1896 may be placed at \$50,000,000 higher. That is, all the lumber of the western, southern and other states, both soft and hard. My hon. friend can realize that our exports of lumber, amounting to less than \$8,000,000 a year, as compared with this vast production, do not cut a very imposing figure.

Mr. TISDALE. Does the hon. gentleman remember the quantity of lumber—the number of feet ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The returns do not give the number of feet ; they only give the values. An attempt has been made to impress the Government here, as well as the local government at Toronto, with the necessity of imposing an export duty ; and I presume that to-night is the first occasion when any attempt has been made to controvert the statements made by gentlemen who have visited this House, and have held interviews with members of Parliament and members of the Government, and have sought to influence public sentiment by communications in the press, and by various other methods. This work was entered upon most systematically and persistently by the owners of pulp mills at Sault Ste Marie. They employed a gentleman to champion their cause, who I think spent most of the time during the session of the local House at Toronto, and who has certainly been here some length of time ; and they sent circulars to all the township councils, all the town councils, and all the city councils in Ontario, asking them to memorialize the Government on behalf of an export duty on pulp wood. I may say parenthetically that this concern is a purely American concern, its owners being Philadelphians, and they were engaged in instructing the Canadians what course they should take to promote, not a Canadian interest, but an American interest at the Sault. The effect of the imposition of an export duty on pulp wood for the time being would have been to make raw material more expensive to the owners of American pulp mills, and temporarily to benefit the pulp mill industry in Canada ; but its effect would also have been to place the whole list of forest products, which by the Wilson Bill were on the free list, back on the dutiable list, as is provided for by the McKinley Bill. Twelve sections of the Wilson Bill, from sections 672 to 683 are required to enumerate the forest products which by that Bill are placed on the free list, and the final pro-

Mr. CHARLTON.

viso in connection with these items is as follows :—

Provided, that all of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 672 to 683, inclusive, when imported from any country which lays an export duty or imposes discriminating stumpage dues on any of them, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

The result would have been, had our Sault Ste. Marie friends succeeded that they would have got not only an export duty imposed on pulp wood, but that all the classes of lumber enumerated in the paragraphs of the Wilson Bill would have been removed from the free list and restored to the dutiable list. These men were like Artemus Ward, who was willing to put down the rebellion if it required him to sacrifice all his wife's relations to do it ; they proposed to get the advantage of an export duty on pulp wood if it ruined all the lumbermen in this country. If they had waited until the American tariff had been consummated and was on the Statute-book, and if it had not made reference to this pulp wood matter, and their scheme could have been carried out, it would have been a successful one, although it would have cost the ruin of the lumbermen of this country ; but by going about the country proclaiming their intentions, they attracted the attention of Congress, and Congress decided to treat pulp and pulp wood in the same manner as other forest products. On this matter, I find in the Dingley Bill, as reported to the United States Senate by the Finance Committee of that body :

Mechanically ground wood pulp, seven and one-half cents per one hundred pounds, dry weight ; chemical wood pulp, unbleached, one-sixth of one cent per pound, dry weight ; bleached, one-fourth of one cent per pound, dry weight : Provided, that if any country or dependency shall impose an export duty on pulp wood, the amount of such export duty shall be added, as an additional duty, to the duties herein imposed upon wood pulp, when imported from such country or dependency.

And so our friends are now in this position that after all their agitation about an export duty on pulp wood, there is in the American tariff, if it becomes law as reported to the Senate, a provision which places them in the same position as the lumbermen, and renders the imposition of an export duty on pulp wood an act of suicide on their part, so that they are likely to cease their agitation in favour of the consummation of that project.

With regard to the quantity of pulp wood exported and the extent to which American mills depend upon Canada for their supply, the calculations of these men were entirely misleading. They represented that our export was 600,000 cords per annum. The truth is it is \$600,000 per annum or 193,000 cords, so that the misstatement only lacked two-thirds of the truth.

I have here in my hand a statement made by Lockwood's Paper Trade Directory of the

United States, in which I find that the consumption of pulp wood in the United States last year amounted to 1,518,000 cords, of which 193,000 cords was from Canada, and that we furnish the United States 14½ per cent of the pulp wood consumed in that country. If then the portion we furnish that country is so small, surely it is the height of absurdity to contend that the Americans are depending upon us for their pulp wood and that an export duty would put them at our mercy. There is a very large amount of pulp wood in almost all the northern states, and the supply for the mills is ample for many years to come. We would be therefore standing in our own light if we were to adopt the policy that would deprive a portion of our people of the privilege of exporting this article. Upon whom would the consequences of the duty fall? The object of the pulp mill owners in Canada in pressing for this policy is to secure advantage for themselves. In what way would they profit by it? They would shut out the competing buyer. They would shut out a competitor who buys a 193,000 cords, and our farmers would be compelled to transact all their business with the Canadian pulp mills and take such prices as the Canadian mill owners chose to give them.

Who would be most affected by a drop in prices? Sixty per cent of the pulp wood in Canada is furnished by small farmers who cut the wood in clearing the land, haul it to the railways, and get from \$2 to \$3.50 per cord for this wood which would be entirely useless for them otherwise. Instead of making a profitable income from the sale of this wood, these men would be compelled to burn it. I am told that farmers in various parts of Quebec and up the Ottawa Valley, in reach of railways, in these hard pinching times, are making payments on their lands by the sale of pulp wood. The poplar that grows upon lands that have been lumbered over makes a growth large enough for pulp wood in ten or fifteen years. The spruce in swamps or on low-lying lands is a source of income to them, and the imposition of a duty would be an unjustifiable hardship, imposed without any possibility of securing any result that would accrue to our benefit in any way whatever. We have enormous quantities of the material and if we can sell the wood and make it a source of revenue, that is much better than burning it.

So far as the relative positions of manufacturers here and in the United States is concerned, I do not think that our mill owners have much to complain of. The Senate Bill as reported imposes a duty of 7½ cents per hundred pounds on wood pulp, but our millers get their wood cheaper, they are nearer the source of supply, they get cheaper labour, and the cost of transportation of the manufactured pulp is less than the transportation of the wood required to make the pulp. So that our mills are at no dis-

advantage. They overcome the duty of 7½ cents per 100 pounds by the compensating advantages of cheaper raw material, cheaper labour, and reduced cost of freight on the manufactured products, as compared with the cost of freight on the raw material. So much for the question of duty upon wood pulp.

Now, whatever may be done with the question of an export duty on logs, whatever it may be opportune to do later on—and I do not pretend to indicate what course the Government ought to take when the time comes to act—clearly, while the American tariff is pending, it would be premature and mischievous to impose an export duty on logs. The instant effect would be to place lumber now going into the American market, free of duty, upon the dutiable list of \$2 per thousand feet and we had much better wait until the \$2 duty is actually imposed before deciding on any line of action whatever. In the meantime let us keep quiet and watch the proceedings in Congress, keep free lumber as long as we can, and when deprived of it then consider what is to be done if the Americans retain the provision of the Dingley Bill regarding export duties, the advisability of our imposing an export duty and by that act increase the import duty on our lumber going to the United States to a corresponding extent can then be considered. But that is a question for subsequent consideration, which we are not facing now. We might consider profitably, so far as the Americans are concerned, what interests are likely to be injured and what are likely to be benefited by any action we may take with reference to export duty.

There is a very influential interest in Michigan that is opposed to the lumber duty, but believing it would be useless to fight for free lumber, they took their stand on a compromise for one dollar duty. They sent a delegation to Washington, kept a committee room open there, incurred a large amount of expense and made a vigorous fight, and actually when the Dingley Bill was reported from the Ways and Means Committee, the vote stood 8 for \$1 on lumber and 3 for \$2 on lumber. But, it is said, at the earnest instance of Mr. Dingley that the committee would abstain from discrediting him before the country, the committee consented to the \$2 duty believing that in the Senate lumber would be placed at \$1 per thousand. The American lumbermen who are labouring for \$1 duty, and who would prefer free lumber, are the men who will be injured by an export duty. The export duty will simply be a blow struck at our own friends. The men who would be benefited by it are those who are clamouring for a duty of \$2 a thousand feet on lumber. They would like a higher import duty on it, if they could get it, and are fighting to the death the reduction of \$1 per thousand. If we adopt the policy which will result in add-

ing to the \$2 of the American Government the export duty of the Canadian Government, whatever it may be, we are playing into the hands of our enemies who are labouring might and main for the adoption of a policy which will be injurious to us, and which will injure those who have stood loyally by us as friends in this matter.

And with regard to the export duty as an abstract principle, perhaps it would be well enough for us to take a look at that question from the American standpoint, if only for the purpose of impressing upon our minds the view that the American is likely to take of the matter. We look at the question from one side, and the American looks at it from another, and whether he is right or wrong, it may be well for us to ascertain what his views are and why he holds those views. It is hardly necessary to say that the fact that the American constitution prohibits the imposition of an export duty of any kind whatever is an indication that the general sentiment of the American people disapproves of an export duty. They look with disfavour upon such a duty, and they regard an export duty upon logs with disfavour for the reason, among others, that they believe the principle to be wrong, and for the reason that they are incapable of retaliating upon us in kind, because their constitution prohibits it. Now, we have imported logs from the United States, as well as exported logs to the United States, and it may surprise some of the members of this House to be informed that up to the year 1890 our import of logs from the United States largely surpassed our export of logs to that country.

Mr. BENNETT. That would include New Brunswick.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) remarks, that takes in the amount imported into New Brunswick. Without this New Brunswick trade, the export and import of logs up to 1890 was about even. The import trade into New Brunswick is essentially the same as the import trade into Rat Portage or any other place in Canada. Of course, owing to the geographical position, the northern half of Maine is dependent upon the St. John River for an outlet. But Canada gets the handling of all this timber. Our objection to logs being taken to the United States is, that we lose the profit of sawing them. But, in the case of the import to New Brunswick, the gain of the saw-mill and more than that comes into Canada. The trees are cut by Canadians, hauled to the water and rafted down by Canadians, and sawn in St. John by Canadian labour. Thus, this is a most profitable and most desirable trade for Canada, and the Americans, in making up their minds on this question, take this trade into consideration. I would like to give the relative import and export from 1885 to 1890. I cannot give the statistics prior to 1885. The Secretary of the

Mr. CHARLTON.

Fredericton Boom Company was good enough to furnish me figures showing the logs handled by that company from 1885 to 1890, and this winter he gave me a subsequent statement covering the figures from 1891 to 1896. I will not read these figures in detail, but will give the summary. The logs exported to the United States, as appears from the Trade and Navigation Returns, from 1885 to 1890, amounted to \$2,567,000. The logs imported from the United States, as appears by the Trade and Navigation Returns, amounted to \$2,329,000. So that the exports to the United States exceeded our imports from the United States during that period by about \$200,000. But the New Brunswick trade during the same period, from 1885 to 1890, amounted to \$4,845,000; and the total of our imports to New Brunswick and imports, as per Trade and Navigation Returns, was \$7,174,100, or, in other words, we imported from the United States from 1885 to 1890, \$4,607,000 in excess of our exports to the United States. Now these are facts that the Americans are aware of, and they take them into consideration. During all the years from confederation to 1885, our imports of logs from the United States were not less in any one year than four times as much as our exports. Now, the American naturally asks: If we have exported to Canada four times as many logs as we have imported from Canada, and our constitution prevents us from interfering in the trade by export duty, what excuse is there for you to impose an export duty? Since 1890 the condition of the trade has been somewhat changed. As my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is aware and will tell the House, the export of logs to the United States has largely increased. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, from 1890 to 1896 we exported logs to the United States to the value of \$10,059,000. We imported logs from the United States, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns to the amount of \$2,248,000. Well, our imports of logs by the River St. John for the period is \$4,113,000. That is, the exports were \$10,000,000, in round numbers, and the total imports were \$6,361,000 leaving an excess of \$3,388,000 of exports over imports. But, if we put the two periods together, from 1885 to 1896, we find that our imports of logs exceeded our exports to the United States by \$919,000. Now, with these facts before us, it is evident that the position of matters is a little different from what is generally supposed, and we can see that when the American Congressman takes this question into consideration, he comes to the conclusion that the export duty is an unjustifiable impost and that he is justified in heading off this policy on the part of our Government by indirect means, inasmuch as the constitution of the United States does not permit him to take the direct measure we are talking about taking in connection with the matter. Therefore, this

proviso with regard to export duty which is attached to the lumber schedule, is resorted to for the purpose of reaching indirectly the result that the constitution prevents him from reaching directly. That is the view of the case taken by the American. Whether it is sound or unsound, whether its conclusion is justifiable or the reverse, it is one that satisfies him and is plausible, and is the one he acts upon. And we are in this position—whether he is right or wrong, if a proviso is inserted in his tariff that the amount of the export duty imposed on logs shall be added to the export duty, and we put on an export duty, we put larger burdens, upon lumber, and, therefore, increase the trouble of which we complain in connection with the imposition of the import duty, and we enhance the protection of the American lumber interest that seeks the duty of \$2 per thousand. This is the unfortunate position we are in; this is the reason it is, in my opinion, impolitic and inadvisable to impose an export duty, for the reason that the consequences react upon our own heads. If we could do this, if we could impose an export duty and no consequences result from it except such consequences as might fall upon the Americans and upon the holder of standing pine in Canada who wanted to make the best use of it he could, the case would be different. But the trouble is that you cannot move in the matter without disastrous consequences to the entire lumber interest, so I say we had better leave it alone.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman taking into consideration the limited lumber supply in Canada or merely the principle of export duties?

Mr. CHARLTON. I may tell my hon. friend from Bothwell that I am not particularly nervous about the lumber supply in Canada; I think we have considerable lumber left yet. We have over 100,000 square miles of territory in Ontario that has not been brought under license, and we have a large amount in Quebec. The growth of our lumber export trade has been very moderate indeed. I have the returns here. I will not weary the House with them to-night, but they show that from 1887 to 1896 the increase in the exports of sawn lumber was about \$200,000 a year, and that demonstrates the absurdity, the utter fallacy of the American contention, that the competition of Canadian lumber men has been the cause of the depression of prices in the United States, which is due to an entirely different cause. The lumber policy we are pursuing is a Conservative one. We have not adopted that wasteful policy that was adopted in the United States where the timber lands of the different states were surveyed and sold without reservation, the timber passing into the hands of private speculators at \$1.25 an acre, and these men getting hold of the timber, it is to their interest to

realize as soon as possible, and the result has been waste and destruction, and the rapid diminution of the forests and lumber resources of the country. In Canada on the contrary the Government brings into the market from time to time such quantities of timber lands as, in the estimation of the Government, the wants of the trade require, and holds back the enormous resources to be handled in future years, and at the rate that the Ontario Government has brought these timber lands into the market, the reserve behind will last for 150 years before it is all brought into market.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. gentleman has not much data for the quantity of lumber in the province of Ontario. The truth is the Commissioner of Crown Lands was unable to give any accurate statement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that I am able to give an accurate statement to the hon. gentleman, but I imagine I know about as much about it as he does himself. While I would not venture to say how much timber there is to the acre in those enormous reserves of forest land, yet it is quite evident that there is an enormous amount of timber, and that the policy of the Government being Conservative with regard to bringing that timber to market, will husband that great resource of the province for generations to come, while the United States are upon the verge of having their own reserve in that direction exhausted. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I need to detain the committee much longer with reference to this question. But unless it might be asserted that my statement with regard to the provision under the Dingley Bill is not well founded, I will read the proviso adopted by the sub-Finance Committee of the Senate with regard to the export duties. The proviso is as follows:—

Provided, that if any country or dependency shall impose an export duty upon saw-logs, round unmanufactured timber, stave bolts, shingle bolts or heading bolts, the amount of such export duty shall be added, as an additional duty, to the duties imposed upon the articles mentioned in this paragraph, when imported from such country or dependency.

And the articles mentioned in the paragraph cover all kinds of lumber, and all kinds of forest products. The proviso is not quite as sweeping as the proviso in the Wilson Bill. Under the Wilson Bill an export duty could hardly be put upon a telegraph pole, a railroad tie, a hop pole, or a broom-stick without the entire list of forest products, being put upon the dutiable list. But we are not proposing to put an export duty upon anything but sawlogs, and that will carry the consequence of adding that export duty to the import duty put by the Americans upon our own lumber. If we put an export duty upon pulp wood under the provision I read a few moments

ago, that will carry the condition of adding that export duty to the duty on wood pulp. Now, with regard to pulp wood, the Americans are by no means dependent upon us for this article at present, as is shown by the fact that we supplied them last year with but 14½ per cent of the amount that they used. There are enormous quantities of spruce in Maine, in New Hampshire, in portions of Vermont, in Northern New York, and the Adirondack region; and there are sources of supply for wood pulp in the Southern States, that are not yet touched, great forests of spruce, and enormous quantities of poplar. It is said there is a supply of wood for pulp in the States of Oregon and Washington sufficient to last the United States for 100 years. So that we need not flatter ourselves with the conclusion that we can control this matter because we have the exclusive source of supply. We do not. The time may come when they will be dependent upon us for it. We have enormous quantities of this wood, but that time has not come now. So far as the effect of imposing an export duty upon pulp wood would be concerned, its immediate effect under the Bill as it now stands, would be to enhance the duty upon wood pulp made by our mills, and to take from hundreds, yes, thousands of small farmers the source of revenue they derive from cutting this wood, into pulp wood in the course of clearing their lands, which wood would be rendered valueless by the imposition of this duty of \$2 a cord. With regard to the export duty upon sawlogs, I fully sympathize with my hon. friend as to the desirability of having lumber cut upon our own side, and would be willing to co-operate in any measure that was practical and was calculated to secure that end. Yet under the circumstances the imposition of an export duty would not have that effect, but would on the contrary impede the export of lumber from this country to a very great extent by adding to the \$2 duty, and enhancing the difficulty of getting it into the American market by adding the export duty to the import duty. Under all these considerations we are placed in such a position that whatever might be our desire, whatever we might do if we were able to do it without evil consequences falling upon our own heads, under the circumstances as they exist, it would be suicidal for us to impose an export duty either upon sawlogs or upon pulp wood, for the reason that our own manufacturing industries would be the first to suffer in consequence of that act upon the part of the Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the committee rise and report progress. The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) would have moved it if he had remained, but he was tired out. He says he wants to speak on Monday.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### QUEBEC RAILWAY BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Whether the hon. member for Québec West is a director of the Quebec Railway Bridge Company?

Mr. DOBELL. I am not a director in the Quebec Railway Bridge Company.

### VOLUNTEERS OF 1866.

Mr. McMULLEN asked :

Whether the Government have come to a decision as to what recognition and recompense in the shape of a land grant or otherwise they have concluded to confer on the volunteers of 1866, and if not yet decided, is it the intention of the Government to recognize their services in any way, and when?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The volunteers of 1866 are anxious to obtain recognition in the shape of a medal granted for that special service, and the Government have recommended that application to the favourable consideration of Her Majesty.

### AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY'S CONTRACT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Under the contract made with the American Bank Note Company, what will be the cost in detail of engraving and retouching one set of plates, including tint plates :—

- (a) For \$1 notes ?
- (b) For \$2 and \$4 notes ?
- (c) For single notes, 1 note to a plate ?
- (d) For large notes, 2 notes to a plate ; also the cost of engraving plates required ?
- (e) For inland revenue stamps ?
- (f) For postal stamps ?
- (g) For postal cards ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). (a.) For \$1 notes—Engraving face plate, \$250 ; engraving back plate, \$125 ; engraving tint plate, \$125 ; retouching plates (½ of \$500), \$250 ; total cost engraving and retouching 1 set plates, \$750. (b.) For \$2 and

\$4 notes—Same as for \$1 notes. (c.) For single notes, one note to a plate, same as for \$1 notes. (d.) For large notes—Two notes to a plate, also the cost of engraving plates required, same as for \$1 notes. (e.) For inland revenue stamps—Cost of engraving included in price per thousand stamps. (f.) For postal stamps—Cost of engraving included in price per thousand stamps. (g.) For postal cards—Cost of engraving included in price per thousand cards.

#### REVENUE COLLECTIONS AT MONTREAL.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Who are the solicitors employed in matters connected with the revenue, in Montreal?
2. What sums have been paid, by way of disbursements, to such solicitors, since the 23rd June, 1896?
3. What sums have been paid to the said solicitors, as fees, since 23rd June, 1896?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. Lomer Gouin and J. M. Ferguson. 2. \$82.85 to Mr. Lomer Gouin. An advance of \$100 has been made to Mr. Ferguson in re case of "Finlayson & Grant." but for which no account of disbursements yet received. 3. \$220 in fees to Mr. Lomer Gouin. \$70 in fees to Mr. J. M. Ferguson.

#### WHARFAGE DUES AT TIGNISH, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked :

What is the amount of wharfage dues collected and paid at Tignish, during the season of 1896? Who is the harbour master at Tignish?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The amount of wharfage dues collected and paid was \$71.05. There is no harbour-master at that port; Mr. George Conroy is the wharfinger.

#### C.P.R.—ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT RATES AT FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. JAMESON asked :

1. Is the Government aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is imposing a discriminatory rate of 10 cents per 100 pounds on freight arriving at Fort William by other than vessels of the C.P.R. and Beatty Line?
2. Is such discrimination being exercised with the sanction of the Government, and if so, when was such sanction granted?
3. Does the Government intend to take any steps to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from discriminating against individuals or localities in the manner above mentioned?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Government has not been made aware that any discriminatory rate has been imposed on freight arriving at Fort William by vessels other than the Canadian Pacific Railway and Beatty lines. No information on the sub-

ject has reached the Government. If facts to the purport and effect of the question are brought to the knowledge of the Government, I shall feel it my duty to look into the matter and give it my attention.

#### MARINE AND FISHERIES—INSPECTOR McNAB.

Mr. BOSTOCK asked :

1. Was Fishery Inspector McNab instructed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make a trip to Ashcroft in the spring of 1896?
2. If so, what were his instructions?
3. If he was not instructed by the department, why did he make a trip to Ashcroft at that time?
4. Who paid the expenses of the trip?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The answer to the first question is, yes. The answer to the second question is, he was instructed to report as to the cost of removing obstructions on the Bonaparte River. The answer to the third question is covered by the answer to question No. 1; and to the fourth question the answer is, that the expenses were paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

#### KINGSTON POSTMASTER.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. If in the statutes relating to the superannuation of members of the Civil Service, it is provided that the superannuation of every civil servant shall be preceded by an inquiry, by the Treasury Board, whether his superannuation will result in benefit to the service, and is therefore in the public interest, and that no civil servant shall be superannuated unless the Treasury Board reports that he is eligible within the meaning of the Act, and that such superannuation will be in the public interest?
2. If so, was the case of Mr. James Shannon, ex-postmaster at Kingston, preceded by an inquiry by the Treasury Board before his superannuation?
3. If so, did it report that his superannuation would be a benefit to the service and in the public interest?
4. Did the Government appoint Mr. Alexander Gunn, ex-M.P.; an inexperienced man in post office affairs, as Mr. Shannon's successor in the public interest?
5. Is the date of Mr. Gunn's birth, as given in the "Parliamentary Companion" for 1885, at which time Mr. Gunn was a member of this House, correct in stating that he was born the 5th October, 1828, thus making him 68 years and 8 months of age at the time of his appointment?
6. Does the Civil Service Act not prohibit the appointment of permanent officers if such appointee is more than 45 years of age?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The answer to the first question is, there are such provisions in the Civil Service Superannuation Act. The answer to the second question is, yes. The answer to the third question is, the Treasury Board reported as follows, following the provisions of subsection of section 5 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act:—The board finding that Mr. Shannon is eligible within

the meaning of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and that his retirement would be in the public interest. The answer to the fourth question is, the Government decline to answer this question, as it contains matter of controversy, and is therefore not in order. I did not consider that the whole question should be ruled out because of this. The answer to the fifth question is, the information in the "Parliamentary Companion" on that question is probably correct. The answer to the sixth question is, there is no limit of age for appointments to the outside service.

#### INDIAN DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to news that has come from the Saskatchewan. It seems that an Indian, called "Almighty Voice," has killed three citizens, one a civilian and the others a constable and a corporal of the Mounted Police.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think that the killing of three men by an Indian is a laughing matter. I must say, that a manifestation of levity like that on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite is a little uncalled for. As this is the latest news we have, and as it sounds alarming, because we gather from the telegram in the newspapers, that Almighty Voice is being reinforced by young men from the reserves, and that the Mounted Police are going out from Regina and elsewhere, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any more recent information.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have all the information obtained so far, and it seems to be incomplete. I may say, in advance, that Almighty Voice has been killed in the attempt to capture him. This is the information that has been supplied by the Commissioner of Mounted Police:

On Thursday of last week, an Indian named Almighty Voice, who had previously shot and killed a sergeant of the Mounted Police, shot from ambush a settler named Venne, wounding him in the shoulder. Venne was brought to Duck Lake, and the police at once started in pursuit of the Indian. On Friday morning, they located him with other Indians in a bunch of timber, but the Indians had the advantage of the position, and in an attempt to capture them the following casualties occurred: Constable Kerr and a volunteer named Gundry were shot dead; Inspector Allan's arm was shattered by a bullet about two inches below the shoulder, and Sergeant Raven was shot in the groin, Corporal Hockin receiving wounds from which he died the same evening. One Indian was known to have been killed. A field gun was sent for to shell the Indians out of the timber, with the result that two Indians were killed, one of them being Almighty Voice. No further

Mr. FIELDING.

trouble expected. We have not been able to get authentic information as to the circumstances which led up to the shooting of Venne by Almighty Voice, but it is believed that he and Corporal Bowridge of the Mounted Police came suddenly on Almighty Voice, when the latter ran into the woods and shot from ambush.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WALLACE. Before section 16 is voted on, I would like to make a few remarks with reference to it, and also some general remarks on the question of the new tariff, because this is the only opportunity that has been afforded us to discuss tariff No. 2, which within the past few days has been submitted to the House by the Finance Minister. There are some portions of this clause 16 which deserve the most serious consideration of this House, and the first feature for consideration is the proposed reduction of 25 per cent on the present tariff in favour of England. I assume, Sir, that that reduction of 25 per cent is only a prelude to further reductions. If those reductions are right and proper, and if they are to be made for many countries, then the Government are adopting a free trade policy in that regard. For myself, I regard it with a great deal of apprehension, because I believe the future prosperity of this country is unalterably bound up in a protective policy, and that, by reducing the protection 25 per cent—one-eighth now, and another eighth in a year—you are going to destroy very many Canadian industries. Now, we have not been given the information with regard to this question to which this House is entitled. The Controller of Customs or the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Trade and Commerce should have furnished this House full and exhaustive information—all the information they have—as to the countries which will come in under this preferential tariff. There is no excuse for their not having that information and presenting it to this House. There is an International Customs Union, with headquarters in Belgium, from which every change made in the tariff of any country is at once sent to the Department of Trade and Commerce or the Department of Customs at Ottawa; so that the Government are supplied with the exact tariff of every country right up to date. There they have the means of knowing and informing this House, what the members of this House have no means otherwise of knowing, what countries to-day are permitting Canadian goods to be brought in on the terms called for in this resolution:

When the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the

whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply.

We are told that the tariff of Great Britain comes within the meaning of this resolution, and that instructions have been given that British goods should be admitted now at one-eighth reduction from the regular tariff, and later at one-fourth reduction. But I contend that there are other countries entitled to the same consideration, and they were entitled to it from the date this Act came into force, that is, the 23rd of last April, and the Government are negligent in their duty in not having provided for them. The result will be that those who have been importing goods from those countries will be applying to the Government for a return of the portion of the duty that should not have been charged. What becomes, then, of the statement that this preferential duty was for the special advantage of Great Britain? Because we have the clause amended by providing that "the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty." This, I assume, applies directly to Belgium and Germany. We were told—and I was pleased to know it at the time—that Great Britain was the only country to which this reciprocal tariff applied—that the treaties to which reference has been made did not apply to Canada. Now we find the Government taking a new position. The Minister of Finance and other members of the Government were positive in their statements that the preferential tariff applied only to Great Britain, and did not apply to Belgium and Germany. If that was the case then, the conditions have not changed since; or, if they have, the Government have not enlightened the House what the changes are which have induced them to add this clause "B," authorizing the Governor in Council to extend it to other countries. It cannot be that they had not, when they brought down the tariff, all the information they have to-day. It may be that the members of the Opposition have been enlightening them on some of these points. In my opinion, the proposal is exceedingly objectionable. While I am in favour of preferential trade with Great Britain, and would go a very long way to secure it, I still consider that it should be brought about with the greatest care—not by a horizontal reduction of the tariff on all items with the exception of a few, such as sugar, liquors and tobacco, but by a careful selection of certain articles on which, in the circumstances of our case, we could afford to make some reduction without destroying Canadian industries. But this resolution does not propose that; it makes an even sweep of reductions. And what will be the effect? That those industries which to-day require 30 per cent protection in order to live, will have 22½ per cent protection, which will

destroy them—destroy the capital invested in them and deprive our Canadian people of the labour they afford. For that reason, I think this proposal is a most objectionable one. Now, there are other countries besides Belgium and Germany to which this resolution will apply. There is no doubt, from information I have, that both China and Japan, and most likely Switzerland as well, will be entitled to this preferential reduction of 25 per cent. If so, we are opening the doors still wider. We are destroying that preference in favour of Great Britain which the Government started out with and we are doing more than that; we are putting Canadian workmen very largely in competition with the labourers of these countries, where the people live on the smallest pay. The inevitable result will be that our Canadian industries will not be able to stand against that competition. The tariff as it formerly was, gave no more protection than was absolutely required in order to sustain Canadian industries, with a few exceptions. Of course, the changed circumstances of a few years may enable certain industries to get along with a smaller amount of protection, but taking it on the whole, the tariff was reduced three years ago to a point where it would not bear further reduction without ruin and loss to many industries. I shall point out some of those reductions which, I think, are very injurious to the best interests of Canada; but before doing that, I must say that I cannot congratulate the Government on dealing with the tariff in a businesslike manner. They came here to Parliament on the 25th of March and kept the House kicking its heels for four weeks or more without bringing down their tariff, and the reason they gave was that they wanted to make a perfect tariff, a tariff that would require no further changes, but which, when submitted to the House, would at once receive its approval. It was to be a tariff which, after the most careful and cautious consideration and balancing of all its interests, had received the approval of the Government, and which the House would fall in love with as soon as submitted and adopt almost without a dissentient voice. Well, they brought down their tariff, and four weeks later they brought down another tariff—not at all the same one that we got on the 25th of April, but a tariff with hundreds of changes in it. At any rate, I counted ninety-three items that were turned upside-down more or less, generally a good deal more than less, and in some of the items two or three changes were made, so that the changes would be at least 200 in number—changes in the rates of duty, in the classification of the items, changes of a most important character. I remember, when we made our changes in our tariff three years ago, how we were criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite, how we were twitted with not knowing our own

minds, with being tossed to and fro, with having no settled policy. But what do we find to-day? We find item after item in the tariff first brought down by these hon. gentlemen changed in the one submitted the other day. They have added new items, they have made extraordinary changes in some of the old ones, and minor changes in others, and have gone back practically, in many instances, to the tariff which they attempted to reform in the first instance.

Take the question of coal dust, which first occurs to me. It is item 174:

Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Let me now refer to the item of coal dust, as it appears in their first tariff of the 23rd of April. I should judge by that item that the gentleman who had devised it was a Nova Scotian, because it looks very like a Nova Scotian item. What did it mean? There are over 200,000 tons of coal dust imported into this country. As the tariff then stood, 95 per cent of that coal would have to pay a duty of 60 cents per ton. What would that amount to? This coal is valued at 25 cents per ton in the Trade and Navigation Returns, although it can be got at 20 cents, and this duty of 60 cents per ton on an article that costs 25 cents per ton, meant simply a duty of 240 per cent on the value of the coal dust. Moreover, that coal dust is the raw material of the manufacturers, it is, indeed, used solely by them; and I submit to this House whether it was an evidence of business capacity on the part of these gentlemen, that, after the most careful consideration, they should have submitted a proposal to tax that coal dust or slack, which we import to the extent of 200,000 tons, and which is used exclusively by the manufacturers, at the rate of 240 per cent on its value. I am glad to see that these hon. gentlemen have made some change in that, but am not quite sure what effect the change will have. As it now stands the item reads:

Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, 20 per cent ad valorem.

I assume that that is going back to the tariff just as they found it before they began tinkering with it.

Here is another item that they have been tinkering with. We had a large industry in manufacturing nuts and bolts built up in this country. There were pretty large importations as well, but there were big industries built up also. What did the Government do? They changed the duty. Under the old duty, there was \$21,576 collected on the amount of those articles imported into this country. The Government reduced that so that the duty collected would be \$16,215. That was under their tariff No. 1. The other day their tariff No.

2 came down, and under that tariff there will be collected on the same importations \$20,517, or they brought back the tariff to almost the identical figures at which it stood before they attempted to touch it. What happened with regard to that industry? They put it into a state of unrest, they caused the establishments to shut down, they destroyed the industry for a time, and now, when they see the wrong they did by their tariff tinkering, they come back to the old figures, or pretty nearly the old figures, of the late Government's policy. That is an illustration of the evils caused by those gentlemen proposing to reform the tariff without knowing exactly what they are going to do.

Then there were bridges and structural work. This was a large industry, and the other day I heard that the Peterboro' works were shut down. Then the Government became alarmed and decided to change their tariff. The tariff of the late Government gave a protection of 35½ per cent, this they reduced by their first tariff to 30 per cent, which was just sufficient reduction to destroy that industry, because the raw material which these men use in the construction of their bridges costs a good deal. When the Government saw the havoc they had made, they retraced their steps and raised the duty to 35 per cent. It was 35½ under the tariff of 1894, and now they make it 35 per cent, or a reduction of just one-half of one per cent, an infinitesimal reduction, but the point is this, that they first reduced the duty sufficiently to destroy the bridge manufacturing industry, and when they found that out, they had to come down with a new tariff and practically admit that they had made a mistake, that they had not examined into the matter, and they had to change their tariff and give sufficient protection to this great industry.

With reference to yarns, the same story has to be told. They first struck down the duty on the low-priced yarns, used by the carpet manufacturers, from 5 cents a pound and 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent. The inevitable result of that must be that every one of these yarn factories, from one end of the Dominion to the other, must shut down. Then the Government saw the error of their way again, and now they come to Parliament and say that they made some sort of clerical error or mistake. There was no mistake about it. They had only seen one side of the question. I presume that they had been interviewed by the carpet manufacturers and had no idea of the immense importance of the manufactories of yarn for these carpets, because the manufacture of yarn is the greater portion of the manufacture of the carpet. They propose now, instead of a duty of 15 per cent, a duty of 30 per cent; that is, they propose exactly to double the duty they announced on the 23rd of April. Now, let me refer to the worsted yarn and these finer qualities of

Mr. WALLACE.

yarn which have to be imported, which are not made in this country and probably will not be made in this country, which are used for the manufacture of hosiery. There was a combined specific and ad valorem duty on hosiery. But the Government have abolished the specific duty of 10 cents a dozen, and the result will be—I have the information from the manufacturers themselves who are not speaking in a threatening way, but simply stating their case—in the first instance to reduce the wages of the mechanics about 25 per cent, and then, if the competition of the pauper labour of Europe is as strong as is feared, to compel the shutting down of the industry altogether. And what is all this for? It is no benefit to the Canadian people that the change should be made, because the articles are made here at a marvellously low price and of better quality than those that will come in when the specific duty is abolished. The country will be flooded with a low and useless class of goods, though fair in appearance and pretty saleable. I say that this is a great mistake. Our Canadian hosiery factories have been making a splendid class of goods out of pure material, and this blow at their industry will be more than they can stand. Then, I take it for granted that they will have the competition of Germany and of Belgium as well as of Great Britain. Germany and Great Britain are the two great woollen manufacturing countries of Europe. This reduction of 25 per cent in the protection afforded to hosiery manufacturers, together with the increase of the duty on their raw material, is in marked contrast to the treatment meted out to other industries that I could name, to which the Government has given additional protection by lowering the duty on the raw material and increasing the duty on the finished product. I think, Sir, that this is most unfair. Some consideration should have been given to this industry, which has been struggling along, the men engaged in which have made the greatest efforts and have made very little profit out of the business. They have put in enormous capital, they employ a great many people, but they have not had adequate results, even under the old tariff; and, under this tariff, with a decrease of 25 per cent in their protection, and with higher duties on their raw material, they cannot succeed, they cannot go on with their business. As the Government have been reconsidering duties, as they have found that they are not perfect, as they made hundreds of changes in the first tariff, I trust they will make a few more and restore prosperity to these other industries that have been struck down by this tariff.

There is another article to which I would call attention, of which I spoke in some remarks I made to the House a short time ago—I refer to rice. I stated then that they had put a duty of 75 cents per hundred pounds on an article of raw material for

manufacturers, the cost of which article was 81 cents per hundred pounds, a duty of 91 per cent. That was wholly unjustifiable. If they had given a protection commensurate with this high duty on raw material, their course might have been justified so far as the industry is concerned, though it would be hard to justify it so far as concerns the people who use this necessary of life. How does this arrangement of duties work? It takes 156 pounds of the paddy, or uncleaned rice, to make 100 pounds of the manufactured article, the cleaned rice. The duty on the uncleaned rice is  $\frac{3}{4}$  cents per pound, or \$1.17 on 156 pounds. The duty on the cleaned rice is \$1.25 per 100 pounds, less one-eighth to Great Britain, which would leave it at \$1.09. Thus, with a duty of \$1.17 on the raw material and \$1.09 on the manufactured article, we find not only that they have no protection but that they are 8 cents per 100 pounds worse off than they would be under free trade.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That calculation is made upon the assumption that the by-product or waste is worth nothing at all. But it must be remembered that the greater part of this fifty-six pounds is sold at from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 cents per pound, and the balance at  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per pound, which brings to the manufacturer a large profit, outside of the sale of cleaned rice. The hon. gentleman's calculation amounts to nothing at all unless he can go thoroughly into the case and show the effect all the way through.

Mr. MILLS. Where is the question?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The question is, how does the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. WALLACE. I will try and explain it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron). I see he has given the matter a little consideration, and so have I. He says that the refuse sells for  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 cents per pound. If he will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that the highest price it sells for is 1 cent per pound, which does not pay the cost of the freight and the cost of the uncleaned rice.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). But there is freight on the other as well.

Mr. WALLACE. But it is not on the other as well, for this reason, that the freight on the unclean rice must be paid from the East Indies, while if the hon. gentleman will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that all the rice, except that which comes from China to supply British Columbia, that is, all the clean rice imported to supply the eastern portion of the country, or about three-quarters of

the whole import, comes from Great Britain, and the freight is not one-quarter as much as from the East Indies. So the freight on the raw material is about four times as much as on the cleaned rice. But the hon. gentleman says that the broken rice and rice meal sell for from 1½ to 2 cents per pound. If he will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns he will find that they sell for 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. I refer the hon. gentleman to the returns.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Ross, who is a manufacturer of rice in Montreal told me, sitting right beside me here, that they were receiving from 1½ to 2 cents per pound for "chips," and ½ cent for meal.

Mr. WALLACE. I have a statement which directly contradicts that, and I have the Trade and Navigation Returns which also contradict it. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the exports, he will find that there is a demand in Canada for only a very small portion of that rice flour, they have to export the chief part of it, and the export price is exactly 1 cent per pound; that is the sworn price of the exports at the customs. Now what more do we find about this rice question? I said that in another year there will only be one-eighth taken off, so that the protection on the rice imported from Great Britain—and the most of it is imported from Great Britain, you may say the whole of it that comes to eastern Canada—when one-fourth of the duty is taken off, the duty will be then, per hundred pounds of rice 93¾ cents, and the duty on the raw material to manufacture that 100 pounds of rice, is \$1.17, or 23¼ cents per 100 pounds against the Canadian manufacturer. But what more? The Canadian rice cleaned here at home, without all the disadvantages of an ocean voyage, is a much more desirable and more healthy article than the rice coming in vessels across the ocean, cleaned in some other country. Now I have here a statement of Mr. Lock-erby, one of the leading wholesale grocers of Montreal who, in an interview that he gave to a Montreal paper the other day, said:

Another point that should be borne in mind is, that we do not get as good an article when we import cleaned rice as when it is cleaned here. There are several reasons for this. When "paddy" is imported, it is shipped from Japan or other places in direct vessels and reaches the mills in good condition. With cleaned rice from Europe it is different. The shippers want the freight to be as small as possible, and take the cheapest means of shipping. Very often the cleaned rice comes in a mixed cargo on "tramp" steamers, and should there be any alkaloids among the cargo, the rice is bound to suffer.

Then he speaks of damage to bags and loss by contamination with other articles in the

Mr. WALLACE.

vessel, whereas a vessel of uncleaned rice takes a whole cargo of rice, there is no other commodity with it, and it is therefore uncontaminated by any other substance. But the point I make is this, that instead of giving a protection to the Canadian manufacturer, the Government discriminates against him to the extent of 23¼ cents per 100 pounds. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) says the refuse is worth something. Well, suppose it is, that does not affect the question. The refuse has to be exported from the country because I find in the Trade and Navigation returns: Rice meal exported from Canada, 1,785,000 pounds, price \$17,891, or exactly 1 cent a pound. That proves what I said before, that the value of that rice meal is exactly 1 cent a pound, and not one and a half cents, or two cents, as the hon. gentleman stated. But more than that. There is no market in this country for this rice meal, or else they would not export the million and three-quarter pounds that they have to send out of the country, and for which they have to take the price that is going. Now, for that 100 pounds they pay 81 cents in the East Indies, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns. They pay for freight more than 30 per cent per 100 pounds, they take it nearly half way around the world, it costs them more than the dollar they get for it, so that there is no profit in that whatever. But I am speaking merely of the duty, I am speaking of the Government's course towards this industry, and showing that 23¼ cents per 100 pounds is the discrimination against the Canadian industry, and that has had the effect of utterly destroying the industry, and of shutting down that Canadian mill. But they say: Oh, you will get more revenue. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know about that. This telegram is just put into my hands:

Victoria, B.C.

New rice tariff utter ruination to me. Equals a duty of 72 per cent ad valorem.

That is the result in British Columbia, the same result is destroying the industry that has taken place in Montreal. Now who gets the benefit, or what benefit is there? The Finance Minister may tell us that there will be a larger revenue. Well, before this duty was put on, rice was sold at six pounds for 25 cents in the stores in Ontario, to-day you can only get five pounds for 25 cents. If you take the whole of the importations into this country of cleaned rice, over fifteen million pounds, the five-sixths of a cent per pound higher price to the consumer, as compared with last year, means \$125,000 that the consumer has to pay more than he did before. Sir, I have calculated what would be the additional amount of revenue you can possibly get, and it is only between \$60,000 and \$70,000, or you tax the people \$125,000 more, but you only get one-half of it back in revenue, and you have the addi-

tional satisfaction of destroying these two Canadian industries. That is the net result with regard to the rice duty. I referred a moment ago to an interview had with Mr. Lockerby. I presume he is not interested, as he is speaking as a wholesale grocer. I know him very well as one of the leading wholesale grocers of this country, and he figures out here a very large increase in the cost of rice to the Canadian consumer by the change in the duties, and he also states, what we all know, that the article is not so clean, nor so satisfactory, nor so healthy as the article that was produced in Canada and furnished in clean sacks to the consumers all over this country.

Now, there is another industry that I was going to refer to, and although it is only in its infancy, it is a growing one, and promises to be an important one in this country. I refer to the manufacture of cream separators. Some years ago when creamery separators were being introduced into this country, the Government of that day admitted free the steel bowls for cream separators used in all the creameries, because they were not made in this country and were being more extensively used day by day; as a matter of fact they were not made in any other country but Denmark; they were not made in Great Britain, they were not made in the United States, they were made only in Denmark. The Government put a duty of 30 per cent on cream separators, but they made free the steel bowl for the cream separator, which is a very fine piece of mechanism, and an important and intricate piece of work. Well, Sir, what has happened now? We see that the Government have made not only cream bowls for the separators free, but the separators themselves. Now, I would like to ask the Government what justification they had to wipe out a Canadian industry, and wipe out that duty entirely? The same argument would apply to wiping out protection on that industry as would apply to wiping out protection on any other Canadian industry. But the Government have taken off the duty in face of the fact that to-day there are two Canadian factories making these articles—the Waterloo Manufacturing Company, and the John Abell Manufacturing Company, of Toronto. The latter company is doing what no other manufacturing industry in the world is doing outside of Denmark: they are making the steel separator bowls, and they have a fair claim for a duty, not only on the separators themselves, but also on the bowls. They were made duty free because these articles were not manufactured in this country; but following the protective policy adopted by this country, if it be followed by the present Government, we shall have to place a duty on the steel bowls for separators and restore the duty of 30 per cent, or whatever may be equitable, on

separators themselves. It would be a great injustice to enterprising business men and manufacturers of Canada that after a line of business has become established and a factory is making both separators and the steel bowls, the duty should be taken off the one, the duty having formerly been taken off the other for the reason that the article was not made in this country. Now, the bowls are made here, the manufacturer has a fair and equitable claim to protection at the hands of the Government. There are a number of other articles to which attention might properly be called; but while I do not wish to weary the House, I cannot take my seat without referring to another item in the tariff, which I think is the most extraordinary item I ever saw in any tariff—I refer to item 433. Under the old tariff of 1894 and the tariff of 1897 there is the following provision: travellers' baggage free, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs. Now, the Government has added to this provision the following words: "And any article by mail or express valued at not more than 50 cents for the whole importation." This means that all articles brought into this country from any foreign country which are not of greater value than 50 cents will come in duty free under this regulation. I observe it states "under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs;" but I presume it was meant to apply to passengers' baggage. Do these words apply to passengers' baggage, or to articles coming in by mail and express?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It applies to other articles.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the phrase "under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs" apply to passengers' baggage, or to other articles?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. To the whole.

Mr. WALLACE. Not by the construction of the sentence. It says "passengers' baggage," and then there is a semi-colon.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The department has rules as to what is contraband; but the words there have reference to the whole covered by the item.

Mr. WALLACE. So no matter what regulations the Controller of Customs may make, he cannot provide regulations by which articles less in value than 50 cents shall not come in duty free. That will be the will of Parliament. He may make regulations as to the package and the examinations of the package, but he cannot make any law that will prevent the importation of any article which may be of less value than this sum. What will be the effect of that clause? Take cigarettes. The importation last year was 4,500 pounds, of the value of \$10,297, on which the duty amount

ed to \$11,770; but the duty under the new tariff will be \$16,370 on an article that cost \$11,000. The average price per pound excise duty paid, of these cigarettes will be \$2.24. Suppose you bring in 50 cents worth of cigarettes, that will be equivalent to two-ninths of a pound, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  ounces. The price here would be \$5.80—that is the price and the duty. The cost of the two-ninths of a pound would be under our new tariff \$1.29; so that by sending to the United States you would get them for 74 cents less than you could get them in Canada, less postage. The postage on a package of merchandise is 1 cent per ounce. There would be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  ounces, or including the package, 5 ounces, and the postage would therefore be 5 cents, which would have to be deducted, and this would leave 74 cents profit by not buying cigarettes in Canada but sending to American dealers for them. This rule will apply to everything, and it will inflict the most gross injustice on the mercantile community of Canada. I believe there is no class of the community that has done more for the development of the country and more for the interests of the people than the merchants. They have gone out into the new settlements in advance of civilization and settlement; they have helped the poor whenever they could do so. Some say that our merchants have acquired great wealth; but the statement that at least 90 per cent of our merchants have failed in business would disprove the assertion that they have been bleeding our people or living on them. They have been enterprising, and they have acted practically as bankers for a large portion of the community, more especially those residing in the newer portions of the Dominion. What effect will this clause have? On every class of goods of which the package does not exceed in value 50 cents, and there are hundreds of small articles imported here from other countries, any one who sends for small quantities will make money by the operation. The first effect will be that price lists from the United States will be sent into Canada, coming in free of duty under the 50 cents value clause; and so soon as the merchants and manufacturers of the United States discover this clause in the tariff, as they will do within a very few days, they will flood this country with price lists and pamphlets. This clause will apply to hundreds of articles, to some of which I will refer. I have referred to the question of cigarettes and have shown that packages of cigarettes can be brought in under this clause and I have shown that profit will be made by purchasing them in the United States. The effect of this clause will be to destroy the cigarette industry here, for it will be impossible to make cigarettes in this country or to import them in the regular way. The man who brings in large quantities of merchandise, we make him pay 25 or 35 per cent

Mr. WALLACE.

duty, but you say to the man who buys from him: You can get in your articles duty free; all you have to do is to get price lists from the sellers in the United States, and at the expense of a one cent post card, you can order a dozen cigars or a pound of tobacco, or a package of cigarettes, and you can get them in free of duty. This provision will destroy the Canadian merchants. Complaint has been made in the past that these departmental stores have been injuring the general mercantile trade of the country, but the effect of this will be to shut up the departmental stores and to cripple every other store in Canada. Take the case of cigars. The average price of the imported cigar is \$4 a hundred, and you can send for a dozen cigars to the United States, which would cost 50 cents. Under the tariff now before the House the duty on these would be 65 cents, but by paying five cents postage you can have your dozen cigars in here at a cost of 55 cents, instead of buying them in this country at a cost of \$1.15. Will the merchants of this country be able to sell their cigars under such conditions as these? I do not think so. Tobacco is another instance in point. The excise duty on tobacco in the United States is 6 cents per pound, but in Canada under the present law, it will be 39 cents per pound. T. & B. tobacco was 60 cents a pound before this 14 cents a pound duty was added, and today I suppose the price would be over 75 cents. Mr. Tuckett, I am told, has a large manufacturing establishment in the United States, and he makes there the same quality of T. & B. which is made in Canada, and which has such a high reputation. If you send a postal card to Mr. Tuckett in the United States to send you a pound package of tobacco to Canada, then, as Mr. Tuckett does not have to pay the excise duty, you get it 39 cents a pound cheaper than you can buy it here for, and from that you have to deduct 16 cents for postage. The Canadian postal law requires 1 cent an ounce, or 16 cents a pound for parcel post, but there is another law which says that you may send samples for 4 cents per pound, or a quarter of a cent per ounce, and I defy Mr. Controller of Customs and Mr. Postmaster General, both, to prevent these goods from coming in here at one-quarter of a cent an ounce, or 4 cents a pound, instead of the 16 cents per pound parcel post. At any rate, it does not make much difference to us, because it is American stamps that will be used. More than that, we are inviting United States merchants to do their business here, without one cent accruing to the Canadian Government, because we take the American stamp on the package and we deliver that package to any part of Canada without further cost. We are therefore making the departments of Government the agents to destroy the business of the Canadian merchants, and of the Canadian manufacturers as well. That is the result of this proposal—the most outrageous

proposal that I ever heard of, and one which I should like to hear the Controller of Customs or Minister of Finance try to justify. There are a hundred other articles similarly situated. Suppose a lady wants a silk handkerchief, and they say ladies are fond of bargains. She sends 50 cents to the States for a handkerchief, and as the package will not weigh more than three ounces, she will not pay more than 3 cents postage on it. The duty of 17½ cents is saved, and if you deduct the 3 cent postage, the lady saves 14½ cents on a single pocket handkerchief. Item 352 of the tariff is full of articles that will come in here without paying any duty whatever. You make the wholesale merchant and the retail importer pay 30 or 35 per cent duty, but you invite the consumer to import those goods from foreign countries without paying any duty whatever. This article 352 of the tariff says :

352. Embroideries, laces, braids, fringes, cords, elastic, round or flat ; garter elastic, tassels and bracelets, n.o.p. ; braids, chains, cords or other manufactures of hair, n.e.s. ; handkerchiefs of all kinds ; lace collars and all similar lace goods ; lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk, or other material ; shams, curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed ; regalia, badges and belts of all kinds, n.o.p. ; linen, silk and cotton clothing, and all other articles made up by the seamstress from linen or cotton fabrics, n.o.p. ; corsets of all kinds, corset clasps, busks, blanks and steels, and corset wires, tipped or untipped, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this country will be flooded with price lists from England and price lists from the United States and other countries, inviting the Canadian people to buy their goods in these countries. They will say : The merchant in Canada has to pay 35 per cent duty on these articles, but we will send them to you absolutely free of duty, you will have no express or freight charges to pay, but just a little postage fee, for we can send them as samples at 4 cents per pound, or 1 cent for four ounces. These goods will be delivered in Canada, and so our Post Office Department will make itself—without any consideration whatever—the agent of these foreign merchants, for the destruction of the Canadian wholesale and the Canadian retail merchants. This proposal to make these articles free of duty is so outrageous that it cannot be defended. The only defence offered is that it is too much trouble for our officials to examine these packages. Well, what are these officers for ? There are plenty of them in the country to do the work, and I do not see that the Government propose to reduce the staff because they are letting these articles in free of duty. This proposal to admit every article valued under 50 cents absolutely free of duty when coming by mail or express, will be ruinous to the Canadian mercantile community. There are numerous articles the price of which is not more than 50 cents. I will give

an example. Ladies' blouses can be bought for 50 cents, and pretty good ones too. They weigh 7½ ounces with collars, cuffs and all complete. The postage under the sample post—and you cannot prevent them from coming in under that—will be 2 cents for the 7½ ounces. That makes the cost of the blouse 52 cents. The duty on that article is 35 per cent, and so 17½ cents duty is saved at the expense of 2 cents for postage, or 15½ cents is saved on the purchase of a single blouse. But, Mr. Chairman, many people send to different parts of this country for their goods. They have to pay the return postage or express upon them ; but when they send to the States or to England, the postage is no more or is even less in some cases ; so that it costs them less to buy abroad than to buy in Canada. Take regalias and badges. I know myself that there is a tremendous business done in the States in the supply of regalias. One firm in New Jersey supplies almost every society in Canada. What will they do under this provision ? They will say : " Send us the names of your parties, and we will send them a 50-cent or a 30-cent or a 25-cent badge direct, and pay no duty whatever." That will be the effect. This American company, I know, came over here and did business, and it was necessary to fine them \$2,400, I think, for breaking the law ; but now they will not be breaking the law, but they will be carrying out the law which is put on the Statute-book by the Finance Minister. They will be supplying goods to this country, and this country will not be getting one cent of revenue so long as they send small 50-cent packages. There are a hundred articles in the same position—flowers, dress buttons, combs, collars, cuffs, men's shirts, socks and stockings ; all these things can be imported from other countries without any duty being paid upon them. How is the Canadian retailer to compete with other countries, when the importer has to pay both freight and a high rate of duty, while the consumer gets his goods under this proposal without paying any duty at all ? I think the Government will reconsider that clause, because if they do not, they will get into a lot of trouble over it. Now, I have nothing further to say to the House at present, only to express my regret that the Government, while they have held out a kindly hand to some classes of manufacturers, have not seen fit to do it to all who require it. They have struck down a number of Canadian industries without benefiting the country to any extent ; and I would ask the Government, who have expressed their wish to make changes if changes shall be shown to be necessary, to make other changes that will make this tariff one that will protect our Canadian industries to some extent, and help to build up this Canada of ours.

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate on clause 16 for the

past two or three days with considerable interest, and while I have heard many important points discussed, there are many other points of great importance to the business men and manufacturers of this country which I consider have not been touched upon by any previous speaker. No member of the Government has as yet given any explanation of clause 16 showing that in the opinion of any business man it can be made to work satisfactorily to the people of this country; and I state here that no member of the Government can give a satisfactory explanation of how this clause will work. That is why they remain silent. To my mind there are many difficulties in the way of carrying out this clause—difficulties that cannot be overcome, difficulties that will arouse suspicion and distrust in the mind of every business man in this country. This clause will open the door to the committal of glaring frauds upon the revenue and upon the business men of this country—frauds which I assert cannot be detected by any custom-house appraiser in the Dominion of Canada to-day. Let us see how this preferential clause is to be carried out, and if I make any mistake, I trust that some member of the Government will put me right as I proceed. Every member of this House must know that the great warehouses of London, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, Nottingham, Leeds, Bradford, Glasgow, Belfast, and others I could mention, are filled with the manufactures of the world, so that, instead of being called warehouses of Great Britain, they might well be called warehouses of the world; and I will venture here to state that 75 per cent of the merchants of the world cannot tell the difference between many British-made goods and foreign-made goods of the same class. I am referring to dry goods more especially, but I can prove it with regard to other classes as well. I find that many members of this House are under the impression that no foreign goods can enter Great Britain unless they are stamped on the fabric with the name of the country in which they are made. That is not so. I grant that there is a law in Great Britain requiring a ticket to be placed on the goods to designate the country in which they were manufactured; but remove that ticket, and I will defy any custom-house appraiser in the Dominion of Canada to tell me the country where many of those goods were produced. I know that we have in Canada the best class of business men, perhaps, to be found outside of Great Britain; but let us suppose that a package of goods arrives to-day in this country, and they are being passed through one of our custom-houses as of British manufacture. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs how he is going to detect or determine whether those goods are British-made or foreign-made. I know that he will tell me that he will compel the British exporter to certify on the

invoice that the goods are of British manufacture. Is that all the safeguard the business men of this country are to have against fraud? If it is, I thank heaven that I am out of business, because it is no protection from fraud at all. While I believe our British and Canadian merchants to be the best and most honest in the world, it cannot be denied that there are many men in this country, as in all countries, who will take advantage of any expedient to make money, especially where protection is impossible. For example, take German-made serge. I will place a piece of German-made serge and a piece of British-made serge on that table and defy the Controller of Customs to produce any man in the Customs Department who can tell the difference between the two. If he says he can, I will tell him he does not know what he is talking about. Take dress goods. We all know that there is not a greater competitor of England than Germany to-day. The German manufacturer copies the British and the British copies the German, and there are many goods in the dress goods line which cannot be detected as German or British except by an expert engaged in the business from morning to night, and that class of men we have not in this country. Take the German hosiery trade. There is German hosiery made to-day which cannot be detected from English; and although it may seem strange, it was only a short while ago that I saw German hosiery made to imitate the Canadian manufacture, and a Canadian manufacturer told me that he himself could hardly tell the difference between the two. The point I wish to make is this, that when different goods are placed in stock in British warehouses, there is no man except an expert who can tell the foreign from many of English manufacture, and I myself, on many occasions, have been very much confused to tell which is which. The ordinary clerk is not allowed to know where the goods have come from, and in many cases he is not allowed to know even the prices paid. The British merchant is very clever in doing business, perhaps the best in the world. Does the Controller of Customs mean to tell me that he has any appraisers in his department who could detect a German velvet from an English velvet, or a German sealette from an English sealette. The latter is a class of goods made to imitate real sealskin, and I venture to state that there is not a man in this country who could detect a German sealette from an English sealette. Then, take the manufactures of silk. We know that in Germany black silks are made largely and in Zurich, Switzerland, as well as in England. I defy the hon. Controller of Customs to produce any customs appraiser in his department who can tell the German or the Swiss from the English manufacture. If he says he can, I would tell him he does not know what he is talking about. If all this is to be left to

the honesty of every little tin-pot merchant in Great Britain, what is to become of honest business men? All that is required of the English merchant is to certify that the goods are of British manufacture; and if he does, who is to say they are not? I hold that it cannot be discovered whether the goods are of foreign or British manufacture. If this clause be adopted, I would advise the hon. Controller to send over to England at once and engage all the expert buyers in Great Britain and place one in every custom-house in the Dominion. If he does not do this, he will have the greatest frauds committed, not only on the revenue, but on the honest business men of this country, and committed without fear of detection. If what I have said is true—and of that I have no doubt—we can never have preferential trade in Canada so long as Great Britain admits the products of Europe free into her ports, because we will be subjected to the greatest frauds on our revenue. There is another class of trade I had almost forgotten, and that is the lace trade. The foundation lace is made in Nottingham, and thence shipped to Switzerland, where it receives the embroidery and other work placed upon it. The article is half made in England and half in Switzerland. How does the Controller propose to enter that goods? The only way I can see is this, the hon. Finance Minister will have to adopt a new clause, which I should call the half-and-half clause, because the goods are half English and half Swiss. There is still another article, and it is one that comes from a country on which the Government are bestowing a great deal of attention, but, I am sorry to say, the people of that country do not appear to appreciate the kindness of the Government. I refer to Ireland and the Irish linen trade. Perhaps hon. gentlemen are not aware that a large amount of the linen called Irish which comes into this country is really foreign linen produced in Germany and Belgium and sold by merchants as Irish linen, many of them not knowing the difference. Then, there is another case in which frauds may be committed to a large extent of the revenue. There is a class in England called the packers who do a considerable trade. Many Canadian importers buy in England small amounts of goods in different warehouses and then send the packages to London, Manchester and Glasgow into packing establishments, where the goods are all packed together in one package and invoiced, and the packers will very often invoice them according to instructions. Are the business men of this country to be subjected to a practice of that kind on the part of men, whom I would be sorry to call dishonest, but irresponsible men, who will invoice the goods, if instructed so to do, as being the products of England, whether they are the products of England or not? In this way, a great many goods may be brought into

this country and passed as the products of England, which are not the products of England at all, and I hope the Controller of Customs will consider this.

I shall not weary the House any longer except with one more remark. I have heard the question of loyalty thrown across from the Government side to this side frequently during this debate, would it not be well to leave the question of loyalty out of the question? It is not many years ago since some hon. gentlemen who sit on the Government side to-day expressed on the floor of the House the opinion that had they been on the banks of the Saskatchewan, they would have taken up their rifles and shot down the volunteers who went to quell the rebellion. I was on the banks of the Saskatchewan just looking for such characters, but they did not dare to put in an appearance, and I regret that any man who would venture to give utterance to such a sentiment should go to England to represent Canada at the Jubilee of Queen Victoria. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I can call this clause nothing else but a clause of false pretenses, a clause calculated to blind and mislead the merchants and the people of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) if he will bring down the papers in regard to the decision come to to admit British goods under this clause. The process, as laid down in the hon. gentleman's own tariff clause, is, first, an investigation by the Controller of Customs, then a report by the Controller of Customs to the Council, then a decision of the Council, which, I suppose, of course, can only be given by an Order in Council. I do not imagine that, in a matter of so great importance, the Controller of Customs would make a decision without having thoroughly gone into the matter, nor do I think that the Council would decide upon his report unless his report were laid before them pro forma. It must be so, because the Controller of Customs is not, up to the present time, a member of the Cabinet. He must, therefore, have reported and given the ground of his recommendation that the tariff of Great Britain was such as compared with ours that their goods could be admitted under preferential rates at once. He may have made—I suppose he must have made—a similar report with reference to New South Wales, and in these reports he must certainly have laid down the principles upon which he proceeded and which were to guide him in making his recommendations with reference to the different countries to the Government. Now, if we had these papers, the report of the Controller of Customs, and the Order in Council upon that report, we would at least have something to guide us as to what is the mode of action, the principles by which the Government are to be guided when they admit other countries under this

reciprocal arrangement; and I think it is but fair that the Government should bring down these papers and lay them on the Table of the House, so that the members of the committee may have them before they are called upon to vote on this resolution. I have striven with the greatest pertinacity to get an explanation of the procedure from the Controller of Customs or the Prime Minister. But neither has met the question; both have shot right past it, and have given us nothing but words and generalities. If we had the actual report of the Controller of Customs to Council, and the decision of the Council in its Order in Council, which, I suppose, must have been passed, that would enlighten the committee more than anything that we have heard from the Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I must at least give partial credit to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). I will say he has been speaking—I will not say anything else—with pertinacity. If it will be more satisfactory for him to have the information in the form of the Order in Council with regard to British goods, it will afford me pleasure to gratify him to that extent, and I will undertake to have it to-morrow.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident that the clause now under consideration cannot be endorsed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who for years back, have stood up on the floor of Parliament and advocated the policy of protection, the only policy, they held, which could promote the various interests of the country. I venture to say that it was a genuine surprise to the country to see the way in which the hon. gentlemen have reversed their political policy, since coming into power. I remember very well, and I am sure it is also within the recollection of this House, how my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, when he was leader of the Opposition, advocated a policy of reciprocity with the United States, and at that time we all heard it stated from the lips of the hon. gentleman: that the first and last plank of the platform upon which he stood was the advocacy of Canadian interests, before everything else. I remember that, speaking about unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, my hon. friend said: I am of opinion that it would be conducive to the interests of Canada that we should enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the great Republic to the south of the line; and I truly believe that such a policy would promote our interests, and should the interests of Great Britain be injured thereby, well, so much the worse for British interests. First of all, he said, I advocate Canadian interests, and therefore I am in favour of Canada entering into a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Now, this preferential clause throws altogether into the background the former professions and

Mr. FOSTER.

the old political platform of the hon. Prime Minister and of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Were the policy and action of the hon. gentlemen to be sized up by that noted writer of the last century who was wont, when describing the statesmen of his time, to contrast their qualities with those of representatives of the animal kingdom, and even of the vegetable and mineral kingdoms, surely he would not have compared the hon. gentlemen with the elephant, which is looked upon as the prototype of good sense and prudence, which qualities should characterize the course of real statesmen; but I rather think he would have described the Government as a wild and carnivorous beast, because, the very first thing they did, after coming into power, was to turn out of office a great many civil servants, and to persecute them in various ways, instead of turning their attention to the vital interests of the country which the Liberals, when in the Opposition, used to call upon the late Government to foster and protect. The second thing the Government did, was to trample under foot and to crush the constitution of the country, and the rights of the Manitoba minority. And their third action was an attempt at tearing to pieces the commercial treaties entered into by the mother country, so far as Canada may be concerned.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has established, so as to leave no room for doubt, that the Dominion of Canada was bound by these treaties, and the Prime Minister, finally did hearken to reason. That is the reason why we now have this contingent clause which will allow the hon. gentleman, should the Imperial authorities so determine, to modify the tariff so as to admit goods from countries enjoying, under the treaties, the most-favoured-nation treatment, on the same basis as goods from Great Britain. Clause 16, now under consideration, is what the Government describe as a tender of preferential treatment to Great Britain. This is decidedly a preference given to the trade of the mother country: but, as stated by my hon. friends on this side of the House, it must apply to all the nations having entered into commercial treaties with England. Now, this clause, while giving a preference to the trade of foreign countries, is also bound, in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, if carried out, to interfere with the manufacturing industries and the farming interests of the country. The Government ought not to disturb the growing industries of this country, because the moderate protection which they are now enjoying is barely adequate to maintain them against foreign competition. In a young country like Canada, growing industries require protection against outside competition with the products of the most highly organized labour and protective countries in the world. But if we

cannot boast of being a great nation, my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, will bear me out when I say that we have one of the largest countries in the world, and that it should be our ambition to add materially to the sum of our national wealth and to increase our population. The manufacturing industries and agricultural development are two important factors which go hand in hand in the march of the country, along the pathway of material development. Those two wealth-producers, as I said, should both together put the shoulder to the wheel; because both manufacturers and soil-tillers are conjointly responsible for the growth and prosperity of the country; and let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite, that unless they bring about such conditions, the country, instead of going ahead, will be going backwards. I need not here invoke the authority of writers on political economy, of the last century, because, during the last hundred years, the world has gone ahead and all civilized nations have made rapid strides along the pathway of progress in all directions. It was during the last hundred years that industry made such wonderful progress in Great Britain, in France, in Belgium, in Holland and in Germany. In order well to realize the economic conditions of our country, so as not to blunder in tariff matters, we should form our opinions as to the best financial and fiscal policy on which to build up our national prosperity, from other sources than the writings of Cobden and other English economists who advocated free-trade as the best economic system, but from the modern writers, who have laid down doctrines more in harmony with the present trade conditions, which have undergone such wonderful changes during the present century, owing to the great improvements brought about by the development of modern sciences.

On these several grounds, I hold that the tariff now under consideration by this House will disturb our national industries and check the general prosperity of the country. If not a free trade measure, I think this tariff bears at least the stamp of free trade and has a tendency in that direction. I am afraid that the free trade doctrine of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) will in the long run prevail and be carried out by the hon. gentlemen opposite, when, under the proposed tariff, they will have to give entrance into Canada to the products of foreign countries which will come into competition with the output of our own industries and the productions of our soil, thus hampering if not totally destroying our manufacturing and agricultural interests. Such is not the view I take of a preferential tariff. I, for one, object to the Government granting to the mother country a preferential tariff, without at the same time securing reciprocal advantages. I would view with favour such

a tariff, on the condition that we were also given a better position and better terms for our products in the British markets. To my mind, a preferential tariff should be one allowing colonial products preferential treatment in the illimitable markets of the mother country. While Great Britain asks her colonies freer admission and preferential treatment for the products of her immense manufactures, I am of opinion that she should also be prepared to meet us half way and say: We are prepared to give your products a preference in our markets, as an offset for the trade privileges you grant us. What I press upon the Government is not to set up a prohibition tariff, practically shutting out of our markets foreign goods similar to those from the mother country, but a tariff adequate to protect all our manufacturing industries and our agricultural interests as well, such, for instance, as the manufacturing interests of the great city of Montreal, those of Toronto, and of St. Hyacinthe, all of which have sprung up and grown up under the fostering influence of the National Policy inaugurated by the late Government. And then, should they choose to give the mother country certain advantages, by granting her products a better position and better terms in our markets, I see no objection to their entering into such reciprocal arrangements, provided that our tariff, even with this reduction, be high enough to protect our Canadian industries. Thus, for instance, the rates of the main schedule could be raised 25 per cent on the manufactures and products coming into the country, over those imported from England. I would not object to such a preferential tariff, even with this dropping down to a 25 per cent reduction, provided as I said, that it afforded an adequate protection to our Canadian industries against competition from the mother country. While giving to the mother country this preference which would entail a loss of revenue, and supposing, as a matter of course that owing to our being unable to manufacture all the products required or in sufficient quantity for our home consumption, we had to import into the country some goods manufactured abroad, still I say, our home industries would suffer, if they were not sufficiently protected against that competition. While granting this preference to the products of the mother country, we must by all means keep up a protective tariff, in order to allow our national industries to grow up and prosper. But how are they to grow up and develop if we do not afford them adequate protection? In order the better to illustrate my meaning, let me give a concrete instance: take a general 25 per cent tariff, which you raise to a 32 per cent tariff, and then you give a preference to Great Britain and the other countries prepared to grant to Canada reciprocal terms, by reducing the duties to 25 per cent on all goods coming from those

countries, and by so doing, you protect our own industries against competition with the products of Great Britain and other countries. Now, in order to obtain these preferential terms in our market, the British Government should be prepared to consider the propriety of imposing duties upon certain products, so as to give the colonies preferential treatment in the English market, as an equivalent for the preference given by the colonies to the trade of the mother country. The better to elucidate my meaning, suppose that our dairy products were admitted in England on a preferential basis, that would give our butter and our cheese an advantage over similar products coming from foreign countries, thus creating a kind of monopoly in favour of British colonies so far as they would be given the preference, as regards those sources of food supply, over foreign countries. Were Great Britain to put an impost upon the breadstuffs, the meats imported from foreign countries, the colonies would benefit therefrom and be given a better position in the English market as a consideration for the preferential treatment granted to the mother country, in so far as we would be enabled thereby to export to Great Britain a larger quantity of our home products. We would thus be given a preference over the products of the United States and even those of the other portions of the Empire where the trade of the metropolis was not treated on a preferential basis. Were this clause to carry, the Dominion would thereby be deprived of the advantages we could claim as a return for the sacrifices made in favour of British trade, and which we could secure, should Great Britain impose duties upon breadstuffs, dairy products and meats coming from foreign countries. How, I ask, is the hon. Prime Minister, how is the Government going to obtain from the British Government these advantages for Canada, when they admit English goods under this preferential clause, and when they have to extend the same preference to the countries enjoying under the treaties the most-favoured-nation treatment? This preference given to British trade is, in my opinion unfair to our Canadian industries in so much as our tariff, as it now stands, does not afford more than an adequate protection to all our manufacturing interests. I hold that this clause is unjust, because it is proposed to make a reduction of 25 per cent in favour of Great Britain. I submit that the tariff, as it stands now, or rather the tariff submitted to the House, will not afford an adequate protection to our home industries against the keen competition of British manufacturers. It is a well known fact that the English people is, in an economic sense, the best equipped of all nations, having at their disposal an enormous working capital invested in numberless manufactures, and the service of a large fleet for the transportation of the products of

those manufactures and to subserve the wants of a globe encircling trade. How dare we hope, with infant industries still growing up, enter into successful competition with British industry, when the American people, with grown-up and powerful industries, nearly three-quarters of a century old, still have to protect themselves against British competition? American industry has to protect itself against British industry, although the Americans possess a vast accumulation of capital, a most modern equipment, having also immense natural resources at their disposal, and skilled labour in the several branches of their manufacturing industries; still they are satisfied that they are not yet able to enter into competition with either the English, the Germans or the Belgians. How dare the hon. gentlemen opposite pretend Canada to be strong enough to enter into successful competition with older nations, after fifteen or sixteen years of protective policy? How dare they expose Canadian industry to foreign competition and what arguments can they invoke to satisfy our manufacturers that our industry is strong enough to stand successfully the assaults of foreign trade and keep its vantage ground against competition, whatever it may be? None at all. The hon. gentlemen are dumb and they have not undertaken to contradict one single argument brought forward by the hon. gentlemen on this side against clause 16 of the tariff. The Government are silent, on the ground that they have long ago answered the arguments brought forward by the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers.

Mr. Chairman, modern economists divide nations into two classes, with regard to the economic system which is best appropriated to them. Free trade countries, they hold, are either those which have a preponderant industrial production, or which have a preponderant natural production. The protective nations are those in course of a very high industrial development, and those where industrial and farming interests grow apace. I think Canada comes under the last standard, as protection is perfectly well adapted to our environment. If we want capital to flow into the country and seek investment here let us endeavour to develop our manufacturing interests on a par with agriculture and the development of the natural resources of the soil. Without industry, our country will always remain poor and backward in the development of the natural resources of our boundless territory. Without a prosperous industry, we shall never have enough capital to develop our immense natural resources which are still in a latent state, such are the mineral wealth hidden either in the bowels of the earth or in the bosom of our mountains, and our immense plains which are awaiting the arrival of settlers to yield their latent wealth of luxuriant crops. The

same may be said of our immense forest wealth; of the forests which adorn a large portion of British North America and will long continue to be one of the great sources of revenue for this Dominion of ours. Therefore, ours is the protective type, by reason of our extensive natural resources, and on account of the facilities which motive power affords us for the building up of our national industries. We have, in this country, abundant motive power under either form, as revealed by modern discoveries. I mean water and steam. We have immense water powers formed by rivers issuing from our mountains. We have, moreover, coal deposits at several points of the country. We have large water courses which allow us to transport fuel into all our industrial centres. We have a railway system built with a view to developing our industry and the trade of the country. With a view to a successful operation of our railway system, it is of vital importance that coal, iron and all our raw materials should be protected; it is necessary for our industries to be given a sufficient sum of protection, so as to enable our own or foreign capitalists to maintain them in this country. In addition to the conditions I have just described, there is, according to modern economists, another condition which largely conduces to industrial success, that is the different races and peoples inhabiting a country. Canadians are the offspring of two great nations which have created European industry, and have made of France and England two countries where industry has reached the highest development. Canadians are the descendants of two great races which have made modern civilization what it now is. Why, I ask, Mr. Chairman, should we allow those valuable intellectual and physical qualities inherited both from the Anglo-Saxon and the French races, to slumber as it were and lie idle, for want of proper food to stimulate the latent energies of our people? Why should the Government not allow our people, through a liberal tariff, to devote themselves to industry, the more so as they have all the necessary qualifications to make industrial operations a success? Why, I ask again, should the Government not foster and stimulate that genius which is, to such a degree, a characteristic of our people, that all things considered, we may on good grounds hope soon to reach the high degree of industrial wealth and growth that other nations, as England, France, Belgium, the United States of America are now enjoying. To my mind, Sir, the Government would be altogether wrong were they to neglect giving their attention to these matters, to adhere to their free-trade doctrine, a very questionable panacea, to be applied only to nations having reached a high industrial state. The Government, I hope, do not pretend to say that our people lack energy

and spirit of enterprise to the point of comparing them to the people of Turkey, Spain, Italy and of the South American Republics. For, it is a well-known fact, that those people lack the energy and the necessary qualities to develop large industries. As far as the carrying out of those industries is concerned, I maintain that the hon. gentlemen are making an egregious mistake in presenting such a tariff, which is calculated to hamper, injure, and even ruthlessly destroy our home industries. Should it long remain in force, the energy of our people would be impaired and diminished. It would, in the long run, affect the natural activity of our people for industry, and would tend to place our people in a state of deplorable inferiority to their neighbours. The people of the United States, like our people, are descendants of the Anglo-Saxon; they are the offspring of the inhabitants of Great Britain and France. Now, the United States, peopled with the descendants of those two great races, have become, thanks to the protection granted to the industries of their country, a great industrial nation, which has accumulated an enormous capital, which has enabled them to increase their industrial population and export their products throughout the different countries of the globe. Such is the history of the development of our neighbours' resources and natural wealth. Why, then, I ask, with the same natural resources, could not our people create industries on a large scale, the more so as we have at our disposal motive power in abundance, with a population able to pursue industrial occupations like people of other countries? Wherefore, I ask, should our Government not try, through the tariff, artificially, if you like, to stimulate the energy of our people and enable them to implant here industries which will create wealth and prosperity, by developing our resources and inducing immigrants to come and settle down in our midst? The Government of the day pretend to have an immigration policy; but, I say, if the industries of the country are imperilled through our tariff, the farming industry will also be jeopardized and immigrants will not stay here. Without home industries and developing the resources of the soil, you cannot create wealth in this country. Modern economists state that the Turks, notwithstanding the natural resources at their disposal, will never be an industrial nation, owing to their having no natural genius for the creation of a national industry on a large scale. But it is quite the reverse with the Canadian people. Why, I ask, do Canadians go abroad and settle down in the United States of America, and especially in the New England States? Is it with a view to developing the natural resources of the soil that they leave the country and a more fertile soil than that of the neighbouring Republic? No, Mr. Chair-

man; but for the most part, our fellow-countrymen, either from Ontario, Quebec, or from the Maritime provinces, go to the United States to indulge in their natural propensities, as our race is fond, before everything else, of industrial progress. Our fellow-countrymen become industrial workmen in the New England States.

I have often heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were on this side of the House, an objection raised against the system of protection in force in Canada, and it is this: that the protective system fostered monopolies, and those monopolies constituted a public danger, and a great wrong against the consumers, and that a small class of individuals grew rich at the expense of the great masses of the people. Let the hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches remember that monopolies do not spring up from a moderately protective tariff granted to industries in a young country like ours, but that a reasonable system of protection, very far from breeding monopolies, contributes to the building up of industries on a large scale, and those industries, owing to mutual competition, and to the fact of being protected against foreign competition, are forced to lower their prices. When they receive a fair protection, manufacturers dare not create monopolies, for, in so doing, they would provoke the establishment of other industrial establishments. In raising their tariff, monopolists would incur the risk of competition from similar goods imported from abroad. What creates monopolies is not a protective tariff but a prohibitive tariff. Now, I for one, and my hon. friends on this side as well, are not in favour of a prohibitive tariff. There is a marked difference between a reasonable and well reasoned protective tariff and a prohibitive tariff, like the one set up in the states under the McKinley Bill. The tariff, which is going to be passed in the United States Congress, as regards a great many items, is a prohibitive tariff. Undoubtedly, too high imports may breed monopolies, which constitute a public danger, not only because consumers have to pay more for the products they need, but because they retard industrial progress. But a reasonable protection, and a reasoned one, like that established by the Conservative Government, cannot breed monopolies. Now, can monopolies exist under free trade? They can exist even under free trade, for this reason: as manufacturers cannot manufacture and enter into competition with each other without ruining themselves, they are apt to combine to fix a higher price than that established in foreign countries, which are large exporters and in that case, they generally come to an understanding and set up a price which injures the interests of consumers. Therefore, it is better for national industries to have a reasonable and reasoned protection. Now,

Mr. DUPONT.

if we allow our industries to be exposed to foreign competition, and run the risk of receiving the death blow from British competition which will beyond a doubt, take place, the tariff, as carried out after the dropping off of 25 per cent, will prove the ruin of our industries, which will be unable to stand the competition of English goods allowed at preferential rates into our markets. And further, our capital invested in industries on a large scale in course of development will not only be lost, but, we will then surely fall a prey to the monopolists of the mother country. I hate monopolists, whether they come from the mother country or from Canada. I detest them just as cordially, when they hail from the United States of America, as they prove just as merciless to the consumers as Canadian monopolists themselves. When they are outside of our reach, they are quite independent from the citizens of this country; as they operate in a foreign country and no portion of the capital they accumulate through their monopolies can be of any benefit either to the Canadian people or the Government. For one sure thing is that should any monopolists develop their industries, they will do so in their own country and not in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I find the language of the Prime Minister quite different from what it was, when he entered upon his political career.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation). He has improved with experience.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation). I do not think so. As I said, when the hon. Prime Minister entered upon his political career, he one day, repeated the famous sentence of the Hon. Louis Joseph Papineau: Let no Canadian buy any goods from Great Britain. At the time I am speaking of, the hon. Prime Minister impressed upon his fellow-countrymen in the Quebec legislature the necessity of organizing and endeavouring to create a national industry. Now, with a view to inducing his fellow members and fellow-countrymen to create such an industry, he brought forward, in support of his case, the very same arguments I have just quoted.

Mr. LANGELIER (Translation). Did the Conservative party walk in the footsteps of Papineau, when they set up the National Policy?

Mr. DUPONT (Translation). The Conservative party first looked into the development of industrial life in the various countries of the world and then they were satisfied that, if it were not proper, as Papineau contended, to abstain buying goods from the mother country, they were in duty bound at least to give to the Canadian industries sufficient protection to enable them being implanted in the country, developing

and prospering so as to compete successfully with foreign manufacturers. That was our policy. The hon. Prime Minister told us a little while ago that he had profited by experience. Such is not the opinion many fellow-countrymen of his entertain about him; and they are beginning to think that the pleasures of power have unmanned him and weakened his patriotism. Many are asking themselves whether the hon. leader of the House and his colleagues, when advocating free trade as the only system under which our national industries could thrive and develop, have not been misled in their judgment, and whether they have not merely been prompted by the ambition of crossing over to the other side of this House and sitting on the Treasury benches. I deplore the fact of my hon. friend the Prime Minister and his colleagues from the province of Quebec, going through such an evolution in their political opinions, as regards the customs tariff; for I am a firm believer in the National Policy. I am afraid that when the policy of the Government is put to the test, should the tariff be put into force without any amendment, it will be found that the hon. gentlemen have made a sad mistake in the selection of the best means of securing a sum of public prosperity superior as they thought, to that enjoyed by the people under the Conservative rule.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

On the order,

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Belcourt for third reading of Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.

Mr. FOSTER. I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) to the fact that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had commenced a speech on this Bill which he had not the good fortune to finish when the time for private Bills expired on Friday evening. I suppose my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) would not be so hard-hearted as to break off the hon. gentleman in the middle of his speech. I wish to make an appeal to the hon. gentleman's good nature to leave this Bill over until the hon. member for Pictou returns. He is in Toronto to-day and is unable to be here. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) that it will not have the effect of blocking his Bill—that is not the intention.

Mr. BELCOURT. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself intends to make a speech—

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to make a speech, but I may have some remarks covering five or ten minutes.

Mr. BELCOURT. Call them "remarks." But if they prove as lengthy as those of the other night, I think they might well be called "speech." The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) spoke for an hour. If the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) are to be so lengthy they will deserve the name of a speech. I cannot, as I understand the position, agree to let the Bill stand over. This is the second time it has stood over at the request of hon. gentlemen on the other side. There cannot be any objection to the Bill in itself—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) is making a mistake, if he will allow me to say so. The request that is made is certainly a proper one. An hon. gentleman is in the midst of a speech on this subject, but is not able to be present this evening. He will be here to-morrow. There is no intention on the part of any one to obstruct the Bill, but the measure is one that, I think, should be open to full discussion; and I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) that it is not likely he will advance the measure he has in hand, by forcing it on under present circumstances.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) that, with the assurances on the other side—

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not understand that—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There can be no doubt about it; my hon. friend has the assurance of the leader of the Opposition and his colleague that there is no intention to block the Bill. And, even though postponed this evening, it will retain its place on the Order paper.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is an important matter, in connection with the contract.

Order allowed to stand.

### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Lindsay, Halliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 119) respecting La Mutuelle Générale Canadienne.—(Mr. Guay, for Mr. Madore.)

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On section 16,

Mr. FOSTER. Still in the pursuit of information. I think it was on Friday when this same clause was up, and I tried to get from the Controller of Customs what the meaning of this section was, and having plied him with questions to which he said he would answer, I waited patiently for his reply, in which I expected a complete elucidation of what is certainly as obscure as anything that the English language could possibly contain. I have no hesitation at all in saying that it is the next thing to disgraceful that any Government should make a proposition to this House, and ask the whole House to consent to it, putting an abnormal and extraordinary power in its hands without vouchsafing to this House one single glimmer of light as to the method or mode by which that clause is going to be put into operation. I state again, as I stated before, that that clause is as indefinite as it can well be, and to no two minds would it probably carry the same meaning. It is capable of any definition that a Government may choose to give it, and they cannot be criticised upon their definition of it simply because the words may mean almost anything. Now, what I asked the Controller of Customs was this, What is the meaning of these words, "on the whole"? How is he going to decide when the question comes up as to the country to which it is proposed to give the minimum tariff? The clause reads:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the country to which it may apply,—

And then it goes on. Now, I asked the Controller of Customs if, as I supposed, this was the only clear and honest way in which that could be applied, namely, that you were to take the articles which were dealt in by both countries, you were to take the average tariff upon these, and if the average tariff of the foreign country was equal to or less than the average tariff of Canada upon goods which would come from that country, then the decision was to be based upon that clear ground, that then "on the whole" that tariff would be as favourable to Canada as Canada's tariff to that country; and I asked him whether or not that was his interpretation, and paused for an answer. The hon. gentleman said that he would answer me when he rose to reply, that he would explain it all, and here is his explanation:

I will endeavour now to explain it. The Controller of Customs finds that he is under the impression that, if this section becomes law, and a question arises as to whether the products of a country may be admitted under the lower schedule that is contained in this Act, the Controller

Mr. FOSTER.

of Customs will then find it his duty to take the question into consideration—

That is very plain.

—and to judge by the standard which is set down in the law.

But that is the very thing I asked him, what the standard was that was set down in the law, but he vouchsafed no answer, no explanation, not a word, as to what he understands that standard to be.

But it will be his duty to take the question into consideration and to judge by the standard which is set down in the law, as to whether the products of that country should be admitted or not.

Now, we knew just as much after he had made that statement as we knew before, that is, we knew nothing; or we knew that the hon. Controller of Customs either knew nothing as to what the standard would be, or that if he knew, he did not propose to enlighten the House in reference to it. He simply did, in a little varied way, what the Prime Minister did on Friday, read from the words of the clause and say that that was its own explanation. Nearly every one who has heard this discussion knows that the clause does not explain itself at all. The simple straightforward question put to the Controller of Customs was this: Do you understand that when you are deciding as between two countries, that you are to take the average of the tariff of the two countries on the goods which are likely to be interchanged, or which are being interchanged, between the two countries, that you will compare them, and that if you find the tariff of the foreign country is equal to or less than the Canadian tariff, you will make your decision from that basis. Any one can understand the question; the hon. gentleman understood it, the hon. gentleman said he would answer it, the hon. gentleman did not answer it; he simply read to me the terms of the clause, and said that he would take the standard that was set down in the law. Now, I submit this is not fair treatment—not to me, I am only one member of this House—but it is not fair treatment to the House, and it is not fair treatment to the business interests of this country. The business interests of this country wish to know what is the standard by which the Controller of Customs is going to judge, when he allows a foreign country to enter into competition with the industries and labour of this country at 25 per cent less than the regular rates. Is it presumptuous that the business interests should know that? Is it presumptuous that a member of Parliament should ask that an answer be given to that? Is it not fair, and honest, and right, that the Government should give that answer? Now, the Controller of Customs promised to give that answer, and he did not give an answer. He gave what I have read, he read simply the original words in the original clause, which convey any mean-

ing that any person may wish to take out of them. The hon. gentleman goes on a little further and says :

I understand it will be the duty of the Controller of Customs to examine that tariff, to examine it in its details. I would examine the course of trade between that country and Canada, and I would have regard to the products of that country, in a measure, I would look at the trade of that country ; I would look at the subject in all its bearings, and I would, in the terms of the resolution, endeavour to arrive at a decision based upon the information that I had thus gained.

I say that when I asked for the standard, I received no explanation. The hon. gentleman explained neither his own meaning nor the meaning of the Government, and there has not been given by even one member of the Government the least glimmer of an idea as to what that standard is to be. The hon. gentleman further said :

I would report to the Governor in Council, to whose authority the Controller of Customs under this section is subject.

I have asked to-day that the report on which the Controller decided that Great Britain and New South Wales should have entry into this country under the reduction be brought down—I have asked that the report and the Order in Council founded on it should be laid before the House, and those papers should be laid before the House. It may be possible from the report which the Controller made, according to what he says is the procedure, and on which report the Order in Council is founded, to find a statement in black and white as to what is to be the basis on which each single case is to be decided. But so far we have nothing in the least to illuminate or throw the least light on the matter. It is in such a position that the Controller of Customs and the Government can simply decide at their will, what countries shall come in at their own whim and caprice and predilection ; but there is no rule and no standard laid down which is to guide them, and which is to be a guarantee to the country that in the determination of this question a rule which is reliable and definite shall be carried out. I want to try and prevail on the good humour and good sense of the hon. Controller of Customs again to-night. I ask him if he will again tell me whether or not his understanding and the Government interpretation of the case, is, that if for instance he is conducting an inquiry as regards a country, we will say Japan, he will take the tariffs of the two countries, that he will take the products of Canada which go into Japan and the products of Japan which come into Canada, that he will strike the average on those, and if the average of the duties imposed by Japan is equal to or less than that of Canada, then he will consider that the ground and basis on which Japan shall be entitled to the reduction. Would the hon. gentleman consider that to be the interpre-

tation of his ruling ? Or would he take the average of the whole range of goods in Japan and the average of the whole in Canada, and striking the average of each, would he allow Japan to come in under that resolution, provided that on the whole average the Japan tariff was equal to or less than the average of the Canadian tariff ? That is a plain and I think a clearly-put question, and I should like the hon. gentleman to give me information on that point.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). If the hon. gentleman is waiting for my reply. I may say that I do not think I could give the information better than by the answer he has just read, and which I gave the other day. The hon. gentleman is asking the same question.

Mr. FOSTER. I am asking the same question, because I got no reply to my former question. Now I ask the Prime Minister, what is his view as to that, and if he is not bound now, as head of the Government, to explain this clause to the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My view is the view of the Controller of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. The very same view. They simply read like school boys the words they have placed there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does not understand it a bit more than I do.

Mr. McMULLEN. I tell you I do.

Mr. FOSTER. But in the present mood they have great confidence in the Government, individually and collectively. The Prime Minister cannot or will not explain to the House and the country what is the meaning of that clause. His view is exactly the same as the view of the Controller of Customs, and neither of those Ministers attempts to explain the clause. Was ever such a thing heard of in the Parliament before, when a measure was brought before Parliament by a Government ? Ever since constitutional government was the rule, has it not been the bounden duty of the Government to explain its measure before the House is asked to vote upon it ? Has any Government ever before in this House come down and simply out of fear or something that is not even as high as fear, refused to give the House or committee the explanations required, and confined themselves to reading over, just like school boys, the ipsissima verba of the resolution they have submitted. Why, Sir, it never was known in parliamentary history in a country where responsible government existed, that any government ever showed such weakness as to prepare a clause which may have a multiplicity of meanings, and when they come down and submit it for the House

to vote on, for the Government to take refuge in silence and persistently refuse to explain the clause. That is the position of this Government to-day. There they stand—no, there they sit, and find refuge in ignoble silence. The Minister of Finance will not take to his feet, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not stand on his legs, the Minister of Public Works smiles and keeps discreet silence, only two hon. gentlemen do anything, and they rise and pleasantly bow to each other and say your sentiments are my sentiments and my sentiments are your sentiments; and those sentiments they declare to be the ipsissima verba of the resolution. Is the hon. leader of the Government going to put his supporters behind him in a position of sitting silent, refusing to cast a single glimmer of light by way of explaining this clause, when the House wants to know the Government's meaning in regard to it before being asked to vote it through? Hon. gentlemen behind the ministerial seats must be proud of their Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I knew they would be. With that unbounded faith, with that illimitable confidence they possess, as displayed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), they show unbounded faith in the Ministers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. They come here to have confidence in the Ministers. Their expectations are from the Ministers, and they must have confidence in them or their expectations will never be realized. But is there not a member behind the Government to-day who has independence enough to rise in his seat and call upon the Government to explain its measure? I have now said all I propose to say in regard to the matter. We cannot force explanations from hon. gentlemen opposite; they take the responsibility of refusing to give explanations. They place themselves upon the records of this House and give themselves to history as the first Government in this country that has refused to explain its measures either through unwillingness or inability to explain. I propose, as I cannot get their meaning, to move an amendment. I move that after the words "are" in the second line of the clause there be inserted the following words:—

Taking into consideration the average tariff rates of this country on the principal products to be interchanged.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have great pleasure in seconding that amendment, and as I am anxious that as little time as possible should be lost, I shall state my reasons briefly. I am certain that every gentleman on the Treasury benches will admit, that in reference to the tariff of the country it is very undesirable to put any law upon the Statute-book which is not easily intelli-

Mr. FOSTER.

gible to the masses of the people. This resolution No. 16 as brought down by the Government, is now in operation, because, under the practice of this House, as soon as a tariff resolution is tabled it becomes law. I call the attention of the Controller of Customs to the fact that this law is now as much in operation as it is possible it can be at any time, because it does not say, that on some future occasion after some decisions have been arrived at it shall become law, but it says:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. "May then."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Finance does not propose to say that "may" does not mean "shall."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It means "shall" after the Controller decides.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Consequently, I ask the members of the Government, how was it that the night that this resolution was put upon the Table of the House, instructions were issued to all the collectors in Canada to admit the goods of Great Britain at a reduction of one-eighth. It was for one reason and one reason only, and that was because of the declaration contained in this resolution which at that moment became law, that when the tariff of any country bore a particular relation to the tariff of Canada, that moment the goods of that country were entitled to a reduction of one-eighth; and as there could be no question that that applied to England, which does not meet our goods with a tariff at all, the Government said at once, that it would go into operation in favour of England. That resolution became operative the moment it was laid on the Table, and I hold that every country whose tariff bears the relation to our tariff that this resolution contemplates, is entitled to have its goods entered on precisely the same terms that the Controller of Customs instructed his officers to enter goods from Great Britain. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) had within his knowledge the condition of all the tariffs, and therefore, when the Minister of Finance tabled this resolution which then became law, he (Mr. Paterson) was in a position to give such instructions as in his judgment were necessary to his collectors throughout Canada to carry out the law; and when the tariff of any country was of the kind described in this resolution, he had power to instruct them, that they should admit the goods of that country at this reduction of one-eighth. That is a position which I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit,

is fair and legitimate, because the word, "when," is used and there is no postponing the question for future consideration. I do not intend to elaborate this question further than to again hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will recognize as fully as I do, in justice to the commercial interests of this country, the necessity of removing any possible doubt that could exist. I share the doubt which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has so emphatically stated to the House, and I, too, am unable to judge what construction the Government give to this clause. It is a matter of vital importance; it is a matter that affects every customs entry of goods from every country that trades with Canada, and yet I am unable to understand what the Government mean by the words:

Which admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff.

After the closest study of this amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), I believe that it embodies practically what the Government intend to carry out, and if it does, it makes the clause more distinct. The amendment is one which the Government may fully accept, because it is calculated to make plainer a matter which is now very hazy. It also renders the clause intelligible, as it should be, to every one who has business with the custom-houses of Canada. The insertion of the words proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster):

Taking into consideration the average tariff rates of this country upon the principal products to be interchanged,

will make this clause 16 clear, and should be adopted by the Government. Under this amendment the rule to be applied would be: That on the articles that Canada sends into that other country, and on the articles that we receive from that other country, their tariff on the average shall be as favourable to us as our tariff is favourable to them. That amendment will make the clause more easily understood by the masses of the people upon whom this clause bears, and if we are correct in arriving at the conclusion that the amendment expresses the intention of the Government, then the Government may fairly accept it. The Government must admit, that it is most undesirable—and the principle is recognized by all countries and by all Parliaments—it is most undesirable that a tariff law should not be stated in plain and distinct terms, as far as it is possible to do so. It is also very desirable that Parliament itself should know what it is passing upon. I have no doubt that the Governor General in Council, in carrying this clause out, would discharge their duty in what they believed to be the most fair and just manner, but hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me, that it is against the interests of parliamentary government to throw upon the Governor General in Council the

making of a tariff, and to do away with the sanction of Parliament to changes in her fiscal system. I have much pleasure in commending the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to the Government, in the sincere hope that they will be good enough to accept it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident from the remarks which have fallen from the ex-Minister of Finance and from the leader of the Opposition, that it is not possible to satisfy them. They will not be satisfied. No matter what we explain, or whether we explain or not, they will not exercise their own intelligence or their own judgment. Why, Sir, they complain of everything; they complain even that we are carrying on this Government after constitutional methods. We have my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) complaining, that there are five members of the Government now present in the House, that three of them would not speak, that two spoke, and that one of them spoke to say that the sentiments of the other were his sentiments. So they are. The sentiments of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who spoke on this question, are my sentiments. The views which I have expressed are the views of the Controller of Customs, and they are also the views of the members of the Government who are here to-day. They are the views of all the Government. I know that it is the true constitutional method that there should be unanimity of feeling and sentiment in the Government. But, Sir, that was not the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They endeavoured to carry on the Government without a unanimity of feeling amongst themselves. They endeavoured, and indeed they succeeded for some time—though the people put a short stop to that work as soon as they had the opportunity—in carrying the Government through a motley of conflicting sentiments and views. At one time we saw seven members of the Government bolt because they did not agree with their leader—and certainly their leader did not agree with them; but they came back again without agreeing any more than they had done before. On another occasion, we saw two of them voting for a motion of censure and the others voting against it. But they did not resign. We do not carry on the Government in that way. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance has endeavoured, in speech after speech, to convey to the House the impression that he is the very reverse of what we know him to be. We know him to be a man of bright intellect. This is no compliment to him; it is only a truth that we all know, especially those who have been long associated with him. But in speech after speech he has endeavoured to make us believe that he is not the bright man we know him to be, but an obtuse man who could not understand plain words of

the English language. Here is a section as intelligible as anything that has ever been put before a Parliament, and he has pretended that he does not understand it—that it would almost require a surgical operation to put it into his head. If he would exercise his intellectual powers, however, I think he would conclude that “on the whole” meant “on the whole,” and he has shown us by his amendment that he understands fully what is meant. Here is the language of the section that he wants to have explained to him :

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to—

Then, in such a condition of things, that country will be entitled to come in under the minimum tariff. My hon. friend pretends that he does not understand that. He cannot understand a tariff which has perhaps a little higher duty on one article and a little less duty on another, but which is on the whole on the same level as ours. But he could understand it if we would accept his amendment. What does he move? “Taking into consideration the average tariff rates of this country upon the particular products to be interchanged.” That is to say, my hon. friend could understand it if we would amend this tariff by stating that when the tariff of a country upon the articles we sell to it was on the whole on a level with our tariff on the articles they sell to us. He understands this limited operation, but he cannot understand the higher operation of making a comparison not on a few articles, but on all articles. My hon. friend does not do himself justice. He minimizes his own intellect. If he can make a comparison between certain articles, I ask him simply to extend the operation and make this comparison not only with regard to the articles which we exchange, but with regard to the articles which are to be found in the tariff of this country, and in the tariff of another country. Let me in conclusion repeat to my hon. friend what I had the pleasure of telling him the other day, that we have already gone into this operation; we have looked over the whole globe, and we have found only one country whose tariff, so far as we know, is on a level with ours, and not only on a level, but far more favourable than ours; and therefore we believe our minimum tariff, for the present applies to Great Britain, and to no other country.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has arisen in connection with this, probably the most important clause in the whole tariff, as the leader of the Government, voicing the explanatory power of the Government on this important matter, and I do not think he rose to the full height of the occasion when he left the matter of business entirely, to throw a taunt to this

Mr. LAURIER.

side of the House about bolting, or disagreements in the Government, or matters of that kind. Does my hon. friend think that was a statesman's answer to the question before the House? That was a sort of fine dust which was thrown to cloud the eyes of hon. gentlemen behind him, but a kind of dust which had no part or lot with the tariff question before us—nothing more to do with it than would a discussion on the archeology of Egypt or Greece. I simply call attention to that to show the way in which the Prime Minister meets arguments in reference to business matters coming before the House. Then, my hon. friend gave me credit for being sometimes keen enough intellectually to see things, and said he would not attribute to me obtuseness in this matter. My hon. friend did me too much credit. I cannot see their meaning through this clause, though I have tried to.

Mr. McMULLEN. You cannot see through our policy either.

Mr. FOSTER. No. My hon. friend has done his party a pretty hard service in that remark. His assertion is as true as anything can be; and I think he might extend it, and say that neither I nor any other mortal man in Canada can see through their policy, it is a creature of such change, and such constant change, of so many kinds of patchwork welded into one, where performance and promise are so widely separated from each other, where pledges are so constantly broken, and where the remnants of a once sturdy independence, supposed to exist in my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), lie scattered about in ruinous confusion.

And so my hon. friend tries to get out of an explanation by saying that I am wilfully confusing the question. No, I am not; I am anxiously wanting to know, for the information of the House and the business interests of the country, just what the view of the Government is with reference to that matter. Have we got anything? I think we have. I think the hon. First Minister made one very important admission, whether he meant to make it or not. He objects to my amendment because he says my amendment limits the application of the clause to articles which may be interchanged between two countries, and restricts the comparison of tariffs to those articles, whereas the Government propose to take the tariffs in gross and to give any country which has an equal or less tariff than Canada's on the whole the benefit of this reduction. That admission is a very important one. That clears the ground, and if we take that as the view of the Government, then my reasoning the other day was correct, that China can come in, that Japan can come in, that every country almost in the world, outside of the most-favoured-nation treaty countries, may come in. For I say if we take the

tariff of the Dominion on all articles that we import, the average tariff of these other countries is far and away below the average tariff of Canada upon all goods imported into Canada, so that if that is the gloss my hon. friend puts upon it, if that is to be the method of interpretation to which he pledges the Government, and the Controller of Customs says he will carry that out, then we will have the rule laid down, as explained by the hon. First Minister, that he will take, not simply a part of the articles, but all the articles, and the average tariff upon all those articles of imports in the two countries will rule. Well, that may be the wish or meaning of the Government, but I say that nothing more unfair to Canada in the shape of an agreement could be made than to take that as the rule. Why, three-fourths of the articles which might be on the Japanese tariff might be articles that we would never have any chance of putting into Japan. Nine-tenths of the articles which are on our list of goods that may be imported into Canada might not be articles which come from Japan at all. It is one thing to have a rule, but the justice and righteousness of that rule is another thing, and that would be a most ruinous rule applied to Canada, which would let in, as this rule undoubtedly does, every country in the world outside of the most-favoured-nation treaty countries, which are high tariff countries mostly, and these come in under the most-favoured-nation treaty clause, provision for which has been made by my hon. friend the leader of the Government. At any rate, we have the interpretation at last, the Government is going to take the average of the whole tariff. If they are going to do that, the business men of the country will know to what an unfair pressure they are to be subjected because under that rule, to which the Prime Minister has given his authority, all of these countries can throw their cheap labour products into this country and can do it at 25 per cent reduction over countries which are differently situated.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** We have reached a very important stage. After weeks of debate we, for the first time, have had from the Government benches an attempt to construe this clause. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been pressed, they have been implored, in the strongest terms possible, to state to the House what their own view of the meaning of this clause is. Did they do it before? Read the answer which the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) gave the other night, and say whether you will find in it any such statement as has just been given by the leader of the Government. You will find nothing of the kind. You will find now, for the first time, a new, distinct interpretation given to this clause that I do not believe any member of this House entertained down to the moment the First Minister gave it to the House. Cer-

tainly, the Controller of Customs had no such view as has been given by the First Minister. The hon. Controller, the other night, explained that he was going to take the whole gross trade and everything bearing upon it, in order to arrive at a judgment. Here are the words of the clause, which shows the very reverse of what the First Minister has stated:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada—

This is the statement of the clause, but is not the statement of the First Minister. His statement is that we are to take the tariff as a whole, not limited to the products of Canada—for instance, the tariff of the United States as a whole and the tariff of Canada as a whole, and we are then to decide whether that country comes within the terms of this clause or not. I do not believe there is a member of the hon. gentleman's Administration who has agreed with him or entertains the opinion he has just given as to the meaning of this clause. I say so, because the opinion the First Minister has given is in opposition to all the statements that, during the whole of this discussion, have been elicited by members on the Treasury benches. Why, the hon. Minister told the House that he thought it was quite possible that arrangements would be made under this clause with the United States, which would bring them within its meaning. Does the hon. gentleman not remember that? Does he not remember that the United States was declared by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as one of the countries which, under the arrangement that could be made under this clause, might be brought within the meaning of this clause—that is the reciprocal trade arrangement put into operation? But the First Minister has given a statement directly opposed to every statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, which proves to the House and the people that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches either do not understand the subject or are afraid and unwilling to give a fair and candid avowal of the views they entertain as to what this clause means. That is the position, and it is upon this position that the attempt is made to force this clause through the committee, leaving the people of this country—aye, Sir, and the people of the countries that have trade relations with Canada—subject not to a plain intelligible statute, such as should mark the administration of the customs law of every country, but subject to the decision of a Government no two members of which, it appears, agree upon what this clause means or how it shall be interpreted. We have two definitions, utterly diametrically opposed. Read what the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and put that alongside the statement which has just come from the First Minister of this Government, who has declared to the House that it is not at all

a question how the products of Canada are treated in any other country, though that is what the clause says. I seconded the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) because, after the most careful study I could give it and what little information we could glean from the statement of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, I assumed, honestly and candidly, that this was what was intended to be meant, and I believe that I arrived at the same conclusion that hon. gentlemen on both sides had arrived at after a long discussion as to what the true meaning of that clause was. But all this is swept away. That amendment, it appears, has no bearing because, though it gives what appears to be a fair interpretation of the clause according to what the Controller of Customs has said, the First Minister has given a definition diametrically opposed to the words of the clause, a meaning which has never been given by any gentleman on the Treasury benches, or in the House on either side as a possible explanation of what the clause might mean. According to the statement of the First Minister the course must be to take the tariff of Canada and the tariff of the United States, or Japan, or any other country and see which is the highest. If the hon. the First Minister is correct, my hon. friend the Controller of Customs need not have kept this House in suspense a single moment, he need not have kept one of his officials throughout Canada in suspense for a single moment; for all he had to do was to look at these tariffs and a cursory glance would show him whether the tariff of this or that or any other country was higher than ours on the whole. According to the First Minister his direction would be to take, for instance the United States tariff. That tariff would be found higher than Canada's tariff, and so that country could not have the benefit of the reciprocal clause. But the tariff of China or the tariff of Turkey would probably show different results. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that Turkey is the only country in the world, except Great Britain, that carries out the policy of free trade, and certainly, Turkey must be admitted according to the interpretation of the First Minister, because it is a completely free trade country. Turkey carpets, of course, will at once be admitted with this cut of one-eighth, under the direction of the Controller of Customs. It passes belief that in the nineteenth century, in an intelligent deliberative assembly, like this Parliament of Canada, after discussing this question day after day and week after week, we should only now learn an entirely new construction of this clause, and a construction which, I do not hesitate to say, any one who understands the English language will be obliged to admit is a construction diametrically opposed to the words of the clause, because the clause says that this is a question of duties imposed upon the goods of

Mr CHARLES TUPPER.

Canada and not a question of general tariff. I feel that if ever there was a question before this Parliament or before any deliberative assembly in the world in which Parliament and people were entitled to a fair, candid avowal of what was meant by the Government, that is the position in relation to this question we are now discussing. And yet, Sir, having discussed this question day after day, having done our best to draw from the Government some intelligent and intelligible statement of what these words mean, we are now told by the highest authority in the Government, the First Minister himself, that, so far from agreeing, as he has just declared he did, with the Controller of Customs, his views are as diametrically opposed to those of the Controller of Customs as day is opposed to night. It is not creditable to the Government; it is not respectful to Parliament; it is not what Parliament has a right to expect from gentlemen charged with the administration of public affairs, to deal with a question of such vital importance in a manner which certainly is calculated, even after this clause is passed, to leave everybody in this House and everybody out of it entirely in the dark as to what the meaning of the clause is.

Mr. SPROULE. One of the most difficult things in life is to secure agreement in the interpretation of law. The ablest jurists frequently disagree as to the interpretation of certain clauses. Even though at the time those clauses were passed it was thought that they were made quite plain, it is often found they are subject to two meanings or to a variety of meanings. Now in statutes of this kind, where it is a matter of such importance, not only to individual interests but to the great interests of the country, that there should be a clear interpretation, it appears to me that if it is possible to use English words that will convey one clear meaning and one only, it surely is right that we should adopt those words in a case of this kind. It is quite clear that there is a diversity of opinion as to the interpretation of this clause. The fact that the greatest minds of this House disagree as to this interpretation is a proof of that; and it seems to me that the Government should be particular at all times, but especially at this time, knowing that there is a diversity of opinion with regard to this interpretation, to amend the clause in such a way that there should be no two opinions with regard to it. I think it is quite possible to use a form of English words that will convey but one meaning in this section. I think it is quite possible to use a variety of phraseology in the English language that will be much plainer than the form used in this case. Were I charged with the duty of ascertaining whether any country has a right to share in the benefits that are offered in this clause, I would naturally ask myself two or more questions.

What would be the first? Well, the first difficulty that appeals to my mind is this, does it mean the average rate of duty upon all goods imported into each country on the dutiable and free list both, is it the average rate of duty according to the value of the goods in the country from which they are imported, including both goods on the free list and goods on the dutiable list? Then, if the average rate of that duty is as low upon the goods exported from Canada as it is on the goods imported from that country into Canada, I would naturally say that that country was entitled to the benefit of this favoured-nation clause. But then I look at it from another direction, and it appeals to me in this way: That it would be equally correct to ask the question and equally appropriate—is it the average rate of duty imposed upon all dutiable goods only? Because upon a portion of goods there is no duty imposed. Now, if we take the average rate of duty upon all imported goods, both dutiable and free, it will necessarily be much lower than if you confine it to the dutiable goods. But you might with equal propriety ask the question: Will this be confined to dutiable goods? Then, if we ascertain that the rate of duty imposed upon dutiable goods going into that country is as low as the rate of duty imposed by our tariff on goods from said country, then would that country be entitled to take advantage of this clause? But we might go further and ask, will it be confined to a limited number of articles only that we exchange with that country on the lines of a reciprocity treaty? Suppose we import from a certain country certain lines of goods, and we find that the rate of duty upon those lines of goods is  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, then, if we take the goods exported from Canada into that country that are dutiable in that country, and if the average rate of duty in that country upon those particular lines is lower than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, then is that country entitled to that favoured-nation clause? I think we might reasonably ask that question. Now, when it is so plain that these questions may, with propriety, be asked, that there may be three different individuals, each one of whom believes that this is the only proper test for the solution of that question, I say when it is so plain that there is that diversity of opinion and each one might ask the question with equal propriety, does it not behoove the Government to change the language of that clause so as to make it plain, and to make it comprehensible to all? At the very time when we are making the law, if it is shown that the interpretation of that law is obscure and difficult to be understood, now is the time when it should be made plain. We know that many laws are made that create a great deal of trouble afterwards. We know about the Streams Bill law, we know about many other laws that are carried from court to court to get a proper interpretation, until they reach the highest

court in the land, and yet judges disagree as to what is the proper interpretation, and as to what was the mind of Parliament at the time the laws were passed. But the question is raised here at the very time when we are making the law; therefore, I say this is the proper time that we should change the law so that there may be no two opinions regarding it. Now, if we can find in the English language words that will make the meaning clear, then I see no reason why we should not, at this time, make the meaning clear. Now, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the ex-Finance Minister is plainer than the original clause, it reaches the pith of the question, it reaches the kernel, it gives a better interpretation, one that will be better understood by both the exporter and the importer, and that will be more readily understood by the common people. Why should we not, therefore, adopt it? It is not in any way derogatory to the intelligence of the Government that they should accept an amendment that seems to be plainer than the clause they have proposed to the House. I think it is their duty to do so. They ought to be glad that an hon. member of this House has proposed language that will make the clause plainer and more acceptable to the people than the language in which the clause is framed at present, and which, to my mind, to say the least of it, is very ambiguous. I think the Government should adopt this amendment, and let the people know exactly what the clause means, so that it may be read and understood by all alike.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Before this resolution becomes law, I desire to say just a few words with regard to it. In the first place, I do not think that the Government has given that attention to the practical operation of this resolution which it demands. Any person who has had anything to do with the administration of the custom laws of the country, knows very well that there is always enough confusion, enough misunderstanding, in the interpretation of that law itself, without this Parliament adding to it by the enactment of any such law as is embraced in this clause. The 16th clause now before the House is, to my mind, nothing more nor less than an invitation to all the nations of the world whose tariff is, on an average, equal to or below our tariff, or which admits the products of this country on the whole at a rate as favourable as this country to admit the goods of that particular country under the lower tariff. And it is a law in this sense that as soon as it is tabled, it becomes such an invitation, and becomes such a law. Sir, there can be no doubt as to that. Just as soon as this resolution was laid upon the Table of this House, then there was an invitation to all the nations of the world that their products might come into this country on the terms mentioned, or on whatever

might be the proper construction of that resolution at the time that it was tabled. Now, if I am right in that contention—and I thoroughly endorse the position taken by the leader of the Government in that behalf—then I wish to point out to the Controller of Customs that if the interpretation put by the leader of the Opposition upon this 16th resolution is correct, that is, that it became law just as soon as it was tabled, then, just as soon as a consignment arrives at any port in this Dominion from any of the countries that have been named, and where it is claimed there is a tariff as low or as favourable to the admission of the products of this country as their's is to the admission of our products, then the collector of the port must take that consignment and must make that entry on the lower basis. And if any question arises as to whether the understanding of the collector is right in that particular, if any question arises as to the admission of that particular consignment under the lower scale, then it becomes the duty of the Controller of Customs to look at subsection "A" of clause 16, which reads :

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

In other words, just so soon as any consignment is made at any port of entry in this country, the question will arise, will then be forced upon the collector and upon the Controller of Customs, to interpret the treaty, or, to interpret the tariff of the country from which that consignment comes. There is not a doubt in my mind as to that. The Controller of Customs stated in his place the other night :

It will be my duty—and I will endeavour to discharge the duty as honestly as I can, to ascertain, when applications are made on behalf of those countries, whether their tariffs warrant us in admitting them, and then the question will be dealt with by the Governor in Council in the manner in which I have indicated.

I submit to the Controller of Customs and to the Government, that he cannot wait, he ought not to wait, until application is made through the counsels, or the regular channels by means of which an application would be made for the admission of the products of any particular country into this country under this clause. But I submit further, and warn the Government and the House that if this clause becomes law it will certainly become the cause of endless confusion at ports of entry, if my interpretation be correct. We have at the present time in the administration of the Department of Customs sufficient difficulties, and if this clause is to pass without any explanation upon the part of the Government which is to my mind satisfactory, then we shall have a state of uncertainty created in this country as to what particular nations have the right to come in under the wide meaning of the

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

resolution. Is not this an important matter? I can conceive of no resolution or no law that could be enacted by this Parliament so wide in its meaning which possesses so much importance to the commercial interests as resolution No. 16 which we are now asked to vote on; and I do not hesitate to say that if the followers of the Government swallow this without further explanations than they have received, the meagre information in explanation of it, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will have behind them more bolters than ever existed in any Government either here or elsewhere.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is all clear now.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is not all clear—it is as clear as mud. It is not clear in any sense, and if I am to take the remarks of the First Minister and compare them with the Controller and other hon. members, it will be found that the hon. leader made confusion worse confounded. I throw out this suggestion as to the very serious difficulty that may arise at ports of entry, as I do not wish to prolong the debate in committee.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Russell rose together.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) is a legal gentleman, and as we desire to obtain some reasons as to why this clause should pass, I will give way and follow him. I should like to hear something said from that side of the House from the legal point of view.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to vote intelligently on the amendment which the hon. member for York, N.B., has proposed. I was prepared to vote on the original resolution which I thought I perfectly understood. Now, however, we have an amendment introduced by the ex-Finance Minister, and before voting on that amendment I should like the hon. gentleman to explain it, because it is not entirely clear. I do not know how the hon. gentleman intends the average to be made up, and I should like an explanation from the hon. gentleman as to the way in which he proposes that the section, if it should be amended in the direction suggested by him, should be administered. Suppose the hon. gentleman's amendment became the resolution, and suppose we were asked the question by some foreign country whether it could or not come under the reciprocity tariff, and suppose that the condition of trade was such that we imported from that foreign country almost exclusively some one article on which our tariff rate was very low, but exported to it almost exclusively some one article on which its tariff rate was very high. Yet, notwithstanding all this, suppose that there were other articles on both sides exchanged

in such manner that the average rate on the articles, leaving out the element of quantity, was exactly the same—I want to know whether we should be obliged to admit the goods of that foreign country under our low rate or not. The words of this amendment do not state whether the quantities are to be taken into account or not. I consider that the expression “average tariff rates” is a very dangerous term to use. Does it mean the average of the rates on the various articles as shown in the book or the average amount of duty collected on the respective quantities of goods? The amendment presents a very different kind of question to that embodied in the original resolution presented by the Finance Minister. I do not like to vote on the amendment until the ex-Finance Minister has cleared the matter up. It seems to me that he has left it in a very ambiguous form, and the resolution submitted to the House was much clearer and better as it stood. There is a Latin maxim, which I will refrain from quoting, as it is said I am in the habit of quoting Latin, which is to the effect that excessive refinement in the definitions in legal enactments is dangerous. In my opinion it would be very much to be preferred to leave it to the Government to decide each case as it arises on a fair and equitable construction of the clause, leaving the Finance Minister or the Controller of Customs and the Governor in Council to adopt such a decision in each particular case as seems most fairly to carry out the obvious meaning of the clause in view of all the circumstances of the case as I think would have been done under the resolution as introduced. It is far better to leave these matters in the hands of the Controller of Customs, after hearing the arguments pro and con. It would be far better in the actual working out of the tariff resolutions, and of this resolution more especially, that if any importer thinks he has a right to claim the benefit of the clause, he should have the opportunity of arguing his case before the Controller of Customs, who after giving a full hearing to the application should decide it then rather than do so behind the back of the applicant or before his argument was heard.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) is entitled to an answer. I would not follow the bad example given by hon. gentlemen opposite in asking any hon. gentleman to vote for an amendment of mine until he had at least my explanation of it, whether that satisfied him or not. So I intend to give the hon. gentleman as clear an answer as I can with respect to this amendment. But that will not let my hon. friend out of the trouble. There are three points now before this House. One is the resolution itself, which is as indefinite as it well can be. My hon. friend likes the quality of indefiniteness. It is a good thing in some respects, but with respect to tariff

clauses the contention made by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) is one which will commend itself to business men in this House and out of it, namely, that with respect to tariff clauses the very object sought to be avoided is indefiniteness, and what is desired is definiteness. The basis of all trouble in administering tariff laws in a country lies in the indefiniteness which, despite the best efforts that can be made to secure clearness and brevity of expression, will creep into the law and will cause it to become the subject of argument and litigation. My hon. friend has no difficulty in regard to a general clause, which makes no attempt at definiteness and which possesses no conditions of certainty. He was willing to vote for that without any information at all. But my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) cannot vote for the resolution now. Why did he not think to ask for information from the leader of the Government as well as from myself.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asking me a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reason was, because I was perfectly satisfied with the terms of the resolution as explained by the leader of the Government; but I was not satisfied with the terms of the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and I certainly could not be expected to ask the leader of the Government to explain an amendment moved by the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Russell) cannot get out of it so easily as that. My hon. friend (Mr. Russell) was perfectly satisfied with the text without the gloss; he had the gloss supplied when the leader of the Government declared that what was to be taken into consideration was the average of the whole tariff.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly. I am like the old gentleman who was reading the Book of Job. He understood the text perfectly, but he had not yet been able to understand the explanatory comments.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not carry out the likeness between my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) and that good old patriarch of ancient times, but there are some striking points of resemblance between my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) and that gentleman.

Mr. RUSSELL. Allow me for a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Before my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) fires off any more questions, we had better get through with these, and then I am willing to answer any more he may wish to ask. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) was perfectly willing to take the resolution without any explanation. It suited him because of its delightful indefiniteness, and he thought in a matter of this kind you

should not tie yourself down to definiteness. When the leader of the Government spoke in that unfortunate moment—shall we call it of weakness—he declared he could not take my amendment; and why? Because my amendment confined itself to products which are interchanged between the two countries, and was too narrow, but that what he should take would be the whole of the goods which formed the basis of the trade of the two countries, and take the average tariff upon that whole line of goods forming the articles of trade of the two countries. Now, the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Russell), when he saw that delightful indefiniteness taking to itself wings and flying away under this very palpable and definite limitation, he still found no difficulties. He could vote for the resolution because it was indefinite and he could vote for it still because it was limited by the very definite restrictions which the Prime Minister put upon it. But, when an unfortunate member of the Opposition attempts to put a little restrictive clause on, then all the inquisitiveness of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) comes out at once, and he cannot contain himself in silence any longer. Well, Sir, I am going to give you the best answer I can with reference to the question he asks me, and then I am going to ask him (Mr. Russell) to tell this House in general, and myself in particular, what he thinks is the meaning of this clause as it stands. I am sure my hon. friend will not keep that intelligence from me when I am so generous as to tell him my views in reference to my amendment. Now, I admit that whatever restrictions you put upon the clause, it will not be devoid of all difficulty. The clause itself is open to every difficulty. Try to make it as definite as you can, you will still have some difficulties left, but the object of this House ought to be to limit indefiniteness as much as possible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) must take my amendment in connection with the whole clause, because it is meant to be inserted in and read as part of the whole clause. The clause, with the amendment, will read :

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are, taking into consideration the average tariff rates of this country—

That is, "of the any country" referred to above

—taking into consideration the average tariff rates of this country upon the principal products to be interchanged, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff.

Now, I think that is pretty fully explanatory of itself. It seems to me that it would not be just to take the whole range of

tariff articles in each country, because a smaller or a greater number of articles in the commercial catalogue of each country might be articles which they did not interchange and which there was not the remotest chance they would ever interchange. It did not seem to me, therefore, to be fair to take the tariff on articles which could not possibly be the basis of any favourable or unfavourable trade between the two countries, and that, when you came down to the consideration of the tariffs, you should confine your consideration to average tariff so far as you allow that to make up one of the bases of your judgment; but that you should confine that to articles in the two countries which are either at the time interchanged, or in respect to which there was a fair prospect in the mind of the Government that there might be an interchange. My hon. friend (Mr. Russell) raises the difficulty that some of these articles might be imported to a very small extent, having in the one case a very small tariff duty, and in the other case a very high tariff duty, and he says that incongruity might exist in that respect and injustice be done to the country if that were taken as a basis. My hon. friend has listened to the reading of the amendment, and taking the amendment in connection with the resolution it comes as far as I can bring it, to what is the best possible basis that you can go upon. Is it free from all difficulty and trouble? No, I do not say that it is. I say that limit it as far as you possibly can, you will have indefiniteness, but that the amendment brings it down to the most reasonable basis that I think we can get, namely: the average tariff upon the range of articles that are interchanged or interchangeable between the two countries.

Mr. RUSSELL. Nobody that has listened to the explanation can fail to see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has absolutely missed the point of my question. He has not at all addressed himself to the point of the question.

Mr. MCGREGOR. He does not understand you.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; he understands. I will repeat the hypothetical case. Suppose that we send abroad a very large amount of articles of a particular character which bear a very high rate in the foreign tariff, and we import a very large quantity of articles which, under our tariff, bear a very low rate of duty; yet, if you take the whole list of the principle articles which are exchanged, and you find that the average duties are precisely the same, is it not the logical consequence of the hon. gentleman's amendment that we should be obliged to admit all the goods of such a country at the rates laid down in our reciprocal tariff, and still be obliged to send our goods to that country under its tariff,

paying enormously high duties? In other words, the point of my question was whether the hon. gentleman, in making up his average, was going to take into account the quantities of the goods exchanged, or only the tariff rates. It seems to me that it is absolutely necessary to say something in his amendment about the quantities as well as the tariff rates on the principal articles exchanged, and until that is done, I do not feel at all bound to vote for his amendment in place of the resolution, which appears to me to be more plain, reasonable and practicable.

Mr. FOSTER. Will not the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer my question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know the hon. gentleman asked any question.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked two. I asked the hon. gentleman if he would give his legal mind to an explanation of what is meant by clause 16, and if he would also apply his legal mind to state what he thinks of the justice of the hon. Prime Minister's illustration.

Mr. RUSSELL. In regard to that, I may say that I am unable to hear what takes place on the front benches on this side of the House as well as on the other side, and I did not hear the Prime Minister's explanation, but I have no doubt that it was given with his usual lucidity and correctness. Speaking about indefiniteness and the desirability of having clauses in a tariff law which are definite and precise, I have been reading some of the expressions used in the tariff laws which were placed on the Statute-book of this country by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; and though perhaps a little far afield of this narrow point which we are now discussing, yet it may be interesting to the House to learn the kind of legislation which these hon. gentlemen when in power placed on the Statute-book or left there for eighteen years. I notice that they were not at all as sensitive about giving the Governor in Council power when on this side of the House as they have suddenly become since, being transferred to the other side. Then they gave enormous powers to the Governor in Council. I am not arguing that they gave any undue powers, because the Governor in Council is simply a committee of this House which can be made or unmade by the voice of this House. This House gives the breath of life to the Governor in Council, and there can be no action of the Governor in Council which does not depend absolutely on the voice of this House. Therefore, I am not as sensitive as the hon. gentleman now is, but never was before, as to the impropriety of giving powers to the Governor in Council. But when he comes to talk of the indefiniteness of the powers given, I ask his attention to these powers which were given to the Governor in Council by the customs law

which existed prior to this session of Parliament:

For transferring to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty, any or all articles (whether natural products or products of manufactures) used as materials in Canadian manufactures.

I would like to know how any manufacturer, in competing with any rival manufacturer, would know whether at any date any of his materials were to be taxed or untaxed, or admitted at higher or lower rates of duties.

And any such materials transferred to the free list by such Order in Council shall be free of duty of customs for the time therein appointed for that purpose.

It seems to me that there is as much indefiniteness in that as in any of the resolutions before the House. But that was not enough to suit them. They took other powers still. They provided this:

The Governor in Council may interpret,—

That is what he is to do under this resolution. All he can do is to interpret the meaning of this clause which is placed on the Statute-book by this House of Commons. But, under the law of hon. gentlemen opposite, look what he could do:

—interpret, limit or extend the meaning of the conditions upon which it is provided in any Act imposing duties of customs, that any article may be imported free of duty for special purposes, or for particular objects or interests.

What special purposes? What particular objects or interests? Sir, if I had the inordinate analytical powers of the ex-Minister of Finance, his power of finding mare's nests and bugbears, how I could ring the changes on this, how I could excite this House and this country with the idea that the foundations were crumbling beneath us, that the Governor in Council was assuming all the prerogatives of the House of Commons, that the House of Commons was denuding itself of its powers, that the constitution was in danger, that we were erecting a Star Chamber, and all the other exaggerated and shocking terrors which the ex-Minister of Finance and his able co-adjutor the hon. leader of the Opposition with his complete mastery of the superlative, has been able to conjure up.

And may make regulations either for declaring or defining what cases shall come within the conditions of such Act—

Now, listen; is not this perfectly terrifying?

—and to what objects or interests of an analogous nature the same shall apply and extend; and may direct the payment or non-payment of duty in any such case, or the remission thereof by way of drawback, if such duty has been paid.

Why, these are perfectly shocking things. I wonder that when these "monstrous propositions" were offered, somebody on our

side of the House, gifted with the capacity of alarming this country with the latent possibilities of danger which were lurking in such provisions, did not rise and protest. And we have been labouring under these things for eighteen years, unconscious of the concealed dynamite that they contained. The hon. gentlemen made one remark comparing my case, which is that of every hon. member on this side of the House, with the case of Job. What a prodigious amount of patience we have been compelled to exercise while hon. gentlemen opposite have been ringing the changes on this proposition so continuously, and repeating the same things over and over again. I counted as many as ten times that one speaker said the same thing. No wonder that the poor old patriarch, if he suffered as much from his advisers as we have suffered from ours on the other side of the House, turned upon them in scorn with the exclamation, "Verily ye are the people; wisdom will die with you."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to give the House a gleam of light which has visited me while my hon. friend has been speaking. I did not know why the Government had reduced the duty on patent medicines, but I find now that there is a reason. Hon. gentlemen opposite are somewhat selfish. They are all troubled as Job was, and they are going to get their medicines cheaper.

Mr. TAYLOR. When I gave way to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), I expected that he would reply to the argument made by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) as to how this resolution affected the preferential treaties made by England with other countries. I fully expected that the hon. gentleman had risen for that purpose; but I listened in vain for a word from him in contradiction to the statements made by the hon. senior member for Halifax. This House has waited patiently, day after day, to hear some legal gentleman on that side of the House rise to refute the arguments made by the legal gentlemen on this side of the House; but not one has attempted to do so, except the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who spoke first and gave his interpretation of this clause in its bearings upon those treaties. We have heard something from some of the business men on that side of the House, and I purpose saying a few words from the point of view of a layman or business man, particularly as the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) has spoken on the subject, and also the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). Both these gentlemen reside in constituencies adjoining mine, in which there are electors who vote for each of us, and no doubt these gentlemen will send copies of their speeches to some of the electors living in my constituency. I pur-

Mr. RUSSELL.

pose dealing with them for a few moments, and shall then proceed to deal with the question before the House. The hon. member for North Leeds made this statement:

In 1894, we saw in one line of goods, and the seventh largest industry in Canada, the agricultural implement business, the duties reduced from 35 to 20 per cent, and it threw out of work one thousand men in that industry alone, who either had to go into other lines and trades to make a living, or leave the country altogether.

There you have the statement of the hon. member for North Leeds, that in 1894 the Government then in power, because it reduced the duties on agricultural implements from 35 to 20 per cent, drove a thousand workingmen out of the country to seek a living elsewhere. I would ask my hon. friends to apply that same argument to the reductions of duties in the tariff brought down by this Government, and would ask him if in consequence of those reductions foreign goods are not going to come in here and drive out our workingmen.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Do not be afraid.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend is an importer and not a manufacturer. He wants to import foreign goods and make his profit out of them, and he is not particularly interested in the workingmen.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I have a good many more men working for me than you have.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend made a practice the other night, when I was speaking, of interrupting me. If he purposes speaking on this question, he will have the opportunity when I get through. He will then have the opportunity of speaking for the workingmen of Hamilton and explaining to them how this tariff is going to satisfy them.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). They are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are better satisfied under the second edition of the tariff, and we may get a third edition to-morrow which will satisfy them still more. But it is not the free trade revenue tariff which my hon. friend advocated when running his election. It is practically the old National Policy tariff we have to-day.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). My hon. friend is very much mistaken when he says I advocated anything at any election. My constituents elected me without my saying a word to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then my hon. friend was sent down here by his electorate not to advocate any policy, not even the policy of the Reform party, but simply to act on his own good judgment, confident that he would look after their interests. The hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) said also:

If you will look at the Trade Returns, you will find very few goods such as we manufacture in this country, that you will get from those countries under the lower tariff, would be a decided benefit to the consumers of Canada.

There we have another argument from the hon. gentleman in contradiction to the one he uttered a few moments afterwards, when he said the lowering of the tariff by the Government of 1894 drove a thousand workingmen out of the country. Then if this tariff does admit foreign goods the consumer will get the benefit if the workingmen are driven out. I shall not pursue his remarks further but just refer to the statement of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). He said :

When this National Policy was inaugurated, times were dull and business at a low ebb.

When was that? That was in 1878 when our hon. friends opposite were in power and after they had been running the country for several years on a revenue tariff. Then, he continued :

The farmer paid as high as 12 per cent for his money.

What does he pay to-day? But in these times when the country is at a low ebb owing to its having been run by the gentlemen now in power on a revenue tariff at 17½ per cent.

I will now just occupy a few moments with the resolution before us. Resolution No. 16 reads as follows:—

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

When these resolutions were tabled, hon. gentlemen opposite came down with a great flourish of trumpets and called this a preferential tariff, but to-night we do not hear the word "preferential" used. They now call it "reciprocal," it is open to the world, although the First Minister said, when these resolutions were introduced, that he had looked over the whole world, and saw that England was the only country that could take advantage of them. But to-night he comes down with a different statement and gives an interpretation that has never been given before. He says that the Government will take the Canadian tariff, as a whole, and the tariff of a foreign country as a whole. If the average of the Canadian tariff is to-day 19 per cent, then, when we come to compare that with other tariffs, the question will not be one for the Controller to settle or the Governor in Council, but for the courts to settle. It will be for the courts to settle whether the tariff of a foreign country is as low on the

whole as ours is or not. What are the tariffs of foreign countries? The hon. leader of the Opposition pointed to the tariff of Turkey which is a free tariff. Will not the manufactures of Turkey come into Canada and compete with the manufactures of Canadian labour, and what about China and Japan and Belgium and Germany? Leaving aside the question whether treaties made by England with foreign countries affect us or not, we will have to come down to the legal question whether the tariff of a foreign country is as low as the Canadian tariff. The hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) made a statement the other night to the effect that what had been said by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) with regard to foreign countries coming in under this reciprocal tariff would be taken by these countries and pointed to as proof that they were entitled to come in. What does that argument amount to? If the law says they are allowed to come in, they will come in, regardless of the arguments of the ex-Finance Minister, regardless of the arguments of the Premier of this country. And if foreign countries do come in, as they will if this becomes law, if their tariff is lower than ours, what will become of the labouring men of Canada? If the labouring man of Canada is compelled to compete with labour that can be secured in some of these foreign countries at from 10 to 15 cents per day what is to become of him? The hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) said that the Prime Minister made no promise to him or to any manufacturer in this country as to what would be done with regard to the tariff if he came into power. I accept the hon. member's statement that the Prime Minister did not promise him anything. But I know he came to Gananoque and made a solemn promise to Mr. R. R. Johnston, foreman of one of the establishments there—

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will state the question. I tell the Prime Minister to his face that he made a solemn promise to Mr. R. R. Johnston and to his brother-in-law Mr. C. K. Wright, who was with him at the time—and these gentlemen will make a statement of the facts. They said they had always been Liberals and had always supported the Liberal party, but could not do so in this election on account of the policy of the party in favour of a revenue tariff, which would interfere with their industry. And the Prime Minister said to them: Stand by your party, and if we are successful I will guarantee you that the tariff on your industry will not be interfered with. Consequently these two young men stood by their party, but now they find their wages cut from 10 to 25 per cent owing to reductions in the tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. TAYLOR. If hon. gentlemen want to get the question carried to-night, I hope that there will be no more interruption. I can talk until 12 o'clock if necessary, and will if my hon. friends interrupt me.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not carried; you do not know that it will be carried. I see that this resolution exempts certain goods. It specifies, "The reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in schedule "D." And schedule "D" says:

Provided, however, that these reductions will not apply to the following articles, but such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in Schedule "A," namely:—Wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines, and articles containing alcohol; sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar-cane or beet-root; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Now, I would ask my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) why he wants to create in this country a monopoly of the whisky distillers, the brewers, the sugar refiners, and the tobacco manufacturers. He will allow every industry in the country to be slaughtered by foreign competition, but he will not allow whisky or beer or tobacco or sugar to be interfered with. He exempts them by this clause.

Mr. SPROULE. He regards these as the necessaries of life.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, and he puts a tax on the poor man's whisky and tobacco, but he lets the rich man's champagne free. I think, Mr. Chairman, all the words of the resolution after the word "that," should be struck out and the following inserted. If the Government will do this, hon. gentlemen on this side will say that the Government stands up for the interests of the country:

All articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, or all articles that Canada can grow, produce or manufacture, and which are required for the use of the population of Canada, should be grown, produced and manufactured in Canada. That the tariff should be made more defensive than it is at present, so that in times of depression in other countries which grow, produce and manufacture similar articles, or in countries that can employ labour at from 25 cents per day and upwards to grow, produce and manufacture such articles, cannot import them into Canada to compete with the labour of Canada, whether it be on the farm, in the factory, workshop or the private home of the labourer, or whether such labourer be the skilled artisan or the sewing girl, the lumberman, the miner, fisherman, sailor, railway man, merchant, manufacturer or farmer, and that on such articles required for the use of the people of Canada and which cannot be grown, produced or manufactured in Canada, the tariff be made at as

Mr. TAYLOR.

low a rate of duty as the required revenue of the country will permit.

And that, so soon as the treaty objections are removed, preferential rates of duty should be given to England and her colonies on such articles as they produce, provided England gives the products of Canada preferred rates by charging a duty to foreign countries on such articles as Canada and the other British colonies can supply.

If the Government will introduce that amendment and put it in place of this resolution, it is true it might be gall and wormwood to some hon. gentlemen who have been crying for free trade—yet they stand with the Government and support them in maintaining practically the old tariff. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) said in his speech the other day, though he votes with the Government, that he did not think they did right in taking the duty off corn, that they should have held it as a whip over the Yankees so as to get lower duties on some other products of the farm, barley or something else. Still, he has faith that this resolution, whatever it means, will work out for the benefit of the farmer, and therefore he is prepared to support it. He says that, this Government has not done much yet for the farmers. What have they done? They adopted the farmers' tariff as they found it, except that they have put corn on the free list and that is not quite satisfactory to my hon. friend from Frontenac, but he is willing to go it blind and support this party hoping that some good will come of it all. If this resolution goes into effect, and is to be interpreted as the Prime Minister says, by taking an average of our tariff and of the tariff of any foreign country and admitting at preferential rates the goods of these countries that are on the average as low as ours, labourers will be few and far between in this country. We have China and Japan with cheap labour, adopting modern machinery and preparing to make every article made in the country; and we have a line of steamers going from Vancouver to these countries; and my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Prior) who, perhaps, will speak before this debate is over, will tell you what these countries are doing in getting ready to make goods for this market. If their goods come in under a 25 per cent reduction, what will be the effect upon the farmers and workingmen of this country? My hon. friend from Frontenac knows what the city of Kingston is as compared with what it was from 1873 to 1878, when the farmers of Frontenac used to bring their goods to Kingston and then to Gananoque. But see what population has grown up under the National Policy, making a home market for his constituents, though he says that the National Policy has done him no good. Well, I believe that if this tariff goes into effect, three-fourths of the constituents that he represents will say to him next time, We don't want you to go down there to represent us,

and we will send a man there who will support a tariff that will protect not only the farmers, but every article that can be made in this country, thus employing labour at home, because the labourers are the farmers' best customers.

Mr. DAVIN. I was glad to-night to hear the Prime Minister on this subject, and also to hear the hon. and learned gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Russell). Now this last hon. member, in a clever speech, emphasized the need of a clear interpretation of this clause; and although he rose to ask a reasonable question from the ex-Finance Minister as to the meaning of his amendment, he sat down refusing to give an interpretation of the meaning of the 16th clause. Sir, it is a pity that the hon. and learned gentleman did not do that, because he is an able man, and he has great power of exposition, but still he shrank from attempting to explain what seems to be unexplainable. For this clause might be described as tuberculated, it is a chameleon, it presents one character to one observer and another character to another observer. We have had two or three debates upon this clause, and we have had attempts from the followers of the Government to interpret the clause, and every man of them has given a different interpretation. The Prime Minister sticks to the position that it only means preference for England. He has looked abroad over the whole world, and he does not see a country to which it can apply except England. Well, if he has looked over the whole world and examined their tariffs, it would not be unbecoming in him to give the House the results of his examination. Then we had one of the Patron followers of the hon. gentleman, who told us that he supported this clause because it was the embodiment of the 9th plank of the Patron platform, which meant reciprocity with the entire world. Now, my hon. friend from Halifax gave us no bad piece of debating, but still he could not escape from the habit of a lifetime, it was after all a piece of special pleading. He quoted sections 245 and 248 of the Customs Act. Can he point to a single feature in either section which gives the Governor General in Council anything that is not a strictly executive act to do? Everything in these two clauses is strictly executive. But what we complain of is that this clause in the tariff gives the Controller of Customs legislative power.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that everything contained in the clause I cited was executive. I think when the Governor General in Council would be interpreting a clause they would be performing an executive function, which would be very much like a judicial function. But when they are extending and limiting the meaning, and applying the clauses to analogous cases, they are certainly performing legislative functions.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman's explanation does not seem to me to take one whit from the proposition that I laid down. Clause 245 provides that the Governor General in Council may make regulations for slaughtering cattle and grinding corn in bond—that is executive; coasting trade and inland navigation—that is executive; appointing officers to ports of entry—that is executive.

Mr. RUSSELL. In section 248 you will find legislative functions.

Mr. DAVIN. At this moment I am in the same position as the hon. gentleman himself. He said he wanted to vote intelligently on this section, and that is my desire. I take section 248:

The Governor General in Council may interpret, limit or extend the meaning of the conditions upon which it is provided in any Act imposing duties of Customs, that any article may be imported free of duty for special purposes, or for particular objects or interests.

Will my hon. friend maintain that that is legislative? That is strictly executive, because it gives power under exceptional circumstances to the Governor General in Council to depart from a law that has been made and defined by this House.

And may make regulations either for declaring or defining what cases shall come within the conditions of such Act, and to what objects or interests of an analogous nature the same shall apply and extend, and may direct the payment or non-payment of duty in any such case, or the remission thereof by way of drawback, if such duty has been paid.

That provides that when this House has legislated and declares what its tariff shall be, afterwards, in special cases, in order to meet exceptions that must arise in the administration of any law, then the Governor in Council may deal with those exceptions. That is not legislative, that is making no general law. My hon. friend said he wanted to quote a maxim of law, and I expect the maxim of law that he wanted to quote was the Latin maxim which says, that is certain which can be rendered certain. Now, may I ask if this clause can be rendered certain? Here is a clause that we are asked to pass, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have given to us various interpretations, therefore, will any man say that this is a clause that can be rendered certain? What we mainly object to is that it gives power to the Controller of Customs to legislate for Canada. Now the Prime Minister the other night, in reply to the member for York, took the statutory declaration that we are all familiar with, and said that contained the same principle as this clause. I was surprised to hear that proposition laid down by the Prime Minister. Now, what is that statutory declaration? Every article is there defined, it mentions one article after an-

other, and states that if at any time the United States will admit such articles free, or admit them at a lower rate of duty, Canada will do the same. But here is an undefined power given to the Controller of Customs and the Governor in Council, that leaves the people of Canada and this House completely at sea as to what shall be in the future the tariff of this country. Why, Sir, the Prime Minister tells us at this hour of the day, after that clause has been before the country for so long a time, that even now he has looked all the world over, and that it can apply only to England. Although when the clause was first tabled here we had an hon. member, not the highest authority as a statesman, but a very high authority on financial questions, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, tell us that it did not apply to England alone, but applied to other countries as well. So we are fairly in a position to ask hon. gentlemen to give us that interpretation which will enable us to vote intelligently on this question. I am in the same position, I repeat, as my hon. friend who spoke last. My desire is to vote intelligently, and desiring to vote intelligently, I am very anxious that we should obtain something clearer than we have yet obtained from hon. gentlemen opposite; or, to quote a remark that fell from the hon. and learned member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), the commentary has placed us in a more confused position than when we had only the text. The hon. gentleman has given us no enlightenment, while the Prime Minister has told the committee that this clause applied to the whole tariff of a country. The clause reads as follows:—

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff. \* \* \* \*

That is susceptible of this interpretation; the products of Canada on terms which on the whole tariff, or on the whole dutiable goods; or on the whole of the goods imported from Canada are as favourable. Here are three interpretations. Yet hon. gentlemen tell us they have the patience of Job to listen to hon. members on this side of the House when criticising this clause, when the way we have been treated is this, that from the moment the resolution was tabled, although we have heard some rhetoric and had speeches delivered by some of the first men in the Liberal party, not a member until the Prime Minister rose, attempted to define the clause. Hon. members on this side of the House may be excused, great as is our admiration of the Prime Minister, if we have not the unbounded faith, shall I say, the boundless credulity of the hon. member for Halifax? The hon. gentleman declared that although he had not heard the Prime Minister, he was quite certain the hon. gentleman was

Mr. DAVIN.

correct, that his speech would be full of meaty exposition and delivered with the usual lucidity of the Prime Minister; but we, whose 'raison d'être' is to criticise the tariff, may be excused for not having boundless faith in the speech of the Prime Minister. Then there is the question whether taking the goods of another country, the clause means the whole of the dutiable goods, or the whole of the goods imported. The Prime Minister tells us to-night that it is on the whole goods. If it is on the whole goods of a country that should seek reciprocal favours from Canada, then all the criticism passed on the clause by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is perfectly justified, for if there ever was a clause that could not be rendered certain, it is this clause now under consideration.

*Certum est quod certum reddi potest.*

We have had the interpretation of a statesman and the speech of the hon. and learned member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), and neither has helped us.

I ask the attention of the committee to one or two points in connection with this clause. In looking at the speeches delivered on Friday evening, and turning to column 3,083 of "Hansard," I find the committee was told by the Prime Minister, referring to the remarks made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace):

He did not attack the resolution on its merits; he did not say it was wise or unwise in its terms, but he attacked it on account of the consequences to which he said it might lead.

If an hon. member wants to attack a resolution on its merits, he cannot do it in a more pointed way than by showing the disastrous results to which it must lead. My hon. friend, therefore, must have discussed the resolution on its merits. But my hon. friend has discussed it to-day in its details, and has come to the conclusion that its terms are unwise. Let me quote from column 3,122 of "Hansard," where a statement is made to which I have already referred. This was made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). He said:

My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Clancy) asked me some question about the stand I was taking in this matter. Well, Sir, one of the planks in our platform is reciprocal trade on fair and equal terms between Canada and the world. That is the ninth plank of the platform.

That hon. gentleman proceeded to say that this is the reason why he supports this clause, although we are told again and again that it only gives a preferential tariff to England. When we find hon. gentlemen taking such different views of this chameleon-like clause, I think I may be permitted to quote a chestnut, which is sometimes better than a fresh story. An old farmer and his son on a dark night went to look for the family cow, which it was thought had wandered along the banks of a river.

The old man took one side and the son the other side of the river. The old man cried out I have found the tracks of the cow. The son cried out he had found the tracks of the cow. The father then said: My son, let us return, because on this dark night it is no use hunting for a cow that makes tracks on both sides of the river. Why should hon. gentlemen opposite ask this committee to vote for a clause which can make tracks on two sides, and puzzle so many people? My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Clancy) asked the Controller of Customs a question, and it was a pertinent question, and I wish to call attention to the answer given by the Controller. My hon. friend asked respecting goods coming into this country that did not have their origin in Britain. He put a similar case to that presented by the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost). That gentleman indicated, as I understand him, and I think his reported speech will bear me out, that goods would be imported under this particular clause that were manufactured in the United States, sent across the Atlantic by reason of cheap freight rates, and then brought here from England. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said:

The hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) this evening said very boastfully that the consequences of a policy of this kind would be that England would be the road by which the products of the United States would reach Canada; they would go from the United States to England in a partly finished condition, and would finally be imported into Canada. Now, England does not produce raw material. England imports raw material, some of it in a raw state, some of it in a greatly advanced stage of manufacture, and I desire to ask whether the meaning of this resolution is that no matter in how advanced a state of manufacture material may be brought into England, it may come into this country under the preferential clause. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer me that question?

This is what the Controller of Customs said in reply:

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). We shall have to be guided by the law—articles of growth, produce or manufacture of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I have pointed to a case in which an article might be the growth of the United States and have been in part manufactured in the United States and then have been sent to England and finished there, and from England sent to Canada. Would such a case come within the clause, or does the hon. gentleman intend to place any limit? The reason I ask is this: Goods may be made in part in Germany, and England may be made the back-door through which the manufactures of Germany and France and every other country may be sent to Canada. Business men will be shrewd enough to take advantage of a clause open to a construction of that kind, and the consequence will be that any country in the world may send its goods to England in an advanced stage of manufacture, have them finished in England, and stamped as English goods, and then send them into Canada at

the reduced rate. I ask the hon. Minister again if he proposes to put any limit to meet such cases?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Regulations will have to be made under which these goods will be imported, and the exporter will have to conform to those regulations. The hon. gentleman is supposing a case. He thinks the goods will be partly manufactured in the United States and then completed in England and stamped in England and then shipped to Canada. I do not expect that at all, nor do I think the hon. gentleman expects it.

Now, the Controller of Customs will see that he did not answer my hon. friend's question, and the same point was raised to-day by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie). I wish to ask the Controller of Customs will he, or has he already, made arrangement in respect to goods partly or wholly the manufacture of Germany, but coming to us as British exports? What will he do in a case like that, or what has he done already?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). As I understand, under the law, any goods that are the bona fide manufacture of Great Britain will be admitted. If goods come in under a colourable pretext, steps will be taken to keep them out.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) pointed out how difficult that would be. He took the case of Irish linen which, it seems—and it is a very Irish thing to happen—is manufactured in Germany and sent here. What would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) do in regard to these so-called Irish linens, that are manufactured in Germany and sent over to England, and through England to Canada?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I will have to take steps as I told the hon. gentleman just now. I will have to make regulations and use what means we have in order to do it.

Mr. DAVIN. Has my hon. friend given instructions to the customs officers in this matter?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. As definite instructions as will be given have not yet been given. There will be more definite instructions when the Tariff Bill becomes law.

Mr. DAVIN. But the tariff is law now. I just rose for the purpose of contributing my small quota to the elucidation of this clause. In fact, I would not have spoken were it not for the remarks of my hon. and learned friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) which very much interested me; it was bright, it was specious, but it was fallacious, as I have shown. Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help feeling that after all we are still in the same fog as to what is the exact significance of this clause. Hon. gentlemen opposite are under a complete misapprehension, if they think they are acting on the same principle

as the statutory offer in the statutory clause. That is definite; this is indefinite, and the definite and indefinite are as opposite as black and white, and you cannot say that the same principle is behind a clause which provides definitely for what shall be done, and behind a clause which leaves everything vague and indefinite. We are wandering in the fog; we are going into a financial Serbonian bog if we follow in the line marked out for us by the Government.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the main motion passes I desire to emphasize the position of gentlemen on this side of the House by moving another amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend audibly smiles, but probably there are considerations which are grave enough to make even him smile less audibly at the principle which is involved. That principle with reference to which I move the amendment is, the handing over virtually to a member of the Government, and by Order in Council—if even an Order in Council is to be used—the power of making what are the full equivalents of commercial treaties with any country in the world. It is provided here—and there is no distinction of countries—that when any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to, then, through the machinery which is provided—which, according to the explanation of the Controller of Customs, is by way of report of the Controller of Customs to Council, and an Order in Council—then the goods of that country may be admitted into this country at a reduction in the ultimate of 25 per cent. That I say is virtually the power of making commercial treaties with any country, in the world within the limits of a reduction of 25 per cent on the duties in the general tariff of Canada. That is not limited to any country with which Great Britain may have most-favoured-nation treaties at all. But by Order in Council commercial arrangements partaking of the nature of a treaty could be made with any country with which Great Britain might have treaties involving obligations of an Imperial nature. I am not going to make an extended argument on this point. I am simply going to say this much, that when the Prime Minister the other day endeavoured to destroy the force of my argument by citing the statutory clause with reference to the United States, he did not destroy it—he strengthened it. There is no rule but has its exceptions. Government is not a matter simply of cast-iron rules; and every

Mr. DAVIN.

principle, which is acknowledged and acted upon by Parliament and Government, has occasionally to meet with exigencies and contingencies requiring that principle to be relaxed. But a slight relaxation, or even a large relaxation on definite and unknown grounds, is a triumphant vindication of the general principle, and is not at all to be argued from as derogatory to the principle. With reference to that statutory offer, does not my hon. friend know, in the first place, that Parliament was dealing with a condition of circumstances which had actually been tried in a treaty extending from 1854 to 1866; that it was with reference to a country with which we had had an experimental treaty, in which every product was definitely mentioned and had been discussed in this Parliament over and over again; and a treaty which this House was willing and anxious should be put into operation again at any time on the same lines? How different that is from handing over to the Government the power to negotiate a commercial treaty with China, with Japan, with any country in the wide world, the details and the conditions of trade with which this Parliament has never had experience of, and has never set itself even seriously to consider. So I say on that ground the argument adduced by my hon. friend is not good at all, that because the statutory offer was passed, and could be put into operation by an Order in Council, therefore the making of an entirely new commercial treaty with an entirely new country was a thing which ought to be taken from Parliament and handed over in the gross to a committee of Parliament consisting of the Cabinet of the country for the time being. I instance this case. Even when we were making a most limited commercial treaty with France, involving but a few articles, and not of the greatest importance, either by way of trade or revenue, the Government did not think of asking to be empowered to negotiate and put in force a treaty with France on terms which it might think favourable to Canada. The power which the Government asked, and which Parliament gave, was simply the power to negotiate, and afterwards to bring the results of the negotiations before the House and submit them in their detailed form to the arbitrament of Parliament. I have stated also that on several occasions delegations went to Washington to arrange if possible for a limited trade with the United States; but no Government ever asking or thought of asking from any Parliament, and certainly no Parliament would have granted, the power to go to Washington to arrange even the best commercial treaty we could get for Canada, and to put it in force, without asking the assent of Parliament to its details. But much farther afield are the Government going at the present time—a Liberal Government, and Liberals are being asked to support them in their request—in asking, with-

out giving details, without specifications of articles, and with nothing to report, that they should be authorized to arrange a drop of 25 per cent in existing duties with any and every country under the sun, without asking the assent of this Parliament to the details in any particular. They are asking Parliament to give up that most sacred and most prized right that Parliament has possessed since it has had an existence—to abnegate that function which is not only a proper but a safe function to be left in the hands of Parliament. With these few remarks, in trying to give briefly the arguments which have been more fully stated at other times, I desire to move this amendment :

That after the word "may" in the fifth line, these words be inserted : "after Parliament has given its sanction thereto."

The object and purport of that is that if the Government, in the interim, after examination, thought it would be advantageous to allow China, Japan, the South American States, or any other country in the world to have access to this country for its trade at the reduction of 25 per cent on existing rates, they should make their investigations and make the tentative arrangement, but should come to this Parliament and ask Parliament to sanction the details. Is that more than Parliament should ask? Is it anything that Parliament ought not to ask? Is it anything that any Government ought to refuse to give to a constitutionally-formed Parliament such as this?

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I think that those who listened to the hon. Prime Minister a few days ago when he instanced the case of the standing offer as part of the National Policy of 1879, will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that as a matter of principle there is no possible difference between that offer and the offer which is made in the resolution now before the House. In matters of constitutional government and principle there are no questions of degree. The question of principle is the same, and if the principle of constitutional government is violated by this resolution, then I shall be prepared to show that it was violated in a much larger degree by the resolution which hon. gentlemen opposite incorporated in the tariff Bill of 1879, and which is commonly called the standing offer. When my hon. friend says that we are proposing to take power to change the duties and make them higher or lower at will, he is of course exceeding the limits of discussion, because my hon. friend is well aware that the power of the Government in this matter is strictly limited. It is limited in this respect, that by the general tariff it is not proposed that this or any Government shall, by executive action, have power to raise the duties beyond the limits fixed in that tariff, and the rates

of duty we may apply under the reciprocal tariff are also clearly fixed, so that the power which it is proposed by this resolution to give the Government is simply a power confined between the two limits, namely, not to raise beyond the duties in the general tariff, and not to reduce lower than the rates fixed in the reciprocal tariff. My hon. friend said we opened the doors to an abuse of power. He repeated with emphasis what he said in a previous discussion. In that discussion he used these words :

Well, Sir, what is the proposition here? The proposition is that when Parliament has fixed a revenue after carefully looking over the advantages and disadvantages, when Parliament has fixed the rates of duty and then fixed the expenditures, a Cabinet of thirteen men shall have the power placed in its hands—it asks for it and proposes to get it through its majority—to diminish these revenues so far as the imports go, by 25 per cent of the whole, which totally disarranges the financial basis, turns a surplus into a deficit or adds to a possible deficit many thousands of dollars, may be many millions of dollars. Now, I say that no Finance Minister, no Parliament, can see its way clear and take its steps carefully and prudently under such conditions, such unknown and contingent conditions as these. This disarranges the whole basis of the finances of the country by giving up to the Cabinet what Parliament always keeps in its own hands and jealously guards.

Let us make a comparison between the possible effect, for it is only a possible effect, of the resolution as it now stands, and the possible effect of the standing offer in the tariff of 1879, if we were proposing that standing offer to-day, taking in both cases, as the basis of comparison, the trade of last year. The hon. gentleman talks about the uncertainty of this matter. Well, if there are uncertainties—and I think there are not so many as the hon. gentleman imagines—there are also some certainties. In the first place, it is certain that this proposal is intended to extend the preferential rate to Great Britain. There can be no doubt about that. That was announced in the Budget speech and carried out in every custom-house in Canada the following morning and is being carried out to-day. There is another certainty in the matter. It is certain that this does not extend to the United States. Nobody pretends to say that it does. Unquestionably if the United States were to change their tariff and reduce it to the level of ours, they would come under the operation of this clause, but no sane person imagines they are going to do that right away.

I find that in 1895-96 our total imports for home consumption amounted to \$110,587,480. If we deduct the imports from Great Britain, \$32,979,042, and the imports from the United States, \$58,574,024, we have left \$19,033,714 as our total imports from all other countries except the United States and Great Britain—that is from all countries to which these possible uncertainties might apply. We

find also that upon this \$19,000,000 worth of imports from the world at large, exclusive of Great Britain and the United States, there was collected a duty amounting to \$5,092,530. Now, what is the uncertainty that we could possibly have to confront between this date and the next meeting of Parliament? The full one-quarter cannot be taken off before the next meeting of Parliament but only one-eighth of the duty, so that if we can imagine it possible that this policy is all wrong and rash, Parliament, which will be in session in a few months, will then have the opportunity of preventing the Government from pursuing this rash and dangerous course, if it be such. Therefore, all that we have to deal with at present is what may happen between now and the next meeting of Parliament. I am assuming that every country in the world, except the United States—Great Britain, of course having now the advantage of the resolution—should come in and avail itself of it. If the worst that the hon. gentleman mentions can happen, or the best, as he may consider it, what will we then have to face? We would be dealing with countries which last year only sent us \$19,000,000 worth of goods on which the duty amounted to a little over \$5,000,000. Divide that by one-eighth, and you will find that the utmost that could possibly happen, if all the countries of the world were to take advantage of that clause, would be to diminish the duties between now and the next session of Parliament, which we might otherwise receive, by the amount of \$636,566. That is the worst or the best, as the hon. gentlemen may consider it, that could happen if every country in the world should come in and place itself within the operation of that resolution.

Let us now see what would be the effect of the standing offer of 1879 of hon. gentlemen opposite, if we had embodied that in our tariff instead of the resolution which they call in question. I have here a list of the goods embraced in that standing offer, and I find that on these goods which we imported last year from the United States, there was paid a duty amounting to \$1,722,757, so that if we were to incorporate the standing offer of hon. gentlemen opposite in our tariff to-day, we would be giving the Executive Government the power of throwing away that amount of duties, whereas the utmost we could lose, if this resolution should be availed of by every country in the world, would be only \$600,000. Therefore, if this proposition be one which strikes at the foundation of parliamentary government, which opens the door widely to a disarrangement of our fiscal system, which gives up parliamentary control to this enormous degree, which allows us to face the possibility of a large increase in our deficit or a large diminution of our surplus as the case may be, all these horrible possibilities which the hon. gentleman points

Mr. FIELDING.

out would be increased threefold, if we adopted instead the standing offer which the hon. gentleman placed in the resolutions of 1879. All these alarming possibilities which the hon. gentleman points out would be multiplied three-fold, if, instead of this proposition, we had before us the standing offer which he placed in the statutes in 1879.

That, Sir, was the only point I rose to make, but since I am on my feet, I would like to add a statement which, I think, will not be without interest, a statement of the value of our trade with these countries of which we have heard so much—the countries that have favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. I have here a statement showing the imports from every country—there are twenty of them—with which Great Britain has a treaty containing a most favoured-nation clause. It will be interesting to see the great dangers we are opening ourselves to by admitting goods coming from these countries. First, there is the Argentine Republic. We actually imported from that country last year \$936 worth of goods. True, we did not get much duty, for they were all free goods. I find that there is a favoured-nation treaty with Austria-Hungary. From that country we imported \$203,713 worth of goods the duty collected upon which was \$58,306.88. Belgium comes next, and it is one of the countries with which we have a most-favoured-nation treaty. The amount of imports was \$920,758, the duty collected being \$192,457.64. Then there is Bolivia. Think of the terrible thing that would come upon us if we were to open our markets to Bolivia, which did not send anything. Chili, Colombia, Costa Rica, Liberia, Madagascar, Morocco, the Sandwich Islands and Tunis, every one of which has a most-favoured-nation treaty with England, did not send a penny's-worth of goods to the Dominion of Canada. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is trying to scare the country with talk of the vast volume of trade that would overwhelm our industries—

Mr. LISTER. Slaughtering the working-man.

The FINANCE MINISTER. Exactly. There are some other of these most-favoured-nations with which we did some business, but I think you will find that outside of France, Germany and Belgium, there is not much to alarm the House, and I do not think hon. gentlemen are much alarmed about that difficulty. Denmark sent to us \$12,905 worth of goods, the duty upon which amounted to \$420. From France our importations were large, amounting to \$2,810,942, and the duty \$1,020,804.74. Our total imports from Germany were \$5,931,459; duties, \$1,329,186.36. Persia sent us \$515 worth of goods, the duties on which amounted to \$162.94. How alarmed we should be at the prospect of the goods of Persia coming in. Russia

sent us \$15,974 worth of goods, upon which we collected \$259.50. Our imports from Sweden and Norway amounted to \$45,150, the duties upon which were \$7,658.86. From Venezuela we imported \$266,927 worth of goods, the duties upon which amounted to \$212. From all the countries having most-favoured-nation treatment with England, including Germany, Belgium and France, which are the only countries with which we have considerable trade among the nations mentioned, the total imports were \$10,209,279, or less than one-tenth of the total imports of the Dominion. And on these we collected \$2,609,478. I think I have shown very clearly that the volume of trade we have with these countries is not a very alarming one, and if we should open the doors to the whole of them there would not be much cause for alarm. But the principal point I rose to make was that, so far as the volume of trade was concerned, so far as our financial state is concerned, so far as the possibility of increasing a deficit or diminishing a surplus is concerned, which are the very points my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) touched upon, this resolution is almost harmless, as compared with the standing offer under the National Policy, which involved a possible loss of revenue of \$3 for every \$1 under this proposal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House is to be very much congratulated that at last some members of the Government have found their voices and have ventured to offer a few observations. But it is only necessary to listen to the statement just made by the Minister of Finance to find that he has entirely evaded the argument that is before the House. What is the question that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has put before the House? The question he has put before the House, the very serious question whether this House is to delegate legislative powers to the Governor in Council, whether this House is to put into the hands of the Governor in Council the powers to put duties up or put duties down, and, in addition to that, the power of making treaties. Now, I may say, in the first place, that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), who has just taken his seat, has entirely misinterpreted the scope of the argument from this side of the House. The question is not how far the revenue would be endangered, it is not how far the arrangements that the Government make with reference to the revenues of the country are to be affected, but it is the cardinal question whether Parliament is to make the tariff or whether the Government is to make the tariff. The question is whether treaties with foreign countries are to be initiated and ratified by the Governor General in Council without let or hindrance, without this House being taken in the confidence of the Government at all. Now, Sir, take the question of treaties. We

stand to-day in an altogether different position from that in which we stood a few years ago. I dare say that hon. gentlemen remember that when Sir Alexander Galt, as High Commissioner for Canada, was instructed to place himself in communication with the Imperial Government with a view to negotiating better trade relations between Canada and Spain, the Government of Canada applied to Her Majesty's Government to have Sir Alexander Galt, representing Canada in these negotiations placed on the footing of a plenipotentiary. This was refused. Hon. gentlemen will find in the archives a point-blank refusal to this request, made, as lately as 1881, by the Government of Canada to the Imperial Government to clothe the Canadian representative with the powers of a plenipotentiary. They said they had no objection to Canada naming a commissioner, and they would be glad that that commissioner should give all the information in his power to the ambassador of the United Kingdom or whoever was charged with the negotiations, but they absolutely refused the request of the Canadian Government that the nominee of Canada should be appointed a plenipotentiary for the purpose of protecting Canadian interests. Hon. members are aware that, subsequently, when I was High Commissioner for Canada, I raised that question with Her Majesty's Government, and the matter was thoroughly discussed. I was able so to bring to bear upon Her Majesty's Government the vital importance, in the position that Canada had attained, of the representative of the Canadian Government being clothed on such occasions with full plenipotentiary powers, that the policy was entirely changed; Her Majesty's Government receded from the position they had taken in 1881, and I was appointed, a plenipotentiary, in conjunction with Sir Clare Ford, the ambassador of the British Government at the court of Spain, to negotiate a treaty in reference to Canada. Hon. gentlemen will find in the despatches that are under their hands, that not only was the point conceded, not only was I clothed with full plenipotentiary powers, but that the instructions given by the Foreign Office to Sir Clare Ford and myself jointly as joint plenipotentiaries, contained the statement that the negotiation of the treaty would rest upon the Canadian plenipotentiary, though it would be signed by Her Majesty's Ambassador. Therefore, the position has been conceded to Canada that in matters in which her trade interests are concerned, the Queen appoints the nominee of the Canadian Government, clothes him with all the powers of a plenipotentiary and unites him with the ambassador, as I was united, on a subsequent occasion, by the Foreign Office, with the Marquis of Dufferin, then plenipotentiary at Paris, and clothed with plenipotentiary powers, to present the views of Canada and obtain such arrangements as

the Canadian Government desired. That, I mention in passing, as a most important step in which the position of Canada was not only conceded, but in which the representative of the Government of Canada finds himself clothed with the fullest plenipotentiary powers to negotiate a treaty in which the trade of Canada is interested, and is backed and sustained by all the influence of Her Majesty's ambassador to that foreign country, and is backed and sustained by all the influence of the Foreign Office and of the power of England. I say that is a position that, in my judgment, is most important and valuable to Canada. Now, what ground is there for the step this resolution proposes, that is, to clothe the Governor General in Council with this power, irrespective of Parliament, without any knowledge or information on the part of Parliament as to what will be done with power to negotiate a treaty with a foreign country? I say that no case has been made out for such an abnormal and extraordinary procedure on the part of Canada which, after all, is a dependency of the British Crown. But my hon. friend the Finance Minister has entirely failed, I think, to grasp the force of the argument that has been presented on this question, namely, that under this resolution the Governor in Council not only makes treaties, but actually legislates and may make and alter the tariff of the country from time to time without reference to Parliament. Now what is his answer? Why, he produces an argument which only requires to be stated to show how entirely illusory it is. But the hon. gentleman has lost sight of the whole point of the case. He brings forward the statutory offer which has been placed upon the Statute-book, not by the Governor in Council, but by the Parliament of Canada. Even if the hon. gentleman was to state what he proposes to do, and asked permission of the House to do it, that would still be an entirely different thing to the statutory offer. That is the point upon which we have joined issue on the two sides of the House. That statutory offer has no reference to the question whether it affects the revenue or whether it does not. It is an Act of the Parliament of Canada, deliberately put upon the Statute-book, in the full knowledge of all its bearings and all its effects. The hon. gentleman knows that it was embodied in the reciprocity treaty which formerly existed between Canada and the United States. Parliament had the fullest information, it was possessed of all the details, and it declared that the Governor in Council should have power to make what arrangement they, in their judgment, might think desirable with the United States of America. But it confined the Government of Canada to doing that which Parliament had specifically authorized in all its details. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there is any parity of reasoning

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

between the two cases, that the statutory offer had any bearing upon the question of giving the Governor in Council power to make treaties and unmake them, and to make such arrangements without the knowledge of Parliament, and without requiring the assent of Parliament to those arrangements? I say the two subjects are entirely different. I will not take up the time of the House by going into the question of preferential trade, which the hon. gentleman knows has been already completely disposed of by the clause which he has subsequently brought down, providing that the difficulty in reference to treaties shall be obviated by the Governor in Council, having power to carry out the wishes and the requirements of, and to implement the obligations incurred by, the Imperial Government on that question. But I wish now, Sir, to thank my hon. friend the First Minister for the high compliment he paid to the National Policy. Now, it must not be forgotten that for eighteen long years hon. gentlemen opposite have been denouncing the National Policy of Canada, which gave protection to Canadian industries, as a foul wrong done to the people of this country. For eighteen long years the hon. gentlemen opposite have denounced that policy in terms the most unmeasured that were ever applied to any Act upon the Statute-book of any country. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that the Minister of Finance declared to the House that in the general tariff that he was going to submit for the adoption of this Parliament, he had adopted without any substantial alteration, the National Policy, that is to say, that he had adopted in all its entirety the National Policy as the general tariff for Canada, that policy which for eighteen years he and his party had denounced as everything that was bad. What was the objection of hon. gentlemen to that National Policy? Was it not its high protective character? Was it not that it adopted the principle of protection in its strongest and, in their judgment, its most objectionable features? If there was any ground for their denunciations it was to be found in its high protective character. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has paid us that greatest of all compliments, a compliment of imitation, and he has adopted the National Policy so long denounced, as the general tariff of Canada. Now, what does the first Minister say to-night? Why, the policy that he adopts, the tariff that he is going to contrast with the tariffs of all other countries throughout the world, is the general tariff which the Finance Minister tells us is substantially ours. He says that, after looking all over the world, having studied this question in all its bearings, the only tariff he can find that is as favourable and as moderate as ours, is the tariff of Great Britain; consequently, he is not able to find any other country in the world that is entitled to the remissions that this clause pro-

poses. He first lays down the cardinal principle that he is to make a comparison between the tariffs of all these different countries and the tariff of Canada, and he says that, having looked over the whole world, he cannot find a tariff low enough to entitle them to the benefit of this clause except the tariff of England. Sir, I tender my most hearty thanks to my hon. friend for having, at this late hour, vindicated so completely, by his comparison, the moderate character of the protective tariff that the Liberal-Conservative party and Government had adopted. I want to draw the attention of my hon. friend to this fact, that in giving us the trade of the various countries in the world with Canada, he takes last year, he takes a year when Canadian industries were protected. He does not tell you what it will be under the free trade policy, that he proposes to introduce by the cut of one-eighth at first, and afterwards one-quarter of the general tariff, which would probably change these figures most materially. The hon. gentleman will not deny it; he claims, and he prides himself on the fact, that under this preferential tariff, as he calls it, the mother country will reap great advantage. How? By the enormous quantity of goods that will be brought here from Great Britain. When the exports from Belgium, France and Germany and other countries come in, the hon. gentleman will see that all the figures to which he has directed the attention of the House will prove to be utterly fallacious. But I intend to draw the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister and of the First Minister to an important fact which they do not seem to have taken into consideration in proposing the arrangements contained in this clause. I hold in my hand a despatch sent by the Imperial Government to the Governor General of Canada, dated June 28th, 1895, which hon. gentlemen will observe is of tolerably recent date. Are we to pay any respect to such a communication; is there any deference due to the Imperial Government; is the Governor General expected to treat it with contempt, is there any deference due to a communication from the Colonial Office containing the sentiments of Her Majesty's Government of this country and the position in which we stand? Does the hon. gentleman pretend that a despatch to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, giving the views of Her Majesty's Government on a question of this kind, is to be treated with contempt, or is to have some little respect paid to it? What does this despatch say? It has a direct and complete bearing on this question. My hon. friend will not deny that under this proposed clause, a preferential rate is to be established—that he has established a preferential rate already. The hon. gentleman has boasted that this has been done by the hon. the Minister of Customs, whom

I am happy to be able to congratulate on the coming event that will make him, I am glad to say, a full Minister of Customs. I recognize in that action by the First Minister and his Cabinet the adoption of a policy which was inaugurated by their predecessors, as one that having first tried the system of controllers, the Government have felt it necessary to take the further step and clothe the controllers with full power as Cabinet Ministers. If there ever was a time when it was necessary that the Controller of Customs should have a seat in the Cabinet, it was when this clause had to be carried into effect. But that is aside from the question. This tariff is now law and is in operation, and the hon. the Controller establishes different rates of duties. Did not the hon. Minister of Finance say that England and England alone was at this moment receiving the one-eighth reduction?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman is commencing to read a despatch from which he formerly quoted, and on which the views of this Government have been stated. This matter is not new.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If there ever was a senseless interruption it was that just made by the hon. gentleman. He only interrupts for the sake of interrupting. It is a too important question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman should be careful of his words. I have always endeavoured to treat him with courtesy, and the hon. gentleman has no right to make such a remark.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I fail to see where I interrupted him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman stated a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated that the hon. gentleman had admitted that this was a preferential tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated it was not so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I also stated that the hon. gentleman had put it into operation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that a tariff that admits the goods of one country at one rate and denies that privilege to another country, is not preferential legislation? The hon. gentleman has lost sight of this fact, and the issue is uncontradicted. I say this is a differential tariff or it is nothing; this clause means a differential tariff or it means nothing. It proposes to clothe the Governor in Council with power to make half a dozen differen-

tial treaties with other countries, if in the judgment of the Government and according to the interpretation of the Controller of Customs such countries are entitled to receive the advantages of this clause. That is the position. So, if there ever was a tariff which conveyed on its face that it was a differential tariff, it is this that is called a reciprocal tariff, because hon. gentlemen are aware that the First Minister has declared emphatically that Belgium cannot have the advantage of it, that Germany cannot claim the advantage of it, and that looking over the whole world he found that only England could come under it. Yet the hon. gentleman denies that this is a preferential tariff. The question does not admit of discussion for a moment. Without doubt it is a preferential tariff, and comes within the terms of the despatch of the Marquis of Ripon; and one of two things must happen: either the Government will have to instruct the Governor General as the representative of the Sovereign, to disregard the solemn injunction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a despatch written to him for his guidance; or this clause cannot be law if it retains its differential character. What does the Marquis of Ripon say in his despatch, dated as late as June 28th, 1895? I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to this point; I hold it to be a very serious matter, although the hon. gentleman may not do so. I do not want to see a declaration of independence in this Diamond Jubilee year—it is the last thing the people of Canada want—and I invite attention to the serious nature of this clause. The Marquis of Ripon wrote:

While, however, Parliament has thus removed all legislative restrictions on the colonies, so far as Imperial legislation is concerned, it will be necessary, in order that Her Majesty's Government may be in a position to give effect to their responsibility for the international obligations of the Empire, and for the protection of its general interests, that any Bill passed by a colonial legislature providing for the imposition of differential duties, should be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure, so as to allow full opportunity for its consideration from these points of view.

For this reason, and in order to prevent inconvenience, it will be desirable, if such duties are included in a general Tariff Bill, that a proviso should be added that they are not to come into force until Her Majesty's pleasure has been signified.

Has the hon. gentleman complied with this formal instruction from Her Majesty's Government, that if this Government provided for differential duties, it should be in a special clause, and with a proviso added that it is not to come into operation until Her Majesty's pleasure has been signified. Even the Governor General's assent to it is directed to be withheld, and further than that, the Bill itself is to contain the provision that it cannot come into

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

operation until Her Majesty's pleasure has been signified; that is, until the Imperial Government have had an opportunity of passing deliberately upon that Act, and saying whether it should receive Her Majesty's sanction or not. An illustration is given as follows:

I may here point out, that any Act such as that passed by the Legislature of New Zealand in 1870,—

Mark this. That Act of 1870 in New Zealand did the very same thing that this clause proposes to do, and it is here dealt with by the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

I may here point out, that any Act such as that passed by the Legislature of New Zealand in 1870, which proposed to enable the Governor of the colony in council to suspend or modify any of the duties imposed by the Customs Duties Acts of the colony, in accordance with any intercolonial agreement, besides being open to grave objection on constitutional grounds, \* \* \* and unless, therefore, the articles to which the powers should apply, and the extent to which the remission might be granted, were specified, Her Majesty's Government would have grave doubts as to the propriety of advising Her Majesty to assent to such an Act.

Can anything be stronger than that?

They trust, therefore, that the colonial legislature—

Mark, Sir, he passed from His Excellency the Governor General. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Imperial Government itself, pass to a still higher tribunal than that of the representative of the Queen; they make an appeal to the colonial legislatures, they make an appeal to the Parliament of Canada, and they said:

They trust, therefore, that the colonial legislatures will not seek to divest themselves in any measure of their power to fix the amount of their taxation, nor to confer upon the executive a power the exercise of which without the fullest deliberation might inadvertently give rise to serious complications, not only with other colonies, but with foreign powers.

Now, Sir, I want the members of the Government to tell me, if they realize where they are. Do they realize that at this moment they have done that which the Governor General of Canada has been instructed by the Imperial Government they should not do? Do the hon. gentlemen realize the fact, that having passed a discriminating tariff, having boasted that they put a discriminating tariff into operation already, they are told that if any colonial legislature while it recognizes its fealty to the Crown, does such a thing as that, it must do it in a separate Bill, and it must connect it with the proviso that it shall not come into operation until Her Majesty's pleasure has been known—not merely the assent of the Governor General but Her Majesty's pleasure. Sir, this Government has done neither of those things. In defiance of the positive, clear and emphatic instructions

from the Crown itself, as expressed by the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies in a despatch to the Governor General of Canada, they have done that in every particular, and they are asking this House to do that which the Marquis of Ripon, a long tried statesman of immense experience, has implored the legislature of Canada not to do.

These gentlemen on the Treasury benches are asking their followers behind them, and they are asking this House, to do that which Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies has implored them not to do, because it might lead to serious complications not only with other colonies but with foreign powers. Under these circumstances, I feel that this legislation has been of a hasty and ill-considered character. I do not believe that the Government recognized the tremendous responsibility they were assuming in adopting a policy directly at variance with the instructions from Her Majesty's Government, and directly at variance with the principle which lie at the very foundation of British parliamentary government. That principle is: that Parliament should retain its own grasp and control over the action of the Government in regard to the imposition or removal of taxation.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I cannot attempt to follow the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in his closing argument, if I might so designate it, because I consider it is not pertinent to the amendment which is now before the House. It seems to me that as the seconder of the previous amendment that was put to the House and voted down, he had committed himself practically to this clause which he now says is unconstitutional. The hon. gentleman proposes now to amend it in another particular, while in his closing remarks he takes the ground that we have no right to pass it at all. Perhaps I may be allowed just one word of reference to the amendment which was previously moved. He professes to not feel pleased with the wording of the resolution, and he undertook by his amendment to make it, as he thought, clear. He will pardon me if I say, that instead of doing that, he simply restricted the reading of the resolution in one particular. The resolution as it stands now gives the power that he asked, for he only asked that a certain subject be taken into consideration. The clause as it stands gives power to take the whole situation into consideration, and now the hon. gentleman proposes a second amendment which he thinks is important, namely, that this reciprocity clause if proposed to be applied to any country should not be applied until the ensuing session of Parliament. As the Minister of Finance has clearly pointed out, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has attempted by his words in the House and throughout the country, to create alarm, as if the power that was being taken here might be of the

very greatest detriment to the country. The Minister of Finance has pointed out, that if the countries which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, were to come within the operation of this clause, the result that would follow could not be of such vital importance as the hon. gentleman represented. The Minister of Finance showed very plainly, that there was no necessity for the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) to lash himself into fury, as he announced himself as being the champion of the workingman, and the manufacturers that were to be crushed. There was no necessity at all for that, in the light of the figures which the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) gave him (Mr. Foster) as to the trade of all other countries, outside of Great Britain and the United States, with Canada. I simply rose, however, to mention that the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in looking at any possible evil results that might follow gave the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) more of the argument than he needed to do, because the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) took the total imports of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who made this amendment knows that as far as the trade of Belgium and Germany are concerned—and these are two countries he harped very much upon—and two countries, that as he stated, if he were in the position of Controller of Customs, would to-day be in the enjoyment of this reciprocal clause. The present Controller of Customs has not so decided, and consequently they are not within its operation. But if the hon. gentleman had the power, and brought them within its operation, how serious would it be during the next nine months—and it will be only nine months before Parliament meets again, I trust. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of this clause in the same light as treaties; treaties that are formally made, treaties that have periods to run, treaties that may be denounced. This is a tariff Act that we are passing here. But, Sir, let us look at the trade of Belgium and Germany, and let us look at them, not in the light of the total trade, for we are not wholly concerned with that. The hon. gentleman knows that under schedule "D," which forms the reciprocal tariff, the article of sugar is excluded from its operation. Let us take the trade we have with Germany, the country he spoke so much about. The total imports of this country from Germany under the tariff of the hon. gentleman was \$5,931,459. But out of that there is an import of \$2,043,882 worth of sugar that will not be interfered with by this at all. In addition to that there is admitted from Germany under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, not at one-eighth reduction, but free, \$813,214 worth. Put these two amounts together, and you have \$2,857,096 out of \$5,931,459 worth of goods that do not come within these provisions at all.

Mr. BEATTIE. Does not the hon. gentleman know, as Controller of Customs, that the amount he gives as coming from Germany is not half the amount that actually comes—that double that amount of German goods comes in through England as English goods? The hon. gentleman only gives the figures of what comes direct from Germany.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Then the hon. gentleman gives us to understand that under their tariff German goods came in through England?

Mr. BEATTIE. Certainly, and they paid the same duty as English goods.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Then, with respect to Belgium, our total imports under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite were \$920,758, of which there was \$390,990 worth of sugar, and free goods to the value of \$84,065, a total of \$475,055 out of a total import of \$920,758. So, if the hon. gentleman were in the position of Controller of Customs, and were to do what he says he would do, and what the present Controller of Customs has not done—bring Germany and Belgium within the operation of this provision—instead of the dire results which he says would flow from this to the workmen and manufacturers of Canada, I think he will see, in the light of these figures, that he has been attempting to raise a false alarm. There are other countries which have not treaty arrangements with Great Britain, but which the hon. gentleman has declared he would, if he had the decision, bring under the reciprocal tariff—for instance, China and Japan; and that would mean the competition of the cheap labour of those countries against the workmen and the manufacturers of Canada, whose friend and champion he is. Though the present Controller of Customs does not take the view of the hon. gentleman that these countries come in under the reciprocal tariff, let us see, if he were Controller of Customs and had his way, what the effect would be during the next nine months before Parliament would meet again. Our total imports from China under the hon. gentleman's tariff were \$1,027,757, of which \$688,879 came in, not at one-eighth reduction, but absolutely free, and \$338,878 of dutiable goods; and if you admit these at one-eighth reduction, the hon. gentleman says the workmen and manufacturers of Canada will all be ruined. Take Japan. The total imports from Japan are \$1,643,661; but out of that \$1,383,672 are admitted, not at one-eighth reduction, but absolutely free under the hon. gentleman's tariff, while dutiable goods are admitted only to the amount of \$259,989, and if these are admitted at one-eighth reduction, he says, you are going to ruin the manufacturers and workmen of Canada. All these, together do not amount to 5 per cent of the dutiable goods coming into this country. I do not want to say anything more. I simply

Mr. PATERSON.

want to point out that when the hon. gentleman offers his amendment, which he says is vital to the interests of this country, if the Controller of Customs took the course which he says he would be bound to take, and gave these countries the benefit of the one-eighth reduction, the dire results he predicts could not follow before Parliament would have an opportunity to pass its judgment upon the matter. He must remember that the imports of dutiable goods from Belgium and Germany which come into competition with the manufactures of this country are wholly insignificant, and that even should there be one-eighth reduction of duty—and it would be only one-eighth until Parliament met, and long after Parliament met—there would still be 30¼ per cent on all the manufactured goods coming from those countries. I think that if the hon. gentleman is not able to carry the amendment he offers, he will find that the dire results he predicts will not flow from the clause, as brought down to the House.

Mr. SPROULE moved that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

INDIAN TROUBLE IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which was referred to yesterday by the hon. member from Western Assinibola (Mr. Davin) in connection with the Saskatchewan. I allude to the trouble which occurred in connection with the Indian named "Almighty Voice." Sir, the newspapers have already made altogether too much of this affair; in fact, they have made a

mountain out of a mole hill. Their reports are exaggerated, and have given a wrong impression as to the state of affairs in that district, and in the North-west Territories generally. As a matter of fact this Indian has been an outlaw from justice and he has been in company with another Indian much in the same plight. The Mounted Police have been looking for those two Indians for some time, and of course they made a desperate stand knowing that their lives were at stake. But the whole trouble has been confined to these two. There is no truth whatever in the statements that the Indians are restless. The Indians are not restless, and I have received a telegram this morning confirming my statement in this regard. The newspapers also tried to make out that the half-breeds refused to assist the authorities, but this also was not a correct statement. There are no more peaceable or peace-loving people in all Canada than the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan, and if it were necessary for them to turn out to assist the civil or military power, they would do so. As a matter of fact they did turn out, and thirty half-breeds from Batoche went to the seat of trouble, and were led by a half-breed. There were also volunteers from the town of Prince Albert led by a distinguished half-breed, Mr. McKay, a Queen's Counsel living in that town. The reason I call the attention of the House to these exaggerated reports in the newspapers, is, that such reports are calculated to have a bad effect on immigration into that country.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is hardly in order at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. DAVIS. I will make a motion to adjourn the House. I was going on to say, Mr. Speaker, that such exaggerated reports as I refer to give intending immigrants a bad impression of the country, and they also have the effect of deterring capitalists from investing in enterprises in our North-west Territories. For that reason I thought it my duty, as representing the district of Saskatchewan, to bring this matter before the House and to offer such denial as I could. I am very sorry indeed, Sir, that so many valuable lives have been lost in connection with this affair. It has at least proved one thing, and that is, the efficiency of the North-west Mounted Police. It is shown that they are always ready for emergencies, and that no danger can deter them from discharging their duty. I am also extremely sorry that Mr. Grundy, a very respectable citizen of my constituency has been killed in this affair. His death is all the more to be regretted from the fact that he has left a widow and a large family. I hope the Government will take the matter into their consideration and will do something for the widow and children. I beg leave to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion negatived.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to an Act that was passed in 1895, entitled an Act to encourage silver lead smelting. I am informed by the owners of some of the smelters at present at work in British Columbia, that up to the present time, they have not been able to obtain any money on account of this Act from the Government. They inform me that it was owing to this Act having been passed and assented to, and their thinking that this money would be paid, that they succeeded in some measure in getting the capital to put these smelters up. Up to the present time the Government have taken no action on the Act, and the smelting men do not know whether they may look forward to be paid for the ore they have already smelted, or whether they will get anything by the Act in the future. I understand that they have not been able to get any definite information one way or the other from the Government as to what their policy is in regard to this Act. It is a large sum of money to be paid out for the benefit of the mining industry, but when divided among the smelters already working in British Columbia, it does not come to very much for each. But they wish to have some definite information as to what the policy of the Government is in regard to this Act.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman will know that as a requisite to any payments being made, certain regulations need to be framed. These regulations have been framed, but they have not been entirely considered by the Government, owing largely to the extreme pressure of work. Also, one or two questions arose as to the construction of the Act, as to which information has been asked from the Department of Justice. As soon as we have a little leisure to attend to the matter, I hope to give the hon. gentleman a definite answer.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the hon. Minister a question that relates really to the Department of Agriculture, but I have been waiting day after day, and every time the Orders of the Day are called, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is not in his place. Perhaps one of the Ministers will take note of the question I ask. Early in the session the House passed an order to have brought down certain correspondence and petitions respecting quarantine in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The hon. Minister several times told me that he would bring the papers down the next day, but they have never been brought down, and the session is passing away.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Before my hon. friend continues, I wish to ask whether the papers with reference to the admission of Great Britain to the one-eighth reduction are ready to be placed on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I will send for them immediately.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, when you left the Chair last night, I was about to direct the attention of the House for a few moments to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) and the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson). The hon. member for Halifax endeavoured to show the House that there was no difference between the provision contained in subsection "b" of clause 16 of these resolutions, and the clause of the customs law of 1879 that provided upon certain conditions for the admission of goods from the United States into Canada at a different rate of duty from what was imposed by the general law. He said there was no difference between the offer of the tariff of 1879 and this one. To my mind there is a very great difference. The first difference is this, that the offer in the Act of 1879 applied to only one country, and it referred to certain specified articles that were set forth in the resolution. I have it under my hand, and it reads as follows:—

Any or all of the following articles, that is to say:—Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish salted or smoked, lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

This was specific and definite. It related to a number of articles that were included in the old reciprocity treaty, and as to which Canada knew the advantages that would accrue to this country if they were admitted into the United States free of duty. It was definite in regard to the amount, because we knew the exact rate of duty at which they must be admitted. Our goods must be admitted to the United States at a rate of duty not exceeding that

Mr. DAVIN.

payable on goods from the United States coming into Canada. But this clause of section 16 does not provide that each article from Canada shall be admitted into the other country at as low a rate of duty as that at which Canada would admit a similar article from that country. It might be desirable that some articles coming from the other country should be kept out or charged a higher rate of duty, while it might be reasonable to admit others at a moderate rate of duty. As I have said, the provision in the law of 1879 was specific and definite. It enumerated the articles, and provided that none of these articles should be admitted into Canada at a low rate of duty unless the same line of articles were admitted into the United States at an equally low rate. But this clause 16 makes no such provision. The other resolution was confined to one country while this resolution provides for the admission of goods from every country. The other admitted certain specified articles, while this one covers the whole tariff schedule with very few exceptions. The other was in the nature of a limited reciprocity, and we knew what would be the effect of it if it were carried out; but the present proposal is one that no person can know the effects of. There is that very wide difference between the provisions of the customs law of 1879 and the provisions of the proposed customs law of today. Then, again, the hon. Controller of Customs, replying to the arguments of the leader of the Opposition, attempted to prove that the resolution before the House would not do the country so much harm, even if we brought this portion of the schedule into operation, because inside of nine months Parliament must meet again and could then review the legislation. But that does not affect the point in dispute. What is in question is not whether the evil will continue long or short, but the principle involved. It is the right of the executive to bind Parliament to any agreement which they may make affecting our trade relations with other countries without the authority or consent of Parliament. It has never been recognized heretofore, neither in the British nor in any colonial Parliament, that a Governor in Council had the right to bind Parliament in advance to any agreement of this nature before submitting that agreement to Parliament for its sanction, and this proceeding is a departure from that constitutional practice and one we should look upon with a great deal of suspicion. I have here Anson's "Law of the Constitution," and in that work I find that Mr. Anson dissents from any such proposition. Speaking of it, he lays down this doctrine:

No one but the Crown can bind the community by treaty, but can the Crown invariably do so without the co-operation of Parliament? This much appears to be certain, that where a treaty involves either a charge on the people or a change in the law of the land, it may be made, but can-

not be carried into effect without the sanction of Parliament.

Now, that is exactly what we are asked to do. The Government are asking us to give them the power to carry a treaty into effect—because this proposition is equivalent to a treaty—without the sanction of Parliament. We on this side hold that such a proposition should not be carried into effect without the sanction of Parliament, because Parliament should retain the power to ascertain, before it goes into effect, whether it would be wise to allow such a provision to become law. Take the reciprocity treaty of 1854, and I find the same principle laid down in that treaty. Article 13 of that treaty provides :

That treaty shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry it into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other.

That article 13 refers to that part of the treaty which would have similar effect to this proposition, provided we should adopt it, and provided the Governor in Council should exercise the authority which we are asked to give the executive under this clause. It is therefore plainly laid down in the treaty of 1854, as it was also laid down in the proposed treaty of 1874, that neither treaty shall come into operation until sanctioned by Parliament. In the treaty of 1872, which is set out in the sessional papers of that year, I find the same provision :

The foregoing Articles 18 to 25, inclusive, and Article 30 of this treaty shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry them into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, by the Parliament of Canada, and by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other.

Thus, in every case the treaty must be submitted, first, to the Imperial Parliament, secondly, to the Dominion Parliament, and thirdly, to the Parliament of the province. The proposed treaty of 1872 also provided that Parliament should sanction it before it became law. In the treaty of 1888, I find almost the same words :

This treaty shall be ratified by Her Britannic Majesty, having received the assent of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Newfoundland, and by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

Now, we contend that this clause before the House is equivalent to a draft treaty. It constitutes an agreement that will affect our trade relations with other countries, and therefore, if we should adopt it, we would be violating the well-understood principle of parliamentary government that Parliament should always control the act of the executive before Parliament can be committed to such acts. If we were to allow this clause

to become law, we would be violating that principle. The doctrine advanced by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) is a sound one, namely, that the Governor in Council may, after Parliament has given its sanction thereto, give effect to this clause. This clause proposes to allow the executive to exercise power which is equivalent to the treaty-making power. It proposes to put in the hands of the executive the power to put in force, without the previous sanction of Parliament, what is equivalent to a treaty, and, therefore, I maintain that the amendment is a sound one, that this House should accept it, and that the Government should embody it as part of the resolution.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sorry the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not in his place, but in his absence perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will reply to the question I desire to put. I wish to call his attention to the fact that we are every day importing goods that must have been exported to England by foreign countries before being re-exported to Canada. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if any express instructions have been given to the collectors of customs throughout Canada by which goods coming direct from England, but which were previously sent into England from foreign countries, are to be prevented coming in at the lower rate. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to the case of Germany and France. Large quantities of goods manufactured in these countries and brought into England cannot be distinguished from those which are solely manufactured in England and entitled to the rebate of duties. Take, for instance, cork manufactures of all descriptions, which are imported very largely from France to England and then exported direct from England to Canada. Take, also, cotton manufactures, immense quantities of which are exported from France to England, and in England become confounded with English goods, so that Canadian authorities cannot have any definite knowledge as to the extent to which these goods are mixed up with English goods, and sold as such by the English houses. There is a long list of such articles, with which I shall not trouble the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I fear that the hon. gentleman who interrupts me neither cares nor knows very much about the existing condition of affairs. I ask the question because it seems to me a very important one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am sorry my hon. colleague the Controller of Customs is not in his place because he could better answer the question. He has given some instruction, a copy of which I am sure he would be pleased to lay before the House. At the beginning, no doubt, there will be some difficulty in identi-

fyng the particular goods, but after this clause is in operation some time, the regulations will be of such a character that the difficulties will be largely, if not wholly, avoided. My hon. friend will see that the point that he makes—and I grant you that difficulties might arise—is a point that he could make against any preferential tariff that we might adopt. If we had adopted the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) declaring in favour of a preferential tariff on certain concessions being secured, the same difficulties would arise that my hon. friend anticipates under this tariff; and therefore, we are much in the same position as if the policy which, I presume, he favours, were adopted. I confess that such difficulties will arise. I shall not be surprised if, in the beginning, it is necessary to give a somewhat liberal interpretation to the clause as respects goods imported from England, which may be in part of foreign origin; but, after the matter has been in operation some time, I anticipate that the regulations of the Customs Department will be such that goods merely passing through England will be identified, so that the true intent of the clause may be carried out with respect to British goods without admitting the foreign goods which, as the hon. gentleman points out, might possibly be imported as British goods.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite recognize the difficulties in any system of preferential trade; but the hon. Minister must see that the difficulties are greatly multiplied under this system. Those difficulties are serious under any condition of preferential trade, but the consequences to arise from the present system are much more serious, in fact the hon. Minister must see the difficulties will be almost insuperable. England has no defensive lines; goods from all countries are entered there upon the same terms. The manufacture of many countries may be combined in articles that may be entered as a single manufacture. So that, the hon. gentleman will see, how—I was going to say—utterly impossible it will be to make the distinction which he now seeks to make. The difficulties seem almost an answer to the hon. gentleman's question as to whether preferential trade can be adopted or not, considering the principal points involved. The first of these is the possible diminution of the revenue in consequence of goods coming in by way of England rather than direct from other countries. It is apparent to everybody that trade will flow in the channels of least resistance—resistance by tariff or otherwise. Therefore, the possibility of a large quantity of goods being imported into Canada by way of Great Britain rather than direct, may affect the revenues of the country to some extent. But a more disadvantageous effect will be the uncertainty of trade. If, from considerations of freight, goods were

imported, say by some of the American steamships, and if this were not counted as direct importation, the case would be surrounded with great difficulties. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will see that then the question of freights will arise and there will be disadvantage in preventing importation by the cheapest lines. Then there is the question of goods coming into competition with the Canadian products. The more I consider this question, the greater seem the difficulties that confront us; and I think they are so great that the hon. Minister might well withdraw his resolution and give time to think the matter over to see how it will work out, because it is impossible to forecast it at present, with anything like certainty. The proposal is a wholly experimental one, and if the difficulties are to be overcome, this can only be done by the exercise of the greatest care. I still hope that the hon. Minister will not proceed with the resolution but will give further time for the consideration of the difficulties involved.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) has admitted that the objection he has taken will apply quite as fully to any preferential tariff that we might have, either in the form of the resolution now before us or of that which finds greater favour with gentlemen opposite. I admit that there are difficulties; but I do not think that in a matter of so great importance as the matter of preferential trade, even from the point of view of hon. gentlemen opposite, we should withdraw from the step we have taken merely because there will be some difficulties in the custom-house. The resolution for which my hon. friend voted declares that there is a general desire for preferential trade. According to his present statement, the difficulties in the way are so great that, in his opinion, this general desire cannot be carried out. I admit the fairness of the hon. gentleman's criticism, but I think it will be found that he rather magnifies the difficulties. In the matter of freights I think there will be no difficulty in determining that goods imported from Great Britain under a bill of lading through to Canada, even though they come by the way of a foreign port, are British imports within the meaning of the clause. I do not think that the clause must be interpreted to mean that the goods must be shipped direct to a Canadian port. We have not done that hitherto in the case of those clauses of the law in which the term "direct importation" is used. The other difficulty, I admit, might arise, and we must meet it as best we can, with every desire to confine the privilege for the present, and until the ultimate result is known, to British goods, but with the full knowledge that it is understood that some goods of not purely British origin may possibly come in. But I do not think that that will happen to

Mr. FIELDING.

a large extent, and I hope that, after a time, it will not happen at all.

Mr. CRAIG. Before the vote is taken, I desire to say a few words. I do not intend to detain the committee very long, and during the few minutes I shall occupy, I will confine myself strictly to the amendment before the Chair moved by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) yesterday. That amendment reads :

That after the word "may," in the fifth line, these words be inserted : "after Parliament has given its sanction thereto."

I think that this amendment is a most proper one. In thinking over this resolution it seemed to me that one of the strongest objections to it was that it took the power of making treaties out of the hands of Parliament and handed it over to the Government. I think it will be admitted by all who consider this question apart from party bias that, in making any treaty or in reducing the tariff reciprocally with any other country, Parliament ought to be consulted, and consulted on every occasion. After all, Parliament represents the people. The Government is a committee of Parliament appointed to discharge certain duties a great many of which are executive. But the Government is not supposed to make laws, it is not supposed to execute treaties with other governments without consulting Parliament. Parliament is the supreme power, and I hold that Parliament should retain this power in its own hands. There is one great advantage in Parliament retaining this power in its own hands and not allowing any Government to make a treaty without bringing it before Parliament, and that is that such a course insures full discussion. Under this arrangement the Government might make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, France, Germany, or some other country which would not be acceptable to the country as a whole, or even to their party as a whole ; but, after all, it would be done, completed, without discussion and without any chance for those who opposed the arrangement to say anything about it until it was all over. I hold that it would be in the interest of the Government, and still more in the interest of Parliament and of this country that the power should not be conceded to any Government of making a treaty with any foreign nation without submitting that treaty to Parliament for discussion and without giving Parliament an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. Now, Sir, I do not think this has ever been done before ; I think the method which is proposed by this resolution now before the committee, is a complete innovation. The French treaty has been referred to in this House. We all admit that when that treaty was negotiated, it did not take effect until this Parliament had pronounced upon it, and it would have been considered an outrage

on this Parliament and on the people of Canada if that treaty had gone into operation without Parliament having an opportunity of discussing its provisions and pronouncing upon it. Although this was a treaty made between France and Canada, yet it did not really become a treaty until Parliament pronounced upon it, and had had an opportunity of rejecting or approving it. Now, if we commit this power to the Government by this resolution, they can make a treaty just as effective as the French treaty, they can make a treaty reducing the tariff of Canada in return for reciprocal reductions by another country, and we have nothing to do about it, Parliament is not consulted at all. Now, I submit whether that is not asking a most extraordinary power on behalf of the Government. I was not in the House when the Premier spoke, but I notice that he made the point that practically the same thing has been done by the former Government when they put in the tariff a list of articles which were to be treated as reciprocal products if the United States made them free, then we would make them free too. But I hold that is an entirely different thing, Parliament pronounced upon that, Parliament agreed to those articles being mentioned ; but in this case we agree to nothing in particular, nothing specific ; but we agree to say to the Government : You are perfectly at liberty to go and make a treaty with any country on the face of this globe, on certain conditions which we do not know, which are most indefinite ; that is to say, you can make reciprocal arrangements, you can reduce our tariff if they reduce theirs in certain lines, in lines which might be opposed by Parliament if the matter was submitted to them, but which Parliament will have no opportunity of pronouncing upon. Then we have heard a great deal about reciprocity treaties with the United States. But how were they brought about ? Why, commissioners went to Washington to meet commissioners of the United States Government, and they sat down and talked these matters over. But suppose they made an arrangement, suppose they made a treaty, the treaty was not binding on either country until it was ratified by the Congress of the United States and by the Parliament of this country. Now, in this case we propose to do away with that entirely. I do not know whether hon. members opposite look at it as I do ; but looking at this matter without reference to party at all, thinking over it carefully, it does seem to me that we are entirely giving up our powers to the Government of the day, that we are virtually saying to them, if we pass that resolution : You have a free hand to go and make a reciprocity treaty. Without consulting Parliament they can go to the United States and make a reciprocity treaty with that country. I would like to hear whether hon. gentlemen opposite deny that

statement. I would like to hear whether that is not the case, because, as I have said, this resolution gives the Government that power distinctly. I might not have been surprised if the Conservative party, sometimes called the Tory party, had talked in this way, had talked about taking away the rights of Parliament. But what must we think when we find the Liberal party, the party who have called themselves in the past the defenders of the rights of the people, and who have arrogated to themselves that position far more than the Conservative party have ever done—when we find them asking this Parliament to give them this power of making treaties, to hand it entirely over to them without consulting Parliament. I do not intend to detain this committee any longer on this question, but I would like to hear whether my view of the case is not correct, that if this resolution is passed by this Parliament, the Government will then have the power to go to Washington, for instance, and negotiate a reciprocity treaty without submitting it to Parliament. Now, if that is not the case, I would like to hear hon. gentlemen opposite set me right.

Mr. BELL (Addington). I desire to say a few words upon the amendment that is now before the committee, without intending to detain the committee but a very short time. I look upon the present discussion as one of the most important discussions that has taken place since Parliament assembled. We are discussing the fiscal and trade policy of this country, and the propriety of handing that over entirely to the Government. Now, I rise particularly in order to gather information. I think we cannot give the ex-Finance Minister too much praise for the amendment that he has moved. First of all, the Government have been very slow in bringing down their policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always told us that they were opposed to the policy of the late Government, opposed to the policy of protection; and I have not time to consider all the strong adjectives that they used against that policy. We were assured that when the Liberal party came into power they were ready with a policy that would be in the interests of this country. The Government has now been in power for nearly a year, and we are yet almost entirely in the dark with regard to what the trade and fiscal policy of this Government is. Now, I am anxious to understand this clause, to know what it means; because when I go into my county I shall be asked what it means and I want to be in a position to explain it. I feel that the object of this discussion, on the Opposition side of the House, at least, is to elicit information on this most important clause. The ex-Finance Minister made an able speech asking for information, we have asked for information time and again and the only answer we have received

Mr. CRAIG.

is summed up in these words: We are here and you are there. Now, we want to know a little more about the legislation that is proposed than a mere statement of that fact. When the ex-Finance Minister moved the first amendment yesterday, I was glad to see it had the effect of bringing the Prime Minister to his feet; he got out from that hiding-place where he is known to have rested on many occasions before. He made a statement, but there was not very much information in it. I am glad the ex-Finance Minister moved another amendment that brought out the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs—or the would-be Minister of Customs, I suppose I should say, for he is now only in the pin feather state; but I presume before Parliament rises he will be a full-fledged Minister. Now, I am sure that no man can charge the ex-Finance Minister, in discussing either the tariff resolutions or the amendments, with looking at them from a partisan standpoint. I am sure no hon. gentleman in this House could stand up and discuss this question in a more statesman-like and honest manner than he did, and when he asked for information, he got very little indeed from the Government. Now, the resolution in this tariff which particularly interests me at this moment is number 16, which reads:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole,—

And so forth. Now, this is what we are talking about, and on which a great deal has been said. I have listened very attentively while hon. gentlemen have quoted paragraphs from the London "Times" and other British papers, giving the opinions on this question held by the people in Great Britain; and I also listened with a great deal of pleasure when the resolutions were brought down, particularly this clause regarding preferential trade with Great Britain. Now, Mr. Chairman, anything that connects Canada with Great Britain more closely, whether by means of trade relations or otherwise, always has my support and my strong approval. Well, we are not sure that this resolution is going to give us preferential trade with Great Britain, that is to say, something that Great Britain is not going to enjoy exclusively, and that we are not giving the same favours to other countries. Now, since these resolutions were introduced there seems to have been a change in front. It is now called differential trade; and as I have been recently reading in regard to this question, I should like to quote from some of the papers of the United States to show the way in which the people there view this great question. The New York "Post" says as follows:—

Some of the superficial features of the Canadian Tariff Bill and certain of the catchwords thrown out by the Canadian Minister of Finance in his

Budget speech are regarded by a part of the American press as declarations of tariff war against the United States. American journals and politicians who take that view are victims of a clever illusion, which was intended, not for them, but for a large section of the Canadian and British public. When the changes in the tariff are carefully examined, they will be found in their sum total to be at least as pro-American as pro-British. In presenting the new Bill to the country, however, the Government deemed it expedient to give it an anti-American squint. Hence in his Budget speech Mr. Fielding spoke meaningfully about dealing with those nations that would deal with Canada, and christened his minimum tariff a preferential arrangement in favour of Great Britain. The pro-British, anti-American aspects thus suggested were at once seized on, not only in Canada, but also in Great Britain and the United States. In the heat of the enthusiasm with which the so-called "British policy" was received in the mother country, Rudyard Kipling struck off his piece of frost-work, "Our Lady of the Snows."

That poem has been referred to in the House by a hon. member possessing a literary mind and who has often entertained the House with his classical references, I refer to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who, however, has thrown a different light on that poem. The "Post" proceeds to say further:

It has also—and the Government thanks it not for this—helped to spread in the United States the British interpretation. There, too, the Canadian tariff is represented as an Imperial development, as so much new mortar for cementing the colony and the mother country into one solid political whole.

If it has that object and tendency, I should like to know in what way it is going to be enforced, for I should like to have preferential trade with Great Britain myself. Further on the "Post" says—(and this is an American paper):

It is also taken as a blow to commercial intercourse with the United States. Thus, a false impression, calculated to make the Administration prodigiously popular at home and in the mother country, may work the Dominion mischief with its neighbour. Mr. Laurier would be the first man to deprecate such a result as this. Anxious as he is to beguile the Imperialists into the idea that his tariff is more partial to Great Britain than to any other country, he is still more anxious that the United States should recognize that he has sacrificed more to it than to any other country.

That is the opinion of the New York "Post." At this stage of the debate, while there is a field here for lengthy remarks, I do not propose to offer them, as I am quite as anxious as any hon. member to proceed to consider these resolutions; but I think it is asking Parliament too much to place in the hands of the Controller of Customs, upon whose opinion confirmed by the Governor in Council, the control of the whole fiscal policy of this Dominion. I do not consider we can afford at this stage of our history to introduce such despotism as prevails in Russia. I think the amendment of the ex-Minister of

Finance is in the right direction and that no such power should be given without the express sanction of Parliament, and I have therefore pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) proceeds, I should like to present the Order in Council of which I have spoken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the adoption of section 16.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a little difficult and not exactly as it should be that this important information has been kept from us until the very moment when a vote is to be taken. But at the risk of attacking a document, which I have not yet been able to read through, I am going to ask the attention of the committee to it, and in that way the committee may with me analyse it and ascertain upon what rule the Government has acted in the one case in which it has acted, so that we may judge from that the rule on which the Government propose to act in every case in which it has to act hereafter. What I find here is an extract from a report of the Committee of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on 11th May, 1897. The committee will see that 11th May, 1897, was twenty days after the first resolutions were brought down, and that consequently after the whole load had been carted away, the horse was brought out and harnessed, and put into the vehicle.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce submits the annexed memorandum from the Controller of Customs, having reference to the tariff resolution making provision for a reciprocal tariff, stating that he, the Controller of Customs, has decided that the customs tariff of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is such as entitles articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of that country to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff, subject to the limitations mentioned in Schedule "D," and has so directed all collectors of customs, and recommending that his action be approved.

The Committee advise the adoption of the recommendation of the Controller of Customs.

I think that gives the committee food for thought, and I want the committee to follow me while I direct its attention to what is involved in this the only case we have, and consequently the only standard we have to guide us as to future action on the part of the Government. The Governor in Council under this section is to approve the action of the Controller of Customs. Ordinarily we could understand by that phrase that the Governor in Council has to have certain statements and facts placed before him, and on that basis of fact and reasoning the Governor in Council comes to the discussion of the question and decides ultimately that question. That must be the case where the question is to be decided—if that

is the rule to be adopted at all—upon the recommendation of a man who is outside of the Cabinet, just as much as my hon. friend sitting by my side (Mr. Davin) is outside of the Cabinet, and cannot give his reasons by word of mouth to the Council, and consequently in the way of conversation to convince them as to certain facts and certain things. The Controller of Customs himself has led the House to believe, that a contrary mode of procedure would be carried out—I would like to have the attention of the Controller of Customs for a moment. The Controller of Customs, in explaining the modus operandi, gave this House to believe that he was going to go into the subject, to study the course of trade, the tariffs, and all these questions; he was going to lay those before Council, and Council was then to make up its mind, and an Order in Council would be passed before any definite action took place.

Now, Sir, the papers laid on the Table of the House show what? Simply this: That a man entirely outside of the Cabinet, sits in his chair, comes to a conclusion, writes down the fact that he has decided to allow such a country in under one-eighth and a one-fourth reduction, and sends that decision of his over to Council, taking care before he sends it over to advise the collectors of customs throughout Canada to carry out his decision—the decision of the Controller of Customs who is outside of the Cabinet and has no place in the Cabinet. The Cabinet, as a deliberative body meets together, to do what? To discuss a set of facts placed before them by the Controller of Customs? No, Sir, but simply to register the previously made decision of the Controller of Customs, a decision which has been already made operative under the law by the orders that have been sent to every collector of customs. That means, that the only man who is to decide as to what country is to come in under this clause, and when it is to come in, is the Controller of Customs, that all he has to do is simply to decide; he need not give a fact, or a figure, or an argument to Council; and it means that what Council has to do is simply to register this decision of the Controller of Customs.

Now, Sir, that is the pass that parliamentary government has come to in this country. One man arbitrarily makes his decision on arbitrary grounds, communicates that arbitrary decision to the Governor in Council, and the Council without a scrap of information, without a single presentment of the circumstances or facts in the case as regards tariff, or trade, or conditions; simply by its order ratifies the decision of the arbitrary judge, coming to his conclusion from arbitrary reasons. There we have the procedure of the Government? Well, Sir, what may take place after this? The Controller of Customs having declined to tell this House upon what grounds he is going

in any case to make up his decision, he may sit alone in his office and arbitrarily make up his mind that the United States of America has a right to be admitted under this clause 16, because of certain advantages that would come to this country in the course of trade between the two. All he would have to do is to simply decide, send that decision over to Council, and the thirteen men sitting as a Cabinet, are simply to register the decision thus arbitrarily given by the Controller of Customs. They do not ask for a single fact, for any information, for statistics of the course of trade, or anything of the kind to be placed before them; they abnegate their duty of reasoning and coming to a conclusion from a state of facts set before them; they abnegate their position as such a body, and they simply sit there in order to register the opinion of the Controller of Customs. Now, Sir, there is nothing else disclosed in these papers. What has the Controller of Customs sent over to the Cabinet? He sent over simply this? He recited the fact that on the 22nd day of April—and he recites this fact on the 11th day of May, more than half a month after the thing had become law; twenty days after the law had been in operation, carried out on his decision and at his arbitrary order given to the collectors of customs all through the Dominion—on the 11th day of May he recites these strong and cogent reasons; these lucid circumstances and facts, upon which the Cabinet has to make up its mind:

That, on the 22nd day of April, the Minister of Finance submitted to the House of Commons certain resolutions for the revision of the customs tariff. That, as has been the practice, without any special statutory authority to give effect to the tariff changes, from the time the tariff resolutions are laid on the Table, subject to amendment, until the Tariff Bill is finally assented to. That, in accordance with such practice, he has given instructions to all collectors of customs to act upon the said tariff resolutions at once. That one of the said tariff resolutions makes provision for a reciprocal tariff on the following terms.

Then he cites the provision, and he cites schedule "D," and he says:

That the undersigned has decided that the customs tariff of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is such as entitles articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of that country, to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff, subject to the limitations mentioned in the said Schedule "D," and has so directed the collectors of customs.

The Controller of Customs submits his action twenty days after he had taken it on these matters for the approval of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. There is not a shred of a reason given, not a single column of statistics, not a single sentence as to the course of trade, nothing of the kind upon which a body of men could reason and make up their minds. The Controller of Customs simply takes it as a matter of course that he should decide, and he sends

over his decision, and he asks the Government in Cabinet assembled, to register his decision. Now, Sir, if he can do that in the case of England which was not specifically mentioned in those resolutions, he can do it—and must, I suppose, do it because this is the procedure he has set down for himself—in reference to any other country which he makes up his mind will come under the purview of this resolution. He looks at another country, he makes a decision, he sends his decision over to the Cabinet. That is, the Controller of Customs actually has the power under this procedure (which is the only comment of actuality we have upon the tariff clause) the Controller of Customs is the man who actually makes the commercial treaty with any country, makes it independent of Parliament, makes it independent of the Imperial authority, and simply sends it over to the Government for their registration and sanction.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite amazed to notice the manner in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has endeavoured for several days to belabour the House with a repetition of useless arguments. However, he has only succeeded in convincing those who have listened to him, that he is trying in every possible shape and way to mystify public opinion with regard to this clause. He says that the Controller of Customs is the only individual who has to decide what country shall be entitled to its benefits. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) reads the two lines that refer to the action of the Controller, he will see that the clause states distinctly “under the authority of the Governor in Council.” I wonder why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) makes repeated attempts to show that the manner in which this clause has been drawn up, and the action of the Government under it, are such as to demonstrate that the Government have been virtually incapable in this matter. It is an amazing thing to me that the hon. gentleman should make these repeated attempts day after day. It looks to me as if he were disposed in every shape and way to belittle the effort the Government have made to show the mother country that we are anxious and earnest that better and closer trade relations should exist between us. He knows perfectly well that that is the entire object of this clause. He knows, also, that our laws are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, but that they can be changed. He knows that Parliament will be again called together in a few months, and that any amendment which is necessary to keep this clause within the limit intended can easily be made. I would suggest that my hon. friend should take a lesson from the example set him by the distinguished leader he used to honour—a man, I admit, of great ability—Sir John Macdonald. When he came to this House to lead the Opposition when the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was called to administer

the affairs of this country, what was his course? Was it a continued, daily expression of bitterness, animosity, disappointment and ill-feeling? Did he from day to day carry on a continuous fusillade such as we have had from the other side of this House? No. He said: “Gentlemen, you have been accorded the confidence of this country; we are going to give you every assistance to carry on the Government; go on, we are going to help you to perform your duty.” Is that the action of the ex-Finance Minister? No. From the day he has come here to discharge his duties as a member of this House, he has displayed the utmost bitterness and wickedness, determined, if possible, to frustrate legislation, and prevent the passage of the Government measures, keeping us sitting here day after day and repeating the same thing day after day. Surely the hon. gentleman will come to the conclusion that we have had enough of this sort of thing. He professes that he does not understand this clause. It is very convenient for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they do not want to understand a thing, to say they do not understand it. Prior to the 23rd of June last they declared that they could not understand the policy of the Liberal party; but the people of this country understood it right well, and when they came to vote, they recorded their votes with that understanding, and it is going to be given effect to by the measures which this Government have introduced and intend to carry through. The hon. ex-Finance Minister should try to possess his soul in patience. He has been relegated to the seat he occupies by the pronounced verdict of the people of this country, and he should cultivate a little patience and a little respect for the people, who have declared that the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier and the men he has around him shall have a fair opportunity of handling the affairs of this country. He should be willing to give them that chance. I would just like him to take the example set him by his honoured leader, and say, “Go on, gentlemen; you have the confidence of the country, we will give you all the assistance we can,” instead of carrying on the bitter, nagging fusillade he has done for many days.

Mr. BENNETT. That the session is not going to come to a close suddenly is proven by the breaking into the debate of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He has certainly practised self-denial to an enormous extent; but this afternoon he has given proof, I think, that as soon as the First Minister leaves the country and his restraint over the hon. gentleman is removed, we may expect to hear a great deal more of him. This afternoon he has given us a little preliminary canter. He exercises himself very much as to what the conduct of the Opposition should be in this House. He has pointed to the fact that when Sir John Macdonald led the Opposition, they

kept very quiet in this House. The hon. gentleman must remember that at that time the Government kept very quiet too. They kept so quiet, indeed, that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce described themselves as being simply so many flies on the wheel, and the flies did not go off with the revolutions of the wheel. They were perfectly peaceable. Who ever heard the Mackenzie Government introducing legislation on the trade question? The farmers of the country memorialized, not by thousands, but by tens and hundreds of thousands. The artisans went about the streets begging and praying for work, and whenever they came up, cheerless their faces were, they were met by the answer of the then Finance Minister: "We are simply flies on the wheel; what can we do?" Contrast with that the position of these gentlemen to-day. If they had only continued to be flies on the wheel, the factories would not be closed that are being closed in this country to-day. If they had continued to be flies on the wheel, they would not have had deputation after deputation coming here to protest against the raids and invasions they are making upon the tariff of the country. And, further, if they had continued in that position of acquiescence in regard to the past policy of the country, which has been of so much good to it, they would not have been making the spectacle of themselves that we have seen during the past few weeks. They came down to the House a few weeks ago with a tariff which they said was the result of a year's incubation; and afterwards they came forward—I do not know whether because of the influence of the hon. member for North Wellington—and said: "It is true we did submit a tariff, but we do not know whether the changes we made are improvements or not; put the old ones back, and we will give you newer and better ones." One part of their tariff particularly agitated them, and is agitating them to-day; that is, the resolution which is at present under discussion. When they first boasted, with a flourish of trumpets, that it was a preferential policy, the Minister of Trade and Commerce shook his head in a cunning way and said, "No, it is not preferential at all, for it brings in Germany;" and with a most significant and knowing wink, he added, "Perhaps the United States will come in too." Now, where are these hon. gentlemen to-day? After bringing in their resolutions, they said, "It is true we put in black and white certain statements of fact, but now we see that it is necessary to take a different attitude," and a most vital change is made. It is said here:

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

And further:

Mr. BENNETT.

That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such reciprocal tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

Now, it is to the latter clause, the clause "B," that I beg to call the attention of the House. That was a clause which found no place at all in the first resolution, and it was inserted in the amended resolutions because these hon. gentlemen had to admit that they were not free from doubt and found themselves in a hole and a hole of pretty large proportions. This debate has done a great deal of good. It has certainly cleared the air to a great extent because for at least a couple of weeks these hon. Ministers sat dumb on the Treasury benches, and when the question was asked, what is the meaning of the phrase, "on the whole," the only answer they would give was, it means "on the whole." Last night, however, the hon. First Minister did make a statement, and he made one that will certainly be hailed by business men with a good deal of interest. So that there may be no mistake as to what he said, I shall quote his own words. Referring to the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) he said:

I ask him simply to extend the operations and make this comparison, not only with regard to the articles which we exchange, but with regard to the articles which are to be found in the tariff of this country and in the tariff of another country.

We must presume from that, that if the aggregate tariff of any country, say Germany, is the same as or lower than the aggregate tariff of Canada, then Germany comes in under this clause. It is a pity the hon. gentlemen had not arrived at this conclusion a week ago, for then they might have had a couple of clerks comparing the tariffs of the two countries, calculating the average tariff for each, and then, if the average rate of the German tariff was the same as or came under that of Canada, they might have announced to the House, not only that Great Britain comes in under this clause, but Germany as well. There are, to my mind, very serious consequences to the business interests of the country going to result from the operation of this tariff. I am sorry that the hon. Controller of Customs is not in his place or the Finance Minister, but perhaps the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, whose department is akin to that of customs, will favour the House with a reply on this point. Assuming, for the sake of argument that a man imports \$10,000 worth of silks upon which the duty would be \$4,350; he would, under the present tariff, be entitled to a rebate of one-eighth, which would amount to about \$437.50. Should, however, it turn out that this tariff does not come into force at all, will the importer be called upon to repay that extra \$437.50? And if he has sold his goods, in the meantime, and afterwards the Government decide that the clause can-

not come into force and he is not entitled to the rebate, will the importer be recouped for the loss he has made in selling his goods under the impression that he would be entitled to that reduction. To follow the matter a little further, assuming that a man purchases the same quality of goods and the same amount from the German seller, and after having bought them from the German seller the Controller of Customs has decided that Germany comes within the purview of this treaty, will the Government than be prepared to hand over to the purchaser of German goods the \$437 on the ground that Germany was entitled to the benefit of this rebate just as Great Britain was? There must be a great many business men who are looking with the deepest interest to the working out of this tariff. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite shout "hear, hear" in the most cheerful acquiescent way, and when I hear them express their cheerful acquiescence, I am reminded that in the last Parliament we, then on the Government side were continually being twitted with agreeing to everything proposed by the Government, because so many members supporting the Government held positions or promises of positions, and were therefore disposed to vote anything through. I do not know how many gentlemen over there may be about to take positions under the Government, but if the newspaper reports are true, there is going to be an awful lot of them provided for, and judging by their anxious expectant looks and by the cheerful way in which they acquiesce in everything, it is evident that the newspaper reports are not very far wrong. Whether that be the case or not, one thing is certain, and that is that hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to regard this matter with the serious and sober earnestness that the business men of the country do. In conclusion, I can only say to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the occasion amply justifies the use by us of that classic phrase of the hon. gentleman, which I have heard him repeat, on actual counting, 999 times during the last session of the late Government, and then gave up the calculation, "Let hon. gentlemen opposite possess their soul in patience," the Opposition have a duty to perform and that duty has been forced upon them by the Government of the day. If the Government of the day had been prepared to do what the Mackenzie Government did on coming into power—carry out the line of policy on which they appealed to the country—they would not meet with the opposition they do. But so long as they propose to place on the statute-books perfect riddles in the shape of legislation, perfect marvels of the art, "how not to do it," which they cannot stand up and defend, they must expect to be brought to task by the Opposition. Why, they cannot even determine the question from a legal standpoint. While they all admit that the

hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) made a valiant legal argument, not one of them has had the temerity to stand up and say that the hon. Minister was right. There is not a business man on this side who has stated his conviction that the hon. Minister was right. Even the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is a shrewd business man and a strong partisan, although he talked for an hour the other night on the trade question, was singularly silent on the effect this much-talked-of clause would have. And last night when that eminent constitutional authority, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) rose to break a lance in its behalf, he confined his endeavours to the attempt to make a merry jest, and failed to endorse by a single word the legal opinion of the hon. Minister of Marine. That hon. gentleman, however, is to be congratulated on this, that if there has not been any approval on that side of the House of the stand he took, neither has there been a dissenting voice. Let me say to the hon. member for North Wellington that if he can prevail on his hon. friends to withdraw their legislation on the tariff and do exactly what the Mackenzie Government did, parade themselves as flies on the wheel, they will have a very short session indeed.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the fact that in the report which he has laid on the Table, I am unable to find any instructions given to the collectors of customs. He intimated a moment ago that when this report would be laid upon the Table, it would be found to contain the instructions given the collectors of customs, but if he will read it, he will find that the instructions given are exactly what is stated in the resolution itself. Surely we are not now to be told that after this tariff has been in operation for more than a month, no instructions have been given the collectors of customs on a question which the hon. gentleman admits is so difficult. I am sorry that the hon. Controller of Customs is not here and I am equally disappointed that no definite instructions have been given beyond what are contained in the report of the Controller of Customs, and in that report there are absolutely no definite instructions whatever. The only instructions given to the collectors of customs is that they are to be guided by the articles coming in under schedule "G." There are, of course, the excepted items of tobacco, liquor, cigars and sugar. They were perfectly plain and, standing by themselves, they have absolutely no relation to the broader question affecting the very difficult duties that I attempted a moment ago to point out were required from the collectors of customs, and I think that the House and the country will hear with great disappointment if it can only be said that the collectors of customs take practically the resolution that has been before the House for

more than a month, and that this is all the instructions that they have to go upon in this most intricate and difficult matter. If the Finance Minister can assure the committee that other instructions have been given to the collectors of customs, I am sure that statement will be received with great satisfaction.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). If my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) means to ask if any instructions were given at variance with the Order in Council, I can assure him that none were given. I regret that he did not put the question again while my hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was in his place. No doubt, the instructions were given by the Controller of Customs, in the first place, to apply this reciprocal tariff to Great Britain only. One hon. gentleman who spoke the other day assumed that collectors of customs were to decide that point for themselves. But instructions were given by the Controller of Customs that the reciprocal tariff was to be applied to Great Britain only. If a request had been made for the exact words of the instructions, no doubt the Controller of Customs would have brought the instructions down. No doubt they are exceedingly brief. I believe they were not included in the papers brought down. If it is of interest I will ask the Controller of Customs to lay before the House a copy of these instructions.

**Mr. SPROULE.** This illustrates one of the things which Parliament, unfortunately, has the right to complain of—that while we are dealing with important questions upon which the Government could give us information, they withhold that information until the time is passed when it could be of use. When the question was under discussion how the Controller of Customs was to determine whether a given nation was entitled to come in under the favoured-nation clause of this tariff or not, I think we ought to have had something showing the principle upon which he dealt with the case. No principle is set forth in the Order in Council that has been brought down. That Order in Council leaves us as much in the dark as ever. But we have the information that twenty days after the Budget speech was made the Order in Council was with reference to Great Britain passed. Now it seems to me that an important and interesting problem is involved here. If it took the Cabinet twenty days to determine that a country which levied no duty against Canadian goods should come in under the favoured-nation clause, how long will it take them to decide the case of a country that levies a duty on 2,000 lines of our goods. I imagine it would take two years or more. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) complained of the discussion of this matter by the members of the Opposition; he said we were mystifying this ques-

**Mr. CLANCY.**

tion. If any hon. gentleman of this House has given the House the benefit of his views so often as to be open to the charge of mystifying questions, it is the hon. member for North Wellington. He objected to what he called the "fusilade against us," as though he himself were a member of the Government. Was there ever a member who continued a greater fusilade against the Government than the hon. member for North Wellington when in Opposition? He was not contented with speaking nine hundred and ninety-nine times in a session of Parliament, but went above the thousand and was just as anxious to speak then as when he commenced. He did not think that it was a "continuous fusilade," and objected very much if any one suggested that he was doing anything but his duty. Yet this hon. gentleman complains when hon. members of the Opposition try to elicit information in order that they may decide intelligently upon the subject under discussion. We hoped that when this Order in Council was brought down, it would give us some information, information which we had the right to expect before we dealt with the question under consideration last night. We were trying to ascertain the principle upon which the Government decided whether a country should or should not come under this favoured-nation clause of the tariff. And why did we seek that information? Because we feared that the question might be decided in a manner which might be much against the interest of Canada. Suppose the question came before the Controller of Customs to determine as to the case of any country, the United States or any other. Would he say, for instance: We will take these articles: Wheat, with a duty of say, 15 cents a bushel; oats, 7½ cents per bushel; pease, 10 cents a bushel; barley, 15 cents a bushel; cattle, 20 per cent; horses, 20 per cent; eggs, 5 cents per dozen; fowl, 5 per cent and butter 4 cents per pound, and ascertain not whether the same articles are allowed in at the same rate of duty, but whether I can find any nine articles on this or any other line that are admitted at the same or a lower rate of duty, and upon this I will decide whether this country shall or shall not be admitted under the favoured-nation clause? We were afraid that the Controller of Customs might decide in this way against Canada's interests, in other words that a country might come in under this clause, even while retaining the high duty upon articles which Canada would be interested in sending there, simply because it allowed low rates of duty on articles that Canada cared little about, as to whether they were admitted free or at a high rate of duty. It was for this reason that we wished some information as to the principle upon which these questions were to be decided. We had no information upon the matter whatever. The only answer we had from members of the Government was

simply a reiteration of the words of the resolution that if "upon the whole" it was found that a country had a tariff as favourable as that of Canada, that country should be admitted. We had the right to expect that the Order in Council in regard to Great Britain would have set forth the principle. But does it do so? Not at all. If it is in this way that the Controller of Customs determines with regard to any other country that it shall come in under the favoured-nation clause of this tariff, I am sure he will not satisfy the Canadian people, and is likely to do them great injury. The Government should have given us more information long before this, and to that information we are entitled before we decide whether we shall pass this clause or not. If the Government refuse to give that information, they will be treating Parliament as it should not be treated, they will be treating the people's representatives with contempt and not with the consideration that they are entitled at the hands of the Government.

Mr. BEATTIE. I would not have spoken on this subject but for the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. member for North Wellington is an old merchant, and should be able to give us some points on this question. He sat in his seat and heard the Minister of Finance telling the House that there would be great difficulties in the way of carrying out this clause; but when the hon. member for North Wellington got up, he evaded that question altogether. Now, I will venture to say that that hon. gentleman himself cannot say that this clause can be carried out satisfactorily. He knows perfectly well that there is not a custom-house appraiser in this country that will take upon himself to decide whether the goods imported into this country are of German or of English manufacture. The Minister of Finance, I think it was, stated last night that five million dollars' worth of goods were imported into this country from Germany. Now, we know perfectly well that there are ten or twelve million dollars' worth of goods coming into this country of German manufacture; but the balance over the five millions come in through the back-door of England, they come to this country through British warehouses. Now, will the member for North Wellington pretend to tell me that he can distinguish goods manufactured in Germany from those manufactured in Great Britain? I will tell him he cannot. The Minister of Finance says that they don't intend to leave the matter in the hands of the custom-house appraiser. Now, if the custom-house appraiser is not going to be able to tell us whether these goods are of German or of British manufacture, who is? Is the gentleman who examines the invoices, able to tell us? Certainly not. Then I say there is

nothing in this clause to protect the honest business man from fraud. I think the business men of this country, and the members of this House have a right to know and should know, before this clause passes, in what way or in what manner the business men of Canada are to be protected from fraud. I speak as an old business man, representing, perhaps, the fifth largest business centre in this Dominion, and I say that I cannot see how the Canadian manufacturer is to be protected. I sympathize with the Minister of Finance. I know where the difficulty is, perhaps, just as well as he does, or as any other member of the Government does. If I were a custom-house appraiser, I do not think I could detect but a very few lines of goods of German manufacture from those of British manufacture—not only German goods, but Belgian and Swiss goods also. It has been stated that there are only some nineteen million dollars' worth of goods coming into this country from the different foreign countries of Europe. The Minister of Finance knows that is a mistake. I grant he is right if we take only those goods coming directly from those countries; but he knows perfectly well that double that amount of goods come in from Europe through England. England is the merchant of the world; her ships go to all the ports of the world and bring the merchandise of those countries into Great Britain. No doubt, the hon. Finance Minister is, perhaps, as well posted on the subject as I am, and he must know that the English merchant can go to any of those countries he mentioned last night, and will buy ten times as many of those goods as any merchant in this country dare to buy, yes, fifty times as much. He will buy them at a low price and carry them home to England, because the freight is a small matter, and he sells them to the Canadian merchant at a price much less than the Canadian merchant can purchase the quantities he requires from those countries himself. Now, I do not wish to take up the time of the House any longer, but I speak because I think this matter should be put clearly before the House, and before the business men of the country. The Government should tell us how Canadian manufacturers are going to be protected. It is not abuse we want from the hon. member for North Wellington, but it is information that we are asking on behalf of the business interests of Canada, and that I think we ought to get.

Mr. CRAIG. I resent the imputation made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the Opposition are wasting the time of the House. If I wished to say anything about wasting time, I might point out the fact that practically no Government measures have been brought down at all this session, or pushed through. We have had the Franchise Bill brought down, and that was dropped for this ses-

sion. We had the Superannuation Bill, and after we talked about that, it was also dropped. Then we waited for about three weeks, and nothing at all was brought forward. Instead of wasting the time of the House, I think we have been doing the very opposite on this side of the House; and if the session has been prolonged at all, it has not been by the Opposition, but by the Government themselves. I am not going to find fault with the Government, and say they have been wasting time, as we are charged with doing; because they tell us that they have been listening to deputations from all over the country who said that the tariff, as first brought down, was injurious to their business interests. I am glad the Government did listen to them, did not turn a deaf ear to them in that matter. But we are not wasting time in discussing this resolution. I hold that this resolution is one of the most important parts of the tariff, and if we are going to spend time at all on any part of the tariff, I hold we should spend it in discussing this resolution. I cannot understand how hon. members opposite can support this resolution. I have looked at it from many points of view; and I propose to read, in a little while, part of an article from the Montreal "Witness," which I know hon. gentlemen opposite will listen to attentively, and no doubt they will believe it sooner than they will believe anything that I say. But I wish again to repudiate the idea that we are wasting time in opposing this resolution. In doing so, I maintain that we are defending the industries of this country against the assaults made upon them by this resolution. I believe myself, as I have already said, that this resolution was introduced mainly as a sop to the free traders of this country, because the general tariff is a protective tariff, without doubt. I maintain it is a protective tariff in its main features, and the "Witness" in this article admits that. But there is no doubt that this resolution is put in as a sop to the free traders. They wanted something, and they have got this, and I am afraid of it for that reason. It pretends to give a preference to Great Britain, but there is nothing preferential to Great Britain in it at all. It makes no pretense of being preferential to Great Britain, on the face of it. The speech of the Finance Minister pretended it was, but this resolution itself does not pretend that; and we must admit, after hearing all this discussion, that this resolution is not at all giving a preference to Great Britain. I say that we are defending the industries of this country, and in doing that we are defending the workingmen of this country. It is all very well to talk about loyalty, but I do not want to be loyal at the expense of Canada, I do not want to be loyal to Great Britain as one part of the Empire, at the expense of this part of the Empire. I want to be loyal to Canada, and

Mr. CRAIG.

I maintain, as I have said before, that in building up Canada, in defending the industries and the workingmen of this country, we are building up the Empire, and we are showing our loyalty to the Empire. It is very well to make a pretense of loyalty, but I maintain that Englishmen themselves, if they thought this resolution was going to injure the interests of Canada, would say that we were very foolish to carry our loyalty so far as that. They would not want us to do it. Now, I am going to make a statement which I would like to hear denied by some members on the opposite side of the House, if they can possibly do so. The statement I make is this, that no country ever placed such power in the hands of one man as is proposed to be placed in the hands of the Controller of Customs by this resolution. Now, will that be denied by any hon. gentleman opposite? If that will not be denied, I hold it is a startling statement, a startling proposition. I say that no country has ever placed such great power in the hands of one man as this resolution, if carried, will place in the hands of the Controller of Customs. I go further, and I say that the Finance Minister, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that none of the members of the Cabinet can point to any country which has placed such legislation as this on its Statute-book. If they can, I would like to hear it, I would like to hear what they have to say about that. I do not believe that any country would be so foolish. I cannot imagine the United States doing that, I cannot imagine them passing such legislation as this, and committing such great power to the hands of one man, as the Government and their followers propose to commit to the hands of the Controller of Customs. Now, I am going to read a selection from the Montreal "Witness," which I think is a paper accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite; and I should be very glad if they would listen to this, not for my sake, but for the sake of the Montreal "Witness":

Another thing which has, perhaps, given a false impression of the real motive of the tariff, is the great talk that has been made about the preference given to Great Britain, until the critics have felt themselves justified in speaking as though any reduction to any other country was treason against the principle of the tariff. The first principle of the tariff is reduction of protective duties towards all countries alike. It is only a secondary principle which reserves that reduction as towards protectionist countries until reciprocal reductions can be obtained. Though it might rob us of some chance for chaffering over equivalents, it would be wholly in accord with the great principle of the tariff and a positive and great advantage to Canada, if her duties were reduced toward Germany and Belgium. We should view with no distress at all the necessity that would compel this, or even if, as Sir Charles Tupper a little wildly says, it were extended to all Europe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. CRAIG. I am glad hon. gentlemen opposite agree with those sentiments. I

thought they did so, and I was waiting for some expression of approval from them.

There is one remark reported of Mr. Davies which we take to be either a slip of the tongue or of the pen of the reporter, where he is made to say that until Germany and Belgium offer a preferential rate such as is offered by Canada, those countries cannot obtain the advantage of those concessions. To this we object altogether.

I am reading this portion of the article to show how very difficult it is for people to agree as to the meaning of this resolution. I have not heard two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House agree in their views regarding it. We have heard very little from hon. gentlemen opposite, but what we have heard sufficiently shows the difficulty that prevails. Now we find the "Witness," a paper with very strong leanings towards the Liberals, but which claims to be independent, endeavouring to show that the resolution has a different meaning altogether. It says :

We can never ask for a preferential rate from those countries. All that was said by the resolution was, that we should have as favourable rates from them as we were giving them. It was, we think, implied in Mr. Fielding's speeches, that they must give us concessions in actual return for what we are now offering. This is different from the principle of the resolution, as equivalent concessions might be more or less than enough to bring another country's tariff to as favourable a rate of figures as ours, but it is very different, on the other hand, from demanding preferential concessions.

The "Witness" objects to a statement which they understood the Minister of Marine to make, that a country must offer preferential rates to Canada in order to obtain the benefit of the reductions offered. But they also object to a remark made by the Finance Minister, that such countries must make us concessions for the advantages we offer. The "Witness" takes the ground, which is the common-sense ground, that if the tariff of any other country is on the average the same or lower than our tariff, that country should have the right to come under this preferential rate. That is the ground taken by the "Witness"—I do not know what ground is taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. The "Witness" continues :

In fact, except accidentally, there is nothing preferential in the tariff at all. It offers to all equally liberal countries our lower rate and to all less liberal our higher rate. The talk of preference has been a happy stage effect, very well adapted to this year of loyalty.

I agree with a good deal stated by the "Witness," although it does lean strongly to the other side of the House. I think this preferential idea as regards Great Britain has been very well worked into this resolution and comes at a very fortunate time for hon. gentlemen opposite, this being the Diamond Jubilee year. We on this side of the House are in favour of a true prefer-

ential arrangement. I am very much amused by some of the newspapers which talk about the huckstering policy of the Opposition. Why, we have no huckstering policy. We make a fair proposition. We say we are anxious to have preferential trade with Great Britain, but we want it to be true preferential trade and not preferential trade spread over the whole globe, and one which in a short time would admit here the goods of every country in the world and destroy all the industries of Canada. But we desire, when a preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain is entered into, that they shall secure advantages and we shall secure advantages as well. I hold that we must look first to Canadian interests, and if while doing so we can at the same time secure extended trade with Great Britain, then we should do so ; but if in order to extend our trade with and show our loyalty to England we are to be called upon to destroy the interests of our workmen and of our farmers, I am at all times prepared to vote against the adoption of such a policy.

Mr. SPROULE. I should like to obtain some information as to what has been done in regard to this Order in Council. In the report it is stated :

The undersigned, Controller of Customs, has the honour to report as follows :—

That, on Thursday, the 22nd of April instant, the Minister of Finance submitted to the House of Commons certain resolutions for the revision of the customs tariff ;

That it has been the practice, without any special statutory authority, to give effect to tariff changes from the time the tariff resolutions are laid on the Table, subject to amendment until the Tariff Bill is finally assented to ;

That, in accordance with such practice, he has given instructions to all collectors of customs to act upon the said tariff resolutions at once.

One of the tariff resolutions is the preferential clause. The Controller goes on to say :

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefit of the reciprocal tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

Only a few days afterwards we saw in the Montreal newspapers that the Belgian consul had told an importer that Belgium goods were entitled to come in under the most-favoured-nation clause, and that he should pay duty under protest. So the question has arisen in regard to Belgium. A few days afterwards the same question was raised by the German consul with respect to Germany. But I do not find a word said here by the Controller in regard to these matters. He says :

That the undersigned has decided that the customs tariff of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is such as entitles articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of that country, to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff, subject to the limitation mentioned in section "D," and has so directed all collectors of customs.

In his report the Controller reports with respect to one country, although he has to decide with respect to every question that may arise. These questions have arisen. I want to ask the Finance Minister if the Government has considered these questions, and whether the Controller of Customs has decided if Germany and Belgium are entitled to send their goods here under the reciprocal clause.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The Controller of Customs has decided that Great Britain was entitled, and no other country was entitled, to the reciprocal tariff. If the Controller of Customs decided anything further and prepared a report thereon, then it would be necessary to pass an Order in Council; but the Controller has not considered it necessary—and the members of the Government agree with the Controller—to do anything beyond that report.

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as a decision has been given by the Controller of Customs, must the Governor in Council pass an Order in Council based on the Controller's report?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have certainly no intention to carry out such view. I did not express it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Controller states that the United Kingdom is entitled to the benefit of the reciprocal tariff, but he does not refer to any other country. The Order on which the Governor in Council acted makes no reference to any other country except the United Kingdom. Whether any other country has claimed the right to come under the reciprocal tariff does not appear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Controller of Customs has already laid before the House, or has read a letter from the Belgian consul on this subject; at all events, the fact that the Belgian consul has already made such application is already publicly known. If the Controller of Customs had decided that Belgium or any other country was entitled to the benefit of the reciprocal tariff, the Controller would have reported to Council to consider it as it might please. Not having so decided, Council has not been called upon to take any formal action on the point.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, if he has not decided he has not considered the question at all. I assume of course, that if the hon. gentleman has had it under consideration he would make some kind of a report, whether that country had or had not the right. As there is no mention of it here, I take it for granted that he has not considered it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot help what my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) takes for granted.

Mr. WALLACE. Furthermore, the Prime Minister and the Controller of Customs

Mr. SPROULE.

have made statements to this House, and which statements are diametrically opposite. For instance, the Prime Minister makes the statement:

We had to look around all the world to see what countries could be admitted under this preferential tariff, and, having looked over the world, from the one pole to the other, we saw only one nation in the position to take advantage of this tariff, and it was Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Prime Minister gave any such minute investigation, or that he looked into the tariff's and trade conditions of every country in the world from pole to pole. I hardly think he did that. But the Controller of Customs on the contrary, tells us another story, and his story as given in his own words is:

You have noticed that the question must first arise, and, when it arises, it will be my duty then, under the law, to examine into it, to ascertain the facts that require to be known by the Government before an order is given for the admission of articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of the country in question.

The Controller of Customs here says, that they have not investigated the matter at all, that they have not looked into the circumstances of every country from one pole to the other, but that as soon as any country makes a claim he will investigate it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister admits that a claim has been made.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, for this one country, but the Controller of Customs was speaking generally of all the countries in the world which the Prime Minister referred to, and the Controller of Customs contradicts the Prime Minister and says that the Prime Minister is off his eggs. The Controller of Customs said furthermore:

If any government makes a representation, then it would be my duty, as I understand it, to possess myself of full knowledge as to the tariff and the working of its tariff.

It would appear then, that the Controller does not know it now, and that he yet has to take into consideration whether any other country shall come under this tariff or not. Mr. Chairman, we would like the Controller of Customs to be in his seat in the House now. It is not respectful to this House; it is not respectful to the gentlemen who are discussing this question, that the Controller of Customs is continually absent from his seat in this House when this matter is being discussed. We have rights in this House, and we have duties to perform here, and the members of the Government have duties to the members of this House as well. I say, Sir, that I have looked on from day to day and have experienced the feeling that the Government—certain members of it at any rate—are not courteous as they should be to the members of

this House, and are not ready here to defend their policy which is being criticised. More particularly is this a grievance when the Government do not seem to have any settled policy on the matter. What did the Prime Minister tell us but yesterday. Here are his words :

The sentiments of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, who spoke on this subject, are my sentiments.

Well, now, the sentiments of the Controller of Customs as I have read them to the House are entirely different sentiments from those of the Prime Minister. I need not repeat the further remarks of the Prime Minister where he told us that he looked at the tariff of every country in the world from pole to pole, he not only took in the geography, but he studied their conditions and made a careful investigation of all these matters before he made this tariff proposal. I believe it was the duty of the Government to do that before they submitted this measure to the House, but it is quite evident—even if we had not the statement of the Controller of Customs—that they had not done so. When they submitted this resolution to the House on the 24th of April, they should have previously made all the investigations necessary, and prevented the members of this House from taking a leap in the dark. They should have considered the effect of this preferential tariff upon the business of the country; they should have weighed the advantages and disadvantages that would accrue to Canada. They should have studied the interests of Canada, not the interests of other countries, and they should have considered well whether the adoption of it would be beneficial to Canada or not. We are legislating for Canada here; we should consider what is to the welfare of Canada, and not what is to the welfare or advantage of other countries. The Controller of Customs has repeatedly told us, that he does not know what the effect of this preferential tariff is going to be, but as soon as some country makes an application to be admitted under the minimum rate then he will decide. I imagine the desperate position in which such conduct on the part of the Government places this country. They have made an arrangement for the reduction of the tariff in favour of any country which may comply with certain conditions, but the Government cannot tell us what countries to-day comply with these conditions, and the Controller of Customs coolly tells us, that he is ignorant as to what the result will be, and that he does not care to make any inquiry until some country makes a claim, when he will sit down and investigate, and recommend to Council. On the other hand the Premier tells us that all this work has been done already, and thus, we see how unanimous in their sentiments and their views are the members of this Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be an evidence of my obtuseness, but I fail to discover that remarkable conflict referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) between the utterances of the Prime Minister and the utterances of the Controller of Customs. Undoubtedly it did become necessary, at the beginning of this matter, to take a general look at the tariffs of the world, with a view of ascertaining what countries would come under this proposal, and in that general view—which was not a very exhaustive and minute one I do not mind confiding to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), and the Prime Minister did not say it was—in that general view, we had no difficulty in discovering that one country came within the arrangement and should receive the benefit immediately. That country was Great Britain. If any other country afterwards claimed the privilege, then, as stated by the Controller of Customs, the justice of the claim of that country will be inquired into. My chief object in rising was to say, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is not justified in assuming that the absence of the Controller of Customs is intended in the way of discourtesy, nor is it a neglect of duty. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) did not intend his remarks to mean this. I know that the Controller of Customs has been employed every moment of his time in the discharge of urgent duties in connection with his department, and I know that he has been called out of this House two or three times this afternoon by urgent business. True, we may say that a Minister should remain in his seat, but it is not always easy for a Minister to do so. The other night there were complaints from the opposite side of the House about the absence of Ministers from their seats. On that occasion I myself was absent for a few moments, but I was absent at the instance of a gentleman of the Opposition who wished to speak to me on public business. I certainly did not mean any discourtesy to gentlemen on the Opposition benches when I left my seat for that purpose. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Controller of Customs only left the House because urgent public duties called him away. He was here to-day, and he will be here again before this sitting closes. I would not have the idea go abroad that he has shown the slightest discourtesy to any hon. members, or that he was absent without cause.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister tell us how many and what countries have applied for the advantages of this favoured-nation clause?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking from memory, I think the only formal application has come from the Belgian consul; but I will not be positive.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Minister be good enough to inform us how the collectors of

customs can decide? If, for instance, the Belgian consul said to an importer: "You have a right to have these advantages for your goods," how is a collector of customs to decide when he has no specified instructions beyond those contained in that Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is labouring under the delusion that it is the business of the collectors of customs at the several ports to determine this question. It is not their business. The business of the collectors of customs at the several ports is to carry out the directions of the head of the department; and until they receive such directions, they will not give any country the privileges of that clause.

Mr. SPROULE. That is why I am asking. They are expected to act under instructions, and is it possible they have not been given any instructions up to this time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated that instructions have been given to them to extend this privilege to the trade of Great Britain, and not beyond that.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose I am bringing goods from Germany?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The answer you will get will be that that you will have to pay the higher duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem anxious that German goods should have the privilege of the lower duty. We are excluding German goods from that privilege. Whatever the ultimate decision may be, that is the present decision of the Controller of Customs, and it has been concurred in by Council.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken if he attributes to me the desire to have German goods admitted at the lower rate. I only select that case as an illustration of what might apply to any other country in the world. In the absence of instructions on this point, the Government are only making confusion for the importer. How is he to import goods? The rate of duty he pays enables him to decide at what profit he shall sell the goods he imports. If he thinks he can import at the lower scale of duty, upon that he may be deceived, and may afterwards have to pay the higher rate; and if he pays the higher rate, and afterwards gets the reduction, how is he to get it? The Controller of Customs has not determined. The hon. Finance Minister says that he has decided that England shall get this privilege and no other country; but these instructions do not say a word about no other country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps I misunderstood the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is at the head of the Department of Finance as well as at the head of the Department of Customs;

Mr. SPROULE.

but I thought I heard him say to the Minister of Finance a few moments ago, "Don't answer him." I hope I did not hear him correctly, because I think we are entitled to receive answers to respectful questions and I think the question submitted by my hon. friend was one that demanded an answer. I propose asking one now, and I hope the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not forbid it being answered. I see that the Controller of Customs is now in his seat, and I will ask it of him. I want to know if a number of importers of foreign goods paid the customs duties demanded by the collectors at the different ports, and paid them under protest, claiming the right to have the preferential duty; and if so, what countries the goods came from?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I cannot answer that question off-hand. I will ask for the information from my department, and give it to the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the hon. gentleman aware that some entries have been made and protests filed at the same time?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was rather unfair to this side of the House, when, a few moments ago, he charged us with desiring to have the goods of Germany brought into this country at the lower rate of duty. Speaking for myself, I am opposed to goods coming from Germany to this country at the lower rate of duty; in fact, I am opposed to goods from that or any other country coming to this country at a cut of 25 per cent on the regular tariff, because I believe it is not in the interest of this country that that should be done. Now, I am glad that this question has been so thoroughly ventilated. I believe a great deal of good will come out of this discussion. It will make more apparent the unreasonable nature of the proposition the Government are making. I do not desire to raise again the constitutional question, which was so ably discussed by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), and my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), who the other day delivered a speech which no hon. member on the other side of the House dared or attempted to answer. The constitutional question, I think, is effectively settled, and we may leave it as settled. With regard to the question of the preferential tariff, it is certainly a far-reaching question. I cannot see at all that this provision is confined to England. To my mind, it extends to almost every country in the world, because, as has been so well said by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), even if other countries are not entitled under treaties to send goods to Canada at the

lower rate of duty, there is no doubt that the goods of those countries will find their way into Canada through the back-door of England. German manufacturers will be careful to see that that is done. They will see that an arrangement is made by which the Canadian purchasers of their goods will get them in at the lower rate of duty, simply by passing them through England. We know that the mercantile marine of England extends over the whole world. The trade of England having connections with almost every country on the face of the globe, it is reasonable to believe that England will become to a greater extent the distributor of the commerce of the world, so far as Canada is concerned; and if we admit at the lower rate of duty goods from Great Britain, and not from any other country, we must expect that a largely increased quantity of our imports will come from foreign countries through Great Britain. While we now import \$19,000,000 from other countries than Great Britain and the United States, we must expect that that amount will be greatly reduced, and the greater amount of our imports will come in at the lower rate of duty prescribed by the tariff. Take, for instance, cotton manufactures: we imported in 1896 \$3,366,500 worth from Great Britain, \$115,517 from Germany, \$24,764 from Switzerland, and \$55,271 from France. Now, I am quite sure that there is no hon. member in this House who will believe, for one moment, that we only consumed in this country, in the year 1896, \$55,271 worth of cotton goods imported from France or \$24,764 worth imported from Switzerland. I am quite sure that the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) is correct in his contention that manufactured goods from these countries find their way into Great Britain and are thence shipped to Canada. This practice will be increased under the preferential clause, and the result will be that our imports direct from France and Germany will be reduced while our imports from Great Britain will be increased. I do not believe that this is in the interests of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite might as well make a clean sweep and reduce our tariff generally on goods from these countries by one-eighth or one-quarter, because that will be the practical effect. On this side, however, we do not believe that this is an opportune time to reduce the tariff to the extent to which the Government propose to reduce it. Though in the case of a few articles the appraisers may be able to determine from what country they originally came, in the great majority they will not be able to arrive at any such conclusion. In the article of tea, for instance, which we import from Great Britain as well as from China and Japan, there will be no difficulty in determining whether it ought to come in or not at the low rate of duty, if a duty were at all imposed on tea, because tea is not produced in England; but

in the case of manufactured articles, no regulations can be made by the Controller of Customs which will enable the appraiser to determine beyond doubt, in every instance, whether they are entitled to come in at the lower rate or should be charged the higher rate. Take the article of silks. We imported silks from Great Britain to the amount of \$1,901,627 in 1896, from France, \$126,000, from Germany, \$108,000, and from Switzerland, \$133,000. Now, I am quite sure this does not at all represent fairly the manufactures of these different countries which are purchased by our merchants and dealers. There can be no doubt that, as in cotton goods, a large amount of silks find their way into this country from Great Britain, which are the manufacture of foreign countries, and there can be equally no doubt that under this clause a still larger amount of these foreign manufactured goods will be brought into this country from Great Britain in order to benefit by the reduced rates, and I certainly do not think that the hon. Minister of Finance intended that foreign silks should be given the benefit of the minimum tariff when other articles of more common use have to pay the higher tariff. Then take the articles of spices, there can be no difficulty in determining whether spices should come in at the lower or higher rate of duty because spices are not produced in Great Britain but in the East Indies. Cinnamon, ginger and other spices imported direct from the East Indies should be charged the higher rate, but when sent to England and thence exported to Canada, as manufactured articles, they would come in at the lower rate, so that we would have the manufactured article coming in at the lower rate and the raw material coming in at the higher rate. The whole thing seems to be so confusing, that I would be glad to see the clause wiped out completely. Let the Government take another year to consider this question and see if some better system cannot be arrived at and have the trade of our country better protected than seems possible under the present arrangement. I have said that I am not in favour of giving a preference to Great Britain. I may qualify my statement by saying that I would be glad to support, at any time, a reasonable preferential trade with Great Britain. Such was the policy of the Conservative party, but we never proposed a policy that is all give and no get. I do not believe in a policy of giving everything and getting nothing, and if Great Britain is not going to give us something in return for what we are giving them, I am opposed to preferential trade on that basis. We have gone down on our knees, year after year, and begged Great Britain to admit our live stock into the English markets, but each time met with an absolute refusal, and after that refusal we now propose to give the manufactured products of England admis-

sion into our market at reduced rates. I see nothing fair in a proposition of that kind. Whilst we are willing to make concessions to Great Britain, she ought to be willing to give something in return. It is unfair to our labouring men that they should be thrust out of employment merely for the sake of giving the artisans and workmen of Great Britain something to do. I had a communication from a manufacturer, a few days ago, who told me that he would be forced by this tariff to cut down his business one-half, which simply means that one-half of his workmen would be driven to seek employment elsewhere. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance how he expects our working classes to enjoy this Jubilee year with such a prospect staring them in the face. How can he expect those men, who are thrown out of work by the operation of his tariff, to sing "God Save the Queen" on the 22nd of June and cheer for Her Majesty? Are they not just as much entitled to have a Jubilee year as the artisans and workmen of Great Britain? I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider this resolution and see if he cannot do something for our working classes.

I think it is a mistake to place this great power in the hands of one man. It is a great mistake, indeed, that the Controller of Customs should be entrusted with such absolute power. It is a great mistake to give him the power of determining, at his own sweet will, whether or not any particular country is entitled to this preferential trade. Or even if that power is vested in the Governor in Council, it is too absolute and wide a power to put in the hands of the thirteen or fourteen men who sit on the Treasury benches. I do not think, for one moment, that this Parliament should surrender the trust that has been placed in it and give up its right to determine what the tariff of the country should be, by leaving that determination completely in the hands of the Governor in Council. I am therefore in favour of striking out the latter part of the resolution altogether, and of leaving to Parliament the duty of deciding definitely and exclusively what our tariff should be. If we go back to the days of Magna Charta, we will find that, from that time down, the struggle in the old land has ever been to obtain power for the people over the Crown; and in this country, that same fight went on for years, but it remained for the Liberal party to propose an entirely different policy. In the province of Ontario, which has been ruled by the Liberal party for the last twenty-five years we find the same thing prevailing. By Order in Council the Government there have the power to sell our timber lands, which are the most valuable asset the province has. The provincial government never think of consulting the local legislature as to whether it is right or not

Mr. HENDERSON.

to sell these lands, but they decide for themselves by Order in Council. The effect of it is that we are over-governed by Order in Council. There should be less of it, in my opinion, and Parliament should exercise greater control. It would appear that the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) who was the ruling spirit in the legislature of Ontario, is exercising control of this Parliament, that he is bringing into this Parliament the principles by which he ruled in that legislature, and he is going to introduce here even in a more extended way than he did there the system of governing by Orders in Council. I trust that we shall not adopt this plan, that the principle of governing the country by the opinion of one man or by the will of the Government will be abandoned, and that our good old practice will be continued of leaving Parliament to say how the people of this country shall be governed, what taxes they should pay and how those taxes shall be levied and collected. I trust that this resolution will not receive the sanction of the House. I trust that the good sense of the Government will show them that a mistake has been made and will show them the propriety of not pressing forward this proposal. I trust that Parliament will have an opportunity at least of saying what shall be the taxes imposed on the people of the country and that we shall continue to legislate in the interests of the people.

Mr. CLANCY. The statement made by the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) yesterday, is as follows:—

Let me, in conclusion, repeat to my hon. friend what I had the pleasure of telling him the other day, that we have already gone into this operation; we have looked over the whole globe, and we have found only one country whose tariff, so far as we know, is on a level with ours, and not only on a level, but far more favourable than ours; and therefore we believe our minimum tariff for the present applies to Great Britain, and to no other country.

In view of that statement I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if he will lay these conclusions on the Table. They are very important. I am sure the Government must have done something more than merely look over the matter, that they must have acted, in so important a matter, upon some definite information, they must have condensed all the information that would guide them on so important a question. I ask the Finance Minister now if he will lay that information on the Table because it is very important to the committee. I desire also to ask the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) if he will also lay on the Table the instructions given to the collectors of customs. It has been stated in the hon. gentleman's absence this afternoon, that definite instructions other than what appear in his report to Council have been given for the guidance of the collectors of customs

throughout the country. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he will lay these instructions on the Table.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). I have pleasure in laying on the Table now what the hon. gentleman has asked for from me.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The Minister of Finance has not said if he would consent to furnish the papers I ask for.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am afraid I have had some difficulty in understanding what it was that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) desired to have me to lay on the Table. I do not think I understood him very clearly. I admit that it was my own fault, but I cannot do what he asks without understanding better what it is.

Mr. **CLANCY**. If the House will bear with me for a moment, and if I can claim the hon. Minister's attention, I will endeavour to make it clear. The First Minister said that after a complete investigation, after looking over the trade affairs of the world—at least if this was not distinctly stated, it was clearly implied—the Government had come to the conclusion that the only country in the world whose goods were entitled to come into Canada at the preferential rate was Great Britain. I ask the hon. Minister if he will lay these conclusions on the Table. If there are no confusions it is well that the committee should know that fact, and the conclusion we must draw from this is that the Government made no investigation. I am sure that the hon. Minister is ready with an answer, but it is necessary that we should have these papers.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (King's, P.E.I.) At the risk of wasting a little more time, I will trouble the House with a very few remarks. It was not my intention to inflict a speech on the House, nor would I do so were it not that I see the debate is not likely to close for some little time. With reference to the preferential clause which is more directly under discussion, I wish to say that in my estimation it is not preferential. My idea of preferential trade is a trade that will give a preference to the manufacturers of England in our markets. This goes further, and gives a preference not only to England, but to other countries, and in that respect goes a step further than my idea of preferential trade, and it therefore ceases to be preferential so far as England is concerned. Now, we are giving this preference to England and not getting anything in exchange. I do not find so much fault with that, because if there is anything that I feel inclined to favour more

than another, it is the idea of preferential trade between England and her colonies, and between the colonies of England. I think, further, that this preferential clause is taking too much power from the representatives of the people and putting it into the hands of the Controller of Customs and in that respect it is much to be condemned. It would seem, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, that the position that has been taken by the Controller up to this time indicates that he is the sole judge in this matter; and that the action that has been taken with respect to the preferential clause up to the present time has been taken altogether by the Controller, and without the sanction of the Government, because, if I understand rightly, his report was not submitted to the Government until action was taken on it. Now, a great deal has been said about this matter of preferential trade. But, so far as I can find out, there is very little in it in favour of trade with England. As an instance of that, I will give the case of an importer of goods that has come under my own observation. An invoice of English goods amounting to \$281, was imported since this tariff came into operation. The duty on that invoice, at 35 per cent amounted to \$98.35. Take one-eighth off as coming from England, which was \$12.29 leaves the total duty under this new tariff, at \$86.06. Now, applying the old tariff to that same invoice, the case would stand as follows:—Value, \$281; duty under the old tariff, at 25 per cent, \$70.25; 199 pounds of cloth at 5 cents a pound, \$9.95. Add duty of \$70.25, and you have \$80.20, showing a balance of \$5.86 more under the operation of the new tariff than would have been paid under the old tariff. This shows that instead of being a free-trade tariff, and as carrying out the policy enunciated by the Government while in Opposition, it is taxing the people of this country to the tune of \$5.86 more on that invoice than the National Policy would have done. Now, the point in this new tariff to which I find fault more especially as regards the province of Prince Edward Island from which I come, is the abolition of the duty on corn. This is a matter, no doubt, that affects all sections of Canada, but there is no section that the repeal of the duty on corn affects so much as Prince Edward Island. We find that a large quantity of corn is grown in Canada, something like twelve or fourteen million bushels, yet we find that the people in the province of Ontario in which the most of that corn is grown, are opposed to taking the duty off. Not only that, but, in my opinion, the removal of the duty has been altogether in the interest of a few rich individual farmers, and this remark possibly applies more to Ontario than to any other part of the country. Now, Sir, I do not come here to assist in legislating altogether in the interests of the rich farmers, who are able to take care of them-

selves ; but I come here to legislate, and to do what I can, in the interest of the poorer classes of the people, more particularly the people that really require our attention, and for whom we should do everything we can. Now, we all know very well that last fall the price of oats had gone down so low that it would not pay any man to raise them. The price was as low as 20 or 22 cents a bushel, which is, of course, below the cost of production. Now, it is ridiculous to suppose that a poor farmer can grow oats at such prices as that, and go to the expense of marketing them, and then import corn from the United States or elsewhere to feed his stock. It is entirely out of the question. I contend that the effect of the duty being removed from corn will further depreciate the price at present obtained for oats in the Dominion of Canada, it will so depreciate the prices that it will be utterly impossible for the farmers of this country to grow oats in face of the immense quantities of corn that is imported from the United States. We find that the United States has put a duty on wool grown by the farmers of this country, and I suppose that in response to that action, this fatherly Government of ours has taken the duty off corn. It is a queer way to retaliate on them by punishing us, but that seems to be the fact of the case. The effect of the present tariff, if I understand it properly, will prevent the small mills of this country from utilizing our home-grown wool, and it will be, under the circumstances, next to impossible for our farmers to find a market for wool. But this Government, in face of the Americans putting a heavy duty of 12 cents a pound on wool, turn around and take the duty off corn. For my part, speaking for the farmers, I cannot see how it is possible that they can appreciate legislation of that kind. Then, again, while the Government take the duty off corn in the interest, as they say, of free trade, I must say that I am glad to see, on the other hand, that they show their protectionist proclivities by leaving the duty on pork. Now, we know very well that last fall as was stated by a gentleman in this House, if I mistake not, that when the tariff commission was on its rounds it was interviewed by the pork packers of this country. They wanted to find out what the Government were likely to do with respect to the protection on pork, in order that they might regulate their prices accordingly. But the tariff commission could not see its way to give any information to the pork packers in order that the farmers of this country might get better prices for their pork, and that a proper basis might be arranged by the packers on which to pay them for their pork. The commission could not give them any information with respect to the duty on pork, while at the same time the Finance Minister and other members of the Cabinet and the leader of the Government could give

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

large corporations, the large coal corporations of this country, a tip with respect to the duty on coal, while the farmer must be left out in the cold without any consideration. The consequence was that the price of pork never went so low in this country, because the pork packers had to guard themselves against the possible removal of the duty under the so-called free trade policy of the Government, and therefore had to pay a price that would protect them, providing the protection was taken off pork altogether. The result was that 3 or 4 cents a pound was the price paid in my province for pork that would have commanded a much higher price had it been known that protection was likely to be left on by the Government. One reform promised by my hon. friend the present leader of the Government in 1883 was that if he were elected to power, he would remove the duty on pork. I am glad to say he has not carried these free trade principles to such an extent as to remove that duty, and that the protection given to pork by the Liberal-Conservative party has been retained at the same rate as it was levied under the late Government. We were told by our opponents that the National Policy was "the robbery of the many for the enrichment of the few." I suppose on that principle the protection on pork has been retained for the benefit of certain classes of people, and that the Government have thereby placed themselves in the category of robbers. We were told that the "National Policy was the robbery of the many for the enrichment of the few." The Government have retained the protection on pork, at which I feel very much pleased ; but they have stultified themselves and placed themselves in a very awkward position in view of their previous statements. Another change that is going to be detrimental to some of the interests of this country is the removal of the iron duties. If there was any duty or protection that interested the people of the lower provinces it was covered by the iron duties. What was their effect ? Their effect was to give employment to a very large number of people, who became large consumers of the farm produce of Prince Edward Island, and the small towns built around the iron centres also became large consumers of our farm produce, and we thus possessed the very best market that our people could desire, namely, a home market within easy reach. If those iron industries should be shut down under the present tariff, which is more than probable, this home market will disappear, and we will be thrown back into the position occupied by us in 1878, when the present party was in power. If there was one cry we had to face during the last election campaign more than another, it was the injury done to the farmers by the excessive protection placed on farm machinery, it being asserted that every far-

mer had to pay an excessive price for his thresher or self-binder, even in spite of the fact that the late Government lowered the duties from 35 to 25 per cent before they went out of power. Since the elections, however, hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of removing the duties which the Conservative party left on agricultural implements such as I have named when they went out of power, have given this industry increased protection by reducing the duty on iron used in manufacturing these machines, and have left the duty on the machines as it was before. Another accusation we can fairly bring against the Government in connection with their new tariff is that they appear to have sought to punish the poor man while allowing the more wealthy classes to go free. We can all look on tobacco as a luxury, but it is one of the poor man's luxuries. The duty comes home to every poor man; he takes as much solace out of his pipe of tobacco as the more wealthy man does in drinking costly wines. It is a source of comfort to him, and the Government have made a mistake in increasing the duties to such a large extent. It will undoubtedly lead to increased smuggling. Not only so, but tobacco was one of the few articles manufactured in Prince Edward Island. Two small factories established there have been gradually increasing their trade; they manufacture a good article at a reasonable price, and it is appreciated by the people of the island as a whole. I saw in the newspapers the other day that these factories were about to close down under the new tariff; and this is another example of the effect of the tariff on the island. Then again there is the poor man's grog. We only wish the poor man would not drink any spirits, but unfortunately such is not the case; and when the Government were altering the duties on wines and liquors, they should not have placed increased duties on the poor man's grog without increasing the duties on the rich man's wines. We were told by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that "the protective policy was deliberate and organized robbery." The Liberal-Conservatives never believed that such was the fact. It remained for the present Government to carry out a system which they themselves called "deliberate and organized robbery." They also said it was "a villainous system." We believed it was a system necessary for the purpose of building up the manufactures of this country. While hon. gentlemen opposite believed it was a villainous system, they still continue it. We were also told that the tariff would be altered so as to eliminate every vestige of protection. Yet we find they are continuing protection to almost the same extent as before, and in some articles to a greater extent. We were told also by the hon. member for South Oxford that the Liberal-Conservative party of that time were

in league with "scoundrels great and scoundrels small" to rob the people of this country under the system of protection. These gentlemen still continue this system of protection. We did not believe that we were either scoundrels great or scoundrels small, or that we were robbing the people of this country by protecting our young industries, and if hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches believed their own utterances, then they are the very people who are in league with scoundrels great and scoundrels small to carry out what they believe to be "this villainous protective system." On the 26th April, 1897, the Toronto "Globe," the organ of the Liberal party wrote as follows:—

If we give our market to the manufacturers of the United States and allow American goods to come in at the flood, many of our factories must be swept away in the deluge, and widespread commercial disaster would be the result.

Why, Sir, you would imagine that this was the utterance of a Liberal-Conservative National Policy newspaper. It seems, that the party which denounced protection from one end of Canada to the other, and got into power on that cry, are now compelled to continue the system that they have for years past decried. The "Globe" continued:

To reduce our tariff to a free trade basis in the face of the high tariff of the United States and the low freight charges across the border into Canada, would be to doom even the most deserving of Canadian industries to decay, and to send our young men in ever increasing droves to the United States. We assert as strongly as ever the advantage of free trade with the neighbouring countries, but we must consider self-preservation, and we must have national self-respect.

After eighteen years of denunciation of this system by the Liberal party, we to-day find their newspaper organ writing in favour of the very principles they have denounced.

Now, Sir, if there was one thing more than another which the present Government when in Opposition promised, it was that they would confer great benefits upon the farmers of Canada. Can hon. gentlemen opposite tell me what their tariff has done for the farmers? Does it give them an increased market for a bushel of oats, or does it compensate them in any way for the duty that has been taken off corn?

Mr. COWAN. Do you raise corn down there in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman must be corned. Does the present tariff give the farmer an increased market for a pound of butter, does it give him an increased market for his cheese, does it give him an increased market for his beef or his pork? No, Sir, it does not; and the Liberal party have failed to fulfil any one of the promises they have made to the agriculturists of Canada. Not only that, Sir, but the Government by the present tariff, are doing all they can to destroy

the farmers' home market by allowing corn in free to take the place of the coarse grains produced in this country. I remember that the leader of the Government, during the ante-election canvass, spoke of protection as slavery. Well, then, he and his friends are in favour of slavery, because they have continued protection in nearly every item of the tariff as they found it when they came into power.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) then stated, that the system of protection was "a system accursed of God and man"; and yet, Sir, he sits there as complacently as you please, continuing this accursed system. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not believe what he was saying at that time—I doubt very much whether he always believes what he is saying, but I will not chide him with that failing on this occasion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) also said, that "protection was the bane and curse of Canada," yet he continues protection, and therefore according to his own view he perpetuates the bane and curse of Canada. The hon. gentleman also told us, "that every dollar of protection must be taken off." Has he carried out that promise? Most decidedly not. We were also told that "for every dollar that went into the treasury two dollars went into the pockets of the manufacturers." If such is the case, it is an extraordinary thing if the people of the country continue to have faith in men who would continue a system, which they believe that for every dollar it puts in the public treasury, puts two dollars into the pockets of our manufacturers. protection was denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as "legalized robbery," and yet they continue this system of legalized robbery. They talked a great deal about the oil robbery, and that more than anything else was used as an election cry in our province. The hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) placed the protective duty on oil at 170 per cent, and we find that when he comes into power he continues that robbery, by only taking off one-sixth of the duty. Now, Sir, I shall refer for a moment to some of the planks of the Liberal platform as promulgated at the Ottawa Liberal convention. One of the planks was, that protection had decreased the value of farm products. But these gentlemen in power continue to depreciate farm property by continuing the system of protection. Protection was denounced in the Ottawa convention, because "it oppressed the masses for the enrichment of the few," and yet a Liberal Government continues the system. So I might take every plank in their Ottawa platform, and make the same remarks concerning it. The coal and iron industries were obnoxious forms of protection to the Liberals in opposition, and yet in power they continue the duty on coal. Well, Sir, from my point of view,

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

that is a very proper thing for the Government to do. It was one of the principles upon which the National Policy was founded, and it should be continued with every other feature of that National Policy.

The Minister of Finance told us in his Budget speech that protection had been shorn of its enormities. For my part, I cannot see where it has been shorn to any great extent. In some things such as coloured cottons, the protection has been increased; on mowing machines and other farming implements the protection has also been increased. This is what they call shearing protection of its enormities. But I do not see how they could shear it of its enormities, for, according to the principles laid down by them, the whole system of itself was such an enormity that, if they were true to their principles, they should have wiped it out altogether. But fortunately for the country they have not done so.

Now, Sir, if I remember rightly, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that he had nothing against the Patrons of this country; and in this connection, I might refer for a few moments to the Patron platform. According to that platform, "no member of Parliament should receive a pass," but has that been carried out? We know it has not. "Government House should be abolished," but Government House is still to the fore. "The Mounted Police should be abolished," but fortunately for the country, we have still got them. "The Military College was to be abolished." We have that still, and we are likely to have it continued. "Railway subsidies were to be abolished," yet I expect to find my hon. Patron friends voting for railway subsidies before the close of this Parliament.

Now, I will just refer for a little to the matter of tweeds. There is a large quantity of tweeds made in the smaller mills of this country. These tweeds are the cloth which the farming population of this country use. Their own domestic wool is used in its manufacture. The effect of the present tariff will be, I fear, to do away with these small mills, and in that way do away with the manufacture of these cloths and the home market for our wool; and as a consequence, the employment which is given to our own people in and about these mills will be to a greater or less extent wiped out.

The Liberal party, from one end of the country to the other, denounced the system of giving bounties; yet we find them going back on their principles in this respect also, for they favour giving bounties for the production of iron. Another thing that was denounced by the Liberal party from one end of the country to the other previous to the last election was the system of specific duties; and yet we find them bringing down a tariff and doing away with some of these specific duties, and afterwards bringing

down a second tariff and going back to that system. For my part, I cannot see on what principle they can, as a free trade party, put a duty of 15 or 20 per cent on one article and a duty of 30 or 35 per cent on another. If they were true to their principles of free trade, I think they would make their tariff as nearly level as possible, putting the same duty on one article as on another. But on what principle they can put 35 per cent on blankets, 25 per cent on boots and shoes, and 15 per cent on something else, I cannot for the life of me see. It only goes to show that they have thrown their principles to the winds, and are adopting the principles of the Liberal-Conservative party, which they have been denouncing for the last eighteen years.

Now, I must say again, with respect to the preferential clauses at present before the House, that I am sorry that they are not in a strict sense preferential clauses. If they were, I would, even if I stood alone, so far as my party is concerned, be very much pleased to support them.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding all I have heard for the last couple of days, I still venture to express myself in favour of the tariff resolutions now before this House. My reason for this approval is that I consider this a Canadian tariff. It is a tariff made in the interests of the Canadian people, and constructed with a view to the welfare of all the existing and varied industries of the country. I see in this tariff protection against countries that will only deal with Canada in a grudging or unfriendly way. Moreover, I see in the preferential schedule of this tariff a kind of invitation extended to the countries of the world that wish to deal with us on fair and friendly terms. They are told in these resolutions that Canada is ready to reciprocate with any country that wants to trade with us. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me have alluded to this tariff according to the way in which it affected their respective callings; and I think the House will bear with me for a moment or two while I refer to it from the standpoint of the agriculturists. The agriculturists of Canada are a producing people. We produce a large quantity every year for export, and what we export has to meet in competition the surplus products of all the nations of the world. With this state of things, it is very hard for a Government to frame a tariff that is going to give protection to the agriculturist. What they can do, however, is to lessen his burdens by cheapening the articles he has to buy; and I think the resolutions before us have had that object in view in very many cases. While we have to export a surplus to other countries, the quantity we have to export has a great deal to do with regulating the prices of the whole products of our farms. Therefore, any one can easily see how difficult

it is to give the farmer protection on what he has to sell. I am fully aware that, under existing circumstances, our revenue has to be raised by excise and customs duties. I know that in making changes of this kind, it is very difficult to avoid striking individual and private interests, but I believe that the Government have succeeded fairly well in treating all classes justly, though some individuals may suffer. Speaking from a farmer's standpoint, we, the farmers of this country, do not want to shirk our duty and obligation to contribute our fair share to the revenue of the country, but what we do ask is that every other interest should equally contribute its share. We do not forget that the merchant and the manufacturer and the labourer are all equally necessary to the prosperity of this country as the farmers, and equally entitled to consideration, but we do ask that the agricultural class should also receive consideration in the framing of the tariff. I think that they have received greater consideration in the tariff before us than in any tariff that has been before the country for the last eighteen years. I heard the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) prophesy the other evening that all countries in the world would come in under the preferential clause of this tariff. He said that twenty-two of them can come in now, and that the United States would come in before the year was at an end. If the hon. gentleman's prophesy should prove true, this country will rejoice in the wisdom of a Government that was able to frame a tariff which brought about reciprocal trade with the United States inside of one year. That is what our farmers have been wanting for many years. For years they have been desiring freer trade relations with Great Britain and the United States, and if the prophecy of the hon. member for East Durham should be accomplished, think that this tariff will have accomplished a great deal. I do not think any one can deny that it is to the benefit of our people to have open markets as much as they can. I know that it would not require much to convince me that reciprocal trade with the United States would be a benefit to the farmers of this country. We have now as free trade with England as it is possible to have, and by this resolution we offer Great Britain something in return. This resolution also holds out the invitation to every other country in the world that wishes to take advantage of it, to come in and trade on friendly terms with Canada, and I only hope the United States will avail themselves of our invitation. The hon. gentleman who spoke before me (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) declaimed against the introduction of free corn. Well, Mr. Chairman, that may be a rather difficult question. I have heard a great many people say that free corn would be very beneficial to our farmers, and I

have heard others express the contrary opinion. It is a debatable question, but if free corn should not prove a good thing, there is nothing to prevent our removing corn later from the free list. Another thing to which that hon. gentleman called our attention, was the fact that the duty on agricultural implements had not been lowered. With respect to this, I might just say that a revenue has to be raised in this country to meet the expenses of administration, and so long as the manufacturers of Canada give to our consumers agricultural implements at the same rates as the American manufacturers sell them to the farmers of the United States, the farmers of this country have nothing to complain of. At present I know that agricultural implements are sold in Canada as cheaply as they are in the United States, and I am quite satisfied that if the Government should see that a monopoly was formed among our manufactories in order to charge our consumers more than fair prices for those goods, they will see that the tariff is lowered. So long, however, as the Canadian manufactories of agricultural implements sell to the Canadian consumers at the same prices as these implements command in the open markets, I do not think that any complaint will come from our farmers.

I had no intention of taking up the time of the House for more than a few moments on this question. Judging by the different positions which hon. gentlemen of the Opposition take on this question, it is very difficult to tell what kind of a policy would satisfy them. Some of them condemn this policy because there is too much free trade in it; and the same people who condemn it on that ground will, before they are half through their remarks, condemn it likewise because there is too much protection in it. These hon. gentlemen talk about consistency; I only see one point in which they are consistent, and that is they are consistent in their inconsistency. Reading between the lines, I say that this is not a free trade policy nor is it a protective policy, but it is what the Liberal party went to the country on—a revenue policy, based, not on the principle of protection, but on the principle of a tariff for revenue. Notwithstanding all the fault that has been found with these tariff resolutions, I am convinced that the people of this country are quite satisfied with the policy of the Government, and that if the Government were to go to the country on this policy to-morrow, the people would sustain it by a larger majority than they did on the 23rd June last.

**Mr. McNEILL.** I do not at all suppose, after all that has been said in reference to this resolution, that I shall be able to say anything at all that is new, but I feel that it would be improper for me not, on this occasion to put my views on record and state why it is that I am unable to support the resolution which, in some respects, com-

**Mr. McHUGH.**

mands my sympathy. I had fondly hoped, Mr. Chairman, even when it seemed almost hopeless to hope, that it might be possible to frame a resolution which would command the support of both parties in this House, and which could be sent, in this Jubilee year of the Queen, as a message conveying the united voice of Canada to the people in the mother country. Unfortunately, however, it would seem that that cannot be. It cannot be, not, I am sure, because there is any difference of opinion among members on either side of the House as to what our duty is with regard to the mother country—that country which has sheltered us and protected us and given us our safety—but because there seems to be fundamental differences—difference in principles as to trade policy—between the parties on either side of the House. For my own part, I am, so far as Canada is concerned, a protectionist. I am not going to argue that question now. My views on that subject are thoroughly well known in this House. I will simply repeat, what I have so often called the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to, this proposition that no country in the world, no country of which we have any historic record, has ever succeeded in building up its industries without having had recourse to the policy of protection. I say that if any country could have done so, circumstanced as we are, we would be one of the very last countries to be able to do so, for we lie under the shadow of the great producing country to the south. That being my view, I am unable to support this resolution, for many reasons. And of these reasons, I will state shortly three or four.

In the first place, I am unable to support this resolution because, by the terms of it, I say it must, and the Government admit that it may, let in in competition with our industries the gigantic producing agencies of many of the greatest and most famous producing countries in the world, at a reduction of 25 per cent upon a tariff which is lower, according to the estimate of the Government, than the tariff of last year. That to me is a fatal objection, on the face of it, to this resolution. Then, in connection with that, I would say that there is this other objection, in my mind, to the resolution—that the Government themselves seem scarcely to be aware of the scope and extent of the policy to which they have committed themselves. When, some time ago, I asked my hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) whether he considered the tariff of Germany as favourable, on the whole, to Canada as the tariff of Canada—our schedule "D"—was to Germany, and when I repeated the same question as to Belgium, the hon. gentleman said in reply, that he had not yet decided. And when, later on in this debate, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) referred to that matter, called the hon. Controller of Customs's attention to the subject and again asked him his views in regard to

it the Controller of Customs said he would take these objections up one by one as they arose, and he would then feel it to be his duty fully to inform himself—I took down his words at the time—as to whether or not the tariff of a particular country was as favourable to us, on the whole, as our schedule “D” was to that country. Now I venture to say that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs and the Government ought fully to have informed themselves in regard to this matter before they made this proposition to the House. And I, as a private member of the House, even, would feel that if, under these circumstances, I were to support a resolution of the full scope of which I was not informed, I should be taking a most perilous leap in the dark. Then what does my hon. friend the Finance Minister say in regard to this? In the most interesting speech which he made to us in introducing the budget, he told us that he would consider it a very improper thing if he were to take any rash step in regard to this matter. He said :

But, Sir, we are dealing with more than the protected interests of the manufacturers. The evil of protection, like most other evils, is wide-reaching in its influences, and it has become so blended and interwoven with the business of Canada that if we should attempt to strike it down to-day, we should do harm not only to the protected interests, which have no claim upon us, but to other interests which are not directly connected with the protected interests. It would be folly not to remember that we are dealing not with the protected manufacturers only, but that the interests of labour have to be considered, as well as the interests of capital. We have to remember that the trade of the country is so permeated by this system that, in the matter of banking alone, there are vast interests associated with this question. I hesitate not to say that if we should to-day, by some rash step, do that which some hon. gentlemen say we are bound to do, but which intelligent men know we are not bound to do, and would not do, we should not only break down the manufacturing interests of the country, but we would deal a blow to other interests of a wider and more serious character.

Then he goes on to say :

I wish to say, and to emphasize the fact, that it has never been the policy of the Liberal party, as declared by any member of the Liberal party occupying a responsible position, if they came into power, to destroy at one movement all the manufacturing industries, or to so change the policy as to place them in peril.

Now, I wish to ask hon. members of this House, whether it was or was not a rash step on the part of the Government, and whether it was not something which might place the interests of the country in peril when they placed this resolution on the Table and proposed a policy of the full scope of which they had not fully informed themselves. I think it was a very rash step and one which I certainly could not endorse and support, however much I might sympathize, in certain respects, with the course the Government have followed. And I contend that the amendment which has

been introduced to this resolution makes the policy of the Government still more indefensible than it was before. For by the amendment they take power to themselves not to withdraw from the position which this resolution would place them in, if it turned out that the treaties stand in the way, but they take power to themselves to let in all the treaty nations—not upon reciprocal terms, not upon the terms of the resolution, but without asking any reciprocity in return. The proposal is to take power to let these nations in in a body, no matter how hostile their tariffs may be to this country, and so to discriminate still more than the resolution itself does against our own fellow-colonists in other parts of the Empire. From that point of view also, it will be impossible for me to support this resolution. Then, Sir, from another point of view, one that touches me very nearly, I find that I could not support this resolution, however much I might desire, from some points of view to do so. I think that the reduction in the tariff on all lines of goods, even to England alone, to the extent of 25 per cent, is dangerous to the industries of this country. I would view such a step with very great misgiving unless we had some corresponding advantage given to us in the markets of the United Kingdom. I feel that if I were to support this resolution, I would be striking a dangerous blow at the interests of this country, and even for my own native land, England, I could not betray Canada. Canada is the land in which I have spent twenty-five of the happiest years of my life, it is the land which has sent me here to represent her interests, it is the land that has put its trust in me for fifteen years; and if I were to betray her, I would betray my trust as a member of this House. Therefore, if that terrible alternative were placed before me that I were called upon to decide as between the interests of Canada and the interests of my own mother country, England, I should as a member of this House be obliged to decide in favour of Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, fortunately, so long as the Empire endures, no such invidious choice can be presented to me to make; because, as I have said from my place in this House before, so I repeat here to-night, if we view this question from the broadest standpoint and from the highest point of view, we shall find that the interests of Canada and the interests of the mother country are so closely and inextricably woven together, that it is impossible to check the progress of Canada without striking a blow at the best interests of England. Sir, it is impossible to divorce the interests of the mother country from those of the great free, self-governing, prosperous, victorious communities to which she has given birth, and which it may be said, I think, without exaggeration, cling to her with a fervid loyalty. And Canada,

from the vastness of her resources, and from the geographical position which she occupies, must become probably the most potent factor in the bringing about of that imperial greatness and splendour which the mother country herself must so greatly share, and which will enable her to endure, as no other country has ever heretofore endured, the weight and wear of the centuries. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, anything that cramps and stunts the development of Canada, to that extent injures the best interests of the mother country. Our first duty, our most immediate duty, not only as Canadians, but as loyal subjects of the mother country and of the Empire, is to build up in the closest possible connection with the mother country, the industries of this portion of the Empire which is committed to our care; and in doing so, we shall be building up, as I have already said, in the surest and most stable manner possible, the interests of the mother country herself. Let me assume for a moment that the United States of America had remained still a portion of the Empire, and that their trade policy had been handed over to the tender mercies of the Manchester school; does any one suppose that the school of gentlemen comprising Mr. John Bright, great and liberal as he was, who was the man to rise up in the House of Commons and object to Canada exercising her right to frame her own tariff, and not very long ago, too, and who spoke also of the mother country having little interest in countries that were 3,000 miles away—does any one suppose that that school represented by that gentleman, if they had had their own sweet will in connection with the United States, would have allowed the industries of the United States to be built up as they have been under a policy of protection, so that they are to-day among the most magnificent and gigantic industries in the world? Would the United States have developed as they have developed under such conditions as these? Surely not. And what would be the advantage to the mother country to-day if the United States, with all the vast resources which she has developed, were of the Empire? So it is with Canada. Our duty is to build up our industries and thus to strengthen the Empire, remembering always that while we in this indirect way benefit the Empire, yet we ought on every possible occasion so to shape our policy as to assist her directly as well as indirectly. My objection then, as I have said, is this, that by allowing goods of the mother country to come into this country at a reduction of 25 per cent, without obtaining any corresponding privilege in the markets of the mother country, we shall imperil the building up of the interests of this country which is so important in the interests of the mother country herself. But while I consider that to reduce the duty levied against

Mr. McNEILL.

the mother country to the extent of 25 per cent would be perilous without getting some corresponding advantage, I am not prepared to say that we should not reduce our duties at all unless we have some corresponding privileges granted us by the mother country. I venture to think that there are few members in this House who are not prepared to concede that we owe to the mother country something more than we owe to foreign nations. I think there are not many members of this House who will not be prepared to concede that while we may owe nothing to her for her tariff arrangement—for those arrangements have been made by her from the point of view of her own interests—yet that we do owe something to her for the protection that she affords us, for the fact that the armies of England, and the navies of England, are as much at the service of the citizens of Ottawa as they are at the service of the citizens of London, and for the fact that we have her consular service, and her diplomatic service, and the highest court of the Empire provided for us, absolutely free of charge. Therefore I say we ought to be prepared to make some concession to her without asking anything in return, and the resolution which I shall move in a few minutes contemplates that fact, and announces that principle. Now, Sir, I feel that in proposing such a resolution, I am exposing myself for the first time in fifteen years to a charge of inconsistency. I admit that when, in 1892, I proposed a resolution in this House in favour of preferential trade with England, it did not contemplate the reduction of the duties in favour of England, without asking something in return; it did not contemplate to any extent such reduction of those duties. But, I agree with the hon. the Finance Minister when he said that the world moves. I feel that we have made great advances in the past five years along the path of imperial unity. We had the resolution of 1892, to which I referred; we had the great colonial conference following upon it two years later; and two years subsequent to that, we had a resolution moved in this House and unanimously carried, pledging this House of Commons to support the mother country in case the integrity or the honour of the Empire were imperilled. The effect produced by that resolution in the mother country was, I may say, extraordinary. The "National Review" of the next month, spoke of it in this way:

This great manifestation of loyalty, attachment and determination on the part of our fellow-subjects in Canada has created an extraordinary effect upon Englishmen, to whom it has brought home in the most vivid manner possible the oneness of the common Empire. The attitude of Canada, Australia, the Cape, New Zealand and Natal opens up a splendid field for statesmanship, and we cannot believe that our Ministers, either here or in the colonies, will be unworthy of it.

Following almost immediately upon this manifestation of loyalty here in this House and in the other colonies, we had the epoch-marking speech of the Colonial Secretary; and I want hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially those on the Treasury benches, to do me the honour to listen for a moment to the statement I am about to make, for it is only contained in a word or two. That speech was a frank avowal on the part of Mr. Chamberlain that he personally would view with favour a policy which would differentiate in the English market in favour of British goods against foreigners. That is the policy which Mr. Chamberlain enunciated in that speech, and I shall have a word to say in regard to it a little later on. Then in addition to Mr. Chamberlain's speech, we have had the extraordinary manifestation of enthusiasm which has taken place in the mother country lately arising from the course pursued by the present Government of Canada; and I desire to offer my humble congratulations to the Government for having succeeded in evoking that strong Imperial sentiment at home. In view of these facts, it has seemed to me that while it might have been improper, and in my judgment would have been improper, in 1892 to make a proposal to reduce the duties in favour of England unless we got something in return—because I thought, if we did so, we would place a weapon in the hands of the Cobdenites by which they could attack the great Imperial policy of preferential trade within the Empire—while that might have been a dangerous experiment to try in 1892, so great progress has been made, the Imperial sentiment, which after all is the vital force of the Empire, has become so much stronger since then, that I believe we may safely do now what we could not safely do then.

I now come to the last but one of the objections which I have to urge against this resolution, and which has obliged me to oppose it, and that objection is, that the resolution is in principle absolutely opposed to preferential trade of any kind with the mother country. The hon. Finance Minister has spoken of preferential trade. I wish to say with all respect to that hon. gentleman that preferential trade within the Empire has a certain well-defined acceptation. It was invented, if I may make use of the word, by those who had for years been advocating a certain policy, and was used by them for the purpose of expressing what that policy was. It is a technical term in Imperial politics; it has one meaning and one meaning only, and it is a meaning which the people of this country perfectly well understand. It does not mean the making of a reciprocity treaty with every nation in the world which agrees to enter into reciprocal terms with us, but it means preferential trade within the Empire as against the outside world, it means a preference in the British markets for British goods

against foreign goods. This is what the people understand it to mean; and when the hon. Finance Minister uses the term in any other way he, unintentionally, I am sure, confuses and misleads the public mind on this question. This proposal for reciprocal trade with all the rest of the world is not, the Government say, a fair exposition of the policy they have pursued. They say: we have done more than that; we have given a preference to England; there is to-day and has been for some time past an actual discrimination in Canada in favour of English goods. And they say, we should get credit for that. Well, I give them credit for it; in my humble way, I give them my meed of praise for it. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a question too great, too serious and too deep with me for trifling of any kind. I cannot consent to delude myself with regard to this question; and I ask myself, what is the prospective value to the Empire of this preferential trade existing now? How long will it endure? May it not disappear in a month? Is it not the result of a mere accident at the present moment? Is it not dependent upon the accident that no other country has yet demanded from the Controller of Customs that he should decide whether or not it has the right to enter its goods under this reciprocal clause? If countries do come forward, and if those countries are admitted, as many of those best-informed on this side of the House maintain, they must be admitted, what becomes of this preference to British goods? It vanishes into thin air—it is gone. It is not such a preference as I can accept for one moment, in face of the principle laid down in the resolution itself, which is a principle directly opposed to preferential trade within the Empire. Therefore, from that point of view, on the ground that this resolution is in principle opposed to preferential trade of any kind with the mother country; whether it be a preferential trade asking for a 'quid pro quo,' or whether it be a preferential trade without asking for a 'quid pro quo'; on that ground I must object to this resolution.

Then my last objection to the course pursued by the Government is this: that by the course they have pursued—even supposing this were a preference for the United Kingdom alone—by the course they have pursued, they have, as the leader of the Opposition has said, weakened the hands of those in the mother country who are desirous of giving preferential trade to the colonies in the markets of England, as against the outside world. Any one who will take the trouble to look at the remarks Lord Salisbury has made from time to time, in which he has pointed out how helpless England is in endeavouring to arrange reciprocal terms of trade with foreign countries, just because she has given away all she has to give; will see the force of the objection that I make to the policy which

the Government has pursued. Now, I wish to say most respectfully to the Government, that they have rushed into this question of preferential trade, as they call it, without having properly considered the question, without having properly studied the question, without having had faith in the policy, and they have rushed into it in such a way as to place themselves in antagonism to the policy that has been laid down by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his Budget speech, told us distinctly, that he had no faith in preferential trade as it has always heretofore been understood. He told us, that when we made an offer to England it was coupled with conditions which could not be accepted by England, that we asked England to put a duty upon her imports which she would not impose. But if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) had looked into this question a little more deeply, he would have found that Mr. Chamberlain himself has laid down in the strongest possible way, the principles of this very policy which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) used to laugh at, and which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; I suppose because of the ancient laughter of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) has considered a policy very little to be valued. Just let me read to the Finance Minister, what Mr. Chamberlain has said in regard to this matter. In his famous speech of the 25th of March, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain points out that a proposition had been made by the colonies for the purpose of establishing a commercial union within the Empire, and he says :

Such a proposition is one that, at any rate, ought to receive respectful consideration.

He quotes the resolution of the colonial conference, and he says :

The principal resolution, principal at all events in regard to its importance, which was passed at this conference, was the following :—

“That this conference records its belief in the advisability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.”

And he goes on to deal with the matter, and he himself makes a proposal. Before he comes to that proposal he does not say that the proposal that the colonies have made is one that is altogether ridiculous in principle—although the proposal that he specially refers to, he has misapprehended. It was a proposal that I made in this House in 1896 with regard to raising a revenue for defensive purposes, and Mr. Chamberlain does not seem to have realized that at all. But, he says, even that proposal of a small tariff against all the world is one that ought to receive careful consideration. He also says, that the colonies ought to “better their

offer,” and then he goes on to make his own proposal :

My fourth proposition is : That a true Zollverein for the Empire, that a free trade established throughout the Empire, although it would involve—

I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to this :

—although it would involve the imposition of duties against foreign countries, and would be in that respect a derogation from the high principles of free trade and from the practice of the United Kingdom up to the present time, would still be a proper subject for discussion, and might probably lead to a satisfactory arrangement, if the colonies, on their part, were willing to consider it.

So that you see, Mr. Chamberlain accepts the principle of protection against the outside world. He speaks in that sentence of free trade within the Empire, but he modifies the proposal later on by referring to duties levied for the purpose of revenue only. He accepts the principle of the policy of protection against all the world, with a revenue tariff inside the Empire. I say, Sir, that the proposal which is brought down by the Government here, and which is placed before this House for its acceptance, is in principle diametrically opposed to the principle which has been laid down by the Right Hon. the Colonial Secretary.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) told us the other day, that the Government had solved the difficulty. Well, if the difficulty was so easily solved as that, it would not be a very great difficulty. The difficulty which my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) has solved is simply this : that he has reduced duties in favour of any country which will give us reciprocal trade terms, and he says, that if the favoured-nation treaties are denounced, that that will give a preferential trade to England. In the first place, I must say to my hon. friend (Mr. Davies), that it will not give a preferential trade to England, because other countries can come in under the resolution, and in the next place I say, that if the difficulty had only consisted in the reducing of duties in favour of the mother country, it would be a very simple problem that had to be solved. The difficulty does not lie there at all. The difficulty lies in this : that we have got to bring the views of free traders and the views of protectionists within the Empire, near enough to one another to enable us to frame a policy that will be accepted by both. I do not see where, the proposition of my hon. friends opposite, in any degree comes near to the solution of that very great difficulty.

My own belief is, as I said here in 1896, that the line of least resistance is to be found in Mr. Hoffmeyer's proposal, which is a proposal that the Empire should impose a moderate duty against all foreign countries

upon all lines of goods, with some few exceptions, and that the proceeds of that duty should go for purposes of Imperial defence and inter-communication. That is a proposition which might well be accepted by free traders in England, because the duty would be merely for revenue purposes; and so soon as that duty was imposed, it would imply preferential trade in the markets of England for the colonies. However, I do not wish to elaborate that proposition. I do not wish to weary this committee at this late stage of the debate. I have to thank hon. members extremely for their great kindness in having listened to me so far; and I would only like, in conclusion, to say one other word, and that is this, that it does seem to me we are at the present time engaged in one of the very gravest and most important works that any Parliament could lay its hands to. It seems to me that at the present time we are liable to do great good or to do great harm. If we, standing on these latter years of this nineteenth century, look back down the long vista of the ages, we shall see it strewn with the mouldering wrecks of empire—empires which one by one have risen and flourished, and faded and withered away. They have borne within them the taint of an inevitable decay; and, as the centuries rolled upon them, they sank into decrepitude and death. But Mr. Chairman, man never before saw such an Empire as ours. In the vast fertile regions that own the sceptre of the Queen, and that are peopled by the overflow of the parent state, there exist the conditions of an almost perennial youth, such as no Empire has ever before possessed. The Empire of England at the end of a thousand years is still young. It is so young that we are not able in any degree commensurately to anticipate the majestic proportions which it will eventually assume. All the world round there are British hearts yearning, and there are British minds planning, for a means to draw these great self-governing, kindred communities of ours more closely together. All the world round there are also jealous eyes and hostile hearts watching and hoping that we shall fail in our efforts; and there are not wanting those who, if a favourable opportunity offered, would very gladly strike a blow at our Imperial power before it is completely organized. It seems to me, therefore, that the question for us to consider is whether we are worthy of the occasion, whether we are worthy of the trust that has been placed upon us, whether we are prepared to lay aside party considerations, and join together for the purpose of sustaining and maintaining and developing the Empire to which we are all so proud to belong. That seems to me to be the question; and whether we can agree on this resolution or not, I do hope, at all events, that in the future we shall endeavour to view these great Imperial questions from a plane

somewhat higher than that which is occupied by mere party discussions; because, after all, where is the member of this House, or where is the Canadian or the British born subject of the Queen to be found who, for the sake of a poor, paltry party advantage would risk the future of his race?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would venture to move this resolution, but before doing so, lest I should in any way have misrepresented the position of the Government, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Finance Minister a question, which I hope he will kindly answer, and that is, whether the Government are or are not in favour of preferential trade with the mother country, in the sense of giving her better terms in our markets than we accord to foreign nations.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think the best answer I can give my hon. friend is to say that that is exactly what we are doing at the present moment.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman might, I think, treat the question a little more gravely. I have already explained that the preference which is accorded to the mother country in our markets at the present moment is a preference which is not a preference in principle at all; but it is simply an accidental preference, which may be swept away at any moment that any country shows that its tariff is as favourable to us as our Schedule "D" is to that country. I asked my hon. friend a grave question with reference to a very grave matter. I asked him whether, on principle, the Government were prepared to accord to the mother country better treatment in our markets than they would accord to foreign countries—whether they were in favour of discriminating in the markets of Canada in favour of the mother country, as against the foreigner, all things otherwise being equal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How can my hon. friend gravely—as he has used the word—ask the question, when that is exactly what the Government are doing at the present moment. And if it shall prove in the end that we are not able to give that preference to the products of the mother country, it will not be through any act of ours; it will be through the interpretation placed on those treaties by Her Majesty's Government; and if Her Majesty's Government say that we cannot have preferential trade with the mother country, my hon. friend, as a loyal Britisher, will, I suppose, say that Her Majesty's Government are the best judges of that matter. So far as the Government can deal with that matter, we desire to have preferential trade with the mother country, and we have it at this moment.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not want to be importunate in any way, but my hon. friend has really misapprehended my question altogether. I say: all other things being equal,

we are not giving the mother country a preference. We are giving to the mother country a preference, because we say she alone fulfils the conditions of this offer which you make to the whole world, but what I want to know is, whether you will make a better offer to her than to any other country in the world.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really think the hon. gentleman will find that I cannot answer his question more fully than I have.

Mr. McNEILL. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and am glad to find that I have not misrepresented, in any degree, the position of the Government. The hon. gentleman refuses to say that he will make a better offer to England than to any other country in the world.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am saying that we are doing it now.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman say that he is making a better offer to the mother country than to the other countries?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that we are now admitting the goods of the mother country on better terms than those of any other country.

Mr. McNEILL. But I am speaking of the offer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On this side we prefer to deal with the substance rather than with the shadow.

Mr. McNEILL. I beg to move:

That all the words in the resolution after the word "that" be struck out, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

That in the opinion of this House it is advisable that a customs arrangement be effected between the United Kingdom and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries; that while it regards a reduction in duties of 25 per cent, without any compensating advantages in the markets of the United Kingdom, as greater than the industries of Canada can at present safely endure, yet, as an initial step in the direction of a commercial union of the Empire and in recognition of the many benefits conferred upon Canada, this House will make an appreciable and unconditional reduction in the duties it levies on goods the produce of the United Kingdom only, so soon as the Government and Parliament of the United Kingdom are prepared to take advantage of such reduction.

Mr. KENDRY. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any length, but cannot allow so important a question as this, one of the most important that has ever come before this country, to pass without expressing, as briefly as possible, my views on the subject. We have before us tariff resolutions, the meaning of which I doubt whether any hon. member

Mr. McNEILL.

of this House fully understands. The most important part of the resolution before us is that giving power to the Controller of Customs to make at any time tariff arrangements with any other country. This is certainly a very extraordinary power to put in the hands of the administrator of any department, and one the carrying out of which may affect this country very materially. It will affect this country in this way. Take any business man who contemplates investing his capital in any Canadian industry, he has to do so, facing the possibility of the Controller of Customs at any day giving such effect to this clause as will compel this intending manufacturer to close down his establishment. It is evident therefore that a proposition involving such a serious contingency as this is one which we are bound to consider very carefully before giving it a place in our statutes. I do not know of any other Government which arrogates to itself such power except perhaps the government of the United States. The President of the United States, I believe, has power at any time to alter any part of the tariff at short notice, and certainly it seems that those hon. gentlemen opposite, in framing this proposition, have copied from the United States. Throughout this discussion, what do we find? We find that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who advocate this proposal of preferential trade very strongly, do so from a personal point of view. One in particular, the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) declared that he favoured it because he preferred it to the National Policy. And why did he prefer it to the National Policy? Because it does not affect his own particular industry. In that industry he has no competition from England, and he has taken the resolution as applying solely to British goods, and so long as it is confined to British goods and is not applied to the United States whose manufacturers are his competitors, he is prepared to support it. That is the statement he made in this House, and that statement shows that those gentlemen opposite who are supporting the resolution are actuated solely from the selfish point of view of their own particular interests. But what we want in this country is that our tariff legislation should be in the interests of all concerned and not legislation which is suitable only to particular interests. There can be no disguising the fact that a great many manufacturing industries in this country will be injuriously affected, and affected very materially, by this preference, even if it be restricted to England, and for my part I am in favour of consulting first our own interests, even if that should involve our discriminating against England. We are sent to this House to legislate in our own interests and not in the interests of any other

country ; and while I am as loyal as any other man in this House, I am loyal to Canada first before any other country. If we want to build this country up, we have got to build it up on the policy of looking, in the first place, to the interests of our own country. The representatives of other countries look after the interests of their own country ; and I am here to speak in the interests of Canada. So far as the tariff is concerned, I would not make any concessions to any country, I do not care what it is. I will look after our own interests first. It is not my intention to go into the details of the preferential clause, but I wish to call the attention of the Government to one or two points. Suppose, as the Finance Minister says, Germany and Belgium might come in, what would be the effect upon our labouring classes ? There can be no question that from one end of the country to the other they will have their wages reduced. Why ? Simply because we cannot otherwise compete with these countries, because these countries have cheaper labour. We know very well that it does not cost the labouring classes there so much to live, because they do not live so well as our people and the people of the United States. I have had some experience in this matter, having visited some of these places. I know exactly how the labouring people there live. I have interested myself in manufacturing in this country, and I do not want to see the labouring classes of this country reduced to the same position as those of Germany and Belgium. Canada is one of the best countries in the world and I think we should protect our own people. My hon. friend from South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) expressed himself as quite satisfied with this tariff. I can tell him that the farmers come nearly thirty miles to the town of Peterborough to sell their grain, because it is a manufacturing town.

An hon. MEMBER. A home market.

Mr. KENDRY. It is a home market—exactly. And what we want to do in this country is to build up the towns. That is in the interest of the farmer as well as the workingman. It is something in which we can all work together. If this preferential clause is carried, its effect will be to stop 50 per cent of the machinery in important lines in this country. It is one of the most important questions we have ever had brought before this country. Other items in the tariff also are very important. For instance, there is the proposal to abolish the duty on corn. I have talked to a number of farmers in the vicinity of my home, and I find nearly all opposed to free corn, because they grow a great deal of coarse grain, oats, &c., and they say that this will kill their market for that class of grain. Of course, it will be a benefit to some gentlemen sitting on the other side

of the House who are feeders of cattle ; but I think that the farmers of this country will not thank the Government for this change. It has also been brought out in the public press that the effect of free corn will be to reduce the quality of our pork. At present the quality of our pork is such that it commands 1¼ cents per pound more than the American pork in the English market. I have a word of comment on what was said by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost). He said :

We have ten thousands of men, workingmen, honest, upright men driven out of this country through the action of the so-called National Policy. In 1894 we saw in one line of goods and in the seventh largest industry in Canada, the agricultural implement business, we saw the duties reduced from 35 per cent to 20 per cent, which threw out of work one thousand men in that industry alone, and they had either to go into another line of trade to make a living or leave the country altogether.

Thus we see that the hon. gentleman says that the lowering of a duty from 35 per cent to 20 per cent had driven a thousand men in one industry alone out of the country. But the hon. gentleman said that he favoured a preferential tariff, that it was the best thing that this Government had done. According to the hon. gentleman's own reasoning, if the preferential tariff cuts off 25 per cent of the duties, the effect must be to throw thousands and thousands out of work. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should speak both ways on this question. The tariff question has two sides for the hon. gentleman, and the side that suits him is the side that suits his pocket. I am a protectionist, and I do not wish to disguise that fact. My hon. friend from South Victoria is also a protectionist, as he advocated the duty on agricultural machinery. I am in favour of that, as I have always been. The hon. gentleman says that this tariff should be imposed because we must have revenue. But why should not the same apply to everything ?

Mr. McHUGH. I would advocate protection to the hon. gentleman's industry if they would sell at the same prices that foreign producers sell to our consumers.

Mr. KENDRY. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McHugh) that in the industry in which I am engaged—though there is some shoddy coming into the country, and I except that—we sell our goods as cheaply as any concern in any country. But I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that we are paying our labourers to-day \$2 where they only pay \$1, and we make a better article. Now, if this hon. gentleman wishes to compete with them, he wants us to get our labour down 50 per cent.

Mr. McHUGH. No.

Mr. KENDRY. Well, that is exactly his argument.

Mr. McHUGH. What protection has the labourer against foreign labour coming in ?

Mr. KENDRY. I say he has this protection, that when he comes to this country we give him \$2, where he only gets \$1 in the old country. I think that is good protection.

Mr. ROGERS. How can a farmer pay a labourer \$2 a day ?

Mr. KENDRY. I see the hon. gentleman wants to get a trunk full of stationery. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) says in reference to the farmers—I have in my hand the report of his speech :

Have not the farmers to compete with the cheap labour of India, of the Argentine Republic and of other countries? How can we expect to do it, when at the same time farming does not pay unless the family are employed on the farm?

Now, the hon. gentleman's argument is this, that labour is paid higher in this country than it is paid in the Argentine Republic. I take him on his own argument, and I must say that we protect the farmer's wheat in this country. Suppose we bring our wheat from the Argentine Republic, will that not lower the price of wheat in this country? And so with pork, and beef, and corn, and everything in that line. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish again to remind the Government that they will find out later on, if this preferential clause goes into effect, giving 25 per cent advantage to the mother country, that it will have the effect of closing up nearly 50 per cent of the manufactories in this country, and I must oppose the resolution for that among other reasons.

Mr. McCLURE. I do not wish to encourage any further discussion of this question, but at the same time I do feel like giving hon. gentlemen opposite this much encouragement by saying that there was a time when I entertained some slight doubt as to whether I could conscientiously support the resolutions proposed by the Government. I have not been worrying myself as to the reasons the Government had for bringing these resolutions down, I felt it my duty as a member of this House not to worry myself about the reasons that induced the Government to come to this conclusion, but as a private member of the House, I desired to look conscientiously at these resolutions, and to see if I could justify myself in voting for them. I confess, that while I had made up my mind to vote for the resolutions, when I heard the hon. leader of the Opposition and several of his followers so emphatically and positively assert such strong opposition to them, I did begin, as a new member of this House, to be a little shaky in regard to the exact meaning of these resolutions. In the first place the leader of the Opposition started with the rather startling proposition that this clause was unconstitutional. Well, that was rather a sweeping assertion,

Mr. KENDRY.

and I did not desire that my first vote in this Parliament should be cast in favour of anything unconstitutional. I did not want to get into trouble. I have no doubt that the feeling that most pervades the mind of a new member of this House, is the fear that he will do something in violation of some rule, or trample on some particular section of the constitution and get himself into trouble; and I thought perhaps I was approaching the verge of some such terrible disaster as that. But when I followed the hon. gentleman and found that he was simply making a sweeping assertion unsupported by any arguments that appealed to my reason, I began to feel a little more comfortable. I recalled to my mind a statement that I read some years ago when I used to indulge in reading light literature. In reading the appendix to one of Lytton's novels where he gives directions how to be your own rogue, he says that when you meet a man in argument and he gets the better of you, and you can find no reason on earth to overcome him, you simply appeal to the laws of nature. If he presumes to doubt that those are the laws of nature, or to express any doubt as to whether you are a good expounder of the laws of nature, simply lay your hand upon your heart, look up, and impressively say: I feel it here. So I observed that the hon. gentleman, finding that there was no other argument to urge against this resolution, boldly asserted that it was unconstitutional, and left it there.

An hon. MEMBER. Where did he put his hand ?

Mr. McCLURE. I do not know where he put his hand, but I know where he has been accustomed to put his hand. I also noticed in addition that while the leader of the Opposition asserted that this was unconstitutional, none of his followers took up that line of argument. His first lieutenant, when he followed, did not assert that those resolutions were unconstitutional, but he took the ground that they were going to admit the products, not only of Great Britain, but of all these countries that had favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. Well, again I began to be frightened. Then we had that followed up by what we have been repeatedly told was an unanswerable legal argument by the hon. gentleman for Halifax (Mr. Borden). Now, I do not presume for a moment to discuss legal questions with the hon. gentleman for Halifax; I have no doubt that the argument that hon. gentleman presented was as clear, as lucid, and as emphatic an argument as could be presented upon that side of the question by any hon. gentleman among the Opposition, for I know his ability, and know what he is capable of doing. I am not going to argue the legal question, but I simply call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this fact, that no speaker has addressed himself to that phase of the question but has

admitted that we in Canada have to-day the right to regulate our own tariff. Time and again hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted it. They did not need to admit it. It cost some blood years ago to establish that doctrine on this continent, and time and time again it has been acknowledged in peaceful documents since that day. We have the right to regulate our tariff. In that view, in what position do we stand? In this year of grace 1896—

Some hon. MEMBERS. 1897.

Mr. McCLURE. 1896 was an important year to hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the House, and I beg their pardon for accidentally referring to it. In this year of grace 1897, we have had a further experience of our right to regulate our own tariff. Yet we are told when the Government come down with the tariff and say that on certain articles we will place a certain duty, the leader of the Opposition and all his supporters rise and say, you cannot do it. Why? Because in years gone by, when Canada was little more than a scattered settlement on the edge of a vast wilderness, somebody in the old country entered into a treaty between England and a foreign country, and according to the terms of that treaty we cannot make such a tariff as we would like to frame. That may not be a strictly legal answer to hon. gentlemen opposite; that may not be the line of argument on which the Government proceeded, and I may be told I am preaching disloyalty. I may be told, where is your loyal proposition, then? I am not concerned as to whether this resolution is one of acknowledged loyalty or not, I am concerned whether the resolution is in the interest of the country and whether we are bound by this treaty, but I am not going to argue these points. To me it seems utterly inconsistent with the proposition that Canada has the right to regulate its own tariff, to argue that when we undertake to do so, we are bound by a treaty made in 1865, in the making of which we have no voice and in regard to which we have no interest. But hon. gentlemen opposite very soon abandoned that attack on the resolution, and took refuge in the assertion, which one hon. member after another has repeated and reiterated,—we cannot understand the resolution. That seems to be the chief argument they have to present against it—that they do not understand it, and they have tried their hand at framing amendments which they thought would make it plain, but hon. gentlemen only succeeded in confusing it. Again they shifted their ground, and divided into two factions. One body accused the Government of adopting a policy of protection, and charged the present Government with inconsistency. They said that while hon. members on the Government side preached that protection was

a false doctrine and advocated free trade, when they came into power they adopted the National Policy. The next body rise and bemoan the fact that the Government should strike down the protection given to our industries, that they should jeopardise their existence by leaving them open to the competition of the pauper labour of Europe and they declare that our industries will die in consequence. Both those arguments are presented. I fail to understand what hon. members of the Opposition mean. I do not think, however, I should worry myself as to what they mean. I only say this: I came to this House understanding that this Government came into power pledged not to give the country absolute free trade, although if they had done so they would have had my support—and I warn hon. gentlemen opposite that although we do not have a free trade Government there is growing to-day a party that has faith in the principles of free trade—but being called on to adopt a policy to meet the country's needs, I believe that the Government to-day although not giving the country a free trade policy is giving the people what they promised; they are striking the first blow at protection and are heading the country in the direction of an era which will give us a policy of free trade. I do not for one moment say that this tariff is an ideal tariff, that it is a tariff I should like to see adopted here. And why is it not? If to-day there is such a strong element of protection in the policy propounded, who is to blame for it? Who introduced the policy of protection, that tied and shackled our industries until to-day we do not stand in the proud position we occupied in 1878 when Canada stood free with hands untied as regards its tariff policy; but to-day, as an hon. gentleman whose name must be remembered, said, "we stand with our hands tied and our future compromised," and if the Government is charged to-day with inconsistency for not having given free trade to the country it is because our hands are tied and our future compromised by eighteen years of the rankest kind of protection, diverted from the original policy of protecting our native industries into a gigantic scheme of corruption for keeping a certain political party in power. Then hon. gentlemen, as a last resort, finding none of these attacks availed, say—they fear this resolution because it gives too much power to the Government. Such a declaration coming from hon. gentlemen that proposed and carried out the National Policy, is amazing. Those hon. gentlemen have undertaken to speak in the name of the business men of the country. They have no right to speak in the name of the business men of Canada. The business men rejected those hon. gentlemen in 1896, and I believe one reason was because of the arbitrary and extreme way in which they as a Gov-

ernment exercised their control of the tariff. If there was one feature of the National Policy worse than another it was the power it placed in the hands of the executive to interpret the tariff law so as to give favours here and there when it suited the Government. There never was a tariff in this country that placed such enormous powers in the hands of the executive and its officers as the National Policy introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. Some examples were pointed out last night, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point in this resolution to anything like the power placed in the hands of the Government compared with that exercised by the late Government for purposes which they knew so well how to exercise in their own interests. So after all these attacks I have to thank hon. gentlemen opposite that they have convinced me, notwithstanding all their ability, all their zeal for party advantage, for the workingmen and for the down-trodden and suffering manufacturer, that their objections are groundless and have taken away any doubt I entertained in respect to the soundness of this resolution, so that I have now no fear of trampling on the constitution or ruining any one in this country.

Mr. GANONG. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had no need whatever to tell the House that he had not changed his mind in regard to the tariff policy, for, if I mistake not, it was the National Policy that elected him.

Mr. McCLURE. No.

Mr. GANONG. It was the duty on coal that gave the hon. gentleman a seat in this House to-day. There is no hon. gentleman sitting opposite who believes that the hon. gentlemen would have been elected in June last on a straight trade policy. I do not propose, however, to deal with this matter at present; but I desire to ask the Controller of Customs a question to which I hope he will give a reply. It is an inquiry that is quite pertinent in connection with the resolution we are discussing, and it is in regard to the granite business. Some of our Canadian granite men have been importing what is known as Quincy granite, and what they want to know is: Whether that Quincy granite can be shipped from the city of Boston to Aberdeen, there to be finished and polished, and sent back into Canada under the preferential clause. Will the Controller of Customs please answer that?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I think it would be better if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) would call around at my office and we will discuss that.

Mr. GANONG. We can scarcely expect anything more definite than that from the hon. gentleman. We have been for days trying to get these hon. gentlemen on the

Mr. McCLURE.

Treasury benches to give us information on these points, but they are all of the same artful-dodger class.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We are considering the preferential tariff just now, and, when we reach the granite item, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) will allow us, we will discuss it fully.

Mr. GANONG. We will also discuss it on this item, for it is quite pertinent to the question before the House. I simply ask if under these conditions granite will come under the preferential clause. It is business and it is the business of the Government to tell us. I shall not say, Mr. Chairman, like some other hon. gentlemen, that I do not purpose taking up much of your time; you apparently have lots of it; but, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has referred to matters away back in the Mackenzie Administration, I shall also have to speak of them in connection with the matter I am now discussing. The granite business was started under the Mackenzie Government in 1873. I may say that there is a history to the granite business, and it differs from the general industries of this country, because of the fact that it is the history, to some extent, of the Liberal party. It is not written, as it has been in many instances, in broken promises and repudiated policies, but it is written on the face of those grand old granite hills of the county of Charlotte. Now, Sir, I have been perfectly frank in stating that this industry was started under the Mackenzie Administration, but the year that saw the demise of the Mackenzie Administration also saw the death of that granite business. It may have been a strange coincidence, but it is nevertheless the fact, that the day that marked the death of that Government also marked the death of this industry. It is not only in the mountain passes of the west that the failure of that Liberal Government is marked in broken promises to carry out the contract with British Columbia, but it is also marked in the mountains of the east. Monuments are frequently erected which are worthy of consideration, and some of these monuments have inscriptions upon them for the benefit of friends that follow. I believe that the Liberal party might write on its monuments, both in the east and in the west, such an inscription as can be found on a certain tombstone in a graveyard in eastern Canada, and which reads in this fashion:

Awake, asleep, at home, abroad,  
Protected still we are by God.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. GANONG. I have noted, as one of the results of this preferential tariff, or whatever else you may call it, a certain lot of parrot-like cries in this House, and I wonder if they are the product of this clause. They seem to come from the back benches you-

der, and occasionally we hear one from this corner of the House down here.

Mr. TALBOT. Carried.

Mr. GANONG. There he goes again. Now, Sir, as regards the trade policy, I believe that in no province of Canada were the issues fought out so squarely last June as in the province I have the honour to represent. We did not have so many outside questions down there, as they had in the other provinces. We were led to believe that the Liberal party were going to carry on the contest on the same old lines as since 1878, and that they were at liberty to use any old policy that was available, so long as they could get into power. That the Liberal party did, while the Conservative party carried out the campaign on the principles of the grand old National Policy. As an evidence of this, allow me to read you from the principal organ of the Liberal party in my province, with all due apology to the hon. member from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis). The St. John "Daily Telegraph" stated, on June 10th, 1896 :

The trade issue must ever be the principal one in Canada with parties constituted as they are, no matter how much it may be obscured for a time by other questions.

There is no uncertain sound in that, and it was on that policy that the elections were carried on in New Brunswick, with the result, as you see, that in almost every county where the trade question came to the surface, a Liberal-Conservative was elected. That applies to every constituency except the city and county of St. John, where a side issue intervened, and on which side issue, no doubt, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) could give us some information, if he were so inclined. In that constituency the side issue succeeded in defeating the Conservative candidates. Now, Sir, I wish to call your attention to a few New Brunswick counties that lie immediately along the American border, and, if there are any counties in this country where we can get an idea of the relative positions, it is in these counties. In the county of Victoria, you will note that the people still have confidence in their former member, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan). In the county of Carleton, we find that the people were tired of chasing Will-o'-the-wisp doctrines, and they sent another Conservative here, in the person of the Hon. F. H. Hale. When we come to the grand old county of Charlotte, we find that the National Policy also prevailed. In that county we had quite a spirited campaign, and we had the Liberal doctrines preached, not only by hirelings from St. John and other districts, but we had one imported from the city of Boston to help them out. That gentleman travelled over the county, particularly amongst the fishermen, and he could so readily tap his lachrymal glands that

his tears almost washed the soil from the face of the somewhat barren rocks. But, strange to say, on the evening of election day, the 23rd of June, that gentleman did not go to a free trade country. He skipped to the United States under a 40 per cent tariff, and he has not been heard from since. We had also the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) down there. He came into the county in the daytime, I believe, but he left in the middle of the night. He talked free trade for everything but granite, for he was in a granite town. But the opinion prevails there very strongly that he was sent out of the county rather hurriedly. There was a time in the past records of that county when the hon. member had some little difficulty with the late member for that county, and there was a feeling down there that his talk was not sufficiently in favour of the late member to induce them to agree very well; and as a consequence, the hon. member for King's left by night for St. John, not waiting for a train that was to come in in a very few hours. We had free trade advocates also along the shores of the islands. But when we got to the manufacturing town of Milltown, we had another hireling at \$10 a night to come down and tell the mill people that they need not be afraid, that they would be looked after. From a letter I received yesterday, I think the present Government are looking after them—in a rather unfortunate manner, however. But strange to say, there was one honest Liberal at that meeting in the person of the late Hon. A. H. Gillmor, the gentleman who was left out in the cold by his party. The gentleman who was brought there gave an elaborate discourse, telling the people practically about the beauties of the National Policy. True to his principles, Mr. Gillmor repudiated every word of it, saying that if the Government adopted such a policy he would resign the next day. Such were the policies we had to contend with in the county of Charlotte; but, after all, there was no difficulty. When we came to nomination day, what did we have? For six weeks we had this canvass of free trade; and why should not Mr. Gillmor talk free trade? Had he not come from the very feet of the prophet of reform? What did his chieftain say to him? We have it in his chieftain's own words, and he (Mr. Gillmor) knew whereof he was talking. His chieftain had said to him: "Our ideal is free trade. I propose that we shall follow England's example; we shall give you free trade." That was the talk that he had come down there with, because he had been educated in this school of reform. But, Sir, there came a date after the first of June when even the late member for Charlotte began to waver, for his chief organ published a letter which the hon. leader of the present Government had written to a Mr. Bertram, and one clause in that letter reads thus :

Whether a policy of absolute free trade would or would not be injurious to the manufacturing industries of this country, is a question I will not stop to discuss here. There is no occasion for such a discussion, as the intention of the Liberal party is not, and never was, to establish free trade in this country.

When the late member for Charlotte began to put that statement beside the education he had received here in Ottawa just a few weeks before, it made him rather shy, and he scarcely knew what to do. In his extremity, what did he do? He telegraphed to his chieftain to come down and reconcile his statements. But his chieftain was wiser than he; he did not come down. He had been up in the county of Victoria, and he concluded, from his experience there, that he had seen quite enough of New Brunswick for that trip. He knew that no French domination cry would take in the county of Charlotte. But when nomination day came, our friend the late candidate, the Hon. A. H. Gillmor, was just like the members on the other side of the House. When questioned as to what he would do, he simply said he proposed to follow Mr. Laurier. It did not make any difference what the policy was, he was going to swallow the dose.

There have been a few remarks made in regard to the speech of the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost). I must say I was surprised to hear that hon. member make the statement he did, and I would like to call his attention to it. He states:

We have seen thousands of men, workingmen, honest, upright men, driven out of this country through the action of the so-called National Policy.

That is the first statement that I have ever seen made just in that way. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can justify it. I claim that there has never been a man who has left Canada through the effect of the National Policy, and there is not a man on the Government benches to-day who can prove it. I take issue with the hon. gentleman in regard to that. What is the principle or purpose of the National Policy? He seems to have lost sight of that entirely. It is simply to conserve Canadian markets for Canadian products, made by citizens of Canada who are fed on food produced in Canada and clothed in the fabrics of Canadian factories, paying Canadian taxes. That is the principle of the National Policy; if the application of that principle was not right, these gentlemen have no right to claim that the principle was wrong. It was not the National Policy that drove people out of the country. I am not willing even to accept the statement that the National Policy drove them out because the duties were reduced from 35 to 20 per cent. The hon. gentleman looks as happy as any man on the Government benches; in fact, I think

Mr. GANONG.

he should look happier, but there is one clause in these resolutions which may set him squirming some day. They have virtually told him that while he had protection enough under the old policy, they are going to give him a little more. Can it be that they mean, some time before the next election, to put that patent Fielding thumbscrew upon him, and make him disgorge something of what he has taken from the farmers, according to the statements made before the election? It would be a sad thing to see. It would even be a sad thing to see the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) putting that thumbscrew on the senior member of the firm of William Paterson & Son. There are a good many of these hon. gentlemen who may be forced to feel that thumbscrew before that time. The hon. gentleman also made the statement that this tariff would change \$20,000,000 of imports from the United States into imports from Great Britain. He was not quite so wary as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) because that hon. gentleman did not make so broad a statement. He had examined the figures, and what did he touch? He barely touched the cotton industry, and he said that he was much mistaken in the British if they did not look a little more closely after that particular branch. I think that if the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) would examine the goods that are imported from the United States, he would somewhat change his opinion. We imported from the United States goods amounting to \$58,544,000, of which \$29,472,000 were free, and the hon. gentleman will scarcely say that any of those free goods are likely to come from Great Britain. Of the balance \$29,000,000 which are dutiable, \$20,000,000 consisted of the following goods: Coal, cotton, lumber, grease, tobacco, animals, hides, broom corn, fruit, hams, seeds, hops, cotton wastes, and other lines which we could not possibly import from Great Britain, leaving at the most \$9,000,000 that might be imported from the mother country. But the difficulty with the hon. gentleman was that he just reversed the figures. Instead of saying that at the outside only \$9,000,000 of these dutiable goods which we get from the United States could be imported from Great Britain, he said that \$20,000,000 might be imported from that country. But at the most there cannot be over \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 worth of these goods that Great Britain can send us, and the reason of that hon. gentlemen can readily understand. The manufacturers of wood are all imported from the United States as Great Britain cannot produce those, and besides that the conditions of the United States and Canada are so completely identical and the habits and methods of our people so completely alike that the classes of goods made in the United States are more desirable and will be purchased by our

citizens in preference to the manufactures of Great Britain.

An hon. gentleman a short time since, asked what it was had driven our people out of the country. Well, there are some conditions that I believe the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has not considered. There is no trade policy that can apply to Canada satisfactorily that does not take into full account the conditions in the country to the south of us. I care not what the Government may be, they must take into consideration that condition. In their old policy hon. gentlemen opposite said that we had lost our population under the National Policy, that our farmers had gone away from us. We admit that they have gone, and regret it, but where have they gone? To a free trade country? No, Sir, to the United States. Why have they gone to the United States? Not because the conditions of farmers are any better there than in Canada. Certainly not, because not five per cent of our people who have left Canada for the United States have engaged in the farming industry. They have simply gone because the conditions of trade and the rates of wages are more favourable there than in Canada, and to-day you will find our people in the industrial centres of the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If then the conditions with regard to farming are no better in the United States than in Canada, what have you to offer those people, under this new policy to induce them to come back and farm in Canada? Not one single advantage. Neither have you anything in your financial policy to tempt them to return, because, from the best evidence we have, the probability is a higher rate of taxation will prevail here than has ever prevailed in this country in the past. It is true that the United States, in the past thirty years, have received by far the greater portion of the immigration to this continent, and it may be pertinent to look to some of the causes of that great influx into that country. There are two principal causes. The first is, perhaps, that in Europe the socialistic element of discontents, made perhaps so to a great extent by the enforced military service on the continent, and more particularly by the low scale of living and low rates of wages, have the idea that the United States is a country where they can have their own sweet will; and judging from the police records and criminal statistics of that country, there is not much question but that they have attempted to exercise their own proclivities in that sense. I do not think that Canada wants any of that class of immigrants, but there is a better class which through published reports and statistics have been led to believe the United States is a better country to live in, simply because the rates of wages there are higher than in continental countries. Behind that, too, is the fact that they know the constitution of that

country is founded on the great charter given to the English people many years ago. We have not anything to induce these people to come to this country commensurate with the inducements held out to them by the United States. Our rates of wages are lower, and until they rise to the level or very nearly the level of the wages in the United States, we cannot look for much immigration to our country, and neither can we expect to keep our own people from going to the United States. In fact we have the evidence of this right here before us from the father of discord in political and religious matters in this country, the Hon. Thos. Greenway, of Manitoba. That hon. gentleman, in a recent interview, said:

The Hon. Thomas Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, was interviewed in Chicago recently, and is thus reported in the "Canadian American": "While in the United States the free grant lands are practically exhausted—as is proved by the overwhelming rush when any reservation is opened—there is lying across the border, in Manitoba, any quantity of free land, and also lands in settled portions at \$4 and \$5 an acre. When the Red Deer Reservation in Northern Minnesota was opened, not long ago, there was a rush of ten men for every lot, and yet, if they had only known it, about 50 miles north there lay across the border, in Manitoba, as fine land as the sun ever shone on for \$4 or \$5 an acre by purchase, besides much more, free to settlers, further north."

It is not any inducement which this Government holds out that Mr. Greenway looks to, but simply the fact that the United States are so filled to-day that they cannot accommodate any further immigration, and Mr. Greenway expects to get the surplus into Manitoba and the North-west.

As regards this question of preferential trade I agree with some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side that the Conservatives are a unit on the question of protection. We have stood during the past eighteen or twenty years on that ground, and to-day we are as firm upon it as we ever were. We can love our English and our Scotch artisans better than those of continental nations without question; but when it comes to Canadian artisans, then we say that the Canadian who does not love his own country and his own people better than other countries and other people is not a good Canadian citizen. We require in this country a continuance of the judicious tariff legislation which has in the past retained so many of our artisans, even under conditions so difficult, considering the intense competition we have had to the south of us. We have to consider the United States, because they are competitors with us not only for immigration, but in every product that we have in this country. We want immigration of a class such as will build up our country on a sound basis. If we are to have goods made by English, Scotch or German artisans, let us have them manufactured by

Englishmen, Scotchmen and Germans, living in Canadian homes, eating Canadian food, wearing Canadian fabrics and paying Canadian taxes. It is time our Parliament got upon a higher plane than that of mere politics, a national plane more fully recognizing protection to our labourers as the basis of our national life. That is the one thing that has tended to bring us credit, to establish greater confidence in us abroad and greater confidence among our people at home—that confidence which underlies the whole scheme of industrial development, and the attainment of a higher civilization.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am informed that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) addressed some remarks to me as representing King's County.

Mr. SPROULE. You are right.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend whom we have so often heard in committee and who seems to take command of the forces over there, says I am right. It must be so if he says so, for he occupies so much of his time telling this House and this country what they should do, that he could hardly be mistaken. Possibly, if he had to listen to himself as often as we do, less would be heard from him. I do not know why my hon. friend from Charlotte should criticise me in King's County. We all know King's County. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) knows it. The hon. gentleman says I fled from King's County. I never left King's County, but I stood by the county as I intend to stand by it and to hold King's against all comers as long as the breath of life is in me. I know the people there and understand their ideas. A great many gentlemen come there and claim on the platform that they are sons of King's, but they never came from King's.

Mr. LISTER. To whom do you refer?

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is not necessary for me to say to whom I refer, because the hon. gentleman whom I refer to knows it. He stood on the platform and said that he was a son of King's and he never was a son of King's. King's repudiated him, and will continue to do so. And, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Charlotte may say, King's County and New Brunswick will stand up in support of a Government that is loyal to the British Crown, loyal not only in words or in sentiment, but loyal in deed, ready at all times to stand by British ideas and British institutions. I have been surprised to see what my hon. friend from Charlotte says about the Americans. He lives on the American border, and it is hard to say which side they live on when they trade. There is a river flowing down there between the two countries, as you know, Mr. Chairman. The stream is rapid and goods coming down land sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other. You will find that the peo-

Mr. GANONG.

ple live in Calais and they live in St. Stephen and they are people of the same origin, and they are apt to forget even their obligations to their country as they carry their goods from side to side as their own interests direct. The hon. member for Charlotte should be glad that we make the tariff as we do, because great changes would be injurious to friends of his if not to himself. They have made a great deal of money out of the tariff, and I have no doubt that that will continue. My hon. friend from Charlotte did come from King's County, but he left King's County for King's County's good, or if not that, he left it for his own. I am glad and proud to know that he has prospered in Charlotte, though he did not prosper in King's. He points out that our young men go to the States to prosper. Why should they not? Great Britain raises a hardy race of sons, and they go all over the world, and wherever they go they make their mark and make their influence felt in foreign countries. But, because we bring down a tariff that will build up Canada, the hon. gentleman finds fault. I did not intend to say a word had not the hon. gentleman referred to me, but now that I am on my feet I may say that, in my opinion, the tariff is one that will benefit Canada. In our elections we asked the people to return us in order that we might introduce a tariff that would lead in the direction of free trade. Was there any man idiotic enough to think that we would have free trade at once, that we would take duties off at one swoop, that we would do away with revenue, and that so far as concerns the heavy burdens of expenditure laid upon the country by hon. gentlemen opposite through their reckless expenditure, we would raise that out of the wind? No, we told the people that we were going to inaugurate a policy that would lead in the direction of free trade, and assimilate our conditions to those of England, a country that has under a policy of what we call free trade, raising her revenue from a few articles, and is able to control the world, to take her fleet up the Dardanelles, and to restrain the Sultan, to take her army up the Nile and control the Malidi, to control India and to control the world. And I have always felt that after the Government was able to get time to regulate the affairs of the country, and get rid of the abuses which have grown up under their predecessors, they will give us a British policy. I was amused to hear my hon. friend from Charlotte criticise the Government and its policy. Does he mean to stand up and instruct men who have had vast experience, men who have been twenty or thirty years legislating in these halls—he with his limited experience? True, he has had success in Charlotte County. I wish I had been able to put sugar together and make what he

has made out of it. Had I been able to do so I would not have called down his censure, but I would have been able to sweeten the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite criticise, but their criticism is simply a wail that they are no longer in power. They cannot realize that they have been driven out by the people; they cannot realize that Canada is with the present Government, be it Liberal or Conservative. Be it Liberal or Conservative, what difference does it make? But it marks this fact, that the people have decided, that the sovereign will of this country has been pronounced, for a change of Government. They were tired of the past Administration, they are tired of the gentlemen who are getting up here to-day and bewailing the acts of this Government, and posing as statesmen. The people are tired of them. The people denounce them. Look at Nova Scotia; look at Quebec the other day; and so it will follow in New Brunswick. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) went down to Charlotte, and he told them that he was going to carry the county. At his meeting he would not even allow me to reply; he claimed I was an intruder, and quoted the saying that I was an unbidden guest at the feast. I asked him to allow me to speak under the blue canopy of heaven. When he was done, I asked in vain for the privilege to hire that hall and to speak, if there were only three remained to hear me; but he objected, and said that I should not speak, that it was his night, it was his occasion, it was his opportunity, and nobody should reply to him, nobody should be there to correct all the mis-statements that he made, which he knew were incorrect; and he did not dare to allow anybody to set the people right. Now to-night he sits there, and I will read him just a little piece of poetry which may be applicable. I take it from the "Globe." The picture, perhaps, is not quite as well drawn as it might be.

Mr. FOSTER. Not artistic.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, they could not make it artistic. They would need Hogarth's lines of beauty to make it artistic:

I represent the workin' man; I'm toll's unhappy son,

'Oo's lost 'is job an' seeks in vain to find another one;

My trade was cuttin' Cab'nit ice—

A well-paid job as I thought nice—

But since that fatal day in June I ain't a-cuttin' none.

Now, they have cut no ice so far. But the unhappy position they are in is this: They forget that there is a reading public; they forget that Great Britain, that we all love and revere, is watching us; they forget that the British press condemns them. When my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) talked about Canada for Canadians, I would have him understand that there is no such nation as Canada; there is the British na-

tion, the British Empire, and Canada is an integral portion of that Empire, just as much as India is, or Ceylon, or the Cape of Good Hope. England won't thank them for throwing all these ideas out about Canada for Canadians. England is willing to defend us to the last drop of her blood; England lends us her money; England has produced the finest statesmen in the world, the finest sailors and the finest soldiers. England has produced the Irishmen my hon. friend speaks of, and the Scotchmen and the Englishmen. England will continue to produce them, and to send them here. I do think that when these remarks of these hon. gentlemen—although, perhaps, the press will not take the trouble to cable them over to England; they have cabled them over so often that the story has become threadbare—but I do believe that, if they should ever reach England, English statesmen will look on the utterances of these hon. gentlemen with any respect. England has discredited them. England has placed a star on their breasts, England has given them titles, and what thanks have they given England for these? They have simply got up here and opposed the Governor General. I saw the "Sun" newspaper, which my hon. friend for York was editor of for a time. It was his organ, it gave his name as editor, and what does it say? It finds fault with us in this House because we did not pitch into the Governor General and the vote for the Governor General's house at Rideau. Why should we? They left us embarrassed with it; they built the Government House—or if they did not build it, they repaired it. They have placed the necessity for it on the Government of this country. I voted for it, it is true, because I would vote for anything that is right in the way of paying legitimate expenses. It is time enough when we get a new Governor General to make a new bargain with him, if we choose; but for us to repudiate the bills of to-day, which hon. gentlemen opposite placed upon this country—it is not our duty so to do. I will tell my hon. friend about his Government House business. He pointed out, as a temperance leader, when he addressed our people, that his whole heart, his whole life, was bound up in that great temperance cause, that he would die for it. The hon. gentleman will not drink rum himself, but he knows that it gave him his election, he knows the value of it well; and the whole country knows that the rum was bailed out by the gallon for him, and what I say I can prove. I showed, on the hustings platform, that all this expenditure for champagne glasses and wine glasses, and decanters, labelled brandy, and gin, and rum, he should have paid for himself. I pointed out at that time that the expense should have never been incurred. They said, if this country is to be charged with decanters, and wine glasses, and labels marked brandy,

and gin, and rum, and there is no liquor in them, what is the charge for? Where is the charge for the liquor they drank? Because they did not buy wine glasses and decanters for nothing. But he was very ingenious in explaining it. He tried to explain to the people that they were gum bottles, moisteners, so charged in the public accounts, but the people would not credit it. I pointed out to my hon. friend, and I pointed out to the meeting, that it was under the head of moisteners. Now, my hon. friend represented strongly that it was not moisteners, but I think the people believed it was.

Mr. KAULBACH. It was only the spirit of the resolution.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, my hon. friend can go down to his constituents and talk that way. What we have got before us to-day is a change of Administration, and it was time it came. It does not make any difference who got in or who got out, so long as the floor was swept. That floor was swept completely. There is no use of my hon. friend discussing what I did, or what anybody else did, we are only here for the time being; we are making history, and some are making very poor history, because they will find that, as the ball rolls and the wheel goes round, Canada will not stand still. The working classes that my hon. friend pretends to champion, have no confidence in him. They have no confidence in him in New Brunswick. Take the result in Queens county. My hon. friend went from pillar to post, and he was left literally without a corporal's guard.

Mr. COWAN. Did they know him in York?

Mr. DOMVILLE. They knew him in York, but I am afraid they will know him no more in York. As I was saying, as the ball rolls round and the wheel goes round, so will my hon. friend go from York to find another constituency, and I think he is correct, because New Brunswick at the next election will make a good showing for itself. The tariff, perhaps, is not all that we should like. There is no question that you cannot serve every interest in this Dominion at the same time and in the same way, according to what they would wish. But do hon. gentlemen opposite think that we are so stupid, or that the people are so blind as to be deceived when a herring is drawn across the track in order to raise ill-feeling and animosity? No, Sir, the people are not stupid, the people know we have got to get out of the difficulty that we are in. They are hopeful to-day. I was down to my county, the great old county of King's, the other day, which the member for York used to represent, and there I found they were perfectly satisfied with the efforts we were making. We told them what we had done about the duties. We said: We have taken a step in the right direction; there is so much off coal oil; more will follow. We

Mr. DOMVILLE.

are not going to ruin Ontario by at once shutting up her industries. We talked about spirits and alcohol, which my hon. friend from York is so much interested in, and I showed them that we had put 15 cents a gallon on that, and they said it was a step in the right direction, unless we took it off altogether.

What do they want? Do they want to get into power? That is impossible. They do not realize that there is a race to be run; they have had eighteen years of solid comfort. They do not realize that to-day they are unable to send people over the Intercolonial Railway with free passes to the tune of several thousands in number. They do not realize that they cannot have returning officers at their back, that they cannot make up the lists and carry out the elections as they please. They are gone for some time. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has got to eat the bitter fruit. The hon. gentleman has played a hand that never was played in this country before. He has spoken in this House for the whole of Canada; he has imagined there was no wealth except what was in his pocket. With what result? He is a lone man to-day, taking up the time of the House and costing the country a great deal of money while entering protests. The other day he took up an item of \$50, and said: We must know for what these \$50 are intended before we can go into this extravagance. He dwelt on this \$50 item, and yet not long ago the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were using the Intercolonial Railway to the tune of thousands of dollars to convey voters to the polls. Will the hon. gentleman deny it? No; because the proof is not very far off, if it is necessary to produce it. At all events, let hon. gentlemen opposite be patriotic. Let them remember they are out of office to-day by the will of the people, and the people have a say in this country. They are not bound to one man, but they desire the country to be managed in their interests. They placed the Government in power, believing that they will introduce a policy which will in the long run be beneficial. Let hon. gentlemen opposite give the Government a fair trial. Let them try to keep quiet and not seek to turn out the Government at once; let them show they are statesmen and willing to wait, and allow this party to show what it can do, and if this party fails to carry out its policy and its principles and commits errors and mistakes, to use no strong words, such as were committed by hon. gentlemen opposite, then the people will be prepared to declare that the party in power have not fulfilled their promises, have not done their duty, and there are no hon. members on this side of the House who will then be prepared to endorse the Government for a single hour. But we have faith that the Government will fulfil their pledges. Did hon. gentlemen opposite ever want free trade? I will go back to

1878, before the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) came to this country. Why was the National Policy introduced at that time? It was because it was necessary to protect the trade of Canada against the United States: it was because we said, if you will not allow our people to play in your yard, we will not allow yours to play in ours. We desire free trade at the present time, but we have been met with hostility on the part of the United States. We could not throw down our barriers and allow American goods freely to come in, but we have to meet them with a measure of justice; and to-day we have to secure two objects: one is to keep together the trade we have and prevent American goods entering our market except on fair terms; and the next is to deal generously with the mother country. The press of England to-day is congratulating Canada that under the present Premier we have shown our willingness to approach the trade question in a spirit of generosity and give preferential terms to Great Britain. Do hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with provisions to allow English goods to come in under preferential rates? If our conditions were such as to permit it, I would be willing to allow all English goods to come in free of duty and allow England to have our market. I believe in our farmers, I believe in my friends the Patrons, and if our farmers could get agricultural implements cheaper, they would be able to produce cheaper, and we would become a shipping country; but if our tariff conditions make productions dearer here than elsewhere our farmers are handicapped. The common market for Canada is England. Canada, the United States and the rest of the world ship to England, which redistributes our products. If we could produce cheaply here, we would be able to give employment to the sons of our farmers and keep them in the country; but if we are going to place this country in the hands of combines, if we are going to allow the money interests to control our industries, then we are not adopting free trade or protection, but we are simply allowing certain men, as was allowed by the late Government, which fostered them—excuse the pun—to control the production, and our people become simply hewers of wood and drawers of water. We must assure the world by this tariff that we are in dead earnest. We want to let England and the rest of the world see that Canada is the leading colony of the Empire, that the people are not Canadians at one time and British at another as it suits them, that we are not asking the British fleet or army to protect us and at the same time telling Great Britain that we will not trade with her. Hon. members on this side of the House have listened with a great deal of patience to hon. gentlemen opposite; they have repeated the same speeches night after night and have told the same old stories. But what does Canada care about them? The

people turned them down with their thumbs.

Notwithstanding the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Cape Breton, Canada will show that she will stand up for the British Empire. I do not know that there is much use in discussing the matter because it is a dead horse, and there is no necessity for whipping a dead horse. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Foster) tried to whip up the dead horse in King's, but it was a complete failure. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) has gone further, but I remember when I went down to his old homestead and bought plums for \$8 a bushel, which were never delivered. That was election time, and it was all right. I have got a plum myself now, and I do not require them. I do trust that when hon. gentlemen opposite stop to remember the manner which they have inflicted us with their incessant talk, they will give us a rest and let the business of the House proceed. I remember that my old friend Sir John Macdonald compared a gentleman who spoke a great deal in the House to a windmill run by water power. There are windmills all over the country, and in this House to-day, and they go around and around with the wind all the time, but the wind bloweth where it listeth. It affects no one except the continual crank and jar of the wheel going round on its chain. It lifts so much water out of the well, and that is the end of the water. So it is with the speeches of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and these other gentlemen over there. They amount to nothing, and they might as well stop and give the country a chance to rest. If hon. gentlemen opposite think they are strong enough to prevent the business going on let them take a vote, and see where they are. All their talking cuts no ice in the country, and the people of the country only ask: Are they rational men in Parliament that they sit day in and day out discussing all kinds of fly resolutions which are voted down and amount to nothing. Cannot we come down to some rational reasoning on the matter.

Mr. McCLEARY. We give it up.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend says that he will give it up.

Mr. McCLEARY. The rational part of it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. But my hon. friend here reminds me that the Conservative party have got no rations now.

Mr. McCLEARY. Your rations are coming.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We are going to England, and we will have rations there, and good rations too. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) is like Davie Crockett's coon; he came down before he was shot at. We do not take any stock in him, however. This side of the House will carry out what it proposes until they are relieved from office

by the sovereign will of the people of Canada, and when our friends go into Opposition, I hope they will not go into it complaining about everything and preaching disloyalty to the Crown of England and disloyalty to the British Government as these gentlemen over there do. These gentlemen opposite are out of office now, and they are crying and whining over it, and are afraid that they will never get into power again. I had the honour of being defeated five times by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Foster), but I took my medicine like a man, and did not whine about it, and I am here to-day representing the county of King's. I am sorry that he and his colleagues preach disloyalty to the British Crown and Queen Victoria in this the greatest year of the great Victorian age, an age that has never existed before. Victoria's armies have been successful all over the world, and England's policy has been successful, and the only party unsuccessful this year are my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) and his colleagues, who are now finding fault with loyalty to the British Government.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not intend to discuss this question at any length for it has been threshed out over and over again, and many members of the House as well as myself are sick of it. I again take exception to some remarks that were made to this House at the expense of the Patrons. When the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendry) was speaking to-night he said that the manufacturers in Canada paid \$2 to their labourers for every dollar paid by the German manufacturers, and I asked him the simple question, if he thought the farmers of Canada could afford to pay that \$2 when one was paid by other countries? He answered back something about: Did you get a leather trunk. That was a nice intelligent answer for him to give to a fair question. It was exceedingly nice to come from a man who calls himself a gentleman, representing, as I am sorry to say he does, many, good, sturdy farmers. It is an answer that will sound well in his constituency, and he will hear of it, if from nobody else, from me in his constituency. The other night also, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—and I am sorry he is not in his seat to-night, spoke of this trunk business. I hope I would be above referring moreover to anything on the floor of the House so small and contemptible as this was, if it had not been introduced by others. It was talked of throughout the country, and I am not ashamed to say that it was, even if it was called peanut politics.

An hon. MEMBER. Or doughnuts.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, or doughnuts, if you like. It does not trouble me in the least. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) also made a very nice laugh for his friends when he said that Frontenac was

Mr. DOMVILLE.

represented by a haycock and a doughnut. It was a nice thing to say. I am sure he feels proud of it to-day. I am sure the sturdy Orangemen he claims to be the leader of, many of whom are farmers, would not thank him for that remark, and he will hear of it. I was not the first to refer to the trunk business in this House. When asked, I said, I was not going to say anything about it—I would leave that to others. But I was pleased to see that the Government dealt with that matter and abolished it altogether. After I had denied the statement of the hon. member for East Simcoe with regard to the trunk, he threw back the nasty sneer that I had gone back on my principles in regard to that as well as in regard to other things in the Patron platform. I beg to say that I have not gone back on my principles as laid down in that platform. I take my own interpretation of the principles of that platform, not that of any one else. Some went further than I did; but I do not go by what individual members say in the country. I came here to follow my own judgment in carrying out the principles of that platform. I deny that I have betrayed those principles, and I believe my constituents in the county of Frontenac do not think I have. When I denied the hon. gentleman's statement on the floor of this House, some of the papers rather unpleasantly alluded to me as threshing the air with my hands. If I did, I was only following the example set me by others, notably, the ex-Finance Minister. They also said that I was ordered to sit down by the party whip, that the party whip was lashed over us, and that we had to follow the leaders of the Government. I assure you that the leaders of the Government never approached us as to what we should do on any subject, directly or indirectly. The hon. member for East Simcoe said he would watch the Public Accounts to see whether I took a trunk or not. He was not satisfied with that, but I understand he went around inquiring whether I did take it, and sent somebody sneaking around to see if there was a trunk for me in the cellar or in the back rooms. Contemptible actions. He said he saw my name printed on the end of a trunk, and would corroborate that statement by three or four other members. I defy him or any other member of this House to say so now. This is only one instance; but any other time there is any sneer or slur cast against me, hon. gentlemen opposite need not expect me to take it; I will not take it. When I consider whence it comes, it does not hurt a bit. But when any contemptuous remarks are made about me or about the cause of the Patrons, you may depend upon it that I will defend myself. I did not intend to refer to this, for I did expect something better from hon. gentlemen opposite than this small talk.

Mr. OSLEK. Lest I should have to return to West Toronto and be pointed at

with scorn as the only member of this House who had not spoken on this question, I would just like to say a word or two very briefly. I want to give the Government credit wherever I can in their trade resolutions. I will assume that they meant to give preferential trade to Great Britain. If they do that, I will support them first, last, and always. I believe that was their intention when they drew up these resolutions. They have been mistaken, however, and I would like to see them, as men and as Canadians, in this Jubilee year, come out and say: "We made a mistake; we will give preferential trade to Great Britain and her colonies, and only to Great Britain and her colonies. I am a National Policy man, first, last, and altogether. I believe the National Policy has built up Canada, so that during the last five or six years of hard times the world over, Canada has held her own against all the other nations of the earth—held her own as no other nation has done—held her own as against the rich and prosperous and more numerous people to the south of us. Who will say to-day, looking over this vast continent, that Canada is not in a better and more prosperous state than any other part of this continent. I believe in the National Policy. At the same time, I believe in a preferential trade policy that will bind all parts of this Empire together as against all the world. I am entirely against any preferential trade policy that will admit other nations on the same terms as the different parts of the British Empire. I am not proposing to go into the question of free trade or protection, or to take up the time of the House except on this one point. I do not believe that any one reading these resolutions, which assume to give preferential trade to Great Britain, can say that they do give preferential trade to Great Britain. If the Government say that they will only give preferential trade to Great Britain and her colonies, and not merely make it a catchword and let in other nations on the same terms, and that at the beck and will of one member of the Government—if they say they will admit goods from Great Britain and her colonies on better terms than goods coming from other nations, I will support them first and last on that point. I give them credit for meaning to give preferential trade to Great Britain and her colonies when they brought in their resolution, and I believe it is not yet too late to change it. I am not speaking of something that is new, but shall merely quote what I stated as my views in my retiring address to the Board of Trade of Toronto in January last. I concluded that address by saying:

I believe that our true interest is to cultivate the closest business relations with Great Britain and our sister colonies, and I, for one, would not hesitate to take the first step in this direction by admitting all goods coming from England, or any

of the colonies, on more favourable terms than goods coming from any other country.

I am entirely in accord with what I then said, and I support the amendment offered by the hon. member for North Bruce, because I believe it covers what we all desire, preferential trade with Great Britain; and on the other hand, I believe that the resolutions of the Government do not meet that desire for preferential trade about which we all talk so strongly.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 33; Nays, 67.

Resolution agreed to on same division.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE PATENT ACT.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) further to amend the Patent Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to carry out the abolition of the office of Patent Commissioner, which was created by an Act some years ago, and which, I believe, in the interest of economy and efficiency in the patent branch of my department, I can dispense with.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. BEATTIE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets. He said: This Bill is to bring the sale of steamboat and ferry-boat tickets under the same restrictions as are applied to railway tickets, to prevent scalpers dealing in those tickets to the detriment of the companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### BRITISH COLUMBIA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. When was the Act intituled "British Columbia Southern Railway Aid Amendment Act, 1896,"

and passed by the Legislature of British Columbia in the 59th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, received by the Governor General, in compliance with section 56 of the British North America Act?

2. When does the time within which the Governor General in Council can disallow the said Act expire?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry that I cannot give a precise answer to my hon. friend's question. The time for disallowing the Act will expire some time in July.

**CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND GRANT.**

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Lister) asked :

How much of the land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been patented?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The area of the land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which has been patented to date is 1,429,935 acres.

**ST. ANDREWS POST OFFICE, N.S.**

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

Has the Honourable the Postmaster General received any report respecting the fire which destroyed the post office at St. Andrews, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia? If so, what amount of mail matter appears to have been lost, including post office orders and registered letters? Has any investigation been directed respecting origin of the fire? If investigation has taken place, what is the conclusion reached?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A report was made on this subject in the month of February last, but it has been mislaid. The inspector will be asked to furnish a copy of it.

**DANIEL G. RIORDAN, POSTMASTER.**

Mr. MILLS asked :

For how much has Daniel G. Riordan, a postmaster in Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, given bonds, and who are his bondsmen?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Daniel G. Riordan, postmaster in Annapolis county, has given bonds in the amount of \$250. His sureties are James F. Morrison and Daniel Cronin.

**ST. AUBERT AND ST. PAMPHILE MAIL SERVICE.**

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Was a contract entered into between the Government and any person for the carrying of the mails between St. Aubert and St. Pamphile, in the county of L'Islet, since the 1st of July last?

2. If so, were tenders called for before awarding said contract?

Mr. McINNES.

3. What are the names of the tenderers and what is the amount of each tender?

4. To whom was the contract awarded?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. A contract has been entered into for the St. Aubert and St. Pamphile mail service since the 1st July last. 2. Tenders were invited before the contract was awarded. 3. The following is the list of tenders received :—

	Per annum
C. Bois.....	\$233
S. Blanchette.....	250
P. St. Pierre.....	265
S. Lamarre.....	294
A. Chouinard.....	300
L. A. Robichaud.....	350
A. Tremblay.....	450

4. The contract was awarded to C. Bois, at the rate of his tender.

**POSTMASTER AT STE. PHILOMENE.**

Mr. SCRIVER (for Mr. Brown) asked :

1. Who was the postmaster at Ste. Philomène, P.Q., in June, 1892?

2. Was he dismissed from his position as such postmaster? If so, when, and who succeeded him?

3. Were any complaints made against him? What was the nature of the complaints, and who was the complainant?

4. Was any investigation held on such complaints? Who investigated? Was any report made thereon, and what was the effect of such report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. Mrs. M. D'Amour was postmistress of Ste. Philomène up to 28th June, 1892. 2. The office was made vacant about the date mentioned owing to the non-residence of the postmistress. Mr. J. B. Loiselie, the present postmaster, succeeded her in the office. 3. There were no complaints against the postmistress. 4. Information having reached the department (through Mr. J. Lessard, of Montreal) that the postmistress had removed from Ste. Philomène, inquiry was made by the post office inspector at Montreal, who found such to be the case. The office was accordingly made vacant.

**JUBILEE CONTINGENT.**

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Bell, Pictou) asked :

1. What are the names of the officers on the Jubilee Contingent selected as representatives of Nova Scotia militia or volunteer force?

2. To what corps were they attached?

3. What are their ages, duration of service and rank?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to give him the following information :—1. Beckwith, Major E. M., Borden, 2nd Lieut. H. L., Humphrey, Lt.-Col. W. M., McDonald, Lieut. C. deW. 2. 68th Battalion, King's Canadian Hussars.

and 66th and 63rd Battalions respectively.  
3.

Name.	Rank.	Date of Birth.	Date of first Appointment.
Beckwith.....	Major.....	Jan. 31, '45.	Sept. 10, '69
Borden.....	2nd Lieut.....	Aged about 20 years.	April 23, '97
Humphrey.....	Lt.-Col.....	July 8, '52.	Oct. 8, '69
McDonald.....	Lieut.....	Oct. 26, '54.	April 22, '92

### MAIL ROUTE, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY.

Mr. MILLS asked :

Has the Postmaster General received the following petition :—

To the Postmaster General of the Dominion of Canada.

In the matter of the mail route between Bridgetown, in the county of Annapolis, and Dalhousie West, in the said county.

The petition of the undersigned, ratepayers and electors of Dalhousie West, in the county of Annapolis and province of Nova Scotia, humbly sheweth :—

I. Her Majesty's mail is at present delivered to your petitioners once per week by a courier starting from Bridgetown and reaching Dalhousie West via the Morse Road and returning to Bridgetown via the Thorne and Morse Roads.

II. That under the present system of delivering the said mail your petitioners receive their mail in time to send any replies back to the post office at Bridgetown (from which there is a daily mail communication with the rest of the province, or at least with the principal parts thereof) by the courier the same day that the mail is delivered to your petitioners.

III. That if the said mail route were reversed and the courier start from Dalhousie West and go to Bridgetown and return, the replies to any letters that your petitioners might receive in any mail could not be posted until one week after the receipt of such letters, and this delay would tend to very materially hinder the transaction of business.

IV. That in the opinion of your petitioners the best interests of the people of Dalhousie West require that there be no change in the said mail route as at present established.

Your petitioners therefore pray that the mail route between Bridgetown and Dalhousie West may be allowed to remain as it is at the present time and that the proposed change, viz.:—to start from Dalhousie West—be not effected.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

Dated at Dalhousie West, in the county of Annapolis, this eighteenth day of May, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety seven.

John Anderson,  
Robert Kelly,  
Alexander Taylor,  
Aaron T. Wilde,  
John Norman,  
Tillie J. Milberry,  
Philip Best,  
Elias Durling,  
Abram Medicraft,

Joseph Gillies,  
George Hannam,  
Samuel Hannam,  
Sydenham Kelly,  
Avery W. Hannam,  
Clarence Hannam,  
John Greenlun,  
Charles Norman,  
Charles Taylor,

John McGill,  
John Gillis,  
William McGill,  
Albert Dawling,  
John Hannam,  
Joseph Frederick,  
William Medicraft,  
George Medicraft,  
Jacob Medicraft,  
Ritson Durling,  
Joseph Durling, jr.,  
Joseph Durling, sr.,  
William Durland,  
William John Hammon,  
John Shipp,  
Mellidge Hannam,  
Stephen Hannam,  
Trueman S. Shipp,  
Albert Falkenham,  
David Shipp,

James Pewenney,  
Mrs. Lewis Jodiry,  
Isaac Langley,  
Millin Buckler,  
William Buckler,  
Joshua J. Buckler,  
George Buckler,  
Appleton Buckler,  
Joseph Buckler,  
Norman Buckler,  
William Anderson,  
Thomas Gillis,  
Warren Fredericks,  
Gilbert Thompson,  
Barlett Gillis,  
Nelson Barnes,  
Robert McGowan,  
Daniel Langley,  
Charles Gillis,  
Charles Barnes.

Will the prayer of said petition be granted? If not, why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the petition mentioned was received on the 29th ulto., and the question as to which is the most desirable starting point for the mail service between Bridgetown and Dalhousie West will have the consideration of the department.

### POSTMASTERSHIP OF FORT ERIE.

Mr. McCLEARY asked :

1. Has Isaac White been dismissed from the postmastership of Fort Erie?

2. If so, were charges made against him, and what were the nature of such?

3. If charges were made, by whom were they laid, and was there an investigation into the truthfulness of same held?

4. Has a successor to Mr. White been appointed? If so, who is he, and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. Mr. Isaac White voluntarily resigned the postmastership of Fort Erie on the 18th July, 1894, but his successor has only recently been appointed. 2. There were no charges of mismanagement against Mr. White. 3. Same answer as to No. 2. 4. Mr. William M. Baldwin has been appointed to succeed Mr. White, on recommendation of Mr. James A. Lowell, of Niagara Falls south.

### QUARANTINE IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the hon. Minister of Marine call the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the question I put yesterday as to when certain correspondence and petitions respecting quarantine in Manitoba and the North-west Territories will be brought down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I did both in writing and orally.

### THE JUBILEE CONTINGENT.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw attention to a very important matter. I have direct information from Quebec concerning the character of the Jubilee regiment. It is most desirable—I think the House is agreed on that—that any representation made in England by Canada during the Jubilee should reflect on us the highest credit. I am told, however, by an eye-witness on whom I can place the greatest reliance, that the regiment to be sent across, is not of such a character. I am sure that this is unknown to the acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright), because I am certain that he is most anxious that his department should excel in whatever it does with regard to the display that Canada will make during the Jubilee in England. What has been done with regard to the Mounted Police shows that the Government is anxious that everything which can reflect credit on Canada should be done. Let me quote the language used by the Quebec "Chronicle" with regard to the regiment we are about to send over, which is language that could not be used unless the circumstances called for criticism and for action on the part of the acting Minister of Militia. There is no time to be lost, and therefore I feel compelled, though most unwilling to obtrude myself upon the House, to call the attention of the hon. Minister to this criticism. It is headed "The Jubilee Regiment," and is as follows:—

The first appearance of the Jubilee Regiment on parade on Sunday last, as hinted in yesterday's "Chronicle," evoked considerable adverse comment. It includes a number of men to whom it is no disrespect whatever to say that they should never have been selected for the purpose. The regiment ought to be the possible representation of Canadian manhood. Those members of it who do not enter into this category are, of course, not responsible for the fact, but the commanding officers who selected them are far from blameless. Either their corps must be most miserable ones as a whole, or favouritism would seem to have decided the choice of the men, for it is hard to imagine many of them as anything like the best possible representatives of their regiments. A number of them are of poor physique, others have a miserable unmilitary carriage, and a good few would stand quite a lot of brushing up and tidying. If to all this, poor marching and ill-fitting uniforms are added, the result can be imagined. In short, our proposed picked Jubilee contingent, intended to do Canada credit, will fall far short of its object, if some marked improvement is not at once visible. This criticism is made in no carping spirit, but for the best interests of all concerned, and it is to be hoped that some better showing may soon be made, for Quebec is a military city, and a soldier's faults are soon noticed here. Our representatives will rub shoulders with the best troops of the Empire, and will need to be at their best. A large proportion of them are undoubtedly men to whom not the slightest exception can be taken and who would do credit to any country. But the crazy-quilt, patch-work appearance of the detachment is painfully apparent on parade, and it

Mr. DAVIN.

is hard to say how the matter can now be remedied.

Having called the attention of the acting Minister of Militia to this, I need not read the whole article, but simply point out that the sizing up of the men, according to the information I have received, has been bungled. That is a mistake which can be remedied, because it is not yet too late, and it should be remedied. I have been speaking to some of the military men, and am very sorry that some of my military friends have not brought this matter before the House, because it would have been more pleasing to me had they done so. We are all jealous, however, whether military men or not, of our reputation, and anxious that Canada should make a display of her soldiers which will do us credit on this occasion. We know that the Canadian people are a people of splendid physique; we know that our men are all men of their inches. The average of Canadian manhood is tall and well built, and therefore if very short men have been picked from some of the corps, a very regrettable mistake has been made. Although these short men may make very good fighters, still they are not fit for a pageant of this kind, and every man with the eye of a soldier knows what a bad impression is made by a corps in which there are some men who are six feet or over high, and others only five feet six or seven inches. The sizing up of a regiment can only be done by revising the drafting of the men, and I am told that the majority of the men drafted are all that could be desired. The drilling is bad at present, but that of course may be remedied by a little energetic practice, and so far as the uniforms are concerned, if they are ragged, they can be easily replaced by better ones. But you cannot make elephants out of mosquitoes or men out of mice, and if some of the men are too small to form part of a Jubilee regiment, the only thing to be done is to re-draft a portion of the little regiment. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am sorry to hear such an account of the Jubilee regiment from my hon. friend, but I may tell him that I was informed, no later than yesterday or the day before, by the officer in charge, the Adjutant General. Col. Aylmer, that he was extremely pleased and well satisfied with the appearance of the Jubilee regiment. He had just returned from Quebec after inspecting them, and I think, that in all probability the Adjutant General is better posted than the newspaper correspondent to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) referred. As a matter of course, the units from the various corps were selected by the officers in command. It was impossible, I think, to do otherwise than place the selection in the hands of these gentlemen. I am aware that the

selection of a number of men from different regiments some twenty or thirty in all, is likely, to some extent, to result in a lack of uniform appearance; but I may say that that was done at the instigation of Her Majesty's authorities. I mean the Horse Guards, who thought that the force of Canada would be better represented by a number of units, as they call them, from the several regiments than by choosing a larger number of men from a few corps. However, I will cause further inquiry to be made into the matter, and I think it will be found, that, possibly, with one or two exceptions the physique of the force is much better than the correspondent the hon. gentleman refers to believed it to be.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should be very sorry indeed if the report which my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) submitted to the House turned out to be correct. We, as Canadians, must all feel anxious that Canada should be represented in the best manner possible on this memorable occasion. When I remarked I met a commanding officer from Quebec who was present on the occasion of the church parade on Sunday, and I can tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is now in charge of the department, that this gentleman, whom I regard as an expert—belonging to the permanent force—spoke very highly of the physique of the contingent and very highly also of their drill. It was merely by accident that this gentleman mentioned this to me. I hope that what he told me will turn out to be correct and that Canada will be represented, as we would all wish to have her represented, by men who will be a credit to our militia force, as that force has proved itself to be on all occasions when its services were required, a credit to the Dominion.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

#### I.C.R.—NEW TIME TABLE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to the great injustice committed against the ridings below Quebec by the new time table for the Intercolonial Railway, which has just been issued, and which, I believe, is to take effect in a few days. I have just received a note from the Deputy Minister stating that the first train to arrive in Quebec is at four o'clock in the afternoon. The result of this will be that persons having business in Quebec with the bank, with the courts, &c., will have to start a day in advance of their engagements. This first train to arrive is the through express from Halifax, and the exact time of its arrival is 4.05 in the afternoon. The next train is at 9.45 in the evening. This means that those living below Quebec and having business in that city must lose a day on the road. I think

it is quite sufficient to lay the facts before the Minister to cause him to order the cancellation of this time table, as it is perfectly ridiculous to have such a service as that proposed. I do not lay the blame on the Government nor on the Minister himself, but I put the blame on the officials of the department, who do not accept information given to them to guide them in making up these time tables.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) seems to be going into a discussion such as is not allowed on the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not, under the circumstances, care to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The adjournment cannot be moved again.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I desire only to lay this matter before the Minister. I trust that he will cancel this time table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I shall be very happy to look into the matter with a view of remedying any grievance that there may be. I will look into it at once.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the best arrangement would be to go back to the time table in existence before, as no better arrangement could be made, in my opinion. The train from Halifax used to arrive just about the time the Grand Trunk train was leaving for Montreal. I understand that under the proposed arrangement the train arrives at four o'clock in the afternoon, which will be awkward to those who wish to continue their journey to Montreal. I trust that the old arrangement will be continued.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. We are not satisfied below Quebec, with the old time table; there must be a local express stopping at every station and arriving at Quebec about nine or ten o'clock in the forenoon, the through Halifax express to arrive in the afternoon or evening.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) when the return of the number of persons dismissed from the department and the number of appointments made since the 1st of July, 1896, will be brought down. The order for this return was passed about five or six weeks ago. Two weeks ago I asked the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier), in the absence of the Controller of Inland Revenue, when the information would be brought down and I understood him to say that he would communicate with the Controller and that the return would be hastened forward. I be-

lieve it would not take an officer of the department more than an hour to obtain the information required. I think I am entitled to this information, and I think the House is entitled to it, before the discussion of the Estimates proceeds. I cannot understand why this delay has taken place.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I hold in my hand the return asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Brockville), but the different names and the different heads are not properly arranged. Before I lay it on the Table, I would like to have it revised, and it will be laid on the Table tomorrow.

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville). I would like to ask for information with regard to a similar return moved for respecting the Department of Customs.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Mr. Laurier). In the absence of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), I can only say that I will call that hon. gentleman's attention to the matter, and I have no doubt that the return will be laid on the Table as soon as possible.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to several orders of the House for returns respecting the dismissal of certain postmasters. I refer to the postmasters at Hopefield, Little Sands, Kinross and Stanley Bridge, in Prince Edward Island. I should think that these returns would not involve a great deal of labour on the part of the officials of the department, and I trust they will be laid on the Table at an early day.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Would the hon. gentleman have the kindness to send me over a memorandum of the Orders? I could not hear what he said.

#### ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Mr. Laurier). The Senate have adopted an Address to Her Majesty the Queen in connection with her Diamond Jubilee, to which they have asked the concurrence of this House, and I am sure the concurrence will be cheerfully given. The Address of the Senate, which is now submitted to the House, reads as follows:—

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty :

Most Gracious Sovereign :

We, Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Senate and <sup>of Canada</sup> of Canada in Parliament assembled, beg to offer our sincere congratulations on the happy completion of the sixtieth year of your auspicious reign.

When, on the memorable occasion of Your Majesty's Golden Jubilee, the representatives of your loyal Canadian people joined those of other parts of the Empire in expressing their heartfelt pleasure that by the grace of God the nation had for half a century enjoyed the inestimable benefit

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville).

of Your Majesty's constitutional and beneficent rule, they stated their earnest hope that Your Majesty might be spared for many more years to reign over your loyal subjects.

A decade has since passed, and to-day we contemplate with renewed satisfaction the fact that Your Majesty is still the head of the State. Not only have none of your illustrious predecessors sat on the throne of our country for so extended a period, but in the history of the nations of the world few monarchs have ruled so long, and none have been so universally honoured and revered.

Looking back across the sixty years which have elapsed since Your Majesty ascended the throne, it is impossible not to be impressed with the immense strides which during that period have been made by the civilized world in all that constitutes the moral, intellectual and physical well-being of mankind. The Gospel of our Divine Teacher has been preached in the remotest corners of the earth; temperance in all things has become more than at any previous period an accepted rule of human conduct; more adequate provision has been made for suffering humanity; the administration of justice has been placed upon a more humane and otherwise satisfactory basis; great advances have been made in science and the arts; and the literature of the Victorian era surpasses that of any former period in breadth of thought and general excellence, as well as in volume and popular appreciation. By the establishment of railway and steamship communication, the inauguration of an improved postal system, the invention of the electric telegraph and telephone, as well as the general utilization of electric power, and by an infinite number of other agencies, the comfort and convenience of the people have been immensely increased. During the same period the Empire has been enlarged, and its scattered members brought into more intimate fellowship with one another and with the motherland. Your Majesty's colonies in North America have, but with one exception, been gradually consolidated into a united Dominion, the people of which have been, and, we believe, will continue to be, amongst the most loyal of the races and peoples owing fealty to the British Crown.

We trust that we, and Your Majesty's subjects in other parts of the Empire, may continue for many years to come to enjoy the benefit of your gracious and peaceful rule; and we earnestly pray that He who is the Supreme King of Kings, may endow Your Majesty with every blessing in what remains to you of this life, and with everlasting felicity in the life to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will appreciate the language of this Address. It seems to me to convey in very felicitous terms what are known to be some of the splendours of what will be known in future ages as the Victorian era. It has been our privilege, and I may say a privilege which will be more and more appreciated as time rolls on, to live under what is certainly one of the most brilliant reigns in all history, certainly the most glorious of British history. In many respects the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria resembles, and in other respects excels, the reign of Louis XIV. of France. In the number of years the reign of Her Majesty approaches, though it does not yet equal, the reign of Louis XVI. In many respects it equals and in some other respects it surpasses the reign of the French monarch in the develop-

ment of the arts, and in literature it may perhaps be truly said that it is equal if not superior to the reign of Louis XIV.; whereas in the application of the arts and sciences to the comfort of mankind, and to the benefit of the human race, it surpasses not only the reign of Louis XIV., but all other periods known to history. It was the misfortune of Louis XIV. that his reign was cursed by war, whereas the long reign of Her Majesty has been comparatively free from that mighty scourge. Wars have been few, happily for the British people and for mankind at large. But it is gratifying to British subjects of all origins to remember that in the wars which took place, the old renown of the British arms for pluck, endurance and valour, has been maintained at the highest pitch. But above all this there has been the personality of the sovereign herself. The personality of the sovereign herself has been high in everything that has tended to cultivate and adorn her reign. Of what we know of her private life, we know that in all those domestic virtues which above all appeal to the human heart, she has been a model to the humblest of her subjects; and in public life, though she has been a constitutional sovereign in every sense of the term, yet it is known that on more than one occasion she has exerted a personal influence in unravelling difficulties, and in carrying the nation successfully through troubled periods. Perhaps one of her chief glories, perhaps the chiefest of all her glories, is that in so far as she has been a sovereign she has been in every sense a model constitutional sovereign. For us Canadians, one thing which we cannot forget is that under her reign we have obtained the inestimable benefit of responsible government. It is as dutiful subjects that we approach her on this occasion, and not as sycophants; but it is our pride to give her upon this occasion the allegiance, the willing allegiance, of free men. It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I move, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper, that the House do concur in the Address of the Senate to Our Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, congratulating her upon the completion of the sixtieth year of her illustrious and auspicious reign, by filling up the blank with the words "House of Commons."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It gives me very great pleasure to have an opportunity of seconding this Address to Her Majesty from the Parliament of Canada. After the eloquent words to which we have all just listened with such pleasure from the First Minister, no poor words of mine are required to commend this Address to the hearty approval of the House of Commons. But I may, at the outset, take the opportunity of expressing the satisfaction I feel that this tribute of the Parliament of Canada will be laid at the foot of the Throne by one so

well calculated in every way to represent this Dominion. The hon. mover of this Address has already stated that the Victorian era will be one that will shed lustre on the world. He has referred to the fact that as a woman, as a wife, as a mother, Her Gracious Majesty has presented an object of admiration and a model for the women of every country and of every clime on the globe. The condition of the court over which Her Majesty has presided has never in the history, certainly of this Empire, been excelled, or I may say, equalled. In everything that has tended to elevate the tone of public sentiment, Her Majesty has contributed in no slight degree. As a sovereign, Her Majesty, although administering a system of parliamentary government which, during her reign, has reached probably the highest point that parliamentary government has ever attained in any country, has yet by her great ability, by her devotion to her public duties, exercised a most potent influence on the administration of the affairs of the Empire, and, as has already been mentioned, we have every reason to believe that on more than one occasion, the influence Her Majesty has acquired with the Ministers of all parties has been such as to determine the fate of the nation towards peace rather than towards war.

The great achievement of Her Majesty's reign, so far as we are concerned, is the fulness with which the great principle of self-government has been conferred upon the autonomous colonies. The House need not be reminded that when Her Majesty ascended the Throne a rebellion prevailed in the old province of Canada, a struggle caused by the determination of the people to obtain that power and influence in the control of their own affairs which they felt they were entitled to achieve. That result has not only been obtained, but, under the beneficent reign of Her Majesty that fulness of self-government has been given to the outlying portions of the Empire, to the autonomous colonies, which has resulted in bringing about a condition, not only of complete and thorough devotion to the Crown and to British institutions, but has secured the happiness, prosperity and well-being of all those great portions of the Empire. Reference has been made, and properly made, in this Address to the confederation of this Dominion, and the following words have been used:

Your Majesty's colonies in North America have, with but one exception, been gradually consolidated into a united Dominion, the people of which have been, and, we believe, will continue to be, amongst the most loyal of the races and peoples owing fealty to the British Crown.

We all not only concur in that sentiment, but I think we will, one and all, agree that there will be no exaggeration in stating this, that not only is this a united Dominion, but it is a Dominion which at this moment

is as happy and as prosperous as is to be found in any portion of the world. I trust that Her Majesty may still live to see a great confederation, not only of Australasia, but of South Africa, and that those great outlying portions of the Empire being consolidated as the Dominion of Canada has been, will not only be equally happy and equally prosperous, but in their progress and prosperity will become still more capable of strengthening the hands of the Imperial state and increasing the greatness of the Empire. In that prayer for the long life and happiness of Her Majesty we will be joined, not only by the peoples of all climes, by the peoples of all races and colours, of all sections of the British Empire, but every good man and woman throughout the world will wish long life and happiness to Her Majesty the Queen.

Motion unanimously agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That an Address be voted to His Excellency the Governor General ; praying him to transmit the joint Address of both Houses to Her Majesty in such a manner as His Excellency may see fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne ; and the said Address was ordered to be engrossed, and to be communicated to the Senate for their concurrence.

Motion agreed to. (The hon. members of the House joined in the singing of "God Save the Queen.")

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On section 17,

17. That whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any number of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Supreme Court or High Court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists ; with power to such judge to compel the attendance of witnesses and examine the same under oath, to require the production of books and papers, and with such other necessary powers as may be conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purposes of such inquiry, and if such judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council may place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty upon it, as to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the effectual conduct of such inquiry.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that so soon we have to return to the less pleasant but more prosaic duty of this committee. After the very long time that has been occupied in discussing clause 16, I propose to occupy the attention of hon. gentlemen only for as short a time as is necessary to state the ground upon which I think this resolution 17 ought not to be adopted. In the first place, I cannot understand why such a clause as is now before the House should have found its way into a revenue Bill. It certainly is not a means of raising a revenue, and as we are in Committee of Ways and Means, I cannot see the propriety of this clause. In the next place, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that this legislation is, in my judgment, of the most vicious character that it is possible to put in a revenue Bill or anywhere else. No person in this House is unwilling to support the Government in carrying out any measure that is found necessary in order to protect the country against the illegal combination of manufacturers, or of persons engaged in business, for the purpose of unduly increasing the price of articles to the detriment of the general public. I am quite sure that any such law proposed by the Government in a separate measure, however stringent it might be, would not fail to obtain the hearty support of this side of the House. But, Sir, the proposal now made is a proposal which is calculated to give undue and improper powers to the Government of the day, whoever they may be, in dealing with the industries of this country. Under this clause, all that the Government require to do, in order to terrorize any manufacturer in this country is to give him a hint that they propose to deal with him under this law. It is, therefore, a power that ought not to be given by this House to a Government. It is true that this resolution has been slightly improved since it was first introduced a month ago, by importing a judge into it ; but, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to have this matter dealt with by a judicial tribunal, why do they not bring in a stringent Bill against combinations, and place it in the power of any person to charge those engaged in industries in Canada with a violation of such a law, and bring them into the courts to answer for their conduct. Why do the Government not take the same course in this as in regard to anything else which is contrary to the public interest and in violation of the well-understood rules of government.

Sir, the very fact of bringing a judge into this clause, instead of improving it, has opened another and a very grave objection. One of the fundamental principles of our

constitution is that the judiciary of the country shall be placed beyond the control or influence of the Government of the day. But here you have the Government for the time being selecting a judge for the purpose of carrying out an object of their own, you have the Government preparing the rules under which that judge shall conduct his investigation, and you have him not conducting that investigation in the exercise of his judicial authority and position, but you place upon that judge the duty of simply making a report to the Government, upon which they are to take action. That opens the door, I think, to great partiality. It opens the door to the Government for the selection of gentlemen to discharge those judicial duties who will naturally suppose that they will not render themselves unacceptable to the Government for the legitimate promotion which they have a right to expect if they meet to some extent the views of the Government. I will not enter upon that. I only require to allude to it to show that the bringing of judicial authority into this measure, in the mode in which it is done, without giving that authority power to deal with the question judicially, is to render the act even more objectionable than it was before. There is a third and last objection which I will state in a very few words and then take my seat, that is, that this Bill on its face does what no law on the Statute-book of any country in the world does. I challenge hon. gentlemen to show me a law anywhere in the world which on its face proposes to sacrifice the innocent with the guilty. What is the punishment which this clause proposes to inflict on any person coming within its terms? It states what it is. The mode of punishment devised here is a mode of punishment which it is impossible to apply to the guilty without involving the innocent. I am engaged in business, carrying on a manufacturing industry, complying with all the requirements of the law, and conducting my business in a manner thoroughly unobjectionable. My neighbour, who is carrying on the same kind of business, chooses to enter into a combine with three or four other persons, and violates the spirit of this law. What is the punishment? Why, Sir, I am to be punished with the man who is guilty of violating the law. I need not use any argument to show that this law is opposed to every principle of justice, fair-play and proper dealing in a matter of this kind. I propose, therefore, to move, seconded by Mr. Foster:

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following substituted therefor:—That while this House is prepared to support a stringent measure for effectively preventing illegal combination with a view to unduly enhance prices contrary to the public interest, it is of opinion that such legislation should not be included in a Tariff Bill nor leave the industries of the country in a position to be interfered with at the

caprice of the Government without the judgment of a superior court of law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that one need say very much in answer to the observations of the hon. leader of the Opposition. To the first question—why put this in a revenue Bill?—I have to answer, this tariff Bill, while undoubtedly a revenue Bill in its main purpose, is not entirely so, because we have to recognize the fact that we have had a protective system for many years, and that even with the amendments we are now making, the element of protection will still remain in the tariff to a considerable extent. We may regret that it is so; but I frankly confess that we are not in a position entirely to eradicate that which we believe to be an evil system. One of the evils of the protective system is that it inevitably leads to the formation of combines; and I am unable to see how, by any other procedure than this, we can effectually reach them. There is nothing so likely to prevent the formation of combines in our country as the recognition of the fact, by manufacturers and others who may engage in forming combines for unduly enhancing the prices of commodities, that the duty on like articles imported into the country can be removed by Order in Council. I believe that to be the most useful agent we can have to prevent the formation of combines. I venture to say that if you attempt to reach combines by the ordinary procedure of law, without any other penalty than that enforceable by the courts of law, you will have great difficulty in reaching them. The efforts made in other countries to reach combines in that way have not been very successful. But if we have upon our Statute-book the power to remove the duty by which combines are made possible, we shall in all probability have no combines in the future. Ample evidence has been given of that by the combines that have existed in the past. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that by this provision we punish the innocent and the guilty together. Under the conditions described, however, I do not think it would be possible for these combines to get into operation. If a number of persons outside of the combine were selling their goods in fair and open competition, the combine would fall to pieces very soon. The combine is only successful when it can bring everybody in. If a dozen people are manufacturing goods, and eleven of them form a combine, they will soon crowd out the twelfth; but if half a dozen remain outside of the combine, it is not at all dangerous, because it has to face this reasonable and free competition. I believe that the clause as it originally stood was in the interest of the people of Canada. It has been received with great satisfaction by public opinion, not only in Canada, but outside of Canada.

In this clause I believe we have devised a means which is likely to be more effective than any other to prevent the evils of combination. If there was any ground in the position taken by the hon. gentleman that the Government were going to deal with this as a party question rather than as a judicial matter, we have removed that ground by providing that it shall be a judge and not the Government that will determine whether a combine exists or not. I do not think it is a provision likely to be acted on very frequently. There are some laws which are valuable by reason of what they prevent rather than what they punish; and I venture to say that the effect of this law will be to prevent the formation of combines such as have existed in the past; and we know that there are combines now existing in Canada. But my expectation is that under this law combines will soon dissolve, and that we shall have fair and legitimate competition, which the people are entitled to have.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I propose to offer a very few remarks in answer to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. It appears to me that the resolution now submitted to the committee is an extraordinary one, to say the least. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should not run away with the idea that we in any way favour combines or agreements of an unlawful nature. We simply differ with hon. gentlemen opposite as to the means for putting down combines in restraint of trade or for unduly enhancing the prices of the necessities of life. We all agree that combines are detrimental to the public welfare, and should be prevented. The rule which is well laid down is that the legislator, when legislating on a subject of this kind, must have due regard, not only for the liberty of the subject, but for the liberty which is necessary to the legitimate expansion of trade and commerce. The difficulty is so great that no legislative enactment has ever been made in England, even in the Criminal Law, except as regards the increasing of wages by conspiracy. In the United States, in several states of the union, there are laws against combinations, as the House, and especially the lawyers in the House know. But this subject is one of so much difficulty that the decisions under these laws have greatly varied. Our Criminal Code has a provision, which, in my humble opinion, is ample for the protection of the public against unlawful combinations, and for the preventing of any combines or unlawful agreements whatever for the purpose of unduly increasing the price of the necessities of life. Article 520 of our Criminal Code reads as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding \$4,000 and not less than \$200, or to two years' imprisonment, and, if a corporation, is liable to a penalty not exceeding \$10,000 and not less than \$1,000, who

Mr. FIELDING.

conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, unlawfully—

(a) To unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce; or

(b) To restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity; or

(c) To unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity, or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof; or

(d) To unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon person or property.

It will be seen from the reading of this section that it entirely covers the ground. It provides against the combination by any persons who conspire in any manner whatever to unlawfully enhance the price of the commodities of life. Now, a combination or an agreement among traders or manufacturers is either lawful or unlawful. If lawful, of course no legislation can affect it. But if unlawful, then, to my mind, the Criminal Code is ample in its provisions to prevent it or punish those who violate the law. It seems to me that it is impolitic, it is wrong, it is contrary to sound principles of government, to punish or to impose a penalty upon any man without following the ordinary rules of procedure or the ordinary rules of law. In the present case, what happens? Just let the committee look at the penalty which is imposed upon any one against whom a report of the kind contemplated in the section before us may be made. The section reads:

If it appears to the Governor in Council that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council may place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty upon it as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

That provides that, to all intents and purposes, a commercial establishment may be completely ruined or, at all events, suffer immense injury through the reducing of a duty or the abolition of it under this section. This is certainly worse than any penalty which the criminal law imposes on a party found guilty. But what is the procedure which would be followed under the criminal law where a party is accused of any such combination? In the first place, the accused is surrounded by all the safeguards which the criminal procedure gives him. He is not simply brought before the court and liable to be condemned on mere suspicion, as may be the case under this section. But he has this safeguard, which is a great one, in the first instance: he is entitled to a preliminary investigation, and

as the lawyers especially in the House know, the court which holds this preliminary investigation is not an open court. In a matter of this kind, I take it that the magistrate presiding would not make his court an open court.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). Is the hon. gentleman arguing on the assumption that the reference provided for in this section would not be a reference; the proceedings of which would be open?

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. I shall come to that in a moment. I say that there is danger if the investigation be private and probably more danger if it be public. There are a great many instances in the books which treat on this question, under the criminal law of the United States, of persons having been brought before the criminal courts, under sections which very much resemble this in the law of the United States, and having been punished, and in all such cases, the accused has had, first of all, the safeguard of this preliminary investigation. He cannot be brought at once before the petty jury, but must be first given a preliminary investigation, and then his case must be passed upon by the grand jury. It then comes before the petty jury, which is the palladium of the liberties of the subject in this country, and no punishment can be meted out to him before he is found guilty after having been given the opportunity of making a full defence before the petty jury. But under this section, no such procedure is provided for. At the end of the section, I find the subsection which reads:

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the effectual conduct of such inquiry.

It seems to me that in an important matter of this kind, affecting the rights of the subject, the procedure should be regulated, not by Order in Council, but by some law passed by this House after a full and critical examination by all the members of this House. This is not a political question but one involving the loss of property and, in a great many instances, the complete ruin of business men. And therefore I say that no procedure should be enacted by mere Order in Council, but should be enacted by this House, and by no other authority, and then only after the most exhaustive and critical inquiry and discussion.

Then we find that, under this section, the question may be referred to any judge of the Supreme Court or of the Exchequer Court of Canada or of any supreme or high court in any province of Canada, to inquire into it in a summary way and report to the Governor in Council. There are thus no such safeguards provided as should be provided in a case of such extreme gravity and as are provided by our Criminal Code. A judge is empowered to pass on it in a

summary way. He is empowered to send for witnesses and for the books and papers of the accused, so that the innermost secrets of the business of the accused may be exposed to the world, if this inquiry is to be made a public inquiry. Even though he be innocent, even though his case may have been brought before the court on the simple suspicion that a combination or unlawful agreement exists, his business may be ruined. I asked the Government whether the accused will have the right to call witnesses in his own behalf and to set up a complete defence. Will he have the right to employ a lawyer or counsel to defend him? Surely he should be entitled to a complete defence. He would be entitled to that in a simple case of assault, and when his whole business career is at stake, when his whole fortune is at stake, when all his business transactions are to be made the subject of a critical examination, surely he ought to be at liberty to make the fullest defence possible.

I asked the question a moment ago whether or not this investigation was to be public or private. If it is to be private, I say that is wrong. You will be imposing on a judge in the first place a very onerous duty, a duty which no judge in this country will care to take upon himself, a responsibility which he will be certainly very loath to shoulder, and I say it is detrimental to the administration of justice in this country to have our judges giving opinions upon matters which are semi-political or which certainly will become semi-political. If this investigation is to be private, then the judge will not be subjected to the critical eye of the public. It will be a star chamber inquiry, and we will have the press of this country and the public opinion of this country—on one side of politics at least—declaring, in every case, that the judge was biassed, and that he gave his decision, not on strict legal grounds, not on matters of fact, but to a certain extent on political bias or on other motives which should not influence the judiciary.

But should the investigation be public, there would again be the greatest danger to the citizen who, on simple suspicion, was brought before the tribunal. Suppose the accused is not guilty; suppose there was some mistake, suppose that he has been subjected to some political persecution. We are all human. Even if this very good Government could not commit any such offence, perhaps some other Government which we may have in the future might bring such person up before this court and persecute him in this way. And suppose that the judge makes a report that there is no such unlawful combination as is supposed to exist. Still, the ruin of this man will be almost complete. Not only will he have been subjected to great annoyance and expense, but he will have had all his business transactions laid before the world, his books and papers exposed to the public gaze and his

most confidential matters made known to his rivals. Now, this is a state of things unheard of under the constitution under which we live; nothing has ever appeared in our Statute-books which equals this. I take it, therefore, that this procedure should be surrounded with the utmost care and prudence, that it should not be left to the Governor in Council to work out these rules but, if this procedure is to be adopted, it must be after it has passed the critical judgment of this House.

Now, there is another objection that I have to this proposal. Suppose that the judge reports that the manufacturer who has been brought before the tribunal is really guilty of the unlawful combination of which he is accused. The report of the Governor in Council will be made against him, their report will go forth to the world, and the duty will be lowered or abolished altogether. This will mean that this man will be punished, and punished very harshly, punished far more severely than he would be if prosecuted and found guilty under the Criminal Code by a jury of his countrymen. But not only will he be punished by the provisions of the resolution now before the committee, but he will be liable to be punished twice, an unheard of thing under British law. Not only will he be liable to be punished in the manner described in section 17, but, when this report is made to the Governor in Council, he will be liable to be brought up before any court of criminal jurisdiction by any informer in the country, and be punished a second time under article 520. What can he expect, after this report has gone forth and he has been branded as a combiner, guilty of entering into an unlawful agreement to enhance the prices of commodities in this country? He will not be able to get a fair trial. Juries in this country are more or less swayed by political bias, and if this man is brought up in a criminal court, the jury having before it the judgment of the other court and the report of the Governor in Council, naturally certain of them will not wish to reverse the judgment of the judge and of these thirteen men of the Cabinet. Beyond the objection raised by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) there are these objections which, I think, should caution the Government against putting on the Statute-book such an unusual procedure as that contained in the proposition before the House.

Mr. BRITTON. It is hardly necessary to speak about combines, as to their being against the best commercial interests of the country, or how they have flourished on the other side of the line and what efforts have been made from time to time to break them up and obtain redress for their wrongful exercise of power. Those of us who have read the newspapers of late have had an opportunity to see something of the work-

Mr. CASGRAIN.

ing of these trusts, particularly in the trial that has just taken place of Mr. Havemeyer and Mr. Searles, which have lately been concluded. No one on this side of the House and, it seems to me, no one on either side can properly object, if this resolution does no harm to any innocent person in the community, to pass this or some similar resolution directed against combinations or trusts or associations that are, to a greater or less extent, a menace to the commercial interests of the country. I rise to submit, however, that there is more force in the objection that was raised first by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) a night or two ago, and to-day by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), with regard to publishing some one who is innocent, than gentlemen on this side with whom I have conversed seem to think. I would suggest—I do not wish to move it as an amendment to the amendment, nor would I move it as a substantive amendment to the resolution after this one is disposed of, if it is disposed of—that something should be done to guard against this possibility. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says there is no danger, because, if there is a combination of this kind, in order to have that association effective, nearly everybody must be in it. That is quite true. But when the hon. Minister says “nearly everybody,” my objection, it seems to me, is sustained. If there is one person who is not in the combination, if there are a few—and it is not going very far that there may be at least a few scattered over the country—they will be injured the same as the others by the Government putting the articles in respect to which a combine has been made, on the free list, or reducing the duty. Something ought to be done, it seems to me, to safeguard the persons, even though they may be very few, who may be in that position. Therefore, I would suggest that these words, or some others of similar import, should be added to the resolution:

And may, if necessary, to prevent loss to any person not connected with the trust, combination, association, or agreement, compensate such person to an extent not to exceed the loss on property on hand occasioned by the reduction of the duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BRITTON. Now, that would cover an objection of that kind, but I can anticipate the objection that hon. gentlemen opposite may raise—that this is giving an additional power to the Governor in Council, and that they have enough power already. Well, I can only say that if so much as has already been left to them, is not likely to work harm, probably an investigation into a matter of this kind, where it only concerns, at the most, a very few persons in the community is hardly likely to lead to substantial injury. Those gentlemen oppo-

site who object so much to the exercise of power by the Governor in Council, can hardly be serious to-day and on the discussion on these tariff resolutions. I cannot add anything to what was said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) on that point the other night. If the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) had heard the speech made by the member for Halifax probably he would not have spoken at so great a length when he challenged the House to name an instance in which the Governor in Council ever had any such power as was proposed to be given to them by one of the resolutions we have disposed of. But I should not take up the time of the committee this afternoon by reading the sections of the Act that the member for Halifax referred to, I will only mention them by number, and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 32, section 9, 62, 68, 87, 88, 92, 100, 102, 103, 108, 111, 112, 131, he will then be prepared perhaps to come down to section 245 which my hon. friend read, and which so fully illustrated the power that then was possessed and is still possessed under that Act, by the Governor in Council, and I do not think that he will stand appalled by the additional power that I suggest should be given to the Governor in Council to prevent an injustice being done to some innocent persons who may be affected by the use of the machinery this resolution gives to break up a combine.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who will determine the amount of compensation to be given? Will the inquiry have to be made before some judge?

Mr. BRITTON. No, I said the Governor in Council.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How do you find out?

Mr. BRITTON. In this way: Here is a duty on a particular article, and when the existence of a trust is established, that duty is removed. It is removed either altogether by having that article put upon the free list, or it is removed in part, accordingly as the Governor in Council may think proper. Here is a man who has innocently procured a quantity of that article that is affected; he is not connected with the trust or association in any way, but under that clause—because that is the only way that any injustice can be done to an individual, the only way there can be a loss to an innocent person—the property owned by him is lowered in value by the removal of the duty, therefore compensation can only be given to the extent of the loss he suffers by reason of the duty on that article being either removed altogether or reduced. So it seems to me to be a perfectly simple matter, and this removes the objection of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What about the future profits that he could have made?

Mr. BRITTON. Oh, well, we won't deal with those, because they are speculative.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then that will only be part compensation.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think that you can deal with speculative profits. This is only the actual loss the man has sustained, and to the extent of that actual loss, the man should be compensated, and with that exception I think the resolution is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether that amendment is an admissible one, because if I understand it, it effects a change in the revenue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No amendment has been moved except that by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CRAIG. I was surprised at the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) referring to my objection to those matters, when he has himself taken one of the strongest objections which, I think, can be taken to this clause. I may say in answer to the commentary which he made on my objections to the former resolution, that I think myself the powers given to the previous Government by the Act, were too great. The reason I object to this resolution, and the reason I objected to the previous one, is and was that the Government are constantly arrogating to themselves too great powers, taking powers away from Parliament, and I object seriously to that state of affairs. Now, Sir, I do not stand up here to discuss this question as a lawyer, but I wish to state my views upon it as a business man, looking at this resolution in a common-sense way. I find that some times lawyers do not look at things in a common-sense way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, take it back.

Mr. CRAIG. They take meanings out of clauses which are not there, and they put meanings into them which were never intended to be in them, and twist them in all directions. But I intend to look at this as a business man, and, as I said, in a common-sense way if I can. Now, with reference to combines, I need not say that I am no defender of combines, and do not stand up here to defend them, that is, illegal combines. I think there are sometimes combines which are not illegal, and which do not do any harm at all, combines which do good to the public. I think there are combines sometimes which enable the cost of goods to be reduced to the public, and the public benefit by them. I suppose that kind we are not discussing here at all. I take issue with the Minister of Finance in the statement he made that a protective system necessarily produces combines. Well, now I would agree with him if he said that a high protective system produces combines, because I think it does. I think that has

been the trouble in the United States where they have a very high protective system. But we have never had a high protective system in this country, our tariff has only been moderately protective. I might point the Minister of Finance to the state of affairs in England where there are a great many combines. In fact I may say that in this country we practically have no combines at all. I have not heard of them, and I do not think that the Government has heard of them either, although they act as if they had. Now, I wish to give briefly some reasons why I object to this resolution. My first reason is that it would place too much power in the hands of the Government, and I hold that the power in this resolution is too great a power to be entrusted to any Government. I have not so much faith in men and in human nature as some hon. gentlemen on the other side have. They seem quite willing to trust the Government in almost anything. I think it is one unfortunate result of the system of party government, that if a Government brings down a resolution, the followers of the Government seem to think that they have to support it whether it is right or not. I do not know whether they have studied this resolution, I do not know whether all the members on the other side of the House have read this resolution, or have carefully thought it out, or whether they are going to act independently on this question. I suppose they say: Oh, the Government have brought this down, and so it is all right. Now, I wish they would look at it in an independent manner, I wish they would study it carefully, and say what they think about it themselves. We have had only one hon. member who seems to look at it independently, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and he has very strong objections to this resolution. He agrees with the leader of the Opposition in the objection that he made to it to-day; and I think that if we had some other members getting up, who are not members of the Government, they might point out some other strong objection, and the result might be that the Government might blot this resolution altogether out of the Tariff Bill. I think it would be just as well if they did that. I see no necessity for this resolution, I do not think they see any necessity for it, they have not shown us any necessity for it, and the Finance Minister says he hopes there will be no necessity for it, that this is intended more as a preventive than anything else. Well, Sir, I object to this, because it entrusts too much power to the Government. Now, some hon. members on the other side act as if the Government were made up of angels. Well, Sir, I want to tell them that the Government is not made up of angels at all. The Government is made up of men, and men who are very liable to be tempted just as other men are. I know it is a theory that I have heard propounded in the

Mr. CRAIG.

country, that all the evil in the country belongs to the Conservative party, and all the virtues belong to the Liberal party. Well, Sir, in my experience I have found that is not the case. I have found that, take them all in all, they are pretty much alike, they are all very apt to be tempted when they are placed in face of temptation. I do not want them to be tempted. I do not want them to be placed in a position where they might yield to this temptation, and on that ground this resolution might lead to great abuses. If we give them this power we are surrendering the rights of Parliament, and I object to giving up the rights of Parliament. Suppose there were such a case as is contemplated by this resolution, would it not be better to wait until Parliament met before proceeding to deal with it? Parliament would meet within six months, and no great injury would be done to any one in the meanwhile. Then, why not wait and come down to Parliament and say: we find in certain lines of goods there are combines, and we propose to have the duties reduced or taken off. That would be a business-like way of acting. This is not a business-like way of proceeding, and it is conferring a power which should not be entrusted to any Government because it is liable to be greatly abused. I object to the resolution as regards the grounds stated for the Government taking action. We find it stated that the Government, "if they have reason to believe." Some men may come to the Government and tell them that certain rivals in business have a combine, and they may give the Government some slight reason for their belief, and the Government may be disposed to follow up the charge. But the resolution goes further, and says if there is "reason to believe that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination or agreement of any kind." It is getting down to a pretty fine point to say, "agreement of any kind" to enhance the price of the article in question. While I am opposed to combines on general principles, I believe there are combines for increasing the price of articles that are perfectly legitimate. This may appear to be a strange statement, yet it is a fact. Manufacturers, for example, may be cutting prices so that some of them will have to go under. They meet and say: we cannot go on in this way, it is impossible to continue, and we must come to some arrangement and agree not to sell under certain prices. No injustice was done, because the prices were already too low; yet those men would bring themselves directly under this clause, and if the Government were informed, they might see reason to believe that an agreement existed among those manufacturers to increase the prices of those articles. So I object to the grounds stated, which will give the Government reason for acting. What are the powers asked?

The Government ask for power, if they have reason to believe there is any agreement to enhance prices of manufactured articles, to appoint a judge to investigate the business. I think that is the most serious part of the whole resolution. What are to be the powers of the judge? He will have power to compel the attendance of witnesses, to force the manufacturers to produce all their books and papers; and it has already been well pointed out that it may prove most disastrous to business men. They do not want to produce their books and papers before a judge and before the public. It would be turning their business inside out when there might have been nothing wrong done, or when perhaps there might be a combine for raising prices to the rates that should prevail. This would prove a great hardship. The power to be conferred on the Government is altogether too great. We are told that the judge will report whether there is a combine or not. What standard is there on which the judge is to proceed to report whether or not a combine exists? How can he decide that it is a combine to the injury of the public? His judgment will be merely the expression of his opinion. The Government will have to decide, after receiving his report, as to the action to be taken, if any. I object to this resolution because I consider it arbitrary, and hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I point out why it is arbitrary. It does not say the Government "shall" do so and so under certain conditions, but that it "may" do so and so. If the Government have reason to believe there is a combine, they "may" appoint a judge. But they may not do so. They may favour some parties at the expense of others. If the judge reports there is a combine, the Government "may" reduce the duty or take it off. But they may not do so. In the resolution as first submitted the word used was "shall," but it is changed to "may," and that renders the resolution worse, because it leaves with the Government arbitrary power to do what they please, and the Government is composed of men who are human and are liable to have friends. I do not care whether the Government is Liberal or Conservative. We know how prejudiced we are in our party affiliations, and the Government is also liable to be prejudiced, and when its members possess arbitrary power which they can exercise or not, they are liable to use it in cases when they should not use it, and they are liable not to use it when they should use it. So I object to this resolution because it is arbitrary and because it opens the door for the persecution of certain men. The Government may think there is a combine, when practically there is no combine to the injury of the public; yet they may subject those manufacturers to very great inconvenience, to large expense in defending themselves when they are innocent, and

in this way the resolution might lead to very great abuses being practiced. The hon. Finance Minister stated that a protective system leads to combines, and he led the House to believe that it was because the tariff policy is protective that this resolution was necessary, and that combines would not exist under a revenue tariff. Do the Government know of any combines existing to-day? We have heard much in the past about the cotton combine. I do not know that there is such a combine, although this was alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in Opposition. What has the Government done with the cotton combine, if there was any? Have they reduced the duties or placed the articles on the free list? Perhaps when one-eighth or one-fourth is taken off the duties they will be no higher than they were under the late Government, but practically there is no reduction. That shows the inconsistency of the Government to-day. If the Government think there is a cotton combine—and I hope they do not think so—they have taken no action. I therefore infer that the Government do not think there is any combine to the injury of the public. This resolution is not only arbitrary, but it is tyrannical as well. It is following the lines of the Government of Russia instead of a Government like that of the British Empire.

It seems to be inaugurating a system of terrorism. I do not say that the Government will do this; but, if a certain number of manufacturers should have some arrangement amongst themselves, and if they should be supporters of the Conservative party, then it is open for any one to levy blackmail upon them. I do not say the Government will do so, but somebody may say: I will inform on you to the Government; and rather than have trouble they might be willing to come down with a consideration to the man who made the threat. The mode of procedure provided by this clause is further open to this objection; that it is entirely contrary to British principle. Under our British constitution every man is considered innocent until he is proven guilty, but here you lay down a procedure which is entirely the reverse of that. The Government say, they have reason to believe that certain manufacturers have entered into an arrangement, and thereupon at once they treat them as being guilty of crime, give a judge plenary powers, and drag the manufacturers, with their books and papers, before that judge. Their business is injured, the secrets of their trade are exposed to the public, a thing which is most obnoxious to business men, and if in the end they are found to be innocent they have no redress whatever. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) talked about an amendment to give compensation to parties who are not in the combine, when the duty was taken off. That, Sir, is a pro-

position which cannot be carried out. But, if this law does go into effect, I hold that there should be a provision to compensate those who have been treated after this fashion at the hands of the Government, and who have been found innocent. I repeat my contention, that this law is unjust, because it will punish the innocent with the guilty. The Minister of Finance told us that probably there would be nobody in the same line of business outside of the combine, but it is nevertheless, the fact that a great injury might be done to manufacturers who were charged with being in a combine, when they were not in a combine, and, when their prices were only fair prices. The amendment of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) would not cover the case at all. If a man's business should be entirely injured by the action of the Government in this respect, the granting to him of a comparatively small sum of money would not compensate him the depriving him of his means of livelihood. But, Sir, do not the Government see that by taking the duty off certain goods which might be manufactured by a combine of this kind, it would open the door to a combine in the United States to send their goods in here free of duty. You would abolish the combine in this country perhaps, but you would place the whole trade of Canada in these articles, under the control of combines in the United States where there is no doubt combines exist. Would that be any satisfaction to the people of Canada? I am afraid the Government do not value my advice as much as they ought to; but nevertheless, my advice is disinterested, and it sometimes might do them a little good. It is said that two heads are better than one, and I would give the Government this good advice: strike out this clause altogether. Perhaps they inserted it in the Tariff Bill to please some men in this country who have been crying out against combines; but surely the people of the country have sense enough to see that it is not a proper law, and surely the insertion of it for that purpose will not be of any service to the Government. So far as I know, I do not think we have any combine in Canada, but if combines should spring up under this protective tariff which the present Government is giving us, then let them come forward at the next session of Parliament and pass an Act to suppress these combines. If the Government show us that there are to-day combines existing in this country, then I might withdraw my objections to this clause; but as they have failed to do that it would be the part of wisdom for them to withdraw the section. I believe that the sense of the country is against allowing the Government to take too much power in their own hands. This clause gives them a very great deal of power which they can exercise without the consent of Parliament; which I hope they will not abuse if they insist on passing this

Mr. CRAIG.

law, but which, whether they abuse it or not they will be liable to be charged with abusing. As a disinterested friend, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to drop this clause and let us go on with the business. We want to get on with the business of Parliament, but we do not want resolutions inserted here which are absolutely unnecessary and which are dangerous to the good government of the country. If this Government really wishes to suppress combines, let them submit a stringent law and the Opposition will be ready to help them in passing it. I do not think that it is the business of this Parliament to constitute crimes to be punished in a special way. Why, even a man guilty of murder would not be dealt with in the manner in which it is proposed to deal with Canadian manufacturers under this clause. If the Government are in earnest in this matter, let them proceed by due process of law in the open light of day, and let the accused have the opportunity of defending themselves. Then, if they are found guilty, let them be punished by a penalty which shall be stated in the law—not the penalty of taking off the duty; but a penalty by fine, or by imprisonment if the Government should deem it wise to do so. Let the Government not go back to the principle of the dark ages which assumed at the outset that the accused was guilty. Let them adhere to British precedents, and let them not go to Russia for an example of how to conduct the business of this country. If this clause passes the House it will be nothing else but a piece of tyranny. I believe that the Government would act wisely if they would withdraw this resolution, and I believe that the friends whom they are seeking to please by the insertion of it, will, on consideration find that there is no good reason for placing it on the Statute-book.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I trust I will be pardoned for being a little suspicious of the gratuitous advice which my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) has tendered us to withdraw this resolution. He is seeking to put himself on record as being sincerely desirous of passing legislation for the purpose of effectively preventing illegal combines, but he himself is supporting a resolution which admits their existence, and which proposes to formulate a law for the purpose of controlling or suppressing them. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) mean by that kind of work? The hon. gentleman, like his colleagues, stands in this peculiar position: that while you are dealing theoretically with the question, they are with you and prepared to take the most stringent measures, but the moment you propose to deal practically and effectively with an evil they withdraw like an oyster into his shell, and refuse to have anything to do with it. The hon. gentleman declares, as a supporter of the re-

solution which his leader has moved, that at the present moment he is ready to support a measure to prevent illegal combinations to unduly enhance prices. Well, both sides of the House seem prepared to do that, and if so, what is the use of his asking proof that such combines exist in Canada, when he thus puts his desire on record to at once legislate to prevent these illegal combinations. Does not the hon. gentleman see the exhibition he has made of himself? Just for the purpose of talking against time, he uses an argument which is answered and condemned—

Mr. CRAIG. I rise to a point of order. I do not know that it is quite in order for the hon. Minister to say that I rose for the purpose of talking against time. I do not know whether he is doing that, but I can assure him that I was not doing it; and I want to say, with reference to my supporting this amendment for the suppression of combines, that it does not show that I admit that there are any now. I do not know that there are. I only say I choose that rather than the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will accept the hon. gentleman's assurance that he is not talking against time. I will accept his further assurance that he does not mean anything by this resolution which he is going to support.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not say so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. However, I believe him to be a thoroughly honest man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not mean privately, for I assume that we are all honest privately in our business relations. I mean politically. At all events, he impresses one with the idea that he desires to do the honest thing. Look at the position he is in to-day. He is not only championing the manufacturer—I do not object to that—he may be one of that class himself—

Mr. CRAIG. I am.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I trust he is a successful one; he has my best wishes in that regard. He is doing more; he is defending these trusts and combinations of manufacturers against the consumers. We do not hear a word said by these hon. gentlemen on behalf of the consumers; but the existence of combinations and trusts for the purpose of fleecing the consumers is defended, and the manufacturer who is engaged in this illegal and improper conduct is held up in the light of a martyr. Hon. gentlemen say, "Be careful what you are doing; see the punishment the poor fellow is getting. If you try him openly, you will expose his business to the world, and if you try him secretly, you will

have a Star Chamber." So we can do nothing. The result of the hon. gentleman's argument is that while there are in the community a number of trusts and combinations for the purpose of fleecing the consumer, you must leave them severely alone lest you injure them in their pocket.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the hon. gentleman tell us where they are?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely, when the hon. gentleman proposes to take stringent measures to suppress them, that is the best evidence that they exist.

Mr. CASGRAIN. For my own information and the information of a great many members on this side of the House, I would ask the hon. gentleman to name some of the combinations which exist to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not the judge to whom this matter of fact has been referred. I have heard several cases of combinations proved in this House within the last year or two. My hon. friend will recall the nail combine which existed some years ago, and the binder twine combine.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You have done away with that, because you have taken the duty completely off.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Thanks to us, we have destroyed one possibility of combination. But we proceed to go further and catch the others, and the hon. gentleman is anxious to prevent us. That is where we stand to-day. Now, I want, in all seriousness, to point out to my hon. friends that that vast number of people in this country known as consumers have a right to some consideration, and I respectfully submit that my hon. friends have not appreciated, or have not fairly expressed to the committee, what is the real meaning of the clause now before the House. I do not understand that clause to be framed for the purpose of punishing the offender either in person or in pocket. The object of the clause is rather that stated by the Finance Minister—to prevent the coming into existence of these combinations than to punish the offenders; and the mode which we have adopted to attain that object is one that ought to appeal—if not to the lawyers, upon whom the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) so severely animadverted—at least to the class of whom he says he is a member—the men of common sense. What does the clause seek to do? It says:

Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any number of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to un-

duly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers,—

This fact must be *prima facie* proved to the Governor in Council before they make a motion at all. Then, what do they do? This clause does not say that they are to decide anything. This fact, which is *prima facie* proved to them, is referred by them for adjudication to a judge of one of the superior courts of the land. What better method could be adopted of ascertaining the fact than to refer it to a judge of the Supreme Court or the Exchequer Court of Canada, or to a judge of the superior courts of one of the provinces? And his duty will be to ascertain whether or not that fact, which appeared *prima facie* to be proved to the Governor in Council, really is an established fact.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In other words, whether a crime has been committed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In other words, whether there is a trust or combination between two or more manufacturers for the purpose of unduly enhancing prices to the consumer; in other words whether, taking advantage of the law, which was intended to give them certain advantages as home manufacturers they, instead of acting honestly under that law, combine to rob and fleece the consumers of the country. That is the fact to be ascertained by the judge, by calling witnesses, examining them under oath, and hearing both sides. A tribunal is utilized for this purpose such as British men are accustomed to appeal to. To a judge, a man above suspicion, who has neither the interests of the manufacturer nor the interests of the consumer to serve, but who stands midway between both, a man not politically biased in favour of one party or the other—to this impartial tribunal is referred for adjudication the fact, which has been *prima facie* proved in the first place to the Governor in Council; and only if and when he reports that such fact has been proved, does this section come into effective working. And what is the effective working of the section? Is there a fine or penalty imposed on the manufacturer? Is he haled to prison or otherwise punished, as you would imagine, to hear hon. gentlemen talk?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Worse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend says we mean to do worse. We do mean to give the consumer a chance to live. We reduce the duties by which the illegal trust carries on its operations, so that there may be competition from abroad—that and nothing more. The honest manufacturer is not interfered with or disturbed. If a manufacturer is not in a trust, and by competition his prices are kept down to a fair and normal condition,

Mr. DAVIES.

the section does not go into operation at all. It is only when prices are unduly enhanced to the consumer; and if there is proper competition at home, they are not unduly enhanced. It is only when a state of things exists which hon. gentlemen on both sides unite in condemning that the section may be brought into operation; and it only may be brought into operation after the facts have been found before a tribunal in whom, heretofore, at least, the people of Canada have had the utmost confidence. But my hon. friend, with his lawyer-like sagacity, discovered that if such a terrible state of matters were disclosed, this doer of evil could be also subject to prosecution under the criminal law. Why should he not be? Will the hon. gentleman answer that? If he has knowingly transgressed the law, and that fact has been discovered by means of this reference, why should he not be punished? Is the manufacturer who legally enters a combination or trust for the purpose of fleecing the consumer to go unwhipped of justice? Is he alone, of all men, to stand above the law because of his money or the fact that he is a manufacturer? I trust not. And if the evil which the hon. gentleman anticipates should occur, I say that justice would be done and justice only.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not British justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, because he would not be punished unless he was guilty, and unless and until he is brought before a jury of his peers. In the first instance, the public wrong would be remedied, and in the next instance the private wrongdoer would be punished. Now, there are two things to be done—to remedy the public wrong and punish the private wrongdoer, and this section seeks to accomplish the one but does not concern itself with the other. The punishment to the wrongdoer would be meted after a fair and impartial trial before a jury of his peers. I do not know that anything more need be said on this matter than has been said by my hon. colleague the Finance Minister.

But the hon. gentleman says that the investigation would reveal business secrets. It appears to me that this class of men who enter into these illegal combinations for the purpose of unduly enhancing the prices of commodities are sought to be guarded and protected by hon. gentlemen opposite in every possible way. Suppose these men do enter into these illegal combinations and unduly enhance prices, is there any man of common sense in the House who would think it wrong to tear away the veil and let the public have a glimpse of the machinations and means by which they are fleeced by these people. Why, I think it is a public good and not a public wrong which would be effected by tearing away the veil and

letting us see the secret machinations of these manufacturers. It does appear to me that this section is so hedged around and guarded that no wrong can be done, because before it can come into operation at all, a prima facie case must be made out to the satisfaction of the Governor General in Council. There must be a prima facie case established that there does exist a trust or combine which has for its object the unduly enhancing of the prices of commodities protected by our tariff. That fact being proved, the case is referred to a judge of the Supreme Court for investigation. The affirmative must be proved to him after a fair trial, after he has examined witnesses upon oath, and after a report to that effect has been made by him to the Governor in Council, they do not attempt to punish the man by fine or imprisonment, but they say to him: The duties behind which you shelter yourself and which were put in, not to enable you to fleece the consumers, but to raise revenue for the country, have been taken advantage of by you to unduly enhance prices and to prevent competition, and we will therefore lower the duties. We are told, however, that evil might possibly result to a manufacturer not in the trusts that he would also be punished, but that appears to me a contingency of a most remote kind, because if there are such manufacturers who sell their goods to the consumer at reasonable prices, the condition of affairs which would enable this section to be put in operation could not exist.

One more objection was raised by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, and that was the objection that the references to the judges, under this section, would place the judges in an invidious position. Why, how could you ever establish the existence of trusts unless you referred them to a judge for investigation? There is no other way of finding out. We do every day refer similar matters to the judges. We refer to them cases arising under the election law, involving political issues, and a much stronger objection would apply to such reference than to the reference under this clause. There are no politics in this. This is a fact, the existence of a combine, which is not a political issue, and which is a very proper matter to submit to a judge.

I would simply suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that in order to put the meaning of the section beyond doubt, the word "unduly" which is found in the fourth line should be repeated in the first part of the sentence as well as in the last, so that it would read "unduly enhances the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers."

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the hon. Minister whether the Governor in Council has any discretion to delay or not the sentence, supposing the judge does report that there is an agreement or combine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I would say the Governor in Council has a very large discretion and I will show the hon. gentleman why I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I want.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want not only to give my answer but the reason. Two facts must be established before the section can come into operation at all. The judge must report that a combination, association or agreement exists for the purpose of unduly enhancing prices, and then it must appear in addition to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the customs duty imposed. If that does appear, the Governor in Council may place such articles on the free list or reduce the duty sufficiently to overcome the existing evil.

Mr. FOSTER. Or the Governor in Council may do nothing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is in the discretion of the Governor in Council to refuse to act at all. And I am quite sure if they did, their refusal would be the subject of proper criticism in the House when it next met. The facts would be brought before the House to pass upon. The best judgment I can form on the section is that it is a discretionary power vested in the Governor General in Council to act, and the extent is always discretionary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the duties of the Governor General in Council be judicial or political?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Judicial.

Mr. WALLACE. One would imagine, on hearing the hon. Minister of Marine denouncing the combines, that he has great consideration for the poor consumer and that he was dead in earnest in all he was telling this House. Why, I remember when a combine Bill was before this House and when we were asking the assistance of members of this House to put the Bill through, the hon. Minister never raised his voice except in carping criticism and objections to the Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I raised my voice to tell the hon. gentleman that the Bill he introduced was a perfect sham and could not be worked, and experience has shown that I was right.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, and the Minister of Justice of that day, the late Sir John Thompson, quite as high a legal authority as the hon. gentleman, stated in this House that it was a workable Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appeal to the logic of the facts.

Mr. WALLACE. The facts have nothing to do with it, because the Bill was mutilated when it went into the Senate. It had the same objectionable feature as this clause has. The Senate put in the word "unduly," and the proposition of the Minister of Marine is to put it in this clause three times, and thus completely emasculate this worthless proposition. We are told that this proposition takes effect when the prices are unduly enhanced to the consumer. Who is to decide when the prices are unduly enhanced to the consumer? Here is an article, say, that costs in England \$1, the duty being 25 cents. If it were sold at \$1.25 by the Canadian manufacturer the price would not be unduly enhanced. But this \$1.25 might give an enormous profit to the Canadian manufacturer, and it might be a price to be maintained only by a combination to control the market for the manufacturers here. The statement made by the hon. Minister is entirely illusory. It will amount to nothing. Then, he tells us: We will examine into these combines. But suppose that examination takes place. A number of gentlemen in the House, or a number of gentlemen on the Treasury benches are in combines, gentlemen who are in the Government if not in the Cabinet. What becomes of the investigation then? Will these gentlemen sit in judgment on themselves and condemn themselves to imprisonment or to submit to the abolition of the duty on the articles in which they are interested? Not a bit of danger of it. I read here of a combine in biscuits, in confectionery. This combine, I am told, exists to-day, and is in full force.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We have been told that there are no combines.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not heard that statement made.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) said so.

Mr. WALLACE. If I heard him correctly, the hon. member (Mr. Craig) said that he did not know of any combines; he did not pretend to give an authoritative statement that no combines existed—for they do. I will tell you of one combine that raised the prices of a necessary of life in this country 50 per cent in one day, and that not many days ago. I speak of the combine of cotton thread manufactured in Great Britain. How are you going to reach that? And there are many combines of the same character. How about Crosse & Blackwell's goods? They compel the wholesale grocers to sell their goods at certain prices, and if they sell at other prices they are refused further supplies of the goods. Does the Bill make provision for such combines? You do not pass a law that will be applicable to every one that breaks it. You come to this House and get a law passed

Mr. DAVIES.

that can be held as a threat over the manufacturers of this country. You can find no other reason for it.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the biscuit combine?

Mr. WALLACE. I was led away from that. But it is nearly six o'clock, and we must soon get back to the biscuits. Here is the unanimous report of a committee of this House which took evidence on this subject.

Separate organizations exist in these products among a large number of the leading manufacturers in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. A number of manufacturers—but they are the smaller ones—are not members. The principal object is to maintain prices.

The Biscuit Association has been in existence about six years, and, although the prices of the ingredients used have in that time very materially decreased, the prices of biscuits have remained about the same.

Mr. FOSTER. And now the duty has been put up.

Mr. WALLACE. The duty on these goods has been put up, and the duty on the raw material has been lowered. I assume that the combination still exists. I know that it did a few months ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And therefore we need this clause.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this clause will not be put in operation against the biscuit and confectionery manufacturer, but it will be held as a weapon over the heads of other men. This report goes still further, and it has never been contradicted, for it cannot be.

It was found by comparison with the United States price-lists, that Canadian goods are, in some finer and fancier varieties, 20 to 30 per cent higher than goods of equal quality on the other side of the line.

Mr. FOSTER. That refers to buscuits.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

The Confectionery Association is of recent formation, and the usual result followed at once, viz., a rise in the prices.

The Minister of Finance said that under this law that he proposes, we should have no more combines. He said that it would prevent the formation of combines and that those which existed would speedily dissolve. Why, as I have pointed out, there are many of these that this proposed law does not touch and cannot touch. Take the first combination mentioned here, that of sugar refiners and grocers. The sworn evidence of Mr. Lightbound contains the statement that the sugar combination did not originate with the refiners but with the wholesale grocers. Then, the first item in the report mentions the case of the watch-case manufacturers in Canada. There was only one establishment in this line here at that time, and they were controlled by the watch-case com-

bination in the United States, which would drive them out of business if they sold at prices that this combination did not approve. Then, take the coal combination.

Combinations exist among coal dealers in Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and London.

In Toronto a Coal Association has been in existence for some years, and in 1886 it was affiliated with the Toronto Board of Trade and designated as the coal section of this board.

In this coal section there are some 56 members, about half-a-dozen of whom are importers, and the others retailers, who get their supplies from the former at 75 cents per ton less than the price charged the consumer.

This combination is pronounced to be a most objectionable one. It is said that they have raised prices, that they have adopted stringent regulations for the government of the retailers, that they have done everything to curtail trade and raise prices to the consumer. But how can the law affect these men? What is the penalty here provided? The lowering or wiping out of the duty. But on anthracite coal, which is the chief item of this coal combination, there is no duty.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman will see if he looks at the resolution, that it is made applicable only to cases where the illegal combination to fleece consumers is facilitated by a customs duty on a like article when imported. If there is no duty, then in that case the section does not apply.

**Mr. WALLACE**. That is exactly what I say. We are told that this is to be a protection to the poor consumer for whom the hon. Minister weeps such copious tears. But it does not protect him at all. That is the very objection I have to it. Why not make a general law? We have a general law now, but it was emasculated in the Senate by putting in the word "unduly" that the hon. member is going to add to this clause.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Your amendment has the word "unduly" in it.

**Mr. WALLACE**. I have not submitted any amendment.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Your leader's amendment.

**Mr. WALLACE**. I don't know that I have any leader, either. I go somewhat on my own lines, and I find the occupation so congenial that I am not in a hurry to leave it.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

## After Recess.

### THE AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY'S CONTRACT.

The House resumed the further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Belcourt for third reading of Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. When the hour for the consideration of Private Bills expired some nights ago, I was endeavouring to place before the House as succinctly as possible, and in the briefest space of time, such portions of the correspondence relating to the facts surrounding this company, which to my mind made it necessary for this Parliament to pause before it gave its approval to the third reading of this Bill. In continuation of the reference to the facts, I very much regret that it will be necessary for me to take up the time of the committee at any further length; but I cannot leave the argument which I deemed it proper to present to the House at the point where I left off the other night. In this blue-book to which I have already made reference, there is, at pages 38-39, a report of the Deputy Minister of Finance made before the contract was entered into with this United States company; and I call particular attention to this portion of the report where Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister of Finance, discusses the facts as presented by the tender. Referring to the difference in prices between the American Bank Note Company and the other tenderer, he says:

This difference is so great that the undersigned deems it desirable to make some remarks thereon, and while he is unable fully to understand the reasons for it, he considers it might arise from various causes. In the first place, the new tenderers—the American Bank Note Company—may possibly think that they would be able to make up the difference by the increased rates at which they tender for supplies that are not generally in demand. If the contract is awarded to them, this feature should be kept in mind and carefully guarded against. Further, a very great difference between theirs and the tender of the British American Bank Note Company arises in the price given for printing notes. Seeing there is such a manifest difference between the two tenderers on this item, the undersigned thinks some inquiries should be made through some expert, and he would suggest that the matter be submitted to the Queen's Printer, in order to ascertain whether the tender of the American Bank Note Company is one that could be carried out successfully, seeing they may have tendered at unremunerative prices in order to secure a foothold in the country.

I am not aware that the Queen's Printer was called upon in connection with that suggestion, and I am not aware, further, that that very serious point was investigated or inquired into, as the Deputy Minister of Finance seemed to think was advisable and necessary. But evidently the Deputy

Minister of Finance had those suspicions which I have expressed in regard to the United States company, that the prices for the work to be done for the Government here, were altogether at variance with the prices ruling in the market where these tenderers had to confine their business. The Deputy Minister goes on to say :

In connection with the foregoing, the undersigned begs to point out, that at the time the present contract was entered into, full and explicit inquiries were made as to the rates of the American Bank Note Company, and also as to the charges made by the British American Bank Note Company to the chief monetary institutions in Canada ; and in one case the department was allowed access to the bills rendered for printing notes for the institution in question by the British American Company. The result of the inquiries proved that the rates charged to the Government for this class of work were in no sense larger than for the institution in question, and were not then higher than the rates quoted by the American Bank Note Company. The account rendered to the institution in question is now in the possession of this department. It can hardly be possible that since the present contract was entered into prices for the work have fallen to such an extent as the rates offered by the American Bank Note Company would lead one to believe. Indeed, from the tender of the present contractors it would appear that it was found necessary to raise the rates in some lines in the offer now submitted. Accordingly, it would appear that other reasons exist than those pointed out, inducing the American Bank Note Company to tender at rates so much lower than now paid. Before entering into a contract with this company, if it be intended to do so, the undersigned respectfully suggests that care should be taken, and a distinct understanding arrived at, that no safeguard observed by the present contractors in conducting the business, should be omitted in executing the work under the new contract.

I have shown by other references to this transaction, Mr. Speaker, that that very wise suggestion and recommendation of the Deputy Minister, even was not adhered to, but was departed from in a singular and important instance indeed, with respect to the very foundation of the work :

In this regard, the undersigned may state, that very great care is taken by the British American Bank Note Company for the custody and safe-keeping of our notes when in course of preparation.

Again the Deputy Minister of Finance says:

Should the Government decide to enter into an agreement with the American Bank Note Company, it would appear to be desirable to bear in mind also, that the institution is an alien corporation, all the officers who would, in all probability, conduct the business with the Government and carry out the orders, would probably come here from New York. In this connection,—

And I call particular attention to these lines of the report :

—In this connection, the undersigned has to call attention to the condition appended to their tender, that they are not to be required to manufacture bank-note and other papers, steel rolls, steel plates, the dies and other tools of their trade,

Sir CHARLES HIBBEHT TUPPER.

inks, colours, &c., at Ottawa, but may obtain elsewhere such supply necessary to a faithful fulfilment of their contract. This would appear to allow them to do a large portion of their work at New York, and is a feature of their offer which seems to require very careful consideration.

Again the Deputy Minister of Finance points out :

A contract with a new company would necessarily entail an immediate outlay for designs, rolls and dies necessary in the preparation of the new plates required. It would, in fact, entail all the expense attaching to the preparation of the new notes and stamps. This, of course, would be unnecessary, if the work remained in the hands of the present contractors, and this extra expense has not been taken into consideration in comparing the tenders.

Then leaving that report of the Deputy Minister of Finance, which does not seem to have been considered or treated with the care that I think it deserved, I find on page 40 that calculations were made by the officers suggested by the Deputy Minister of Finance, but made in another shape, I think, by Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Treadwell. These gentlemen say :

The calculations are based on figures given in Schedule "D" to the terms and conditions of tender of 19th October, 1896. In the calculation as to Dominion notes, the cost of designs, rolls or dies required in case of a new issue of notes, is not taken into account.

On page 47 there is a letter from Mr. Free-land in which he makes, I think, a wholly unsupported statement :

It being this company's intention to prepare the work in the highest style of the art, the limitation to the use of such talent as is procurable within the Dominion, would be detrimental to our intention. Such talent is not resident in Canada, nor obtainable in the market, while the portrait, vignette and lathe-work engravers of the parent establishment could be employed here with much greater efficiency, each in their several branches.

Ignoring the whole fact that there was in existence a British institution in this country, in this very city, under the shadow of Parliament itself, where such talent had been obtained and such experience gained as resulted in work that had elicited the statement from the Finance Minister himself, I believe, that there was no dissatisfaction with the work of the old contractors, I have already referred to the statement of the Deputy Minister of Finance detailing the steady reduction that had been made in prices during the time that the old contractors had been charged with carrying on that work. At page 54 there is a communication from Mr. Burland that I think should have the fullest publicity. In a letter dated January 13th, 1897, addressed to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Burland says :

1st. That ample capital has been invested at the request of the Government, to satisfactorily prepare all the work required by the Government.

2nd. That the contract has been awarded in violation of the terms and conditions of the specification.

3rd. That no notice was given that foreign tenders would have privileges not embodied in the specification.

4th. That the terms of the specification would be violated by giving the privilege to foreign competitors for a double period without equal rights to the local company.

5th. That the greatest injustice would be done local capital by allowing free duty to such foreign competitors without any allowance, in lieu thereof, to the local company.

6th. That all persons tendering against invested capital should show their ability by having suitable premises and machinery with which to do the work, the tenders of all parties would then be on equal terms.

I call attention to a letter from the Finance Minister to Mr. Burland, dated 15th January, 1897, where the hon. gentleman deals with Mr. Burland in this spirit :

You had an ample opportunity of tendering, and you did tender. If your tender had been the lowest, you would have received the contract, but unfortunately your tender was an excessively high one, the acceptance of which would have been a grave injustice to the public interests. The Government deemed it to be their duty to accept the lowest tender coming from capable and responsible parties. Acting upon this view, they have awarded the contract to parties whose tender was very much lower than yours.

I call attention to the fact that the Minister of Finance in that letter seems to have ignored altogether special considerations and special facts brought to his attention by the Deputy Minister of Finance, and to have utterly ignored and overlooked the fact that in the case of what he calls the excessively high tender, there was a strict and accurate compliance with the specification, and in connection with the foreign tender, to which he has been so indulgent, and in connection with which he has gone so far out of the way to meet the views of the foreign tenderer, that that was an irregular tender and was not in compliance with the specification but departed from the specification in most important particulars. In the petition to His Excellency the Governor General, the representative of the old company, the Canadian institution, makes the following, among other representations, and as some of the points that have struck me as important are perhaps more concisely than I have expressed them, I will read some paragraphs from that specification :—

4. That the notice for such tenders was a printed one, and comprised the specifications and the essential terms and conditions of the proposed contract which any tenderer would have to execute if his tender was accepted by the said Government.

8. That all your petitioners' work is done here at the said city of Ottawa, by Canadian artists and artisans employed here, in a special building erected here for that specific purpose and constructed to the satisfaction of the Government of Canada.

11. That your petitioners are also informed that it is contemplated to allow the dies, rolls and

plates used in connection with this work to be brought into Canada free of duty. The value of the dies, rolls and plates belonging to your petitioners and used by them in carrying out the present contract, exceeds the sum of \$50,000.

12. That, if the American Bank Note Company is awarded the new contract, and if it uses the inks for printing bank notes and the post card paper which it usually uses for like work in the United States, the difference in the price of material now supplied by your petitioners and what would be supplied by the American Bank Note Company, would be as follows :—

The figures are given, making a total amount of \$15,495, or amounting in the five years to \$77,475. The petitioner goes on and gives further analyses in the same direction. I will not trouble the House with reading further from the blue-book, for I have referred to those portions which fully bear out the points I have proved from the departmental reports and departmental statements.

Leaving the blue-book, I think the references I have given establish beyond question that in connection with this whole business of letting a contract in regard to this important national work, the British American Bank Note Company, the Canadian company, complied with all the conditions required ; that the American Bank Note Company, a foreign company, did not ; that other Canadian companies did not, and that the English companies were ruled out at the very outset by having put before them the fact that the condition as to manufacture of the dies, and so forth, in Ottawa, would be insisted upon ; and that, afterwards and subsequently, they having been ruled out, that condition was not insisted on, but a private arrangement was made with a foreign corporation, and to their satisfaction, that operated to the detriment of the home company. It follows from what I have said and what I know that we have given to aliens, to an alien corporation, privileges which were not extended either to English people or to Canadians or to the subjects of the Queen ; and now we are face to face with this Bill and we are asked to consent to its being read the third time. What do we see in that Bill, and what does the Bill represent? It asks this House to endorse in blank all the privileges enjoyed by this foreign corporation and to exercise them in the Dominion of Canada, and this House is got made aware in any shape or form as to what those privileges are. This House is not made aware of what the New York legislature thought, in the exercise of its discretion, proper to confer in the way of authority, power and privilege upon this corporation ; nevertheless, though their policy may possibly have no connection with these matters as regards the practice of our committees, we are asked, blindly and in the absence of the information needed, none of which appears on the face of the Bill itself, to say that the whole of the privileges and rights which this corporation was granted by the legislature of New York, shall extend

to the boundaries of the Dominion and that this company shall enjoy those rights. That is a practice wholly at variance with the practice of this Parliament in regard to other corporation charters either in the mother country or in any of the provinces of this Dominion. When a company comes from any of the provinces to this Parliament it has always been the practice of our committees to investigate the powers conferred on it, and the practice of late has been to compel provincial companies, or companies holding charters obtained outside of this Parliament to ask practically for the re-enactment of all privileges they desire, and set them out on the face of the charter this Parliament is asked to grant. There is wisdom and common sense in that course, because the House is thus able to see exactly what is being done and what rights the company is seeking to acquire. But in this case, all these sound principles have been departed from, and Parliament is simply asked to confirm clauses of an Act that has met with the approval of the legislature of New York. We could not obtain any such legislation in any state of the union, we could not get any such legislation in any colony of the Empire, and it goes without saying that we could not get such legislation in the Parliament of the mother country. What kind of organization has this company? Are we to depend on the preamble of the Bill for the statement?

The Bill is an absolute blank regarding its organization; regarding the condition of its finances, and regarding the security that creditors in this country may have who in the future deal with that company. We are left in absolute ignorance as to its organization, as to its corporate powers, and I may say that it is not right that this Parliament should sanction such a thing as that. I have in my mind a few charters that were granted after some discussion, and after objections to them by a very leading authority at that time in this House. For instance, English corporations knocked at the doors of this Parliament and asked for recognition by Parliament of their corporate privileges, but in those cases very good care was taken that a copy of the articles of association of those English companies should be filed with the Secretary of State for Canada. No such provision is in this Bill and no such care has been taken in regard to it.

Now, to strengthen the objections I have been making, I would call attention to a Bill that came before this House, and which unfortunately was not very fully considered, except by the leader of the Opposition at that time, Mr. Edward Blake. I find that among other objection he made to the gift of these corporate powers to a foreign corporation—irrespective wholly of the provision that such powers as they enjoyed in the foreign country should be known to this

Parliament before action was taken—I find the following observations of Mr. Blake in 1882, in regard to the New York and Ontario Furnace Company:—

There is no information as to the character of this company, the nature of its organization, what its corporate powers are, or who the incorporators are.

And again he says:

Now, it seems to me, first of all, that unless there is some overruling clause to the contrary, our legislation ought to be in the direction of creating ourselves the corporation to which we give the power.

Hon. gentlemen will see that I have been endeavouring to argue from that point of view, and I venture to say without fear of successful contradiction, that as a rule that has been the policy of our committees, and that they generally insist upon putting in an Act of incorporation, the powers of companies, whether foreign or from a provincial legislature, when they come to the federal authorities. Again, Mr. Blake said:

That is a good reason, from my point of view, for our incorporating the entity which we have just recognized, with the power of landing its cable on the shores, with certain other powers which it was necessary for them to have, and which they could only get by the joint legislative authority of two legislatures of independent jurisdiction.

He was dealing with that class of cases, in which as he points out, you must have reciprocal action by two legislative bodies in order that a common object should be effected. Mr. Blake said further:

That reasoning does not apply to this case at all. All that is wanting to be done by the New York and Ontario Furnace Company could be done by a corporation composed, if you will, of the same proprietors as the company in this country. They could buy, as they could acquire, personal property; they could mine and carry on business, and there is no difficulty in their completing the whole of their operations by virtue of a provincial or Canadian incorporation, as the case may be. That is the first difficulty I had in acceding to the third reading of this Bill, that, without a clause which would justify a course obviously inconvenient, we are simply recognizing a foreign entity and giving it powers.

Mr. Blake goes on to argue somewhat on the line which I have argued, but I find unfortunately, that that discussion was not prolonged, and that the Bill was read a third time without the objections which Mr. Blake urged having been answered by the leader of the other side of the House. Nevertheless, it seems to be an important consideration. Now, this foreign corporation, this American Bank Note Company, of whose directors this Parliament knows nothing; if they are not prepared to come before Parliament, as other foreign corporations do, and ask for full consideration and re-enactment of all the powers they require outside of our general Act; they of course, under the comity of nations would

have, if we did not pass this Bill, certain rights and be permitted to carry on certain transactions in this country. If they wish to go further than the principle of the comity of nations permits them, it seems to me that they should comply with the practice that has prevailed in regard to corporations composed of British subjects, whether in Canada or in the mother country. I have in my hand (I don't propose to read from them very fully) two cases on somewhat similar lines, relating to Acts passed in 1891-92. In the case of British corporations when they came asking for recognition here, Parliament insisted on having the articles of their association, and the fullest information put within reach of the people of this country.

There has been no reason urged so far in the discussion of this Bill for extending these special favours and adopting this exceptional legislation in favour of this company. In order to show the peculiar favour extended to this company, I may point out that all the books of this foreign corporation—not such books as they keep in Canada and are in this building to be erected in Ottawa—but that in connection with any litigation that may arise in our courts, all their books are to be made a prima facie evidence on the part of that company. It seems to me there has not been that care given, or that it was intended, not to too closely observe these provisions which the company was asking from this Parliament. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, from all the reasons that I have put before the House, that the third reading of this Bill should not be approved by Parliament under existing circumstances. The reason for the Bill is one distasteful for me as a Canadian. The favours granted to this foreign corporation at the expense of our own Canadian industries, calls, I think, for our disapproval, and the exceptional legislation that is proposed—even if the company had merit outside of that—is contrary to the practice of this Parliament, and is establishing a dangerous precedent in connection with private Bill legislation.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). I do not propose to continue the discussion which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has raised, but after the lengthy and exhaustive speech which he has made, I think it but fair to tell the House, that this Bill was the subject-matter of a great deal of discussion in the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee. Every line and every clause of this Bill was thoroughly discussed, and the Bill as amended and framed in that committee, was made, as we believe, in conformity with other Bills which we have previously passed. In some of his criticisms, the hon. gentleman has not been quite fair to the committee that reported the Bill, or to the Bill itself. There is no creation of a new corporation by the Bill now before the House. This Bill simply recognizes a cor-

porate entity which exists and is brought into being in the state of New York. The articles of association of that company were before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and were examined by those who desired to do so; but it was not desired by the company that the powers which they derived from the New York legislature should be granted to them by this Parliament. They simply ask for one or two small but necessary powers. They ask, in the first place, that their corporate entity should be recognized. Every lawyer knows that by the comity of nations this company could do business of a certain kind in Canada, and sue and recover on business transactions which they might have here. But they ask:

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That their corporate powers should be recognized and confirmed.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, that is where I think the hon. gentleman is wrong, and it was for the purpose of correcting that wrong that I rose. This Bill does not profess to recognize the corporate powers of the company as such. It professes to give them the power to do certain specified things, and certain specified things only. The preamble recites:

The said company desires to have its organization and corporate powers recognized and confirmed by the Parliament of Canada, so far as is necessary to carry out this Act.

And the enacting part of the Bill provides that the company:

Shall be entitled to all the powers, privileges and rights, as a corporation, necessary for the purpose of carrying on in the city of Ottawa, Ontario, and elsewhere in Canada, a general engraving, printing and lithographic business in all its departments, and of manufacturing such machinery as is required for its own use, and also of acquiring and holding such real and personal property as is from time to time required for the convenient and proper carrying on of its business.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I had the preamble and that clause before me, and I certainly hold a strong opinion that taking the two together we have by this Bill recognized and confirmed corporate powers of which we know nothing, including the organization and all the powers of the company.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's construction. The words of the first section are very clear, very specific, and very limited. They simply confer upon this company such powers as are necessary to do the specific things mentioned here—to carry on a general engraving, printing and lithographic business, and to acquire and hold such real and personal property as is necessary for that purpose. Everybody knows that without that power they

could not carry on their business here at all. They could not hold real estate, and the main object of the Bill is to enable them to hold real estate.

Mr. POWELL: Could they not do so under the Alien Corporations Act?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that they could not do so in this city.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not directly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, and the Bill is for the purpose of enabling them to do that, and to provide that the moment they cease to carry on their business they shall dispose of their real estate. We do not confirm them in the powers granted to them by the New York State legislature; we simply give them the necessary and limited powers specified in the first section. The powers mentioned in sections 2 and 3 are not powers given to the company, but declarations made in order to give any person power to sue the company. These sections merely declare the manner in which they shall be served with process; and the objection which my hon. friend raises against the third clause, he will see on a more critical reading of it, cannot be sustained, because it does not make the entries in the company's books prima facie evidence for them, but prima facie evidence against them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. POWELL. They are evidence for the company as well as against them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What does it say?

All books of the company kept by the officer specially charged with that duty shall be prima facie evidence of all facts purporting to be therein stated, in any suit or proceeding against the company or against any shareholder thereof.

It would be a monstrous perversion of this section, and contrary to all canons of construction, to declare that the section, which is for the purpose of making entries in the company's books evidence against the company should be considered as making them evidence for the company. I submit that the clause only means, and would be construed to mean, that a party bringing a suit against the company may tender their books as evidence against the company. It would be contrary to all rules of evidence that a firm or company could tender their books as evidence for themselves.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know it is contrary to the rules of evidence, and that is one of the objections to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The clause as drafted was

Mr. DAVIES.

modified in the committee, and, as it now stands, I think it means what I have stated.

Mr. POWELL. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has hastened to that conclusion without weighing carefully the rules of construction. His statement of the rules of evidence is perfectly correct, but he is entirely astray as a matter of statutory construction. What is the meaning of the words, "against the company, or against any shareholder thereof?" These words qualify what immediately precedes them: "in any suit or proceeding." I am astonished at my learned friend arguing to the contrary. If these words are a qualifier of the words, "suit or proceeding," as they unquestionably are, let us look at the matter further and see how simple and natural the construction of the section is. "All books of the company shall be prima facie evidence of all facts purporting to be stated therein"—that is the declaration as to the respect in which they are to be prima facie evidence. In what cases? "In any suit or proceeding against the company." I do not think the case admits of doubt.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman. The rule of evidence is perfectly plain.

Mr. POWELL. It is the rule of statutory construction we are at, not the rule of evidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We must read the section in the light of the rules of evidence. A judge construing it would say that the entries in the books of this corporation might be evidence against them, but could not be made evidence for them.

Mr. POWELL. My hon. friend knows that the declarations of a party, in writing or not in writing, are evidence against him. It requires no statutory declaration for that; the common law is equal to the emergency. Then, if by virtue of the common law, the entries in their books are evidence against the company, as they unquestionably are, what is the need of the section?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You will see that is evidence against them and against the shareholders. The evidence of the charter would not be evidence against the shareholders in the ordinary course of law.

Mr. MONK. Allow me to call the attention of the promoter of the Bill to a matter of detail. Representations have been made to me quite recently that the similarity between the name of this company and the company already doing business in Montreal is calculated to mislead, and, in fact, has already produced some confusion. One is called the "British Bank Note Company," and the other is called the "Ameri-

can Bank Note Company." Where there are two companies in the same field of operations, it seems to me only fair that their names should be made more distinct from each other, and I deem it my duty, in view of the representations made to me, to call the attention of the promoter of this Bill to this point. We have already in Canada insurance companies doing business under almost similar names, the one being the Phoenix Insurance Company of London, and the other being the Phoenix Insurance Company of the United States, and I know that in Montreal that similarity has often produced great confusion. I would suggest to the promoter the advisability of making some change in the name of this company so as to distinguish it more easily from the other.

Mr. BELCOURT. That point was very carefully considered by the Private Bills Committee. The instances which the hon. gentleman has just quoted were quoted in that committee and duly considered, and the committee did not think that any inconvenience would arise from the use of the name as it appears in this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I have several objections to this Bill, and I propose to state them briefly. I am not going to argue the legal points, because that we will leave to the legal members of the House. I have an objection to the name, in the first place. I think it would be much better if a name had been given this company which would distinguish it beyond doubt from the company which has been doing business in Canada for so long. You may say that if you put the word "British" before the word "American" you make a very palpable distinction between the two. But it is no less a fact that, in the general run of business, it is very easy to confound the two, and that possibility might have been well avoided by changing the name of this company. I do not know whether this is the proper place to do that, but at a later stage I shall ask the promoter to consider that point. There are plenty of other names in the world, and it is not at all necessary that two rival companies should be so closely similar in name that there may be ground for confusing the two.

That is my first objection to the Bill. My second objection is this: Whatever the committee on this Bill knew, that committee's work is done. The matter is now before the House, and however able the committee may have been, and however fully they may have canvassed this measure, the House, when it is asked to consider the third reading ought to have all the information the committee had, if it desires. Now, what information has the promoter of the Bill given? We do not know in the least who the promoters of the company are. Why, powers are never given to a company to do business in Canada, whether by an Act of Parliament or under the General

Companies' Act, without the promoters of the Bill being known. That is a matter which is always carefully considered, and very rightly so, because it is well that the standing of the promoters of the Bill should be known. It does not throw discredit on the bona fides of the gentlemen behind this Bill, and it was not a sufficient answer for the promoter to say that these men are all right, that they are good business men, that they have been carrying on business for a long time, and that you must not cast aspersions on them. All that may be true, but at the same time it is a wholesome rule of this House, and one which has always obtained in the chartering of these companies, whether by Act of Parliament or under the General Companies' Act, that the promoters should be known, and Parliament has the right to know their names and what is really the organization of this company.

My next objection is to the powers given this company. I am not a lawyer, but if there is anything in the English language more clear than another, it is that Parliament, when it passes this Bill to its third reading and the Bill becomes law, not only recognizes the corporate powers and organization of this unknown company—a company entirely unknown to us so far as we have had any information given us to-night—but also confirms these powers, in so far as the Parliament of Canada can confirm the powers of any company. What are those powers? There is nothing more jealously insisted upon than that in the competition of business in this country, all companies should be placed upon the same level. We may say that, so far as the powers are concerned of this company for their operations in Canada, these are limited in the succeeding sections. That may be true, but it may be also true that if this corporation has great and inordinate powers, as compared with the totality of the powers which are possessed by the Canadian company, the company, doing its greatest business in a foreign country and with only a branch of its business in this country, has, on the whole, much greater powers, and therefore much greater leverage in the competition. Now, I do not think that this Parliament should be asked to confirm the powers of a foreign company without having one scintilla of information vouchsafed to it. Surely we in this country ought to ask that if a foreign company is to be pitchforked into Canada in order to destroy, if possible, and certainly to compete most strongly with a business which has been long established in this country, we ought not to give it the advantage of greater powers. We ought to at least insist that that foreign company shall have its powers set out before this House, so that this House will know what it is doing. The House has a perfect right to restrict these powers so as to bring this company on a level with the Canadian company. That is my second objection.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has done what he has done because of an alleged saving about which we will have something more to say by-and-by. The debate, which we have already had to some extent upon this matter, went into the facts and circumstances of the awarding of the contract to this company. This seems to be a corollary of the awarding of that contract, and this Bill is introduced by a private member in order to carry out in their entirety the arrangements which were entered into with the Government, and for what purpose? That we should have a foreign company in this country to do the work which a Canadian company has satisfactorily done and was willing to continue doing at the same rates as this foreign company. Now, that makes, or ought to make, Parliament a little jealous of giving this company inordinate powers. Let us know what this company is and what these powers are. Has the promoter of the Bill granted the least information to the House in that respect? I have not heard him; he has not done so. These, then, are my principal objections to the Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that it is unfair, if a contract has been awarded and if this company has been given the contract and if the House has, so far as it can do so without a formal motion approved of what has been done, we should not attempt to traverse that ground again by objecting to the incorporation of this company. I acknowledge the fairness of this argument. If the House is determined to support and approve the Government in giving the contract to a foreign company, it is not fair to attempt, by opposition carried out to its ultimate end of complete estoppel of the passage of this Bill, to subvert or destroy or hinder what Parliament wants carried out. But, at the same time, it is perfectly legitimate that we should give to that company only the powers that are given to Canadian companies. Even if it is necessary to go to the extent of doing that, they can do just as other corporations have to do in this country—apply to the Government under the Companies Act and get their letters of incorporation, and thus carry on their operations in conformity with the laws that Canadians have to conform to. But if the Government wish, through one of their supporters, to go outside of the Companies Act and get a special Act of Parliament, let them go through in the regular way that is followed by Canadians when requiring corporate powers. The plea I take is that we are now working in the dark, that Parliament ought not to be asked to work in the dark in this matter. We ought to know what this American company is, what powers and system of organization are to be given it and have the name changed so as not to cause confusion with that of an already existing Canadian company.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We cannot change the name of this company. You are not, under this Bill, creating a new company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You can do anything you please.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This company do not come here to ask for corporate powers. They simply ask you to recognize a name which neither you nor they can change unless you make a new corporation. To change the name of this company here would be to defeat the operation of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) a question. We will say that these people are to have this contract. Is it necessary that they should have corporate power before they can carry on the work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They can do it without that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They can do a certain work without it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it would not be a complete estoppel of their work. What they ask for is corporate powers, is it not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, then, why cannot they get them just as Canadians do. Let them come as John Smith and Timothy Jones and the others and make their application in the due order and receive the powers that we give Canadians under like circumstances. Let them get letters patent just as Canadians have to do. There is a way of doing these things. But it does seem to be carrying this thing very far indeed that, in the first place, you pitchfork them into Canada, a foreign corporation to do the work which we were prepared to do, and then take extraordinary measures, which are not taken in the case of Canadians, to give them the powers it is desired to give them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All the arguments about "pitchforking" have nothing to do with the Bill. I will not discuss that phase of it. I am pointing out that this corporation has a name and a corporate entity under the laws of the state of New York. It asks for specific powers in Canada. The Bill proposes to give it three specific, limited powers, which are named in the Act. Anybody who wished to deal honestly with the Bill, and apart from the contract, will not object to that. The objection to the name is not tenable. You must refuse to give them corporate powers or else give them.

If you give these powers, it can only be under the name known to the law and specified in the article of associations as already existing under the laws of the state of New York. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that we do not know what the names of the promoters are. All that information was given to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and before the committee passed on the preamble of the Bill, the articles of association were submitted, showing who the corporators and the promoters are, and what their powers are. They do not seek to have these extended corporate powers given in Canada, but only to have the power to hold real estate in Canada and carry on the business of engraving, lithographing and printing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There surely cannot have—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said a word beyond the rule, and I only wish to say another. A foreign corporation has no more rights here than foreigners individually. This company comes here and, as an hon. member of the House has pointed out, its name happens to conflict with that of a Canadian company. To be regular, they should do what a private individual from the United States would be required to do, what other corporations are doing every day, ask for a separate charter under a new name, the charter to cover the powers they require.

Mr. BENNETT. When the general discussion took place on the correspondence regarding this contract a week or two ago, I did not participate in it. But as the discussion on this Bill has grown very general, I desire to say a word. I must say that the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill cannot complain that he has not had ample time and opportunity for meeting the many objections that have been raised to the passage of this Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not complain of that.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says he did not complain of that. But there has certainly been complaint on this side of the House and there certainly have been many strong and forcible objections offered to the Bill. It is well known that not only in this but in other countries many lawsuits arise by reason of the similarity of names taken by different incorporated companies. It does seem to me that the gentlemen who bring this American Bank Note Company into Canada, as they do, not for the purpose alone of carrying on this contract which they have executed—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills having expired, the House will proceed to the Orders of the Day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to call attention to the fact that there was an understanding that the Bill should be disposed of during this hour and would not be thrown over for another day.

Mr. FOSTER. No, my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) is not right in saying that it was limited to the succeeding hour. If he will look at "Hansard" he will see that he is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was understood that if the Bill was postponed until my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) came back, no attempt would be made to block the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I confirm that statement. I myself stated that, so far as I was concerned, and I thought I could speak for my friends, there would be no attempt made to block the Bill, and I should be very sorry if any action of the kind were to take place. But I do not think that anything was said that would limit the discussion, or prevent the full discussion of the Bill, which, as I understand, is not blocking the Bill.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WALLACE. When the Committee rose at six o'clock, I was alluding to the combination that was in existence with regard to biscuits and confectionery. I was saying that though there was evidence, and I have it before me now, that this combination had raised prices to the consumer, and raised them very largely on some varieties of goods, yet I thought that this Bill, so far as that combination existed, would not be very effective. But who are we to have in the first instance as judges? They say they call in the judges of the Superior Court. But the Council of the Government of Canada have to make an indictment before they can call in the judges to examine into any particular case. Well, Sir, the Government, before they call in the judges to make an investigation with regard to this biscuit factory, of course they appoint those whose particular duty it is to make this investigation, and they call in the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his two colleagues, the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs. These three gentlemen are a committee to find out and discover whether there is a case to present, whether there is an improper combination among the biscuit and confectionery manufacturers of this country. Now, Sir, just imagine these three gentlemen at work. I have no doubt the Minister of Trade and Commerce would give a righteous and unbiassed judgment, but

how does the case stand with the other two? Could we expect from those gentlemen, whose interests, we are told, to some extent are bound up in this very item of manufacture—could we expect these gentlemen to condemn themselves and their friends to the penalty imposed by this clause of the Bill which provides that the duty should be entirely taken off, or reduced to a degree to bring the manufacturers to their senses, and then leave them open, after that investigation, to the criminal prosecution which might follow? Because the Combines Act is still in existence, and this Bill, as I assume, will not wipe out the provisions of the Bill enacted some years ago. So I say we might find that these gentlemen, instead of condemning the manufacturers of biscuits and confectionery, would perhaps give them an additional bonus, or give them more protection, would give them more protection even than they had before under this Bill. We find they are hard-working and industrious men, and they might require still further protection. Now, I say that in that regard the Bill would work no good, but incalculable evil. But what do we find in this Bill. Why, Sir, I imagine that I could write a little history of this clause in this Tariff Bill. Don't we know that Sir Oliver Mowat has been adopting in the province of Ontario, for the last twenty years or more, a system in regard to hotel licenses, that deprives the hotel-keepers of their freedom in this country, deprives them of their right and their independence. That is a fact known to every one in Ontario who has taken any interest in this question. And, Sir, I imagine that I see the fine Italian hand in this tariff of Sir Oliver Mowat.

Mr. McMULLEN. Your statement is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for North Wellington should withdraw that statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will correct it by saying that the statement is not correct, but I only do so because the rules require it.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is very good for the hon. member for North Wellington, because I did not make any statement at all; I said I imagined that I saw the fine Italian hand of Sir Oliver Mowat in this clause of the Bill. I was going to ask the hon. member for North Wellington how he knows that the hand of the late Premier of Ontario is not in this clause. He must have been a member of the Cabinet; he must know what took place in the Cabinet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be allowed to set myself right. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented me in the statement which he has made, and I ask the right to correct it. The hon. member said that Sir Oliver Mowat had passed a

Mr. WALLACE.

License Act in Ontario that deprived the hotel-keepers of their franchise. I said that statement was not true, then I corrected it by saying that the hon. gentleman had made an incorrect statement, and I say so now.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is wrong as usual. What I said about the hotel-keepers of Ontario was that Sir Oliver Mowat had deprived them of their independence, not of their franchise, that he had adopted a system of ballot which was not secret, by which the votes of these hotel-keepers could be known, and were known, and by that means the screws could be put on them and they were told: If you vote against Sir Oliver Mowat's Government, you know what to expect when license time comes around. And experience has shown hundreds of times that that threat was not a vain or empty boast, but was carried into effect when the time came round.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says. No. Does he know what is occurring in every riding in the province of Ontario?

Mr. McMULLEN. Give a case.

Mr. WALLACE. I can give him a case in the west riding of York, lots of cases.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, you cannot.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not going to satisfy his curiosity just now. But I will give him two names, John Duck and Thomas Hastings, in the west riding of York. Does he contradict that; does he deny it? He don't know anything about it. I can give him twenty names, if it is necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN. In that case he is a Duck as well as yourself.

An hon. MEMBER. You are a canvas-back duck.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, I was proceeding to say that Sir Oliver Mowat, finding how exceedingly effective his tactics were in the counties of Ontario with regard to hotel-keepers, and how he could exercise improper influence, an influence that he was not justified in exercising against hotel-keepers, he now comes down to Ottawa and says: Gentlemen, I have got a bigger job on hand than that. This scheme against the hotel-keepers has worked like a charm. They dared not vote, or if they did vote, they had to vote the way our friends told them, else they got into trouble. Now here are the manufacturers in this country with tens of thousands of employees, and we can adopt the same method with regard to them if you will let me manipulate the matter. And here, Mr. Chairman, is the result—clause 17 of this Tariff Act, a clause that can answer no other purpose if it becomes the law of the land. It would be a most effective weapon to hold over the manufacturers of this country. Just imagine some Minister of the Crown,

we will say the Postmaster General by way of illustration, visiting a constituency at a by-election, perhaps East Simcoe, and going to Orillia, where he might meet Mr. Tudhope, who is a large manufacturer of wagons and buggies. He might say to that gentleman: we are not going to interfere with your industry; we will give you, in fact, more protection. But when the Minister comes back to Parliament the Government forthwith brings down another tariff dealing with that industry. The Postmaster General may go back at the next general election and say to Mr. Tudhope, who is a large manufacturer: you are making a great row about the duties, stating that we are interfering with the protection you are enjoying; we hear, however, there is a combine in wagons and buggies, and we will make an investigation, the result of which may be that the duty will be wholly removed and we will deprive your industry of the whole protection it at present enjoys. That will be the inevitable result if that clause is adopted. Will it be tolerated in any free country that the whole of an industrial interest shall be held at the mercy of the Government of the day? This is an interference with the freedom of Canadian manufacturers. If the present combine law is not strong enough, then a Bill should be introduced which will make it more effective, and give the law power to punish all manufacturers who organize combines that are against the interests of the consumers. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to look after the interests of the consumers, notwithstanding what was said a few moments ago by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman stated that the combine Bill was a sham. Did the hon. gentleman propose a single amendment to make it effective and give it force when that Bill was introduced, or has any hon. gentleman opposite said one word in favour of any Bill to protect the rights of the consumers? There is not on the records any statement made by the hon. gentleman or his colleagues in favour of such a Bill. During his remarks I pointed out that there was a combination among thread manufacturers in Great Britain, that those companies had a central agency and that the agency had advanced prices 50 per cent in one day. This Bill will not interfere with combinations made in foreign countries, and it cannot interfere to any extent with combinations in this country of men other than manufacturers. These are the two great classes of combinations that work injury in Canada. This Bill will help them, it will not hurt them. I have already called attention to combinations among coal dealers and wholesale grocers. This Bill, I repeat, will not interfere with combinations of manufacturers in foreign countries, who bring their goods here; but it will tend to crush out

the industries of this country, especially at election times, when hon. gentlemen opposite know that tens of thousands of men are employed by manufacturers and their interests are identical with those of their employers. This Bill proposes to take the whole subject out of the courts and place it in the hands of the Government, because the reference to a Supreme Court Judge is a mere pretense. The Government must in the first place, make out a prima facie case, they must make the investigation. They can hold this clause over the head of a manufacturer until an election is over; by this means they can exercise a species of terrorism over not only the manufacturers but their employees, whose bread and butter depends on obtaining employment. This course can be pursued until an election is over, and then either the Government or the judge can decide that there is no case. Another reason why this clause was inserted in the Tariff Bill was because hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition had made a loud outcry against monopolies and combines. Hon. gentlemen opposite brought down the tariff which was a curious muddle of protection, a little free trade and a little arrangement to destroy some of the industries of the country. They now say to the free traders, who are very much dissatisfied with the tariff, that by this clause now under consideration the Government will kill all monopolies. The ordinary elector is not aware that there is already such an Act in operation, and that the common law of the land also to a certain extent applies; and so the Government put in the tariff Act a provision that they allege, will kill all combines and monopolies and show that they are looking after the interests of the free traders in that regard. They think that will satisfy the farmers and be accepted as an instalment of free trade. That might be very well if they were dealing with people who were not intelligent, who were not able to read for themselves and follow public affairs; but the people will see that this clause has not a single redeeming feature, that it is an interference with the courts. This clause should form no part of the Tariff Bill, and there never was a Tariff Bill containing a clause so foreign to it as is clause 17. This subject should be dealt with on its merits and by itself; but that would not be doing what hon. gentlemen opposite desired to do. They are carrying out a lesson given them by Sir Oliver Mowat, derived from his experience in the Ontario legislature, and this clause is introduced for the purpose of intimidating the electors of the country. But I warn hon. gentlemen opposite that it will not work and will not accomplish the purpose desired. Again, the Minister of Marine stated his case in this way: suppose there is a combination on a certain class of manufactures, but that all the manufacturers of that class are not in the combine, then if

their prices are right, where is there any grievance? But, he added, if their prices were inordinately high, then there would be a grievance and all those men would deserve to be punished. But who is to be the judge as to the price at which the manufacturer or producer is able to sell his goods? Was ever such a proposition heard of in a free country before, as that the Government should tell a manufacturer the price at which he should sell his goods? No man has the right, no Government has the right, no judge has the right to dictate the price at which a manufacturer shall sell his product. Who can tell the cost of putting together the raw material, of making sales, the amount of bad debts, the capital required, and what would be a legitimate profit on any article, except the manufacturer? Yet the Government propose, without looking into these matters, to decide them offhand. They are going to say that if the prices are too high they will abolish the protection given to that industry, destroy the capital engaged, drive the men out of employment and ruin the manufacturer's business. That is what the Minister told us; that he was going to decide this on his own knowledge, and if he does not decide it, who will? The judge cannot decide it; nobody can decide it except these men who are engaged in the business themselves. Competition in this country will regulate these prices, and competition from the outside will regulate the prices that should be paid, and if competition does not regulate, and if combines be formed, then let the laws of the land already on the statute-books deal with this question. I referred the other evening to the Canadian Iron Founders' Association, which had a combination at one time. The association was formed twenty years before, and it numbered eighteen firms. Outside of the association there are forty manufacturers of the same goods, some of whom are large manufacturers, but the majority are small firms and they make stoves for wood, stoves for coal, stoves for heating, stoves for cooking, and every class of stoves. Every one of these manufacturers makes an article of a somewhat different kind, and the Government may say that these eighteen men have made a combination of their prices, and then it is decided by this immaculate Government, which knows it all, that the prices are too high. They have no basis to guide them in that decision but, nevertheless, they decide that these manufacturers who are outside the combine, who have broken no law of the land, who are pursuing their business legitimately, this Government decides without a moment's notice, and on a Star Chamber proceeding, and they get notice that their industry is wiped out and that their protection of 30 per cent has ceased. The raw materials which they use are dutiable, and their machinery is dutiable, and everything

Mr. WALLACE.

is dutiable, except their product, and so the industry is wiped out.

Now, is that a power that this Parliament should give to any Government? I contend it is not. I contend that it would be a great wrong, and as the Government have already reconsidered ninety or one hundred clauses of their tariff, I trust they will consider a few more, and that they will bring in a tariff with clause No. 17 eliminated. It is to be hoped that they will leave out that clause, and so remove at least one blot from a tariff which is not a very creditable production for any Government.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words with regard to this clause, because I think that hon. gentlemen opposite have scarcely done justice either to themselves or to the clause, nor have they given such lucid explanations to the House as would enable hon. gentlemen to understand how far this clause can be successful in accomplishing what they aim at. At the outset, I may say, that we on this side of the House are as much opposed to trusts, combines, or monopolies as the members of the Government can possibly be, and we are as willing to fight them, and to fight them effectually, if possible, as any people of this country could be. But where we disagree from the Government is as to the remedy which they propose for accomplishing that end. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us in his opening remarks that the countries in which the protective principle prevailed were always the countries in which combines flourished most successfully. It is evident the Minister of Finance is not an extensive reader, or that he has given little attention to the subject, or else he would not make that statement in the Canadian House of Commons. If he takes up any authority on the subject, and there are many in the Library, it will be made plain to him that these combines, these trusts, and these monopolies were as flourishing in England for several hundred years as in any other country in the world. And, Sir, that remark applies not only to the time when England was under a protective system, but also to the period during which England has been, comparatively speaking, a free trade country, and to-day we find trusts and combines as prevalent in England as in any other period of history. We find men combined with regard to trade, controlling the buying and selling of goods, controlling the various lines of commerce, as effectually in England to-day as in any highly protective country. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to some of the occasions on which the authorities in England have been called upon to deal with this question. In 1340 all the tin mines of England were monopolized by a German. A century later the King's Merchants were said to have the monopoly of the known resources of alum, and they had it under a combine. In 1505 King Henry VII. provided regulations

for the trade of rope-making in the town of Bridgeport in the county of Dorsetshire. Again, in 1830, there was another provision limiting the manufacture of clothing to the inhabitants of Worcester, and there are a number of these in succession. In 1609 the king was obliged to revoke all monopolies by proclamation. In 1618, 1624 and 1639 he was obliged to deal with them again. In looking over this work which I hold in my hand, I find that in every age in the history of England, they have been troubled with monopolies, trusts or combines, to as large an extent as have the people of protection nations. In the United States these combines were more widespread in their evil effects than ever they could be in this country, and perhaps we may benefit from the experience of the United States in considering how they dealt with this matter. They tried the very remedy in the United States that is proposed by the 17th clause of this resolution; that is, to do away or reduce the duties on the various lines with reference to which a combine existed. This was proposed several years ago, and the only difference between the United States law and the law proposed here, is, that in the United States they made it a separate Bill, and did not connect it with a tariff resolution. But the people of the United States found that such a law was ineffectual, and it has been abandoned long since. Then, after several years' experience they fell back on another remedy. There was a committee of the House of Representatives appointed in 1888, which inquired into the working of trusts in the United States, and they concluded their report with the opinion that while a trust may be dangerous and should be watched by law, it did not necessarily imply monopoly; that combination has greater powers of good and evil than individuals, but that its power for the latter is lessened by the discoveries of the age, and, the committee held that the severest penalty should be prescribed and enforced against associations, the object of which may be monopoly or the enhancing of prices. In their wisdom they represented this to the House of Representatives, and the House of Representatives adopted their report, and passed, not one law, but several laws on the subject. As people found ways and means to evade the laws passed by them, they amended these laws and made it a punishable offence for individuals to put their business under a trust, or a combine, or in the shape of a monopoly. Now, then, Sir, the injustice perpetrated on the community by trusts and combines is such that we should anxiously make it our duty to do away with them as quickly as it is possible to do so.

But will this resolution, if passed, accomplish it? I say it will not. Suppose to-day you undertake to deal with a trust known as the Standard Oil Company, which I am told has got a footing in Canada, and whose

influence is beginning to be felt here; how would this clause affect it? It is a foreign corporation. No oil could be brought into this country from abroad, either Russian or English oil, on account of the distance. The country would be under that gigantic monopoly, and it could not be reached by this resolution 17 at all, as it is a foreign corporation. There are other combinations which this does not reach. Men may agree to sell the lines of goods they are handling under one management, or under some arrangement by which they will all sell at one price, and that price far above what they should be sold at. This does not touch them in any way. As the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said, it could only touch the manufacturers who are protected by a duty. But what is the proper remedy for these combinations? I say it is a law that will effectually punish those who form them, by fine or imprisonment, or both; that is the only way you can deal with them. I do not wonder that the Government have devised this means of satisfying a large part of the community who desire to see combines, trusts and monopolies dealt with; because I remember that one clause in the Patron platform was in favour of doing away with combines and monopolies, and when an amalgamation of the Patrons and Reformers took place, it was necessary for the Government to delude the Patrons with the idea that they were trying to accomplish that end. But they must be deluded in this case, because this provision will in no way accomplish it. Another reason why I object to this clause is that it is powerful for evil, but not powerful for good. It puts in the hands of a few men the power to harass or annoy or interfere with the operations of business men in the country. The result of this resolution, if passed, will be to put the traders and manufacturers of the country under the control of the Government to such an extent as to keep them in perpetual dread of being attacked under this law. It might be used as a means of levying on men political contributions or blackmail to any possible extent. I say no Government should have in their hands the power to intimidate or annoy any class of people, or to prevent them freely exercising the franchise, or to make the traders of the country feel that if at any moment they are not friendly to the powers that be, they will run a great danger of becoming the objects of an inquisitorial investigation that might ruin their business. However desirous the Government may be to restrain and control trusts and combines, this law cannot be effectual. What would it do in the case of the insurance combine which we have in the country to-day? What duty could it take off insurance? How could this law reach that combine? There is no way of doing so. If the Government desire, as they profess, to reach these combines and trusts, they should introduce and carry through a special law

for that purpose. In the United States laws have been enacted putting it in the power of private individuals to institute actions against these combines and trusts. But it was found that that would not do, because if they failed to get a verdict, the party who instituted the action was liable for damages, and the combine struck back at him. Therefore it was found that the law had to be enforced by the state. Why did not the state enforce the law which was put on the Statute-book by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)? Sir Oliver Mowat refused to enforce that law. He said private individuals should do it. Did he desire to suppress combines and trusts when he refused to enforce that law? I say he did not want to make it effectual; and to-day he is intelligent enough to know that the only way in which you can successfully strike at these combines and trusts is to make it a punishable offence, by fine or imprisonment, or both, for people to enter into such combines or trusts to the detriment of the country. If they enact and put in force such a law, then and not till then will these combinations be dealt with effectually. For these reasons I oppose this resolution. I hold it to be radically wrong, in the first place, because it is connected with the Supply Bill. It should not be there, but it should be an independent law, if it is to be of any value whatever. Then it should reach combines and trusts of every kind, whether of manufacturers, traders or importers, whether in insurance or in any other line of life, whether in selling or purchasing. It should be a law that would reach all alike and punish all alike. You are making this law applicable to certain classes, and not to other classes. For these reasons I oppose this clause. I think it would be very injurious, and of no value whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say a word or two before this debate goes further, to voice the objections to this clause in the light of some remarks that were made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who thinks the question is of such little importance that he is taking a sound sleep now under the sound of my voice. However, I have no doubt he will wake up before long. I object to this legislation, in the first place, because of the nature of the tribunal in whose hands the prosecution and the final judgment and carrying out of the sentence is reposed. The prosecutor in this instance is what? The prosecutor is the combination of leaders of a political party, who exist to bring their party into power and to keep it in power by opposing all and sundry of the people of the country who are not of their political belief. Now, I say that the head of a party organization to wit, the Government, under the circumstances which exist in this country,

Mr. SPROULE.

is not the tribunal which should have the ultimate arbitrament of cases in which men are to be tried, where evidence of the most minute and technical character is to be brought, and where judgment in the way of affixing penalties is to be made. If there is, in the first place, to be confidence in the country that justice will be done, the very poorest way possible to induce that confidence is to make your tribunal the head of a party organization, I do not care whether you call that tribunal a government or anything else. What is it more than anything else which contributes to a feeling of security in life and property? It is that the judiciary of a country are removed as far as possible from sectarian strife and prejudice and partisan sentiment. It is that these men, so far removed from party strife and prejudice and resentments, are governed by a long array of precedents set by illustrious justices, and an accumulation of legal customs and enactments, so that when they come to the adjudication of any claims, they come to it as far removed from political influence as possible and governed by a long line of distinguished and weighty precedents and law by which alone they are guided. Now, if that be the proper judiciary to which to refer ordinary matters affecting life and property, how is it that when we come to treat of the great manufacturing and industrial interests of the country, in which millions of capital are invested and in which the employment of thousands and hundreds of thousands are at stake, you adopt an entirely different course and submit these questions to a partisan body. In the case of disputes between claimants, involving in many cases perhaps only a few hundred dollars, they have to be submitted to a court governed by precedents and by the law and free from any political influence, but when the interests of merchants and capitalists and of the workmen employed in our manufacturing establishments are at stake, you refuse to allow these to be adjudicated upon by these independent tribunals. I submit to the legal sense and to the common-sense and fair-mindedness of this House whether we can safely refer such matters to a body composed of men like, for instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) who, whatever high estimate we may form of him in his private character, is in political matters a partisan of the most pronounced type, a man of the strongest political views, and an inveterate opponent of all wicked Tories. Does any one suppose that in a court composed of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues there can be any confidence in justice being done entirely uninfluenced by political partisanship? The moment you bring a man before such a partisan court his first consideration will be what political influence he can get to secure a decision in his favour. Why, !

recollect, not more than twelve months ago, a very high official in this country, representing the Queen, stated in a public document that he thought it would be quite well to leaven the judicial bench of Canada by the appointment of a few Liberals thereto so as to avoid the suspicions of having thereupon too great a number of Conservatives. Well, Sir, we are to-day asked to create a partisan court with respect to which every man who is hailed before it, if he is of the same political stripe, feels that he has thirteen judges in his favour and who, if he is on the opposite side, is convinced that he comes before thirteen judges who have every interest in pronouncing against him. That is not going to heighten the feeling on the part of the people that justice will be done. No more fatal blow could be dealt to the public feeling of security in justice being done than to establish a court of that kind.

I object to another thing. These gentlemen actually proposed, in the first place, that both the prosecutor and the court before which the facts were to be submitted were to be those same thirteen partisan men composing the Cabinet. They slept over that proposition however. There were some very strong remonstrances from some of their own friends, and they dragged in the judge—to do what? To help them to carry out the injustice they proposed to perpetrate. They dragged in a judge and a judge appointed ad hoc—one of their own friends if they like. And do you suppose that they would put in one of their former opponents? Is it not a vicious thing any way to make a tribunal which shall be prosecutor, in the first place, and which shall pronounce and carry out the judgment in the second place; and then get a judge appointed ad hoc; selected from their own party, and looking for preferment from that party. And appointed for what purpose? To pronounce judgment according to the law? In no sense, because they take care that the judge should not pronounce judgment. All he has to do is to take the rules of procedure that those thirteen partisans draw and direct and find out whether there is an agreement or not, and when he reports whether there is or not an agreement, that judge's work is done. Apply such a proceeding to the Supreme Court of Canada. Carry your case to that court from any other, have the whole matter sifted in the way of evidence by those judges and let those judges simply give their opinion and then say to them that they must shut their mouths and stay their hands. And a partisan thirteen, to wit, the Cabinet of this country, must say whether a judgment shall be given or a penalty enacted or not. Is that giving justice? But that is what they are doing. And they are taking refuge in silence, in ignoble silence, when arguments are brought to show that their course of

proceeding does not tend to exalt the sentiment or comply with the rules of justice in this country. Then, when the judge appointed ad hoc shall have sifted the evidence and made report, according to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), the partisan thirteen may hold up that judgment in their hand and shake it in the face of the interest affected and say: Do as we want you to do, or we will put on the penalty; do as we want you to do, and we will not put on the penalty.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is what you do.

Mr. FOSTER. I hear my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Oh, how the independent man has fallen! How limp has become the stiff backbone of fourteen months ago! To-day he is willing to sap the very foundations of justice—he, the power behind the throne, who made these speeches here, nine hundred and ninety-nine of them in a single session, and made those speeches in the country on the triumphant force of which his party was floated into power. He, the very builder of his party, must sit there, his strong, adamant backbone reduced to a jelly-like condition, repeating the parrot formula: I have great confidence in the Ministers. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries acknowledged here to-day that it was simply discretionary with the Council of thirteen to carry out or refrain from carrying out the penalty. I object to that. If we are going to have a judge, if that judge sifts the evidence and comes to the conclusion that there is a crime, let him fix the penalty, and let that penalty follow certainly and unerringly upon the criminality. These thirteen men are there. Why? Because they have a majority of the votes in this House. How? Through a political propaganda. They will retain their places how long? As long as they can get the support of the majority in this House; that is, as long as their followers in the country will support them. Now, what will happen? Bring up your case; prosecute it before the ad hoc judge; get his decision that there is a crime. Then comes the question whether the crime is to be met with a penalty. The judge cannot inflict one; it is left for the thirteen to say whether the penalty shall or shall not be inflicted. If the industry that is attacked is a powerful influence in the constituency of my hon. friend from North Wellington, he or his party heelers will come down on the Government in time and say: Don't you carry out the penalty against these men; we will get their votes in the coming election if you use them right. Am I telling of something that is not done? Why, to-day that Cabinet of thirteen have not a peaceful hour in any day of their lives because of the pressure of the back benches to cause them to turn honest men out of office and put party heelers in their places.

They know it; they know it well. And what a tremendous enginery this will be, when the noble and unbiassed thirteen, kept in office by the votes of some hundred odd men who are kept in their places in this House by the ward and county workers. And the ward and county workers will come down in an avalanche of letters and deputations to these unbiassed thirteen and say: Just let that hang there until the elections are over. Will it be done? Of course it will be done.

Mr. MCGREGOR. He understands it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do understand it. Yes, and hon. gentlemen opposite understand it right well, and that is why this resolution is put there. Let us say a word about the penalty. Is it not an axiom that no man can question that if a wrong is committed the penalty must be laid upon the person who is adjudged guilty and upon him alone? What is the penalty in this case? It is one of the most absurd penalties I ever heard discussed. So absurd was it that the generally thick-and-thin supporter from Kingston, the hon. member (Mr. Britton) who spoke this afternoon, felt his conscience stirred so that he had to rise and declare that he agreed with the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) on this point and to ask: If you make the innocent suffer with the guilty in that penalty, at least compensate the innocent. That is something. We have made one break in the serried ranks. We have got the wise representative from Kingston, a legal man too rising and speaking from a long legal experience. An over-weighted man who has felt the burden of Government repression on his shoulders for weeks and weeks, at last feels he cannot remain under it longer and must roll it off. He rolled off the burden of subserviency and told the front benches:—You are putting on a wrongful penalty; I agree with the leader of the Opposition so far as this matter is concerned. And what is the penalty? A number of pork-packers in this country, we will say, in the carrying on of their business and engaging in competition with foreign producers, make a combine or agreement to raise the prices of pork to what they think a remunerative point. The prosecution starts. The unbiassed thirteen get their work in. They call on the ad hoc judge; he gets the evidence and reports that the pork-packers have raised the price of pork. There are the facts, and here are the judges assembled. What is the penalty? The penalty is that the duties are taken off pork and the pork-packers are dished. But when these unbiassed thirteen dished the pork-packers what else did they do? They dished every farmer from one end of the country to the other. What a lovely penalty that is? To punish half a dozen pork-packers you take the duty off pork and expose the farmers of this country to competition without any tariff protection, com-

Mr. FOSTER.

petition which the Government themselves declared is too strong. The first tariff they brought down declared free competition too strong for the farmers and so they put the duty on pork up two and three cents to give the farmers a chance. Beautiful even-handed justice! We often hear of justice being blind. This is justice swaddled completely and laid under the bench. Let us go further. Take the iron manufacture of this country. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite bring down a tariff which provides for certain duties upon iron? Is it for revenue purposes only? They know that it is not. They know that if they wished to raise revenue simply, they would put the duty just below the producing point in this country, so that all the iron would be imported. Instead of doing that, they have put the duty up so that they think there will be a countervailing advantage to preserve the immense iron industry of this country. Some of these iron men go to work and form an agreement, the prosecution starts, the ad hoc judge is brought in, he declares there is an agreement, the penalty is brought down, the iron duties are taken off. What happens? You have punished these few iron furnaces, haven't you? But what else have you done? You have destroyed an industry in Canada that the Government declared ought to be protected so that it might exist. A delightful penalty, an even-handed justice which, in order to punish the wrong-doer, goes to work and destroys one of the vital industries of the country. Take the cotton manufactures. Why did my hon. friend raise the duties on cotton? Did he not raise them? He cannot deny it. Why, he put a double process on, he raised them first and took a bit off afterwards, then he left what he declared to the cotton people was sufficient to protect them and the cotton industry in this country. The cotton men make a combine, some of them, half a dozen of them. They make this combine, the prosecutor goes to work, the ad hoc judge is brought in, his report is that there is an agreement, down comes the penalty, and off goes the complete duty on cotton. What is done? In order to punish a few cotton men who have made an agreement, the whole cotton industry of this country is destroyed, and millions of capital is left barren and waste, and thousands of men are left out of employment. Delightful justice, even-handed justice, most considerate justice at the hands of the immortal thirteen. In order to punish a few recalcitrant cotton manufacturers, you go to work and destroy a whole industry; you go to work and put thousands out of employment, and destroy what you have beforehand declared was a vital industry and ought to be kept. Worse still. The cotton manufacturers do not manufacture cotton for the fun of it. (Now, when that conversation is over I will try to get on.) I give fair warning to hon. gentlemen oppo-

site that some time there will come a day when, if we are debating important questions and debating them fairly and honestly, and we are not treated with the courtesy of listening to our arguments and attempting to give us light where we need it, that there will be a very wholesome discipline which will be imposed on this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it will be done, and it ought to be done. Under the rule of the hon. gentlemen opposite, short as it has been, parliamentary government, parliamentary discussion, the very first element of parliamentary life, is rapidly being thrown out of gear in this House; and these hon. gentlemen begin to think that they have simply to put a resolution on the paper, and bring it down, then leave us to talk about it until we get exhausted, and then pass it by their votes. The time is coming when that will not be possible in this House. It would be well for the Government if they would just give a little heed to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have heard it all about fourteen times already.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some men who can hear a truth fourteen times, and yet get not a glimmering idea of what it means the fourteenth time; and it is necessary that such obtuseness should be pierced, if it is possible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You cannot pierce it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I cannot. I have no weapon strong enough or keen enough to get at the inside of what that hon. gentleman thinks is his brain. Now, let us take up the cotton manufacture again. You have had your attention called, you have had your ad hoc judge, you have had your judgment, you have punished the few cotton manufacturers, but you have destroyed the industry. What else have you done? As I was going on to say, the cotton men do not manufacture cotton simply for the fun of it, they manufacture it to sell. They don't keep it in stock any longer than they can, and when they manufacture their millions of pounds of cotton and put it into fabric, it passes out of their hands. Who holds it? The wholesale men hold it, the retail men hold it, the dealers the whole country through, hold these stocks of cotton. Let this Star Chamber get to work; let it take off the duty and punish two or three recalcitrant manufacturers, and where else does the penalty light? It lights in a reduction to the tune of 27½ per cent upon the whole stock of cotton fabrics in this country, held by innocent dealers, wholesale and retail. Is that a fair penalty? Is that equal-handed justice? Why, Sir, that is playing mad havoc with the industries of this country. Now, will hon. gentlemen opposite, if there is a penalty to be applied, will they apply the penalty where the

wrong is committed, and upon those who have committed the wrong? I will mention again where it is unfair. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Finance Minister was one of them, argued that you could not have a combine unless all the people engaged in that industry were guilty and culpable alike. Can you not? For he said it can never come to the point where the ad hoc judge will be called in if there are manufacturers in that industry who are doing right and keeping their prices right. Now, do business men affirm that idea? Let me ask my hon. friend if this is not possible, if it is not the course of every true and real combination? There may be three-quarters, there may be one-quarter, but there is always a certain number of honest and smaller manufacturers who are actually forced to shut up by the dominant number who make up the combine, and who, by their wealth, and their power, and their capital, keep these smaller men under. Now, what are you going to do that will stop the competition? You have in this country four great manufacturers of rubber goods, we will say, and suppose that three of those form a combine and the fourth one fights the combine. But the fourth one is not able to fight the accumulated money and the accumulated organization of the other three; they force him to side with them or they force him to shut up. He may claim something for shutting up, and you say he ought not to receive it. But it may be just a choice between utter ruin to him and enough to keep starvation from him. Anyway, through this dominant influence he is forced into the position, not because he wishes it, but because of the dominant power of these three. Now, why should you punish that fourth man? He is in a position that he cannot compete with the other three, and so the combine exists, and you put your machinery on, and you get your judgment, and you put on the penalty, and you destroy that man's capital, that man's machinery, that man's industry, because the three stronger men forced him into a position against his own will. There you are putting the penalty upon the innocent man, the man who was not guilty, who was the victim of the force, of the better organization, of the dominant men in that industry who formed the combine. Do not hon. gentlemen see that, argue this as you will, this penalty of the taking off of duties upon whole lines of goods, is a penalty which strikes ninety-nine innocent persons for every one guilty person that it can possibly strike. So I protest against that penalty because it is not just, it is not right, and it is not a wise penalty so far as the business interests of this country are concerned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not rise for the purpose of making a lengthy speech. I said what I had to say in support of the propos-

tion now before the House in the afternoon; and I think I may fairly appeal to the House that the hon. gentleman and his followers have been compelled to take refuge in one single argument, and one single argument alone. The points now resolve themselves into one, which has been forcibly put by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat; and in passing I may remark that the hon. gentleman before he lectures hon. gentlemen opposite on this side of the House on their conduct while he was speaking, should be kind enough to address his voice with his face towards us, not with his back towards us.

Mr. FOSTER. I acknowledge the corn. I learned the bad habit from the Minister of Trade and Commerce and from the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Wherever the hon. gentlemen learned it, he had better in future avoid it. I will now call attention to the one point before the House—the grave consequences that may follow if the plan proposed in this resolution is adopted for the purpose of avoiding combines. That plan, the hon. gentleman says, embodies the fault that it will punish the innocent along with the guilty. That plan, he says, is so objectionable in this respect that that alone should condemn it.

Mr. FOSTER. Not alone.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I appeal to the history of the past if that is not the very plan the hon. gentleman adopted from time to time. I appeal to the history of this House for the last ten years that hon. gentlemen was in power if, when he found combines existing for the purpose of raising prices against the consumer, he did not, as Finance Minister, find it to be his duty to come to this House and ask that the duties be lowered in order to defeat the combines.

Mr. FOSTER. By the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not talking about the tribunal for the moment, we are talking about the plan. The hon. gentleman was contending that the plan adopted was unjust because it would punish the innocent along with the guilty. The hon. gentleman approved the very plan we now propose, and the only fault that can be found with it is that we copied it from him. In a speech his former leader delivered a year or two ago, what did he say with respect to these combines? He said:

Whenever the price of an article was inflated by means of trade combinations, it has either been put upon the free list or the duty lowered to a point which rendered the abuse of the protection impossible.

The innocent and the guilty suffered alike by the very policy carried into effect by

Mr. DAVIES.

the hon. gentleman, who thundered here so long to-night; and that plan which he denounced, and which is depicted in such clear language as I have read, is the very policy introduced into this resolution, almost in the terms of the resolution itself.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, as it has been mainly engaged in by hon. members on this side of the House; but I cannot allow the impression to be conveyed that we are favourable to any extent whatever to trusts or combines. I am sure from what has been stated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that we are just as much opposed to the existence of trusts and combines as are hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches or those who sit behind them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has sought to make a point against the ex-Finance Minister with respect to the manner in which combines were treated during the regime of the previous Government. He has charged that it was the practice of the Government during long years, when it was found that by reason of the duties manufacturers inordinately advanced the prices of their articles to the consumer, to reduce the duties on such goods. But the hon. gentleman must bear this fact in mind, that it was not to a committee of thirteen members of this House that judgment was committed, but the whole question was submitted to the high court of Parliament, where justice may be expected and where favours are not extended. The Minister this afternoon while addressing the House stated that the existence of combines was admitted. On this question, whether combines exist in this country or not, there seems to be a difference of opinion among those on the Treasury benches. While one hon. gentleman asserts that there is abundant evidence that combines exist, another hon. member says that no such evidence can be found. The only illustration brought forward this afternoon was the old one of the alleged combine on binding twine. We have heard of that perhaps a hundred times, and it can be readily demonstrated that a combine has not existed for many years.

An hon. MEMBER. What about coal oil?

Mr. HENDERSON. In 1893 a factory for the manufacture of binding twine was in existence in Brantford. They sold 800 tons of twine, a very much larger quantity than they were able to produce. As they had put their twine on the market, they were compelled to fill their orders. They were only able to manufacture 380 tons; they secured from the Central Frison, Toronto, 186 tons, but they still required a certain quantity, and they bought from the Consumers' Cordage Company, which was called a combine, 234 tons. No hon. member would describe as a combine the Brantford

company, which was organized by farmers, who subscribed the necessary capital on which no interest was paid, the object of the company being to manufacture binding twine and sell it at first cost to the farmers. No one will claim that there was any profit made out of the twine made by that company; no one will say that Sir Oliver Mowat allowed the twine manufactured at the Central Prison, Toronto, to be sold at an excessively high price; but notwithstanding these facts the Brantford company at the end of the year claimed to have made 15 per cent profit on its transactions. Where did they make the profit? Clearly on the twine they bought from the Consumer's Cordage Company, and evidently that company was able to make twine very much cheaper than either the Central Prison or the Brantford Company. There to my mind is a complete demonstration that no such combine existed even on that article, and there has been more said about the alleged combine on binding twine than on any other article manufactured. But while the Minister of Marine declared that the existence of combines is admitted, we have the Finance Minister, who is at the head of this department, with which we are dealing at the present time, stating, that he has no evidence before him at the present time to warrant him in taking action under this clause. Only a short time ago I asked the following question:—

1. Is the Government aware that there exists at the present time in Canada, any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of any article of commerce, or the dealers therein, or any portion of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, and where such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported?

2. If so, in what manufactures do such trusts or combines exist?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to reduce the duties at once on any articles affected by any such existing trust or combine?

The Minister of Finance replied as follows:—

From general information obtained by them, the Government believe there are in Canada some associations of the character mentioned in the question, but the information in their possession is not sufficient to call for a reduction of the duties at present.

So after eighteen years of Conservative rule, after eighteen years of protection—and the Finance Minister declares that protection leads to combines—the Finance Minister is not able to discover in this country a single combine of such a character as could be dealt with under the clause which we are asked to enact at this time. What is the clause for, if it is not to be used for some political purpose. We do not object to a law to suppress combines, but what we

on this side of the House object to, is the form in which this law is brought before the House. This resolution is unfair in many instances, and it is our duty to oppose it. Suppose for example a trust or an agreement is entered into amongst the dealers in an article; why should the manufacturers of that article be punished simply because the dealers have brought about a combine? The manufacturers may be perfectly honest, and they may sell their products at a fair value not unduly enhancing the price by reason of the protection which is given them, but because the dealers are guilty of combining to enhance the price the manufacturers who are carrying on a legitimate business, are to be punished and their industry ruined. Again, Sir, I object to this clause because I believe that it is impracticable and unworkable, and I object to it further, because it is carrying out the system of governing this country by Orders in Council, a system of which we have already a great deal too much in Canada. This clause is impracticable in many respects if it is intended to be given effect to, because its results would be altogether different from anything which the House would knowingly give its approval to. Let us for a moment apply it to a few articles. Take for instance tobacco. There are only a few tobacco manufacturers in this country, and there is no manufacturer in respect to which a combine could be more readily brought about. Now, do these gentlemen on the Treasury benches mean to tell us for a moment, if a combine should be found to exist among the tobacco manufacturers of this country, that the duty is to be removed from tobacco, that it is to be placed on the free list, that the revenue which is now derived from that article must be collected in some other way, and that innocent people must be called upon to make up the large revenue which is derived from that source. Again, suppose the distillers of this country should form a combine to enhance the price of spirituous liquors—and it is just as easy for them to combine as any one else—what are the Government going to do? Are they going to take the duty off whisky, and put whisky on the free list? No doubt some people would think that a boon, but it is a strange procedure that these gentlemen should seek powers to put whisky on the free list, when we are told that in a few days we are going to have a Bill placed before us to tax every man, woman, and child in this country \$2 a year in order to make up the loss of revenue of \$8,000,000, by reason of the enforcement of prohibition. It seems to me that this whole measure is so utterly impracticable, that it would be better that the Government should now withdraw this clause, let us go on with the tariff and get through the business of the House, and let us go home feeling that we have done something in the interests of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. The argument advanced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition has not been answered by either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Britton) tried to answer it to some extent. He saw the force of the argument of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) but he failed to catch the exact meaning. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) took the suppositious case, that the Canadian manufacturer had a combine, and after selling their output to the merchants it was discovered by the Government that this combine existed. The manufacturers were tried by the judge and jury constituted by this resolution, and a decision was arrived at to take the duty off cotton, and the hon. gentleman held that the merchants who purchased their supplies before the duty was taken off, would be losers by this, and should be compensated. Now that was not the argument of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. He claimed that a number of manufacturers might go into a combine and that a number of others engaged in the industry might stay out of the combine, and that the innocent would be punished with the guilty, if this resolution were given effect to. I know of a combine existing in the United States to-day which includes some eleven manufacturers, and there are two or three in the same line of manufacture who are not in the combine. The members of the combine say that these three who stay out cannot affect the market much, because they produce a limited quantity, and so those in the combine go on and enhance the price of the goods. The same thing might very well happen in Canada. Some five or six manufacturers in a certain line might form a combination, and some two or three others might remain out. The members of the combine would say: We can manufacture to supply seven-eighths of the supply of the country, and we will allow these two or three to remain out and sell what they can. Now, if the Government decides there is a combination in this line, and after putting their judge and jury to work they find that these six or seven manufacturers combine together, they will at once remove the duty under the operation of this law. Then what becomes of the two or three honest fellows who did not join the combine? Their industry is ruined by the removal of the duty, and these are the men who should receive compensation. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) did not bear in mind the case of these men, but he only spoke of merchants who purchased goods before the combine was struck at by this resolution. What can be the meaning of this resolution anyway? The Government bring down a tariff which they say is not for protection, but a tariff for revenue, and they put on a duty of from 20 to 35 per cent. Now, will the Minister of Finance tell me how any manufacturer in this coun-

Mr. HENDERSON.

try can unduly enhance the price of any article he produces, over and above the tariff which the Finance Minister says he put on for revenue purposes. If there is a duty of 25 per cent for revenue purposes upon certain lines of manufacture, and if the manufacturers of such articles undertake to combine to raise the price to more than the 25 per cent, why, then, the importers will get their goods from a foreign country, and thus prevent the manufacturers from unduly enhancing the value. Here is what the resolution says, and the idea of proposing such a thing to an intelligent Parliament is all humbug:

That whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe, as respects any article of commerce, there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein.

Now, as regards that, it must be remembered that some articles are not produced in this country. Suppose the tea importers form a combination to unduly enhance the price of tea. How is the Finance Minister going to punish them? He cannot remove the duty on tea because there is no duty on it. What is the use of bringing down a law to this Parliament that is a fraud on the face of it?

The millers of this country have an association, and suppose they should decide to put up the price of flour that is made of wheat grown in this country, and which is protected by a duty of 12 cents per bushel. Where would be the Hon. Mr. Cummings, the gentleman who opposed my friend and colleague the Hon. Mr. Wood, the member for Brockville? Mr. Cummings is the president of that association and combination. Will my hon. friend say that he must break up that association by removing the duty from wheat and the duty from flour? Whom will that hit? It will not hit these millers very hard, but it will hit the farmers of this country, just as will the removal of the duty on pork. The effect will be the same in the case of the millers as in the case of the pork-packers. How are you going to punish the guilty without also punishing the innocent by this law? Speaking for myself, and I think I voice the feeling of every member on this side of the House, if the Government come down with a fair and honourable proposition to deal with combines, we will support it—that is, if combines exist under this revenue tariff. If it is a revenue tariff, there cannot be combinations formed under it, except up to the extent of the duty imposed; because as soon as the manufacturer of or dealer in any article increases its price beyond what the duty will permit him, imported goods will come in. But let them come down with any fair and honourable proposition. If the law that has been read by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) to-day is not strong enough, let them come down with a proposition that is strong enough,

and every member on this side of the House will support it. But they will oppose, as long as they feel opposition to be necessary, the placing on the Statute-book of a proposition so infamous as this one. It is not an honest proposition, it does not bear honesty on its face, but it is simply a weapon in the hands of the Government to be held over the heads of the manufacturers of this country. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) a few moments ago contradicted the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and asked him to mention a hotel-keeper in the province of Ontario who had been interfered with. My hon. friend did not mention a name, because he did not remember one at the moment. I remember one case, and I will mention it. Some years ago, when I was a boarder at the Grand Union Hotel in this city, which was kept by the late John Graham, he was cautioned that if he took part in an election, he would lose his license. He did lose his license. The late Hon. Alexander MacKenzie was boarding there at the same time I was, and he was the first man to sign a petition asking Sir Oliver Mowat to restore the license which had been unjustly taken away. Let the hon. member for North Wellington refute that statement if he can. Every hotel-keeper in Ontario knows that the license law has been held as a club over the hotel-keepers of that province, and my hon. friends opposite want to smuggle into the tariff law this section, to hold it as a club over the manufacturers of this country. I say it is the duty of the Opposition to stay here not only this night, but this month or three months rather than permit such an infamous law as this to be placed on the Statute-book of this country.

Mr. CLANCY. I just wish to say one word, not for the purpose of continuing this debate, but in answer to what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) seemed to think a complete reply to the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman stated, as a justification for the position now taken by the Government, that it was precisely the plan adopted by the Conservative party when legislating on similar lines. It has been pointed out that that was with regard to legislation dealt with entirely by Parliament, and not relegated to the Ministry. If it be true that the Government are proceeding on the same lines, then I ask why introduce this legislation? If that was the object, was it not better for Parliament to deal with the matter than to place it in the hands of the Ministry? But the hon. gentleman said that he agreed with the Minister of Finance that this resolution was for the purpose of deterring and preventing combines rather than for the purpose of punishing those engaged in them. If it is to prevent them, then it would seem that they do not exist now, and if they do not exist what

is the necessity for dealing with them? If combines do exist now, clearly they should be followed up. The hon. gentleman found one combine, which he said was in nails. Let us see how they deal with nails. The old duty on cut nails was three-quarters of a cent a pound. Hon. gentlemen brought down a new scale, imposing on them an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent, and taking off the three-quarters of a cent a pound. But the combines was staring them in the face, and they put back the duty to  $\frac{1}{2}$  a cent a pound. In the old tariff wire nails had a duty on them of one cent a pound. Hon. gentlemen opposite changed that to 35 per cent ad valorem, and then they changed it back to three-fifths of a cent a pound. I would like to ask how they can reconcile that action with the cry against combines. Did they not have it in their power, backed up by a strong majority, to wipe out that combine if it existed? And if it did not exist, their mouths are closed. The cry of hon. gentlemen opposite from one end of this country to the other was that the National Policy was the parent and the fruitful source of combines. If that be true, hon. gentlemen are bound not to ask for a measure of this kind, but to take the power before a single item of this tariff is passed, to make it impossible to combine. They gave the people to understand that the moment they came into power, they would, by removing every vestige of protective duties, put an end to combines. They see the difficulties of the arguments they used in the past. They must destroy every industry; but, failing in that, they seek to put into the hands of the Government of the day the right to be the accusers as well as the judges. The mere fact of an agreement having been entered into, even the goods have not been at all appreciably raised in price, will bring those who make the agreement within the power which hon. gentlemen are now seeking. I shall not enlarge upon the question. The contention on this side of the House seems so overwhelmingly and completely unanswerable that it is amazing to me that hon. gentlemen would continue to ask their followers to give them such powers. It seems almost incredible that they should persist. I admire the courage of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), who, I think with great difficulty, found himself this afternoon compelled to dissent from this proposition. I hope hon. gentlemen will not be put in the false position of being obliged to serve their party before they serve the country, by giving their assent to so monstrous a proposition as this.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the Opposition would be utterly wanting in their duty did they not prolong the discussion on this clause of the tariff, in view of the fact that they have succeeded in making at least one convert to-day in the person of the hon.

member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and I hope, if only for the purpose of keeping the hon. gentleman's company, that before this debate closes some other hon. gentleman on that side of the House will come to his assistance. We are very much to be congratulated on the fact that the hon. member for Kingston has seen fit to announce to the House that he cannot support the Government on this question, because, with all due deference to other hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for Kingston stands prominently on that side of the House. In view of the fact that he is a leading member of the Bar of the province of Ontario and that furthermore for the past few years he has been engaged in a quasi judicial position under the Government, in that quasi judicial position the hon. gentleman's mind doubtless became enlarged and widened very considerably, which fact no doubt it was caused him to break away from his party allegiance.

Discussing this whole question from its very inception, it must be seen that the clause is most unworkable. At the outset it provides that if there be any reason to believe that any article of commerce—and before leaving that point, let me say that it must be patent to the whole House that the greatest confusion must arise from that very term. Take the case of the lumbering industry. Two or three lumbermen in a particular section of the country, who know the requirements of that section, may agree among themselves to fix certain rates for certain kinds of lumber which they alone are in a position to sell. What would be the result of this agreement? It must be that the Government may decide to sweep away the duties upon lumber. Then take the case of the farmers. It is often a matter of complaint among them that in seeding time, some three or four of them, who have a certain amount of seed grain to offer, will raise the price. What will be the result? If during the seeding season, two or three farmers have a large quantity of seed grain to sell and combine to raise the price in excess of the ordinary market rate, immediately there would be a complaint from the other farmers that a combine has been established, and the Government would be forced to appoint judges in every part of the Dominion to inquire into such matters. There could be no restriction placed upon what may be included in the term "articles of commerce" and every industry and trade would be harassed by complaints brought before the Government under this clause.

It seems to me that the second clause will give rise to the greatest amount of trouble. That is the clause which provides that a judge shall inquire into the question whether a combine exists or not, and after that, what is certainly the strangest and most striking part of the whole proceedings, happens. Why, fancy, if one can,

Mr. BENNETT.

a judge in a criminal court presiding over the case of a man charged, we will say, with arson. He inquires into all the facts, and after he has done so, the case is taken out of his hands, and he has to send it to the Minister of Justice and ask him what he proposes to do in the premises. That is what these hon. gentlemen proposed. They do not say that the judge shall inquire into the facts and then adjudicate upon them, but all they empower the judge to do is to report the facts, and then this mighty tribunal of thirteen,—and the number is a fateful one; I hope they will not meet with other than political death during the year—is to decide what will be done with the alleged culprit. If political power is to be exercised, that will be a most opportune time to exercise it, and the very fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have remained silent—because the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), whom we have succeeded in convincing and taking out from the broad path to the narrow path, is the only man on that side who has endeavoured to say a word on the question—is pretty convincing that the resolution is one which they do not feel competent to defend. True, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) vigorously came to the rescue, and brought all his legal acumen to bear on the subject; and when he found himself light in his law, he made up for that by his vehemence. Well, while I congratulate himself on his vehemence, I cannot say that that is the proper way in which to address a legal argument. But he managed to arouse the enthusiasm of his followers, who apparently do not want any legal argument at all but simply violence of demonstration, and the hon. gentleman gives them all the vehemence they can desire on every possible occasion. The section then provides that the Governor in Council may, if they decide that a combine exists, place the article in question on the free list or so reduce the duty as to give the public the benefit of trade competition in it. Well, if there is a defective clause in the whole Bill, it is this one, because it does not meet the case that must be often met and is met to-day and has always been met in the past, and that is that in the very articles which are free of duty, trusts and combines are frequently formed.

But the Administration have been very indulgent. They first of all brought down their first tariff measure, and then, in the most generous way, said it was utterly improper and they withdrew it. It cannot be supposed that they withdrew it as a matter of volition on their own part, but simply because they were amenable to reason and argument; and when to-day we find an hon. gentleman on their own side declaring that this clause is wrong, surely we might, with some confidence, ask them to go a step further and withdraw it altogether. If they should do so, they would

have ample opportunity between now and next session to still further improve their legislation.

The hon. Finance Minister said to-day that although he had searched the records of the protective policy for the last eighteen years, he had been utterly unable to find a single case of the existence of a combine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never said so.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the hon. gentleman was very much misunderstood on this side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry for that.

Mr. BENNETT. I can only say that I am surprised the hon. gentleman did not deny it before, because his statement had been referred to on this side several times without contradiction. I would now ask the hon. gentleman, who is so vigorously after the combines, whether he will tell us of any one case or the existence of a combine under the protective policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that a number are in operation in this Dominion, but from and after the 23rd of June they ceased to meet, and I believe they are in a state of suspense at present; and if this resolution passes, they will not resume operations. I believe there is a combine in this Dominion to-day which not only seeks to keep up prices to the limit of the tariff but has absolutely paid money to Americans not to bring goods into the country.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question. If there are so many combines, if their name is legion, it should be all the more easy to mention one. I am sure the House will be pleased to hear the hon. gentleman name a single instance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have named a case. I did not say they were legion, but I said there were a number, and my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) knows as well as I do what they are. Reference has been made to some of them to-day and they have been discussed across the floor. Some, no doubt, continue to exist. Evidence was given before the Tariff Commission as to one. Not only was it admitted that there was a combine to keep up prices, but it was admitted that they had paid foreign manufacturers not to send goods into Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. How would the present resolution touch them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To the extent of the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. But they could still continue to pay the foreigner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But if the duty were taken off, they would not do so.

Mr. FOSTER. That is too thin.

Mr. BENNETT. It is here provided that:

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the effectual conduct of such inquiry.

If the inquiry is to be conducted on the same line as certain inquiries held with a view to the removal of officials, it will be farcial for the accused to enter upon a trial, because there would be a pre-judgment before the case was heard. In some of these inquiries I refer to, the privilege has actually been denied to the officials of having counsel to appear in their behalf. Is that to be the case here? There is no guarantee that it will not be. The result may be, that, at a moment's notice, an investigation will be sprung upon a person and the privilege of having counsel denied him. I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) touched the key-note when he said that he saw in this resolution the fine Italian hand of Sir Oliver Mowat. This is altogether in the line of legislation that has been effected for years past in Ontario, everything being done with the one view, that of suppressing all opposition by keeping as many as possible of those who might oppose under threat or menace. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) contended that this was not done in the administration of the liquor license law. But he did not remain in the House and did not undertake to refute the statements made upon this subject. It is a notorious fact that in the province of Ontario the liquor License Act has been used simply to terrorize and terrify persons who hold licenses. Hon. gentlemen on the other side who come from Ontario will recall that in the city of Toronto, in one of the past elections, there were openly placarded before the public the very checks obtained from license holders in that city with a view of obtaining renewal of their licenses. And they were obtained by whom? By a gentleman who was a candidate on behalf of the party of the present Government and who is now the librarian for the legislature of Ontario, Mr. Preston. Why, Sir, the same principle has been carried out in the administration of the courts. There was a time when the county court judges had the privileges of appointing the county court clerks and bailiffs. That power was taken away from the judges and handed over to the political heelers and supporters; and the experience in my own riding is that the parties who have been appointed to these positions have generally been partisans, and partisans of the vilest kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not the privilege of resorting to the liquor administration or the administration of the courts, and, forsooth, they have to come down to this interference with the commerce of the whole country. And they find this is objected to even on their own side by the speech from the hon. member

for Kingston (Mr. Britton). They have already seen fit to withdraw the Bill which they first introduced, thereby acknowledging that it was faulty and wrong. I think they should withdraw the Bill now before the House, and, in the few months to elapse between now and the next session, they might inquire closely whether such combinations do exist; and, if they do not exist, there will be no necessity for the passage of such a law as that now before the House.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I have listened very attentively to the debate on this tariff clause which is now under the consideration of the House. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, as well as those who sit behind, have been challenged to mention a few cases of the existence of combines, and they have been unable to find a single case of a trade or industrial combination. It is alleged that combines exist in this country and that this clause has been introduced into our fiscal legislation in order to enable the Government to wipe them out. I am of opinion, in spite of what has been said by my hon. friends on this side of the House, that there exists in Canada a huge combine and that there are to be found here several monopolists. Within easy reach of the Chair where you sit, Mr. Chairman, I see across the floor of this House the most dangerous of all combinesters, sitting on the Treasury benches. There never existed in any country a worse or more dangerous monopoly than that brought about and carried out by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches and those behind them. That monopoly consists in centralizing everything into the hands of the Government. Not satisfied with embodying in the tariff the most objectionable features, calculated to injure and harass our industries and trade, the hon. gentlemen have thought it fit to insert this clause 17 now before the House, a clause under which they will be enabled to crush out those industries which foreign competition has not yet wiped out.

Now, this is a most despotic, a most tyrannical and most dangerous clause. Although the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has pointed out the dangerous nature of this clause, still none of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, or their followers, have risen and contradicted his statement, or tried to weaken the position taken by my hon. friend. The people of this country are not minors, nor are they willing to submit to the guardianship of the hon. gentlemen opposite, or to hand over to them the management of their own private business. What our industries and trade require is a strong combine law, enabling them to put down monopolies and fight combinesters, and with such a law it would be an easy task to kill combines,

Mr. BENNETT.

without those industries requiring the interference of the Government. While endeavouring to find the means of overcoming the existing evils, the Government, under this clause now before the committee, are applying a remedy much worse than the disease itself, one that will result in destroying the energy and spirit of enterprise in the industrial people of this country. As a matter of fact, the Government are on the eve of inaugurating in this country a kind of paternalism, and making an attempt at controlling even the private business of our citizens; and should such a combine law long remain on our Statute-book, I have no doubt it will result in killing the spirit of enterprise among our people, and they will look up to the Government as the source of prosperity and the dispenser of private wealth. There is not the least doubt that in their vain attempt at general control, the Government will never be able to manage the private business of the community, and their policy of centralization of power is doomed to a complete failure. I said, at the outset, that the most dangerous combinester that existed in this country was the Government of the day, with their policy of centralization of power. Now, this is a most dangerous monopoly. The Government have already evinced this, as already stated by those who addressed the House before me, when, under clause 16 of this tariff, which was carried, they managed to submit the products of home industries to foreign competition, and behold now, under the pretense of protecting the poor consumers, they ask us to vote clause 17, under which they will have an absolute control over our industries. Now, with our industries crushed out under the operation of clause 16, and every vestige of energy and spirit of enterprise destroyed in our people by means of clause 17, under the pretense of reaching monopolies, the consumers of the country will be at the mercy of foreign monopolists, and of competition from the outside, for all the commodities which they have to buy. Let, therefore, the Government leave out that clause 17 and give us a strong law, because if that clause be put into operation, it will merely result in our industries being wiped out of existence. Such will be the result of the law now before the House. And when several of those industries which are now supplying our people with the necessary commodities, are destroyed, when our mills are closed down, we will find ourselves under the control of British monopolists, with this reduction of duties of 25 per cent in favour of English exporters. It is always a matter of surprise to me that the people of this country, who are represented in this House by men of their own nationality—I mean to say the Anglo-Saxon element of our people—should entrust the management of our home industries to the Government of the day; and I cannot really understand

how it happens that the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches and the hon. gentlemen behind them should give to the Government of the day such undue and improper powers in dealing with the industries of this country; because, as remarked by the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), if the Government wipes out a Canadian industry, such as, for instance, the cotton or the iron industry, the consumers will have to buy the iron and cotton imported from Great Britain or from the United States. Now, as those industries would no longer have to face the competition of our industries in the Canadian market, they would hold an undisputed sway over our market, and one still more dangerous, and far more objectionable, than the one they have destroyed in our national industries. This clause 17, far from offering to the consumers the protection which the Government are bound to give them, is a menace to their interests. Let the Government give to manufacturers and consumers alike the same amount of protection; and while you give the manufacturers the benefit of a good law, allow the consumers the right of practically enforcing that law, because, after all, they are better informed than the Government as to whether those combines are detrimental or not to their interests, and whether the prices of commodities and of the necessaries of life are unduly enhanced by the manufacturers. It may happen, as just stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that some manufacturers or dealers make an agreement or enter into partnership, in order to administer their common interests or their trade, without their action being in the least detrimental to the consumers. I object further to this clause, because I hold that the power which it proposes to entrust to the Government is a very dangerous one. This clause would prove, in the powerful hands of the Government, a most effective weapon to hold over the head of the manufacturers of this country; by this means the screws might be put on them and large sums of money extorted from them for election purposes. Investigations in connection with these mutual agreements, would be calculated to ruin the credit of powerful industrial companies; and even should it turn out that those manufacturers have not unlawfully enhanced the prices of their products, so as to warrant a lowering of the duties on similar products imported from abroad, these investigations, I say, would prove disastrous to business men. The very fact of holding an investigation of that character is sometimes sufficient to ruin the credit of a powerful company. But, as I just said, the chief danger arising from this clause is that it might lead the hon. gentlemen into temptation, politically speaking; as they might be tempted to extort large sums of money from the manufacturers at election times. Let one of the Min-

isters, not over-scrupulous, turn round and tell a manufacturer: We need \$10,000 for election purposes; and unless you give us that sum, we are going to hold an investigation. The hon. gentlemen will easily understand that those manufacturers, in order to get out of the clutches of the commissioners, will subscribe to the terms of the Government, and then the hon. gentlemen will boast that they have educated the people, and raised the tone of public morals, as they did recently, in the county of Champlain.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) That's the principle you acted upon on your side of the House.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) We never could act on that principle, because we never had on this side, any policy of centralization of power. Never did the Conservatives, when in power, introduce such a tyrannical combine law. The hon. gentlemen on the back benches, as the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) ought to understand, that it was in the interest of the Government of the day that I offered that suggestion, that they might not succumb to the temptations which those in power are liable to; for, as the hon. gentleman is aware, it is better even for men of adamant virtue like his friends not to be too frequently tempted or beyond their power of endurance. With such attempts at centralization of power as those embodied in the measures now before the House, the danger is already great enough for the Government without the hon. gentlemen on the back benches entrusting to them any more power. Let them not forget that he who courts danger will fall into it. Now, were this clause carried, the Government of the day would be exposed to a formidable danger, that of extorting money from manufacturers for election purposes and for bribery and corruption. There is a further objection to this clause which was pointed out a little while ago, by one of my hon. friends on our side of the House. The hon. gentlemen remember how shocked the Liberals in the province of Quebec were, how indignant they felt at the appointment of certain commissions of investigation, a matter which the hon. member for Montmagny has often brought to the attention of the House. Why then, I ask, do the hon. gentlemen opposite propose to import the judicial authority into this matter, and have judges inquire into a legislation which concerns only the Government. I am of opinion that you drag the ermine in the mud when you impose upon a judge such duties as are involved in an investigation of this character, in view also of the fact that there will often be great manufacturing interests at stake, and that the judge will have to conduct this investigation in the way determined upon by the Government. For a Government to impose upon a judge so onerous a duty, and

to use him as a tool for their political purposes seems to me a prostitution of the judicial authority, under the circumstances. I hope the hon. gentlemen opposite will realize the dangerous nature of such a legislation. I have, upon several occasions, heard the hon. gentlemen, when they sat on this side of the House, raise their voices and thunder against some measures which were at different times introduced by the Conservative Government. When, for instance, certain measures came up before the House, as the redistribution of seats in 1892 and the franchise Bill in 1885, we then heard, I believe, the hon. gentlemen thundering against the attempts of the Conservative Government at administrative and legislative centralization. Now, what were those so-called attempts at centralization on the part of the late Government, if we compare them to the undue powers the Government of the day are given under this clause? The Government, after handing over Canadian industries to foreign competition from Great Britain first, then probably from Germany, Holland and Belgium, later on; not content with having brought about by crooked means the triumph of the fiscal policy of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), now under this clause 17, assume the power of crushing out the industries of the country whenever they think fit. This clause, I hold, is the boldest attempt at administrative centralization yet made in any British colony; it is the most outrageous legislation ever introduced yet in the Canadian Parliament, and the like of which will never be introduced after the hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches will have vacated them. Never did the Conservative Government during their long lease of power, ever attempt—withstanding all that has been laid to their door by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the passage of any legislation at all comparable to this most outrageous measure they are now asking this House to adopt. After enacting clause 16, under which they take the power of granting to whomsoever they please the preferential treatment as to the reduction of duties, and having constituted themselves the only judges as to increasing or diminishing the revenue of the country, the Government are attempting now, under this clause 17, to constitute themselves the judges as to the best means to be taken to crush out, whenever they choose, our Canadian industries.

Mr. McCLEARY. I promise the committee I will detain them but for a few moments in giving my reasons for voting in favour of the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, as against the resolution moved by the Minister of Finance. My first objection to the resolution is that it savours too much of the kind of legislation we have been accustomed to in the province of Ontario by the Liberal party ever since

Mr. DUPONT.

their accession to power in that province, for more than a quarter of a century, namely, legislation to keep themselves in office. Any hon. member of this House who is at all acquainted with the history of the Liberal party in Ontario, knows that from the day they came into power in that province down to this hour, they have never ceased to place upon the Statute-books of that province laws which denuded the people of their liberty of franchises in many regards, laws which were placed there for the sole purpose of fencing themselves in office and keeping their party in power. When the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to-night referred to the fact that Sir Oliver Mowat's hand could be seen in this legislation, he spoke a most profound truth. No one can read this resolution but can see the hand and read the thought of that pastmaster in political scheming. Why, Sir, what is his record in the province of Ontario, and the record of his party? The first thing he does when he comes to power is to look over the field and see what he can do in order to establish himself in power; and, as has been stated by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to-night, the first thing he does is to invade the municipalities of the country, and to take from the county councils, from the councils of cities, towns and villages, the rights and privileges they have enjoyed for years, and he arrogates to himself and to his party in Toronto the right to appoint every officer from the sheriff down to the clerk of a division court, and the bailiffs in that province. Then, Sir, not content with that, he saw a broader and a more lucrative field in which to operate, and he at once sets out to build up a machine which has done great and powerful work for him on election day. He saw that the liquor interest of the province of Ontario was a big concern, that the municipalities formerly controlled and looked after that business, and inspected it in a manner satisfactory to the people. But he said to himself: If I can get this under my control, I will have a leverage by which I should not only raise my party to power, but keep them in power for all the years I will be able to manipulate it. And, Sir, he has succeeded, and to-day in the province of Ontario, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) contradicted the statement of the hon. member for West York, there is not a county in the province, there is not a city in the province, but can rise up and bear testimony to the truth of the statement that the license law has been used most iniquitously, and unjustly, and unfairly, against the Conservative party, and men have been deprived of their liberty to go to the polls and vote as they conscientiously would like to do. Does any one ask me for names? Why, in my own county I know of a hotel-keeper who kept the only hotel in which you could get a night's lodging in the village. Because

he refused to vote for the reeve of the municipality, the reeve threatened him and said: You will not get a license next year. And for two years that man was kept without a license, simply because he would not vote for the reeve of the municipality. Not only do they deprive men of the right to vote according to their conscience, but they manipulate the granting of licenses as well, for political purposes. In my own county one of the oldest settled counties in the province of Ontario—and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will believe me that the statement I now make is as true as the ten commandments—in the centre of the county which I have the honour to represent, a hotel-keeper was given a license for no other reason—I must apologize for calling it a hotel, because it was a building that had neither window, nor door, nor floor in it, and the sheep that were grazing along the road went in there for shelter from the sun—but there was a license given to that man in order to help keep a certain gentleman in the county of Welland in line with the party.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Was he a Conservative?

Mr. McCLEARY. No, he was not, or they would not have given him the license. The hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) knows well how they manipulate licenses in his own city.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the line of discussion the hon. gentleman is pursuing now is out of order. He should confine himself as much as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am going to be very brief, Mr. Chairman, I am only illustrating the fact that the Government, now in power, is pursuing exactly the same course to retain power as the Liberal Government have been pursuing in the province of Ontario. Now, surely that is germane to the question. The hon. member for Hamilton reminded me that the man of whom I was speaking in the county of Welland who got the license was not a Conservative. I told him that he was a Reformer. And I can tell him about how they manage matters in the city of Hamilton. He knows as well as I do that in 1894, when the city council of Hamilton desired to reduce the number of licenses—

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). And they did do it.

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, but how did they do it? How did the commission grant licenses? They said: We will not grant any licenses until after the election, and they held that whip over every man who wanted a license until after the election was over in the month of June. But not only does the Ontario Government pursue these tactics in regard to licenses

in that province, but in regard to educational matters as well. They have even tried to make a political machine of that. Why, Sir, the Government have formed one of the most rigid combines that exists in this country, and the farmers, the artisans and mechanics of that province have to pay for their school books 25 and 30 per cent more than they would under fair competition. Not only have they put that kind of a law on the Statute-book but they went further, they went to the city of Toronto and passed an Act by which it was impossible for the electorate of that city—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that subject has anything to do with the question under discussion. I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me point out how it is perfectly germane. The argument of my hon. friend is this, that this legislation is simply a policy of centralization of power, that by clause 16 this Government have centralized into their hands a power which was never before taken by any Government of this country, the power of making commercial treaties with any country in the world. They follow that up by a piece of machinery which places in the hands of those thirteen men, power to terrorise and draw political influence to themselves from the whole of the manufacturing industries of this country. My hon. friend is opposed to that, he wants to show to independent men on that side of the House, if any remain, that this is the same tendency which the Liberal party in the province of Ontario has carried out most thoroughly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the last part of the speech of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) has any bearing upon the question before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. The Chairman has not called me to order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The Chairman has stated what he thinks should be the trend of the discussion, and I am arguing the point of order. The Chairman has not ruled on the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you give your ruling, Mr. Chairman, will you allow me to state the argument? The argument was that not only were the Liberal party, in regard to licensing, centralizing powers in themselves, but that in educational matters the same thing was going on; and my hon. friend was stating that the Liberal party was evidently going to carry out the same policy by this clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had closed that part of his argument, and had passed to another point, which had no bearing on the clause under discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Welland has the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, what is your ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a perfect right to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I know what my rights are. My rights are that when the Chairman gives his ruling, I have a right to ask him in regard to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Welland was referring to an Act which had been passed in Ontario, not the Act concerning education, but another Act, which, as I understood the hon. gentleman's language, had no bearings on this clause.

Mr. FOSTER. What Act?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is the reason why I asked him to confine himself to the matter under discussion.

Mr. McCLEARY. If the Chairman is quite sure I have the floor, I should like to proceed. With all due deference to the Chair, I may say that I would be very sorry to intrude any matter upon this committee outside of the question in debate. I was trying to illustrate by examples of legislation in Ontario, that the party which has come into power here under the guiding hand of Sir Oliver Mowat, who was the leader and Premier of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, was falling into the same kind of errors as had been committed in that province—the centralization of power, the Government fencing themselves in office and preventing the voice of the people being fairly and honestly heard and giving fair-play to all parties when an appeal was made to the electors. I was going on to show that the Liberal party has unfairly dealt with the electorate in our province, that they have in fact legislated against the party to which they were opposed, that they really elected a man in Toronto by Act of Parliament and established minority representation there. I sincerely hope there are enough independent members behind the Government who will endeavour to lose sight of their party allegiance and vote for British fair-play in this regard.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We always do so.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not think I have much to expect from the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, you cannot expect anything from East Grey.

Mr. McCLEARY. The Greys have got mixed up. The spirit of this resolution is bad, it is contrary to the genius of British institutions, it is opposed to British fair-play; and I am therefore in favour of the amendment proposed, to give the courts the right to say when wrong has been committed and not leave that right with the Government. I am surprised that instead of calling in a judge, the Government have not seen fit to make it the duty of the member representing the riding where a manufacturing combine is supposed to exist, or the defeated candidate, to decide whether there is a combine or not. That is a scheme by which hon. gentlemen opposite hope to bolster themselves up in dismissing civil servants. I have felt it my duty to give my reasons, as the representative of one of the counties in Ontario, why I shall vote against this resolution. My strongest reason is, because I think it is a piece of political jugglery, and not for the benefit either of political morals or commercial interests. I believe it was conceived and brought forth for no other purpose than the political aggrandisement of the party in power, and I have been trying to illustrate although hon. gentlemen opposite would not accept with grace my illustrations, how the Liberal party has succeeded in Ontario in this regard; and I would warn the representatives in this Dominion Parliament to escape from and abandon the paths of wrong doing, which have been trodden by the leaders of the party in our province, and give us law for the people, by the people and with the will of the people's representatives, instead of placing on the Statute-book this sort of class legislation, making this Government a huge combination by which they hope to be able to control the manufacturing and commercial interests for purposes which I believe should be beneath any government to stoop to adopt.

Mr. KAULBACH. It was not my intention to say anything on this subject this evening, but as I am not anxious to see myself recorded as being in favour of a resolution of this kind, which is not creditable to legislation and entrusts to the Government too much power, I feel I should express in a word or two the sentiments I entertain. The resolution is very clear, inasmuch as it takes the control of this trade matter entirely out of the hands of Parliament and places it in the hands of the Governor in Council, a course which I condemn on the ground that the Government should bring in a Bill whereby the courts of the country should deal with matters of this kind, instead of having them dealt

with in a clause embodied in the tariff resolutions. For eighteen long years it has been agitated by the Opposition, that the National Policy was the parent of combines and monopolies, which I deny. I feel that the Government should drop this clause entirely, and allow a Bill to be so framed that this matter can be dealt with properly by the courts of this country. It may happen in some cases that combines are useful and in the interest of the consumer. For example, if there should be two or three or more companies running an industry, and they find that they are maintaining that industry under difficulties, or at a loss, and under different management and under one head, these industries could perhaps be brought under one management successfully, and so curtail expenses and lessen the cost of production so as to enable them to place the articles they manufacture at a lower rate on the market. Then combines are an advantage and in that case the consumer would benefit, instead of, as he has been told throughout Canada, that he was supporting the Conservative party who were the upholders of these bloated monopolies. It is our duty on this side of the House knowing these facts to protest against this clause being embodied as part of the tariff resolutions. In numberless instances we have found that as far as combines are concerned, the old tariff has proved in the interests of the party.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. KAULBACH. I should have said, that it has been found in certain cases to form combines, it was in the interests of the country, and for the reason that the consumer found that employment which he otherwise could not have secured at home.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad to find hon. gentlemen opposite express their cordial approval of my sentiments. The Government must feel, that by this they are simply assuming a power which, perhaps, may prove beneficial to themselves as a political party, but under the circumstances, it is most unfair that that power should be extended to them for that purpose. I am therefore anxious to show to the country, and to the people whom I have the honour to represent, that I disapprove of this clause in the tariff resolutions as most objectionable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the motion is put, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance a question. A few moments ago he made the statement that no combines existed in Canada since the 23rd of June, but later on he made the further statement that during the investigations made by the tariff commissioners he had information that a combine

did exist in Canada, and that they were paying money to United States manufacturers to stay out of this country. I want to know how he dealt with that combine, or if it has been dissolved, or is it in force yet? It came under his attention and he knew it to be a combine. Has he dealt with it in the tariff, and has he placed these goods on the free list, or what has he done?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) could answer that, for I suspect that he knows a good deal about that combine.

Mr. TAYLOR. I only know from the Minister in a vague way that some combine did exist. I do not know what he refers to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Are you sure?

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be agricultural implements or anything else for all I know.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Is it shovels or spades?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, we have in our town an industry making shovels and spades, but there are several other similar industries in this country. There is a very large one in Montreal, and another in the province of Nova Scotia engaged in the same line. There is strong competition in Canada. I know that in the shovel industry in the United States there is a combine, but whether our people are in a combine or not I do not know. But I do know, and I believe, that this Government has fostered one of the hugest monopolies and combinations it is possible to conceive. I heard the statement made to-day by a gentleman in this House, that previous to the introduction of this tariff, and previous to the elections this Government were approached by a huge monopoly in the United States, the Standard Oil Company, and the arrangement was made with the Standard Oil Company, you contribute so much to the election fund and we will pass legislation in your favour. The legislation favourable to the Standard Oil Company has been passed, which is the best guarantee that the Government carried out the terms that they made with the Standard Oil Company, provided the oil company put up half a million dollars to help the Liberals to carry the country.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) if he is not interested in the shovel and spade factory in Gananoque, and if he does not know, as a matter of fact, that that company, with others, are paying to the shovel combine in the United States a certain sum per year, to refuse to send their goods into Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) I would just say this: I have no interest whatever in the shovel industry in Gananoque—probably not as much as he himself has. I do

not know anything about their paying money, except from the evidence taken before the commission which I saw reported in the newspapers. That is all I know about that, but I do know that my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) is an importer, and I have been credibly informed that as soon as the tariff was laid on the Table of the House offering preferential trade to the United Kingdom, or to the world, he sent samples of Canadian shovels over to foreign countries to have his goods made there, and imported into this country and sold here.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I simply say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) could not have heard any such statement, because no such thing has ever taken place. Now, Sir, to confirm the statement that I have made here, that there is a combine in this country to keep American shovels out of the Canadian market, I will read a couple of letters which I think will satisfy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. BENNETT. Take it before the Inquisition.

Mr. TAYLOR. Better show them to the Government and let them deal with it under their tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So they will.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). My firm wanted to buy some spades and shovels, and we sent to the States to get the prices, as we wished to keep our friends on this side of the line in check. We were always willing to buy Canadian goods when we could buy the same article at the same price. We wrote to two or three parties in reference to the matter, and here are two of the replies :

Philadelphia, December 30th, 1896.

Messrs. Wood, Vallance & Co., Hamilton.

Gentlemen,—In further reply to your favour, we would say that the associated shovel manufacturers of the United States have made an agreement with the Canadian manufacturers which will prohibit our filling further orders for export to Canada for the present. Therefore, we are unable to quote you, as desired. We hope, however, you will bear us in mind, and should any change occur, we would be pleased to quote you in the future.

That is from the George Griffith Shovel and Spade Manufacturing Company of Philadelphia. Here is another :

Anderson, Ind., January 20, 1897.

Wood, Vallance & Co., Hamilton.

Gentlemen,—In reply to yours of the 18th inst., we would say that on account of previous arrangements made with Canadian manufacturers, we are unable to make you quotations, as per your request, at the present time.

Yours truly,

WRIGHT SHOVEL COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. I trust the hon. gentleman will send those two letters to "Hansard" so that they may be reported in full, because there is a clause in the first one which he did not give in full.

Mr. WALLACE. The significant point, it appears to me, in the letters just read is this, that a corrupt bargain, or a wrong bargain, or some kind of improper transaction, took place between a Canadian manufacturer and a United States manufacturer. The wrong has been done by these two parties to the transaction. The Government steps in and destroys the Canadian industry, and invites the United States industry to come in and supply our market. They put the United States manufacturer on the head, and say, "You are a good boy; though you have done a wrong equally with the Canadian, we will put the Canadian in jail, and invite you to come over and take his market; we have nothing but good-will for you." That is the result of the proposed arrangement. Yesterday they made an arrangement by which they gave the American manufacturer advantages in the Canadian market in many respects; and then they say, "Let us look round and see in what other way we can benefit the citizens of the United States. We will enable the United States merchant practically to do all the retail business in Canada by charging no duty on goods up to 50 cents in value; that will be quite a bonanza to the wholesale dealer, the retail dealer and the small manufacturer." And now they propose, in their fatherly care and great solicitude for the United States, to add something more. In this case they punish the Canadian who has done wrong, and reward the American who has done wrong. That, I think, should be sufficient to prevent the enactment of this clause. But we find hon. gentlemen opposite who are interested in Canadian manufactures. That is no crime. We are glad to see men invest their money to build up industrial establishments in this country, and to give employment to our own people. These are commendable things, and such men are not to be sneered at, even if they are members of the Government, because they have an experience which should be a benefit to this country. But when you come to consider the practical results of these combinations which are illegal and improper, you may find the boys in Brantford, when they see this clause, saying to each other, "What are we going to do about this?" The others say, "Oh, daddy's on the engine, do not be afraid." They know they are not going to be interfered with so long as "dad is on the engine." The argument used by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) was a very cogent and applicable one. Here we have imported from the province of Ontario a gentleman who had been for many years the Premier of that province, who by a system of devices had not only controlled the hotel interests, but had used his power

in so many different respects, such as appointments to office and the creation of new offices, that he got wound around him a great many interests. And he comes down here in this larger arena, where by clever manipulation he might dictate to thousands, just as he dictated to hundreds in the province of Ontario. We know that these gentlemen who have been engaged in Dominion politics would not of their own accord have thought of these little tricks and devices; or if they thought of them, they would not have sanctioned them. But we have this gentleman coming down here; and, seeing that his scheme had been so successful in the province of Ontario, he proposes to apply the same recipe to the Dominion arena, in the hope of accomplishing the same results here. The scheme is to give the Government of the day full control over the manufacturers of the country, so that they can threaten them; and, if this does not succeed, they can put the machinery of the law into motion and take off the duty, which will have the effect of destroying the industry. In view of these facts, I would ask the Government to reconsider this clause. To strike it out altogether would be my proposal; but I am anxious that they should have a record for some good legislation, and I am sure that if they pass that clause with their majority it will condemn their whole Tariff Act. Strike out that clause in deference to the great public opinion which is so strongly expressed by this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. As it is now half-past twelve and several hon. gentlemen on this side wish to speak, I would suggest an adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; go on.

Mr. FOSTER. If clause sixteen was an important one, this is equally important, equally dangerous and equally subversive of well understood usage. We have now discussed it for six hours, and I think it is time that we should adjourn.

Mr. DAVIN. I feel it incumbent on me to give my views on the clause now under discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I fancy that I ought to be in Parliament.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The returning officer thought so too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I beg hon. gentlemen to keep quite and listen to the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin.)

Mr. DAVIN. If my feelings as a partisan were stronger than my feelings as a citizen of this country. I should be inclined to rejoice at these manifestations on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, but in British history the party that has taken not

the least interest in parliamentary institutions and helped to make them what they are to-day in England, is the Liberal party. But what do we find? We find in this country that the moment the Liberal party gets into power, they put their hands upon the jugular of parliamentary government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I never met man or mob that could make me fear. I have stood before hostile mobs and made them, after half an hour, as quiet as tame mice. I do not say that I am before a mob now, but, Mr. Chairman, you may be perfectly certain that, if not to the intelligence of my hon. friends on the Liberal side—and I will say this, that in this Parliament there is more intelligence on the Liberal side than I have ever known in any Parliament. It is not merely in quantity, but in quality. Not merely have they swelled in numbers but they have risen higher in intelligence, and I am very glad of that, because I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if you will not think it impolite for me to say so, there was room for it.

Now, I say that my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) did not err on the side of exaggeration in describing this clause, which, I say, is if anything, more important than the previous clause. I say that it puts parliamentary institutions on their trial when hon. gentlemen in a Parliament like this, introduce an institution that has been dead in England for three hundred years—introduce the Star Chamber into this free Canada. After an arraignment of great power by different speakers has been made with regard to that clause, we find my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) goaded into a few remarks which showed that he had been stung into reply, but evidently the remarks that stung him into replying had not gone to the root of the matter, because they did not lead him to call on that legal acumen which I know he possesses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say this to hon. gentlemen opposite, that I am going to make for this Parliament and the people of Canada my arraignment of this clause if it takes me all summer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You will escape a protest by that.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope that my hon. friend, when he interrupts, will take off his hat, because as hon. gentlemen opposite have got into power and high society and are all lords and hon. gentlemen, and have become very great people, I hope the hon. gentleman who used to be a little rough when on this side, will get as polite as the rest of his associates and take for his motto, as the rest of them do: Let us be genteel or die. I want to call attention to the

character of this clause which, I say, introduces the Star Chamber into Canada. The clause reads as follows:—

That whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that, as respects any article of commerce, there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such articles, or the dealers therein, or any number of them, to enhance the price of such articles or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Supreme Court or High Court in any province of Canada—

To do what? Now, I see an eminent Ontario lawyer—Mr. Lister—in the Chair presiding over this Committee. To do what, Mr. Chairman? To take evidence, in order that, as the latter part of the clause—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Lister). Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. I can wait until hon. gentlemen are ready to let me proceed. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the last words I used were the "latter part of the clause." If the hon. gentlemen are prepared to let me finish the sentence, I will go on.

Mr. TALBOT. Go on; it is all right.

Mr. DAVIN. The latter part of the clause provides that the Governor General may pronounce judgment. And let me call attention to the language. It is left to the judgment of the Governor General in Council whether they will act or not. What is the process? Somebody intimates to the Governor in Council, that is the Ministry, that a combine exists. Then, these thirteen or fourteen men—or fifteen or sixteen, because some of them have no portfolios—assemble in that Privy Council room where so many famous men have met, and discuss the question whether any action will be taken at all or not. Well, Mr. Chairman, you are an experienced politician, and you know what elements of the case will be taken into consideration. I do not care whether the Conservatives or the Liberal party is in power, the result would be the same. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is an experienced politician and he knows that whatever party is in power, under a clause like that, the moment the complaint is made in that council, there is an opportunity for the exercise of political influence. Suppose that a combine is made up, in whole or in part of strong friends of the Government of the day. A gentleman is in the corridor outside the Privy Council room waiting to be heard or he sends in his card to one of the Ministers. Suppose, he asks to see the Minister of Public Works, who is not only a statesman but a politician, not only a man capable of governing an empire, but capable of pulling wires for the

Mr. DAVIN.

whole universe. Hon. gentlemen will see that I have given a correct description. Suppose that this gentleman is a friend of the Minister of Public Works from Quebec and he says to him: Why, you are going to hit at our best friends in the province of Quebec. What will happen? Well, the Minister of Public Works will go back to his colleagues and say:

An hon. MEMBER. Business is business.

Mr. DAVIN. Probably he would say that, for not only is he capable of governing an empire and pulling wires for the universe, but, since he has become a Minister, he has developed the character of a proverbial philosopher. Not only has he given us the proverb "business is business," but he has announced the original apothegm "Honesty is the best policy," thereby sending a thrill of surprise through the whole Dominion. Another of the Ministers would probably be sent for to see somebody from Ontario who would tell him: You are striking at our best friends in Ontario; what are you about? Will you tell me that the Government will not pause before striking at that combine? You know it would. I am not saying that as against the Liberal party. Any Government would do it. Put the Conservative party in power and put this terrible clause in its hands, and the result must be the same. In heated debate, I used the word "bandit." It was in the early part of this session or last session, and I thought that the Government party had stolen all the planks in the Conservative platform, and so I used the word. But, is not this a bandit clause, to enable men to go out in the highways of politics and hold up every man who they think has political influence or who is in a large way of business.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that what you have done?

Mr. DAVIN. I have been twenty years in politics, and ten years in this House, and I can safely say that my political life will bear close scrutiny and lynx-eye inspection.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is going to be very short now.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it? No doubt my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) would be glad of that. But let him not lay the flattering unction to his soul that if he and others could cut short my career in Parliament, they can take the power from my brain or the fire from my blood. Out of Parliament I was before I came here, and just as influential, politically, as I am to-day and I should be as influential as I am to-day if I were out of Parliament. And let the hon. gentleman not suppose that I would not be, to the same small extent that I have been in the past, a force, whether I am in this House or not. Of course, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) would be glad to get

me out. No doubt it would be a good thing to drive out of Parliament such men as I am and fill the House with such large-brained, large-souled, tremendous fellows as the hon. member for Ottawa. If we could only fill this House with gigantic members of the type, the fine, genteel type, the broad-cloth type of the hon. member for Ottawa, it would greatly increase the influence of Parliament. So far as I have seen the exploits of the hon. member, I will say, leaving all joking aside, that I think Parliament and Canada could be very efficient without such little petits maitres as he.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I say that seriously, not as a joke; and it is my deliberate judgment of that very refined gentleman. I will now pursue my argument. Suppose the combine consists of men who are not in favour of the Ministry of the day. The Ministry, of course, will decide to strike them. But before that can be done, what will happen? Why, a shrewd politician like some of the hon. members I have mentioned, will go to the Ministers or will send somebody to speak for the combine. We know the kind of men who will be sent. Why, it has been done in my own constituency. A man was about to be hit, was about to be destroyed, and they said to him: If you will give up supporting Davin and support somebody else that will be put up, it will be all right. And the same thing will happen here. They would come to these men and say: If you will support the Liberal party, it will be all right. The report will come to this Star Chamber that these men were recalcitrant and would still vote Tory. Then the fiat would go out: Let the judge deal with them.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend had better agree that we should adjourn for to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. We are quite able to stay here all night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright.) We are perfectly aware of that, from our past experience. However, there is no particular use in exhausting ourselves in this way. What time do you want to conclude this disquisition?

Mr. DAVIN. It will take me about two hours.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, I am speaking to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be concluded in two minutes if my hon. friend and his colleagues would do the right thing by that clause. But provided they are stiff-necked and don't intend to, we will try and give

them the bridle and let them go their own way by six o'clock to-morrow night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a reasonable proposition. In that case, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISMISSAL FROM LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. How many years has David Dame, of Côte St. Paul, been employed by the Government of Canada on the Lachine Canal?
2. Why was he dismissed from his position on Dredge No. 2?
3. Was there any complaint against him? If so, what was the nature of the complaint, and by whom was it made?
4. Who was named to replace David Dame, and by whom was the new nominee recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. David Dame was employed on Dredge No. 1 for twenty-one years and on Dredge No. 2 for eight years. 2. His services were dispensed with at the request and upon the representation of the members of Parliament for the Montreal district. 3. No written complaint was lodged in the department. 4. S. Whelihan was appointed to replace David Dame.

DISMISSALS FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. For what reasons were Keeper McConville and Guards Pugh and Appleton dismissed from the Kingston Penitentiary on the 23rd day of December, 1895?
2. Were these men charged with any offence against the prison regulations?
3. Were these men ever granted any investigation either before or after their dismissal, or were they ever allowed a chance to put in a defence?
4. Was any other investigation ever held in regard to the dismissal of these three officers?
5. What was the result of that investigation?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. For inefficiency. 2. They were charged with having allowed a convict to escape. 3. At an investigation held subsequent to their discharge, and at which they were represented by counsel, they were given full opportunity to file evidence bearing on their case. 4. Previous to their discharge the matter was investigated and reported upon by the warden. 5. The suspension of Pugh and Appleton, and, subsequently, the dismissal of Pugh, Appleton and McConville.

#### COMMERCIAL AGENT TO JAPAN.

Mr. INGRAM (for Mr. Bennett) asked:

Has Mr. Geo. Anderson, of the Royal Oil Company of Toronto, been appointed a commercial agent to Japan on behalf of the Canadian Government? If so, what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In reply to the first question I beg to say, yes. In reply to the second, he has been appointed for a period of four months at a salary of \$300 per month.

#### RELEASE OF A CONVICT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Solicitor General to the case of the release of a convict in the Kingston penitentiary. No one appreciates more than I do the great desirability of not thrusting upon the House any questions in connection with the exercise of the prerogative of mercy, except in extreme cases, but not only has there been a paragraph going the rounds of the press in regard to this matter but my attention has been specially called to it, and, therefore, I feel impelled to ask my hon. friend for an explanation of the circumstances under which a convict, who was serving a life sentence, was recently pardoned. I find that this convict was convicted in 1887 and sent to Kingston for life for vitriol throwing. He was proved to have been a hardened criminal, who had already spent fifteen years in penitentiary in England. He was there pardoned on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee in 1887, and came to Canada where he committed this very serious crime. According to the newspapers, his case was investigated by the late Sir John Thompson, on a petition for his release, and the petition was not entertained. Recently, however, a recommendation for pardon was made, and this convict was allowed to escape after ten years imprisonment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend gave me notice last night of his intention to ask for an explanation, and I looked up the record.

Mr. TAYLOR.

While I had not time to go into it very thoroughly, I think I have sufficient information to answer my hon. friend except with regard to dates. As a matter of fact, that convict was tried by the police magistrate of Toronto for an offence over which he had no jurisdiction. He was tried ten years ago, and the matter was brought up before the late Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, but the fact that the magistrate had no jurisdiction appears to have escaped the attention of all the parties in the case. It escaped the attention of the counsel of the accused as well as of the Crown Prosecutor and also of the magistrate, and does not appear to have been brought to the notice of Sir John Thompson. However, quite recently, this lack of jurisdiction was discovered and brought to the notice of Mr. Murphy, Q.C., who defended the prisoner at the time. The magistrate then joined with Mr. Murphy, counsel for the accused, in an application to the department for a remission or commutation of the sentence. Naturally enough, the attention of the department was drawn to the fact that this man was illegally detained in the penitentiary, and should not have been there at all. He was, in fact, illegally committed. Then the pardon was granted, for the lack of jurisdiction in the origin vitiated all the subsequent proceedings. The question was suggested by Police Magistrate Denison, whether, the accused having consented to come before him, that ratified the position the magistrate took, and obviated the difficulties that arose from the want of jurisdiction; but, after having considered that question, we came to the conclusion that that consent would not give jurisdiction in a case of this kind. I may add that the magistrate himself, in a letter written to the Minister of Justice, stated that his intention originally was to recommend a pardon at the expiration of ten years, independent altogether of all other considerations; and I will give to my hon. friend the name of another gentleman very high in authority who joined in the application for the pardon. It is not necessary, however, to go into these details, because the matter is absolutely concluded upon the question of jurisdiction. Speaking for the Minister of Justice, I may express my obligation to my hon. friend for having given me the opportunity of making these explanations.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

On section 17,

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, last evening I dwelt on the first part of clause 17, pointing out the character of the tribunal pro-

posed by that clause, and I was proceeding to refer to the next feature of the clause, namely, the introduction of a judge. That provision in the clause in no way gets rid of the objections which have been stated from this side of the House. Let me point out to the committee what is provided :

The Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Supreme Court or High Court in any province of Canada to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists ; with power to such judge to compel the attendance of witnesses and examine the same under oath, to require the production of books or papers, and with such other necessary powers as may be conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purposes of such inquiry.

There you have a second time the introduction of the French system of an interrogatory, which, like the first part of the clause, is contrary to our ideas of British justice. The clause goes on :

If such judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council may place such article on the free list.

A third time the question, what shall be done with the peccant combine or the supposed combine, is inquired into. At the commencement of my remarks last night, I used the phrase "star chamber." That may be thought to compare great things with small ; but I will ask the attention of every member of the House on both sides to the history of the Star Chamber, and I will show that this clause, in the powers given by it, and the motives for enacting it which are put forward, bears a strict analogy to the fact of Henry VII., which, according to the most competent authorities—although there is a dispute about that—was the means of introducing the Star Chamber into England. That Act recites :

The King, our said Sovereign Lord, remembereth how, by unlawful maintenances, giving of liveries, signs and tokens, and retainders—

And it goes on to mention a number of instances in which justice miscarries, and then provides that a committee of the Privy Council associated with judges should be appointed—that committee which afterwards became so notorious in English history. Now, the introduction of the judge is supposed to get rid of the objection to the political character of this tribunal ; but I have an authority here—which cannot, certainly from that side of the House, be questioned—that you cannot rely upon that feature, for I find in "Hansard" of 1896, page 1668, that this was said :

Sir, the hon. gentleman finds fault with that. The hon. gentleman knows the condition of things

in this country. I have nothing to say against the bench. I am prepared to admit everything he said in honour of it. But, Sir, judges are men like all other men ; and the hon. gentleman knows very well that whatever may have been the practice before 1878, since that time all appointments to the bench have been made, not so much for judicial fitness, as for the reward of political service. I am sorry to have to speak in that way ; but, Sir, I speak the truth as it is known to every man in this country. That there are men whose political services were not ignored when they were appointed to the bench, but who are a credit to the bench, I admit ; but suppose every man appointed to the bench were ever so free from partisanship, we have all had sufficient experience of life to know that unconsciously, whether Liberals or Conservatives, we grow into one groove of opinion ; and happy is the man who can say that he is never biased by the opinions of his life. Judges on the bench continue to be human. I do not impugn their motives or their good intentions ; and fortunately at this moment it is not necessary for me to do so. But, Sir, who can say, when a case arises, especially one of a political nature, that the judge on the bench is not biased by the political opinions he has held during his life ?

This is the language of the present Prime Minister, and it is fair to suppose that among forty-five or fifty judges—because any judge of a Supreme Court in Canada is eligible for this position—the man would be selected whose well-known bias would serve the purpose which the men using him in that judicial capacity would require. Now, Sir, one of the defects of the Star Chamber, and one of the reasons why it became such an evil influence, and of such evil-fame in England, was this, that avowedly it acted in cases not examinable in other courts. Now, here is a tribunal established, because you are establishing a tribunal that will act in cases not examinable by other courts. Another charge against it was that of indefiniteness. Can anything be more indefinite than this court, in its constitution and in its functions, will be ? But not to labour this point, I will merely quote what Anson says in his Law of the Constitution, page 25 :

Thus, the jurisdiction of the Council, dangerously indefinite, but on the whole salutary in its exercise under Henry VII., had become a formidable engine of oppression before the death of Elizabeth.

This tribunal we are now discussing has that bad feature of the old Star Chamber. And again on pages 28 and 29 this feature of the old Star Chamber is brought out, that it was exercisable at discretion. There is nothing to compel this court, this quasi-judicial court, to act. The initiation is with the political body, that body of men who, when the matter is brought before them, may have recently come through a hot political fight, and there is nothing whatever to compel them to take any action ; it is entirely at their discretion. Now, here is what is said on that head :

So long as the King could use the indefinite jurisdiction of the Star Chamber for the infliction

tion of punishments for political offences, it was possible for him to issue proclamations which would be enforced by fine or imprisonment in the Star Chamber, although disobedience to them might not constitute any offence recognizable by the common law courts. It is true, that the use of this power of James I. led to a precise definition by Sir E. Coke of the legal effect of such proclamations, a definition which, as I have elsewhere pointed out, is a *locus classicus* for the statement of the relations of Parliament and Crown in the making and enforcement of law. But while the Star Chamber was at the service of the Crown, it represented a judicial power residing in the executive, limited by no settled rules, exercisable at the royal discretion, and alleging the interests of government as the ground of the exercise.

In a country like this the man who stands in the relative position of the King is the Prime Minister of the day; and if you read the Prime Minister in there, every word of it will apply to this new and formidable court you are about to establish: "But while this committee of the Governor in Council is at the service of the Crown, or represents a judicial power residing in the executive, limited by no settled rules, exercisable at the discretion of the Prime Minister, and alleging the interests of the Government as the ground of its exercise." Then, again, it was inquisitorial. That is one of my great objections to this clause, it is inquisitorial, and therefore contrary to the spirit of the English law. Anson says at page 97:

Thus, while we have two courts, both of them exercising inquisitorial and judicial powers, we find that one makes only an occasional use of those powers, and is engaged mainly in administrative work.

But he refers to the inquisitorial character as the dangerous feature. Now, as English history went on, we find that this court did what all courts do, and what, so far as may be convenient to the Government of the day, this court of which we are now speaking, will do, it tried to extend its powers. In volume II. of Hume, I read of this court at page 558:

Early in Henry's reign, the authority of the Star Chamber, which was before founded on common law and ancient practice, was in some cases confirmed by Act of Parliament. Lord Bacon extols the utility of this court; but men began, even during the age of that historian, to feel that so arbitrary a jurisdiction was incompatible with liberty; and, in proportion as the spirit of independence still rose higher in the nation, the aversion to it increased.

Sir, in the same way we, in this colony of a British Empire, see that such a court as will be established under this clause, in so far as it affects the subjects of Her Majesty in this colony coming within its purview, is inconsistent with liberty. It may extend its authority, and encroach on the jurisdiction of the courts. Now, I want to call attention to what Hume says, at page 146, vol. IV.:

Mr. DAVIN.

One of the most ancient and most established instruments of power was the Court of Star Chamber, which possessed an unlimited discretionary authority of fining, imprisoning and inflicting corporal punishment, and whose jurisdiction extended to all sorts of offences, contempts and disorders that lay not within reach of the common law. The members of this court consisted of the Privy Council and of judges, men who, all of them, enjoyed offices during pleasure.

Just as those who would sit here would practically hold—with the exception of the judge, and he would be appointed *ad hoc*—they would practically hold their offices during the pleasure of the Prime Minister:

And when the Prince himself was present, he was the sole judge, and all the others could only interpose with their advice. There needed but this one court in any government to put an end to all regular, legal and exact plans of liberty; for who durst set himself in opposition to the Crown and the Ministry, or aspire to the character of being a patron of freedom while exposed to so arbitrary a jurisdiction?

Now, here again the court that will be established under this will have an arbitrary jurisdiction. How can men be said to have the liberty that they should have in a free colony like this, if they may at any time be haled before an arbitrary tribunal that acts on its own discretion, and that has none of the safeguards that belong to the courts of the country? My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) last night referred to the case of shovels. There was a case that you should meet, but this clause won't meet it. This clause won't meet the case of any number of men, either, who are in partnership, or in business combination, and who combine with somebody on the other side of the line. If the initiation of the combine takes place on the other side of the line, this clause will in no way enable this court to deal with it. So that the only case that could be dealt with is the case of a combine within the limits of Canada, and which, in the first place, the Committee of the Privy Council, and in the next place, the judge, should decide that they were combining unduly to enhance a price.

Now, is it to be thought for one minute that any such case will ever come before such a tribunal as this? Mr. Chairman, the fright of having to be brought before such a tribunal will be enough for those manufacturers, and any penalty that those exercising this power wish to inflict, will be gladly borne. When Sir John A. Macdonald was in power, we had accusations made that he obtained for election purposes, in the Red Parlour, large sums from the manufacturers. I happen to be in a position to say that there was no foundation for that statement, that it was a complete mistake on the part of those who made the charge. But it is perfectly clear that those who made the charge thought it was a common occurrence for politicians to demand certain help

from manufacturers. If they take that view and determine to act upon such a principle as that, here is a clause which will bring a court into existence that will not meet the cases, that will not help the people to strike at the combines, but will be a pistol in the hands of politicians to hold up manufacturers on the high road of politics. Suppose the Standard Oil Company make an arrangement with a number of gentlemen in Canada. You cannot strike at that combine—there is nothing in this clause to enable you to strike at such a combine. It will not meet such a case as the member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) called attention to last night. The only thing this clause does is to place a weapon, a powerful sword in the hands of the Government whereby, under the guise of exercising a judicial function, they may strike home and exact one of two things, on the eve of an election large subscriptions to the election funds, or from terrified manufacturers political support. Any hon. member who has been in business or has had dealings with business men knows how exceedingly nervous business men and manufacturers are, and therefore, looking at the clause in the last form it has assumed, it seems to involve danger to the liberty of a large class of the people of Canada, and it holds out a false light to the mass of the people. We are all anxious to prevent combines to raise prices to the consumer. It is perfectly right to organize combinations in order to lower the cost of production, but it is a wrong time to organize to raise prices to the consumer. All are anxious to prevent the formation of combinations such as were referred to by the hon. member for Hamilton; and, under these circumstances, why should not this committee take the proper course, as is suggested by the amendment? If it be true that the criminal law is not strong enough, why should we not add clauses which would bring every form of combination within the purview of the criminal law and give the courts power to deal with those cases? The courts would act impartially and without suspicion being aroused, whereas under present circumstances, if there was a combine composed entirely of Reformers, and it was desired to strike it, and was brought before the attention of the Privy Council, we know that the first result would be that influential deputations of leading Reformers would wait on members of the Administration, and say to them: you are proceeding against our friends. If, however, an unfounded complaint were made by some portion of the public that a combination existed, and no action was taken, then they would think that justice had miscarried and that favouritism had been exercised, and thereby uncertainty would be created throughout the entire country. If hon. gentlemen wish to strike at the combines, let them submit a clause that will attack them in an absolutely effective manner, one separate from

a tariff, with which it has no real connection, and do not place before the committee a clause like this that will bring into existence a power, not as great, but strictly analogous to the old Star Chamber, capable of being used in the same spirit and relatively to the same extent—a clause that cannot reflect credit on the Government introducing it, or on this Parliament, and which can only be useful to accomplish a sinister end, and that will place in the hands of the Government a weapon with which to strike at political foes under the guise of attacking combines.

Mr. CARGILL. I rise merely to enter my protest against the passing of this clause. I have several reasons for doing so, some of which I will state to the committee. Many arguments have been used against the passing of this clause, notably those delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). In addition we have had the able and eloquent argument submitted by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and if anything were wanting to induce me to vote against this resolution or to convince me of its absurdity, the argument just advanced by the hon. member would decide the matter. What can be the aims and objects of this resolution? I can see no other object than this, that the resolution is for the purpose of giving the Government influence and control over the manufacturers and dealers in the products of this country. The present Government will be able to use this legislation very effectively from the practice which they introduced previous to recent Dominion elections. At that time they formed a combine with the Patrons. I had in my own riding a Patron as my opponent. He had been a Conservative. Objection was taken to him for that reason. Steps were then entered upon to displace him and replace him by a Reform Patron. The Reformers of East Bruce do not like the Patrons any more than the Conservatives do, but, having consented to be represented by a Patron in place of a Liberal or a Conservative, they thought it better to have a Liberal-Patron representing them. The result was that a convention was called by the Reformers of the county. At that convention the Patron delegates constituted a majority of those assembled there. In consequence of that, instead of getting a straight Liberal, a Liberal-Patron was nominated. After being subjected to a series of questions by the delegates present, as to whether he adhered more strictly to Patron or Reform views, and getting the answer that he was a Liberal first and a Patron second, the Patron-Liberal delegates joined him and gave him the nomination. It was then arranged that the Patron candidate was to have two or three days to consult the lodge to which he belonged as to whether he should accept the nomination. He attended a meeting held by the Conserva-

tive-Patrons and stated that he had received the nomination of the Reformers and Patrons of the county, but if the Conservative-Patron in the field would retire he, the Reform-Patron, would stand and not oppose him, but would turn in and give his support to the Conservative-Patron, and the Liberals would join hands with him. That combination was not successful, and I succeeded in being elected for East Bruce against the combined efforts of Liberals and Patrons.

I object to this clause because it does not propose to deal with all the industries we have in this country, and I believe that legislation should not be discriminatory, but that it should refer to all our industries and to all classes of the community. At the present time we have lumber being imported into Canada, and the lumber industry has never been protected in this country. I would like to know how the present Government propose to deal with the Canadian lumberman, suppose they saw fit to organize a combine to extort from the consumers of lumber in this country, profits over and above what they are entitled to. This clause provides that if a combine is discovered the only way in which it could be dealt with is to deprive the manufacturer and producer of that particular article, of the protective duties placed on his products. In that way this law would place the Government in a position to say to the manufacturers of this country: A rumour is afloat to the effect that you are a party to a combine. That would give sufficient reason for the belief that a combine existed, and all that is necessary then is to notify a judge to go to work, and summon witnesses, and make a report to the Government. I would like to know if upon the eve of a general election several combinations are discovered in this country, and if such an investigation took place, and it was established beyond doubt that those combinations did exist; would the Government of this country put this law into force or not. I rather think it would depend altogether upon the price of votes at that particular time, and on the number of employees that each manufacturer had in his employ.

Now, if the present Government proposed to put a law upon the Statute-book which would effectually stamp out all combinations in this country, they would have my cordial support. I am adverse to combinations of all kinds, although I believe that some combinations have had a good effect upon the country. For instance, combinations have been organized for the purpose of facilitating the manufacture of certain products, and for the purpose of economizing the expense in connection therewith. In these cases the prices have been lowered to the consumer, and in that way they have been beneficial. I might mention in this particular the Massey-Harris firm, the head of which is said to have amassed two or three millions of dollars. We all know that

Mr. CARGILL.

after that combination was organized, the prices of agricultural implements were reduced very materially, and the farmers of this country received the benefit of that reduction. I think, Mr. Chairman, if this clause is retained it should be amended so as to prevent any persons from forming combines. It is quite plain, however, that legislation of this kind will enable the Government of this country to form the most gigantic combine that was ever perpetrated upon any free people. It will enable them to go to the manufacturers throughout the length and breadth of this country, and say: We have an election pending, we want your support and influence and if we cannot have it we will originate an investigation, prove that you have been a party to a combine, deprive you of the protective tariff which has been given you for a number of years, and close up your industry. The clause places too much power in the hands of the Government, and for this reason I have very serious objections to it. When this Government came into power I expected a great deal at their hands, and the people of Canada expected to derive material and great benefit from the present Government. I am very sorry to say, Sir, that the result is not such as I anticipated. We have a Government said to be composed of business men, but I think there are only two business men included in it, and the rest are all lawyers or professional men. In the formation of this Government apparently there could not be found in the rank and file of the representatives on the Liberal side of the House, men of sufficient calibre to compose the Ministry; and so, in order to get able and intelligent men, the Prime Minister went outside and selected the Premiers and ex-Premiers of the various provinces in the Dominion. That, I think, was unjust to these gentlemen who sat in the House of Commons day and night and fought out the battles of the Liberal party. We have therefore a Government composed of the representatives from different provinces; men who in their respective spheres have distinguished themselves, men who as leaders in their respective provinces have held the most prominent positions, and I am surprised that a Government composed of men, who hitherto must have legislated in the interests of their constituents in order to retain power, would introduce such a clause as this in a tariff Bill. In conclusion, I appeal to the Government again, and I say to them that if they will withdraw this resolution and introduce a Bill effectually dealing with combines and which will have the effect of extinguishing combines, I will give them my cordial support; but I conscientiously feel that I cannot endorse their action as set forth in this resolution.

Mr. SNETSINGER. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the amendment before the House. The hon. member

for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) asked if there were any combines in this country. I can point out combines in this country. We have had combines, not only among the cotton mills of Cornwall, but in other branches of manufacture as well. The existence of a monopoly in cotton manufacture in this country has obliged many people to leave the country because they could get no employment here. The nail combine has been the most scandalous combine that we have ever had in this country. Two years ago the nail combine made four advances in their prices—first 50 cents, then 40 cents, then 20 cents, and then 10 cents; a total advance of \$1.20 in the price of nails to the consumers of this country. I regret very much that the Government have seen fit to advance the tariff on nails above what it was in their first resolution. Thirty-five per cent was quite enough protection for the nail manufacturers. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) talks about manufacturers being compelled by the Government to subscribe to election funds. I have no doubt that not only manufacturers but contractors have been used in that way to a large extent by the late Government.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. SNETSINGER. I know it.

Mr. DAVIN. I know it was not so.

Mr. SNETSINGER. I know that the hat has been passed round among manufacturers in the city of Montreal during the last ten or fifteen years. So I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman being excited in regard to this clause. I hope the present Government will never do anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SNETSINGER. Manufacturers in the city of Montreal have themselves told me that they have been asked to subscribe, and did subscribe, to election funds; and I know that contractors have been subscribing to them. They do not deny it; they told me so themselves. I hope this Government will never ask anything of the kind. It is time that sort of thing should stop. I regret very much that the Government have made changes in the duties on nails and cottons. These changes, I think, are not in the interest of the people of this country, and I hope they will change them back again. The reduction in the duty on cotton to 15 per cent, in the interest of the shirt manufacturers, I do not think is in the interest of the cotton mills of this country. I would like to see the combines in this country destroyed, and they would have been destroyed if the American Government had acted fairly towards us. The tariff would have been put down to such

a point that no combines would be possible in this country. I would like to see sugar made free, and duties placed on tea and coffee. Raw sugar especially should have been made free, and enough left on refined sugar to protect the refiners of this country, and no more. When hon. gentlemen talk about combines, I want to remind them that the policy of the late Government was the means of creating combines in this country. It is time they were destroyed, and I think this Government will have very little trouble in destroying them. I am prepared on the whole to accept the tariff resolutions, but I regret that the Government have made some changes in the duties as originally brought down, and I hope they will put them back to where they were at first.

Mr. MARTIN. I think the power asked for by the Government in this resolution is an extreme power, and should not be granted by this House. While hon. members of both sides are prepared to deal with combines, it is a new thing to introduce such a remedy as that proposed by the Government, in a tariff resolution, which will not reach any appreciable number of them. A preferable way to deal with combines and trusts would be to introduce a Bill specially for that purpose. How do the Government propose to deal with combines in other countries? It has been said here, and said truly, that the largest combine in the world exists at present in England, that great free trade country, in the article of cotton thread. Perhaps the next largest in the world is the Standard Oil Company in the United States. There are many other large combines, which are a menace to the industries of Canada; and if the Government took steps to prevent these combines injuring the manufactures of Canada, I think they would be taking a preferable step to the one they are now taking. They may reduce the duty on some articles, and as a result Canada may be flooded with that article from the country to the south of us by some combine or trust there. The combine may at first introduce the article into this country at a low price; but as soon as they get control of the market, they can raise the price again, and eventually the cost to the consumer will be greater than it would be if the article were manufactured in this country. How does the Government propose to deal with that? If they are sincere, if they are anxious to deal fairly with the producer and consumer, let them propose that when articles manufactured by a combine or trust in the United States or in Great Britain or in any other part of the world are imported into Canada, the duty on those articles will be increased. Let them give the manufacturers of this country fair-play. But they appear to be after the manufacturers of this country with a gun.

They appear quite willing that the manufacturers of this country should be slaughtered by the combines of the country to the south of us, which is noted for its combines. If they wish to put down combines in goods coming into this country, let the duty be doubled or increased on these goods. We are to be relieved from the operation of combines in our own country, but subjected to the operation of the combines of a foreign country. I think such a proposal as I suggest would be a remedy, but to say that the Government should be given this most arbitrary power is to reverse the principles of responsible government and injure the manufacturing industries and the interest of the consumer. For that reason I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Amendment negatived, on division.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved to amend the said resolution by adding in the fourth line the words "to unduly" before the word "enhance."

Amendment agreed.

Resolution agreed to.

On schedule A, item 1,

**Mr. HENDERSON.** Before we leave the resolutions, I would ask the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the suggestion I made with reference to clause 14, namely, to add after the words "port of entry" the words "a justice of the peace, notary public or a commissioner for taking affidavits," so that when goods are entitled to a lower rate of duty or are on the free list on account of being used for manufacturing purposes in the factory of the importer, the proprietor or importer, if he lives say fifteen or twenty miles away from the custom-house, which often happens, would not be held to go to the port of entry in order to make the affidavits before the collector. In my own village, this difficulty frequently occurs. The large canners there and glove manufacturers and others, who import goods for their own factories, which are subject to lower rates of duty or are on the free list on account of being imported for manufacturing purposes, have very frequently to make declarations before the collector at the port of entry, which is fifteen miles away, or else put in a declaration which does not conform to the law, because taken before a commissioner. I feel sure that the hon. Finance Minister can agree to my suggestion without in any way interfering with the working of the clause.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I hope the hon. gentleman will not find it necessary to press his amendment. My first impression is that in the practical working of the Customs Department, his suggestion would be found difficult. However, we

**Mr. MARTIN.**

both have the same object in view, and if my hon. friend will let the suggestion stand for the present, before we are through with the tariff I promise it shall be very thoroughly considered by the Controller of Customs.

Item agreed to.

7. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at a rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, as follows:—

(a.) Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine; gin of all kinds, n.e.s.; rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p.; amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.e.s.; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether he has had any information of an increase of illicit distillation. What I fear is that the rate of duty that has been placed upon spirituous and alcoholic liquors will defeat its object, so far as the revenue is concerned, by leading to smuggling and illicit distillation. I do not know whether the Government have been watching the matter closely. The Controllers of Inland Revenue and Customs can say how far there is any indication of a movement in that direction.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There has hardly been sufficient time to enable us to say whether there is any unusual movement in that direction, but it is undoubted that there is considerable smuggling and illicit distillation throughout the country. My hon. friends the Controllers of Inland Revenue and Customs are giving that matter special attention, and an extra vote has been taken with a view to dealing more vigorously with the smuggling evil. The hon. gentleman is no doubt correct that every increase of duty increases this evil and necessitates much greater vigilance.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is the excise duty now, and what was the old duty?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. \$1.90 per gallon instead of \$1.70.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of the difference of the increase between excise and customs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difference is against excise, of course. There is a strong opinion among hon. members that the excise duty should be still larger. The difference is 5 cents more against the distiller than the old rates. But it is one of those difficult questions to determine how far the increase of these duties will affect the revenue. We have had some difference of opinion among interested parties on that question, and we have thought that we could afford to make that difference, at all events getting an increased duty of 5 cents upon excise. Whether we shall succeed, remains to be seen.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to hear the Minister of Finance on one point. The customs duty on liquor and spirits is \$2.40 per gallon, the excise duty is \$1.90 per gallon; therefore, the protection enjoyed by the distiller is 50 cents per gallon on an article that does not cost, including interest, insurance and all other expenses, above 15 cents per gallon. That is, upon an article costing 15 cents per gallon, we give a protective duty of 50 cents per gallon, which amounts to 333 per cent, an amount of protection to an industry that cannot be justified. At the same time, it decreases the revenue by just that amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The best I can say is that if it is 300 per cent now, it was more than 300 per cent previously; so whatever change we are making is, according to his own view, in the right direction. The difference between customs and excise before was 55, while now it is 50 cents. The statement of the hon. gentleman as to the cost of the manufacture of whisky is much at variance with the information given by parties in the trade. They will be surprised and shocked by the statement of the hon. gentleman that it costs only 15 cents to make a gallon of good whisky, that is if any whisky is good. Their views are much at variance with that.

Mr. WALLACE. On the question that a bushel of corn makes three gallons of proof whisky, there can be no dispute; the regulation of the Department of Inland Revenue provide for that. It is agreed upon between the distillers and the department that the product of one bushel of Indian corn shall be three gallons of proof whisky.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The exact quantity which is produced from a bushel of corn may be as stated. But the general question of the cost of making a gallon of whisky, is one upon which, if my hon. friend is correct, there is a considerable lack of correct information in other quarters, because the

parties interested in the trade have represented that the cost of making a gallon of good whisky, including the expense of carrying it under the two-years law, taking into account the large capital involved, and the interest, &c.—they represent that it is more than double that. Of course, I must not undertake to sit in judgment between them; that is a question largely for expert knowledge. But as I say, the information given by interested parties is that the cost of production of a gallon of whisky is more than double that stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I can remember myself when whisky was sold at 20 cents per gallon, distillers were selling it at that price. But there can be no dispute of the fact that a bushel of corn makes three gallons of whisky, that is an established fact. As to the cost of manufacture, anybody who goes to a distillery can see that it is not very great. The barrels that are used are charged extra by the distillers, the offal is valuable for feeding cattle, and produces a great deal of money. The Minister of Finance speaks of the large amount of capital required to carry whisky over for two years; but the capital is only the cost of manufacture and the price of the corn or grain; the duty has nothing to do with that. The two or three dollars a gallon that may be charged for customs or excise, if they are not paid by the distiller, he holds the duty over. The full contents of the barrel are worth only about \$6 in bond. So that the interest and insurance are only on the \$6, not on the price the consumer has to pay, which is about \$100. The cost of insurance and the interest of the capital invested are both exceedingly small. And when you put all these together, including interest for the two years the liquor has to be held, and insurance for the two years that it has been held, and the cost of manufacture—if all these are put together, they will not make more than 15 or 16 cents. As to the statement that the hon. Minister has made, that parties have informed him that the cost is 30 cents or more, I think that before he makes that statement to the House he should give some figures which would justify it. At any rate, the fact remains that the protection to the distiller is over 300 per cent, and, in my opinion, that is much too high a protection to give to any industry in this country. I know that the present Government has refused to give even a very moderate protection to some industries, even some that are just beginning their manufacture. For instance, they have taken off the duty off cream separators, which duty, I think, was 30 per cent under the old tariff. The manufacturers have established their industry in this country only within the last couple of years. They are now, as I pointed out in the case of the John Abell Manufacturing Company, able to make the steel bowls for separators,

which before were free and which the Government might fairly be asked to put a duty upon. It seems a most unfair tariff under which these Canadian enterprises are left entirely without protective duties, while the duty is not taken off the raw materials that they are required to import. On what basis of justice does the Government retain the duty of 20 per cent on the larger agricultural implements, and 25 per cent, as I believe it is, on smaller articles of that kind—though I think it is not a high enough duty—and allow no protection to the manufacturer of cream separators and, at the same time, give the distillers of this country a protection of 300 per cent. I do not think that such a thing can be justified. A distillery is not an industry that employs a very large number of men. But here are industries that require protection and get none at all, while the distillers, even if the statement of the hon. Minister be correct—and he does not claim very good authority for making it—have a protection of 166 per cent. The statement is made that the Government are moving in the right direction, that there is less protection for the distillers than there was before. That is quite true. And that may be a reason for criticising the course of the late Government. But we have begun this tariff discussion anew, and must judge everything on its merits.

Mr. FOSTER. The late Government adopted the principle of protection.

Mr. WALLACE. That is true; the late Government proceeded upon the principle of giving protection. In the case of the distillers, I believe, they gave too much. Now that we are making a new tariff, I ask the Government to investigate the matter and see if they can justify such enormous protection to the whisky manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I take exception to my hon. friend's statement that I made any representation on my own account as to the cost of making whisky. I do not profess to have expert knowledge on that subject, but I thought it fair to say that it was a matter of dispute, that the parties engaged in the business—who, of course, are interested—have represented very earnestly that the cost of making whisky was about double that stated by my hon. friend. I have no means of proving the truth of that statement; it is a matter of dispute. The most that we can say in support of the item is that at least the distillers have 5 cents less protection than they had in the past.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. members will notice that the Minister of Finance quotes the distillers as saying that the cost of the manufacture was double what I stated it to be. I showed that the cost was from 2 cents to 3 cents per gallon above the value of the offal. If the representations made to the Minister of Finance are correct, they would

Mr. WALLACE.

show the cost of manufacture to be from 5 cents to 6 cents per gallon above the cost of the offal. The cost of the corn required to make a gallon of whisky is 12 cents. This would make the cost of the whisky, at the utmost, 18 cents per gallon, even according to the representations of the distillers. The cost of the manufacture may be twice what I have stated, but the cost of the corn cannot be twice what I have stated, for we know the price of corn and how much whisky can be made from a bushel. These are points upon which there is no room for dispute, because the Controller of Inland Revenue has the facts and can state them to the House. Even if the cost of manufacture be 6 cents per gallon over the value of the offal, and the price of the corn, that would only make the cost of a gallon of whisky 18 cents. The protection, therefore, afforded to the manufacturer would be about 300 per cent per gallon. Now, particularly as we are going to have a plebiscite very soon—

Mr. McCLEARY. When?

Mr. WALLACE. Right away. The Government is pledged to submit a Bill at this session of the Parliament, and I do not doubt that the electors of the Dominion will be called to vote upon this question within a very few weeks or months. The course of the Government in giving such protection to the distillers is in strange contrast with their desire to pass a prohibitory liquor law.

Mr. McMULLEN. It seems to be singularly inconsistent in an hon. gentleman who has not only been a member of the House, but a member of the Cabinet, or, at least, a Conservative, and who knew all the facts that he has stated to the House with regard to the enormous profit of the whisky manufacturers, never to suggest an increased excise duty on spirits—

Mr. WALLACE. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) know that?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) never suggested that to the House, but the moment he gets into Opposition, he rises to point out that the manufacturers of whisky are getting too much protection. If the facts stated by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) are correct, unquestionably the distillers have too much protection. For my part, I would like to see the excise duty increased. As the Government have moved in this direction, I hope they will keep on. However, it struck me: How peculiar it was that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) and my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), who must have been cognizant of all the benefits enjoyed by the manufacturers of liquor all these years that they were in power, had quietly permitted the distillers—including my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster)—

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am not a distiller.

Mr. McMULLEN. But he (Mr. Foster) was in office while this high protection was given.

Mr. FOSTER. But I thought you included me among the distillers.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman allowed these men to enjoy the excessive protection pointed out by the hon. member for West York without making a single suggestion for its reduction. We would have been glad to join with hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, in a proposal to increase the excise duty on spirits. But not a single move was made by them. But now that the Liberal party has come into power, the hon. member for West York rises and questions the propriety of leaving the whisky manufacturers in the enjoyment of the protection that they have, notwithstanding that the Finance Minister has made a considerable inroad into the privileges they enjoyed.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would suggest that further powers might be taken under the combine clause, to increase duties when an occasion of this kind arises.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Does the hon. gentleman wish to move an amendment in that direction?

Mr. MACLEAN. No; I am only making a suggestion in view of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me.

Mr. WALLACE. I have apparently a little more freedom than the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whose hands now appear to be tied.

(e.) Vermouth containing not more than thirty-six per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than twenty-six per cent of proof spirits, ninety cents per gallon.

If containing more than these percentages respectively of proof spirits, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a change here from the old tariff. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite will make some explanations.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That was made after consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the reasons?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It was found that the strength of different samples did not come within a degree or two of the standard. It was also stated that the standard was too low, and it was necessary to increase it. In view of some of the rulings of the department, it was impossible to carry out the intention of the Act.

Mutton and lamb, fresh, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. How does this matter now stand with respect to New South Wales?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At this moment nothing has been done in relation to New South Wales, but I am quite satisfied that it will come in under the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how will it be in regard to the farmers of the North-west supplying the British Columbia market with mutton? New South Wales is a large producer of mutton. Where are the Patrons? Where are the British Columbia members, who must know that their farming interests depend largely on retaining control of the market of that province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman want me to read part of the speech he delivered before the Intercolonial Conference?

Mr. FOSTER. This will open the market to New Zealand, so that the farmers there will be able to compete with the farmers of British Columbia on a free plane, and this advantage will be given to New South Wales without securing any advantage in return.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The workmen will benefit by it.

Mr. FOSTER. The workmen in Quebec should have a chance as well as those in British Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can find fault with New Zealand mutton being allowed to come into British Columbia. He stated at the Intercolonial Conference that the province was utterly unable to furnish mutton for the Pacific coast.

Mr. ROGERS. We are not afraid to compete with the world, but we do not want to pay \$150,000 a year in subsidies.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend so far in the confidence of the Government that he is aware that they are going to take away these subsidies? Within a few days he will be called upon to vote a much larger subsidy for the new fast line of steamers. Does he propose, or does he think the Government propose to take away the subsidies given in connection with trade on the Pacific coast? With regard to what was stated by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), I fail to see the point of his argument. At that conference we were willing to open up our markets on terms mutually advantageous, and we were to receive in return trade advantages with our fellow colonists.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will tell the hon. gentleman where the point lies. The hon. gentleman stated at that conference that Can-

ada was unable to furnish mutton for British Columbia, and that New Zealand mutton could properly come in.

Mr. FOSTER. Ah, my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) has not read that quite right. He had better turn it up and get the exact words.

Mr. McMILLAN. Perhaps you could explain it, if I have not read it aright.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has made the assertion, and he must carry it out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to draw the attention of the Government to what I think is a failure on their part to act in the interest of Canada. At the great conference which was held in Ottawa, at which South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand were represented, the question of intercolonial trade as well as inter-Imperial trade occupied a very large amount of attention, and an application was made by that conference to the Imperial Government to remove by Imperial legislation the difficulties that prevented the colonies of Australia and of Canada from entering into mutually advantageous reciprocal trade arrangements. My hon. friends know that Lord Jersey in reporting on the proceedings of the conference, strongly urged upon the Imperial Government the desirability of complying with the wishes of Canada, South Africa, and Australia, to have the difficulties which stood in the way removed by Imperial legislation. The Imperial Government assented to that, and by an Act of the Imperial Parliament they placed the Dominion of Canada, and New Zealand, and the provinces of Australasia in a position, for the first time, to negotiate mutually advantageous reciprocal trade arrangements. Now, Sir, I invite the attention of the Government to the fact that Australia and New Zealand joined in this appeal to the Imperial Government, and I want to know under these circumstances, why New Zealand or any of the Australian provinces, should require that this Government should give them a preferential position in Canadian markets, without making a preferential return to our goods in their markets. I want to know, why, under these circumstances, this Government should have thrown away the means they had in their power to secure from the Australian colonies, we will say the opportunity that was presented of negotiating a trade arrangement between the Government of Canada and their Governments under that Imperial legislation which enable them to do so. I cannot see why Canadians should be called upon for a single moment to make concessions for nothing. If my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce had made to the New South Wales Government, the proposal that his Government would give, we will say, this reduction of 25 per cent in the duty on all the products they could send into this

country, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe these colonies Governments would reciprocate. I think, Sir, the Canadian Government have failed in their duty to the House, and to the country, in placing our farmers at the mercy of the sharp competition from New South Wales in our own market, without getting any consideration in return. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce had taken up this question, he would I believe have been able to secure a most advantageous reciprocal trade arrangement, which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance now admits he has thrown away, without receiving any return whatever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has raised the whole question of the reciprocal tariff again, because every word he has said with regard to New South Wales would equally apply to the admission of goods from Great Britain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) mistakes me altogether. The questions are entirely different. England cannot negotiate a reciprocal trade with you, because the treaties by which she has bound herself and bound Canada prevents it, but New South Wales can, under the Act which was passed in the Imperial Parliament permitting her to do so, and of the passage of which Act the Canadian Government has been advised. Before you brought down your tariff, and since you came into power last July, you have been in a position to open up these negotiations, and to make a reciprocal trade arrangement by which Canada would get some return for that privilege, which under the policy pursued by this Government has been absolutely thrown away, although Australia had joined Canada in getting these obstructions removed so as to enable Canada and the provinces of Australia and New Zealand to make these reciprocal trade arrangements.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as their relation to the reciprocal tariff is concerned, England and New South Wales stand exactly in the same position. They have both granted the privileges of their market to us, and from that fact they have the right to obtain the benefit of this reciprocal tariff. In that respect they stand exactly in the same position. It is not easy to see what else New South Wales could do for us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) does not mean to say that New South Wales admits the goods of Canada into her market, under more favourable treatment than she extends to other countries?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both England and New South Wales are free trade countries, and they both give us all the facilities we can ask in their markets.

Mr. McMILLAN.

We do not think it is a sound policy to say we will not recognize what they have done in the past, and unless they do something more we will not admit their products under this reciprocal tariff. We maintain that both England and New South Wales have dealt fairly and liberally with us in the past, and although they do not discriminate in our favour, yet we see no reason why they should not come under the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. SPROULE. This is one of the cases in which the reciprocal tariff will strike us pretty heavily, and because of which, in the judgment of members on this side of the House, it was unwise to make this provision. We are not afraid of England sending meat products into Canada, because she always consumes more than this country can supply, but New South Wales has a large superabundance and is exporting it to every market she can find. Notwithstanding that we had a high tariff against New South Wales last year, she sent us 39,000 pounds. If she could send that to Canada with a duty of 35 per cent against her, is it not more likely that she will send a still larger quantity when you reduce that duty to 27 per cent under the reciprocal tariff? The new rate of duty, which the hon. Minister of Finance tells us will apply to New South Wales, will make the tariff on mutton only 27 per cent ad valorem. If that country sends in so much when the duty is 35 per cent, surely it will be a much more serious competitor with the farmers of Canada when the duty is only 26 per cent; and the reduction applies not only to mutton, but to all lines of fresh meat, as well as to lard and tallow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The duty on fresh lamb and mutton is 35 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, to New South Wales it will be 25 per cent less than it was before; and if under a 35 per cent duty that country can export so much to Canada, under a 26 per cent duty it can export a great deal more; so that it is sure to become a serious competitor with the Canadian farmer, not only in mutton, but in many other lines of meat.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend will do well to remember that if you desire to extend your trade at all, you have to buy as well as sell. If we want the Australians to buy our wheat and flour, which I am glad to say they are buying in larger quantities from year to year, as well as our manufactures, we must buy something from them, and I am not disposed to be frightened or alarmed if the consuming population of Canada get fresh meats or canned mutton a little cheaper than before.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are trying to establish a trade on equal terms, so that

when we gave an advantage to them, they would give one to us.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). They gave you an advantage in advance.

Mr. SPROULE. They gave no advantage to us except what they gave to the whole world. We are giving them a valuable consideration belonging to the farmers of Canada, for which we get no return, and can get no return under this proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a matter of some importance, I think. I recollect not long since hearing one of the Patron representatives in this House declaring that though he had been at one time a Conservative, believing in Conservative doctrines, he had been gradually seduced from the old faith by a conviction, which from time to time stole with great force over him, that nothing was being done for the farmers by the Conservative Government; and that conviction became so strong at last that he had abjured his old faith and took an independent position—occupied a half-way house between the Conservative and Liberal parties. But it was not long before the half-way house was abandoned for the more comfortable house which had been reared by the Liberal Government; and the hon. gentleman is now fraternizing with them under the same roof, eating at the same table, and sleeping in the same caucus with the Government and the supporters of the Government. In the by-elections, the Patrons very forcibly attacked the Liberal-Conservative Government for having introduced undue competition with the farmers of this country by subsidizing a Pacific line of steamers, which they argued would enable freights to be carried at less rates, and consequently give the competing power into the hands of the Australians. In every rural constituency, on every Patron platform, the Liberal-Conservative Government were denounced for this. And so my hon. friend and his Patron friends in the House left the Conservative party, and went over to the Liberal party, because the Liberal party were going to do more for the farmers. The Liberal party are in power, here is their tariff, and my hon. friend has already voted their Estimates, which provide for the same subsidy to the Pacific steamers, and their tariff allows imported lamb and mutton from the Australian colonies to come in at one-eighth reduction now, and one-fourth reduction a year from now. I congratulate my hon. friend on the reason he has given for his change of faith. He has had his reward, and had it quickly. There is more than that in this matter. If there is anything that has been buoying up the interest of the farmers of Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia, it has been the assumption that as the mining interests of British Columbia developed, and the mining population increased, they would

furnish the great home market for the products of the ranch and the farm and the field. Everybody knows that it has been said: "You produce lots of agricultural stuff in the west, but the freights eat up the profit when it goes to the British market. What is needed in the west is a population, and of all population a mining population is the best. They are a well-paid, an extravagant, a generous-living class, who man for man, consume twice as much as any other class." The mining development of British Columbia has commenced; people are flocking into the country; in many of its valleys mining towns are being formed; and the farmers in Manitoba and the Northwest have been saying: "Now is the time to enjoy our markets; now we can sell our beef, our grain, our small fruits and particularly our mutton and lamb." Yet the very first thing that is done by this Government is to open up competition across the margin of any possible profit, by reducing the 35 per cent tariff to one-fourth lower. Added to that, the regulations of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will allow herds to be driven over from the states adjoining the border without any restrictive conditions of quarantine, which I warn my hon. friend, as the experience of a few months will show, will have the effect of inducing a very large importation all along the line of the mining regions of British Columbia from the states to the south.

So much for the farmer's point of view, but I want to emphasize what my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition brought out so clearly a moment ago and which the Minister of Finance seems to have entirely lost the point of. There is a great difference between the position of Great Britain and that of the colony of Australia, a difference which was recognized by the Imperial legislation passed eighteen months ago under which the Australian colonies were empowered to make a bargain on reciprocal terms with us, which Great Britain is not in a position to do, owing to her treaties. My hon. friend is generous with the products of Canadian industries. He is willing to give away the farmers' or anybody else's interests. Well, while it is a good thing to be generous, it is better to be just. The fact that New South Wales asked for that legislation to enable it to treat with the other colonies is proof conclusive that they were ready to enter into reciprocal arrangements with Canada from which each country would derive compensating advantages. But under my hon. friend's resolution, Canada will obtain no reciprocal advantages for what she is giving away. The hon. gentleman replies that New South Wales is a free trade country. Does he say that she raises all her tariff by direct taxation? Has he looked over the tariff of New South Wales and is he in a position to state that all the goods she obtains from Canada go

Mr. FOSTER.

in there free of duty? The hon. gentleman had better study the question in order to ascertain whether there are not articles of Canadian produce which, under a reciprocal arrangement, might be admitted by New South Wales at lower rates in return for corresponding advantages conceded to that colony by Canada. We ought to guard just as carefully the interests of our farmers in the far west, who raise beef and mutton, as the interests of the farmers in the eastern provinces; and I suppose the consumers in the east are entitled to just as much consideration and ought to be just as much an object of solicitude to the Government as the consumers in the west, if not more, because if there is any one class more than another which is better able to pay for its food, it is the mining class who get their wages regularly paid in cash. We can only come to one conclusion, and that is, that Canada's interests are in every case being sacrificed by this Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) if he would be good enough to lay on the Table of the House, for the information of hon. members on both sides, the last returns from the International Customs Union held at Brussels, of the tariffs of all countries. My hon. friend is aware that Canada makes an annual contribution to that customs union, and the Canadian Government has been on various occasions represented there, and one of the duties of that bureau is to furnish to the governments embraced in the union returns of all tariff changes that may have taken place.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall keep that in view.

Mr. FOSTER. What other articles of possible export from New South Wales may be supposed to come in under the reduction of duty proposed? We are now on the item of fresh meats, are there any other products that New South Wales sends to this country?

Mr. DAVIN. I have the tariff of New South Wales here, and my hon. friend the Finance Minister seems to be greatly mistaken when he calls it a free trade tariff. Take timber, for instance, here is its tariff:

Timber.	s.	d.
Dressed, per 100 super feet.....	3	0
Rough and undressed (with the exception of ash, hickory and oak), per 100 super ft.	1	6
Palings, per 100.....	1	0
Laths, per 1,000.....	0	9
Shingles, per 1,000.....	1	0
Pickets, dressed, per 100 super feet.....	3	0

I have not analysed the tariff fully—

Mr. TALBOT. Take time to study it.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought I was doing useful work when I showed to the hon. Finance Minister that he was mistaken in

saying that New South Wales had a free trade tariff. I certainly thought I was doing work of much more value than sitting down in my seat, as the hon. gentleman constantly does, with my hat over my eyes and interjecting senseless interruptions.

Mr. SPROULE. As an illustration of what might occur from a very slight change in the tariff, let me point out that last year we imported from Australia, mutton, 22,229 pounds; dead meats, 100,000 pounds; butter, 6,997 pounds, or in all, in these three items alone, 129,206 pounds. That took place under a 35 per cent tariff, but if we reduce that tariff to 26½ per cent, as it would be reduced under the most-favoured-nation clause, Australia would no doubt send in a great deal more. As an evidence of this, I need only mention the fact that, a few years ago, we found fresh meats coming in very largely from the United States, despite the duty.

Now, at the request of the farmers of Canada, the Government raised the duty. How much? Only half a cent a pound. And the result was to shut out over fourteen millions of pounds of this meat. Before the increase of the duty the quantity imported was 33,000,000 pounds a year, and after that, about half the quantity. The farmers of Canada might as well understand what it means to reduce the duty by one-quarter in favour of Australasia. When the representative of Australasia was here a few years ago at the colonial conference, he said: We would consider ourselves well off if we could get \$2 apiece for our sheep and \$10 apiece for two-year-old steers. If animals and meat are so cheap there, then, notwithstanding the long distance, if you lower our duty, that country must become a serious competitor with the Canadian farmer. It is a very serious matter to the Canadian farmer to have the duty lowered to almost any country but especially to that country that can offer the greatest competition. When the election was on in North Ontario, Mr. Lockie Wilson, one of the representatives of the Patron order went through the riding carrying two cans of Australian mutton, which formed the principal argument that he used. He told his audiences: The Canadian Government have subsidized a line of steamers to bring Australian mutton to compete with you farmers; and here it is. And then he would take from his pocket a can of this mutton that he had got in Montreal. That was the argument used by the Patrons throughout the riding. But what will be the effect when we reduce the duty one-quarter and subsidize the steamers just the same as before—because that subsidy is still continued. Surely the result must be worse for the Canadian farmer. If the competition was injurious before, it must be much more injurious now, and it is well that the Canadian farmer should understand it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The tariff items that we are now dealing with, from item 11 to item 101

inclusive, may be called the farmer's tariff. This schedule is headed "Animals and agricultural, animal and dairy products." I have a copy of the old tariff here and a copy of the new one, which is now before us, and I find that, with few exceptions they are, so far as these items are concerned, line for line the same. I want to ask what this paternal Government are doing for the farmers of this country. They have simply adopted the tariff of their predecessors, the National Policy tariff that gave protection to the farmers. There are a few changes which I will read. In the old tariff there were 87 items bearing upon the products of the farmers; in the new tariff there are 91. The first change that I notice is that eggs, under this tariff, are 3 cents a dozen (item 29) and under the old tariff they were 5 cents a dozen.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a mistake.

Mr. TAYLOR. That has been amended, has it? Then in that case, there is no change made by this tariff.

Mr. DAVIN. There was a duty of 5 cents a dozen under the tariff of 1894.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is changed, I believe. On condensed milk there is an increase of ¼ cent per pound—the old tariff was 3 cents per pound, and the present tariff 3¼ cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a mistake. The duty is not changed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have the old tariff here, and the duty on condensed milk is given at 3 cents per pound, while in the new tariff it appears to be 3¼ cents per pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no change in this item since this Government has come into power.

Mr. TAYLOR. In that case then they have only adopted the old National Policy tariff on this item also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an amendment of the tariff after the list which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has was published. I think you will find that there is no change in the duty on condensed milk in the new tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the next change I find in the tariff is the absence from this schedule in the new tariff of the item of corn. Under the old tariff there was a duty of 7½ cents per bushel while now it is free. Then on the item of cornmeal there is less protection by 15 cents per barrel.

Mr. SCRIVER. Indian corn imported for the purpose of distillation is subject to a duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. So it was under the old tariff. But now it is free for all other purposes except distilling, and no doubt a good

deal will be smuggled in for distilling purposes also. Cornmeal is reduced from 40 cents a barrel to 25 cents a barrel, being 15 cents a barrel less protection to the farmer. Then we come to wheat, which has been reduced from 15 cents a bushel to 12 cents a bushel, and flour from 75 cents a barrel to 60 cents a barrel. Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages have been increased from 2 cents per pound to 2¼ cents per pound, for what purpose I do not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Something for the farmer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think so. There seems to be something for the manufacturer there. I fancy that some manufacturers have made representations that they wanted further protection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What items is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. TAYLOR. Items 80, 81 and 82.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change in any of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am reading from the tariff of 1894, and if the hon. Minister has it in his hands, he can see that—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would call the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) attention to the fact that some changes were made after that tariff referred to by the hon. gentleman. The tariff on these three items as brought down is the same as when this Government came into power.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Conservative Government gave that much protection, before going out of office, that is so much in favour of the Conservative Government and so much less in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite who have adopted that tariff line by line.

Mr. TALBOT. You have the wrong tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not asking my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) for information. Where I am wrong the Finance Minister will correct me, and I am ready to accept his statement as to changes made since this tariff was printed. We sent for the old tariff to compare it with the new, and this is what was furnished us.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There were not a great many changes made after that tariff was printed, but there were some, and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) may accept the statement of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do accept it. So we see that, as compared with the old tariff, this Government have made only about five changes in this schedule, and all of them against the farmer. There are several new items, Nos. 100 and 101. No. 100 is "fine salt in bulk and coarse salt, n.e.s., 5 cents

Mr. TAYLOR.

per hundred pounds." If I am right, under the old tariff, salt was on the free list.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think these two items were simply brought from another part of the tariff. This is a change in classification, but the duties remain the same.

Mr. WALLACE. The duties on salt are precisely the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. Therefore, they have kept so much more of the National Policy. They have made about five changes which are against the protection that was given to the farmer. I expected to see the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) get up and defend the farmers whom he claims to represent as belonging to the Patron body. But here he is supporting this Government because they are doing so much for the farmer. What have they done for the farmer in the agricultural list of this tariff? Simply copied the tariff that they found prepared for them by the Government that left power in June last. My hon. friend talked about the subsidy that is already voted, as the ex-Finance Minister has explained, to carry mutton, as he claimed during the election, from Australia to Canada to compete with ours. I thought that hon. gentleman came here as an independent man representing the Patrons, and that he and his party would remain a purely independent party. But what did we find yesterday? We found him in the caucus of the Reform party, gone over body and bones to the Government, attending their caucuses, therefore he is no longer an independent man in this House, nor can he have any more influence as an independent representative of the Patrons. He identifies himself with the Government as well as with their policy, and votes for free corn to the injury of the farmer, votes for a reduction of the protection on wheat and on flour, and these are the only changes. I expected him to advocate the interest of the farmer for which purpose he was sent here; but he comes here and backs up this Government in reducing the protection that the farmer received at the hands of the late Government.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this thing noticeable in connection with it. It was claimed before that there was not sufficient protection for the farmer, those who opposed the Conservative Government did so on that ground. But whatever protection there was for the farmers before, there is 25 per cent less protection for them now under the favoured-nation clause. If you take those ninety-one items affecting the farmers, you will find that on every single item there is a reduction of 25 per cent under the most-favoured-nation clause, and Australasia, we are told by the Minister of Finance, is one of the nations in favour of whom there is a reduction of 25 per cent in the tariff. In

addition to that, there is a reduction of the duty on wheat and flour, two of the main commodities in which farmers are interested, and corn is brought in free. Now, if the farmer is satisfied with that, if he feels that he is better protected under the present tariff than he was under the old, if he has any greater reasons for gratitude towards this Government than he had toward the Conservative Government, then I do not understand by what process he reasons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The difficulty with the western farmer is not that protection is being lessened in the new tariff, but the difficulty is that there is too much protection left in it yet. We did not ask for protection, and the reduction of the duty on wheat amounts to nothing so far as the interests of the farmer are concerned. We sell our corn in the east, and no one in his senses would think of importing or sending corn to the North-west to be sold. This reduction of duty is a matter in which we are not interested, as farmers. You cannot protect the farmer in the North-west Territories, because he has the wide world of free trade as a market for his products. But you can take away as much duty as you please, and we will not grumble.

Mr. MACLEAN. I know that the farmers in my portion of the country desire protection. As a protectionist on principle, and as representing the farmers of East York, I must protest now against a reduction of those agricultural duties. I protest against giving our market for mutton and beef and hides to the Australasians. I protest against the reduction of the tariff in favour of American corn, American wheat, and American flour. I say we ought to keep our own market for our own products, and as long as I am in this House I will maintain that doctrine.

Mr. ROGERS. As regards the bringing in the farm products of the Australian colonies, I never objected to competing with the world on equal terms. What I did object to was giving a bonus to a steamship company to bring them in. That is the ground that we took in the campaign.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that on this item we should proceed with a great deal of care. It is an important item, because, if we are to receive the mutton of New South Wales at a low rate of duty, no doubt we will receive mutton from all parts of Australia. It will be an utter impossibility for an appraiser at our ports to tell whether a carcass of mutton brought into this country, was produced in New South Wales or in any other part of Australia. We may therefore expect to have our market invaded by a large amount of shipped meat, which must be detrimental to the interests of our sheep-raising farmers. I confess that I cannot understand the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) when he

says we do not want articles that are products of the farm to be protected. Whether he means "we," the clergymen of the west, or "we," the farmers of the west, I am not very sure; but on this question I think he must be speaking for the church and not for the farmers. We understood from him a short time ago that he was perfectly satisfied that the duty on agricultural implements should be maintained because the revenue was required, and he was perfectly satisfied that the farmers of Manitoba should be taxed to pay a bounty on iron in order that the producers of iron and the agricultural implement manufacturers should get their raw material cheaper; but he does not ask that the duty on agricultural implements be reduced. He is perfectly satisfied, however, that the duty on the products of the farm should be reduced, a strange representative, to my mind, of an agricultural county. If that is his view, it is not mine. I do not favour the reduction of the duty on wheat from 15 to 12 cents. I am satisfied that it is detrimental to the interests of the farmers of the province of Ontario, if it is not to those of the province of Manitoba. I know that the result would be, and I believe it is being felt already, that the farmers throughout the province of Ontario will be compelled to accept a lower price for their winter wheat. It is true that the people in the maritime provinces may say that they are going to be the gainers, but from the standpoint of the section of the country from which I come, I know that this reduction of the duty on wheat and flour is not received with favour, neither is the putting of corn on the free list. That will be a most injurious thing to the agriculturists of Ontario. It may benefit a few men who are feeding cattle very largely, but only perhaps one out of twenty or thirty, or even one out of a hundred. Another hon. member said that the great bulk of our farmers are not going to be benefited. They are not, they are going to be injured very materially. The effects, of course, are not felt yet, but I know from conversation with the farmers in the western section of the country that the prevailing opinion is that it will result in very great injury indeed to the agriculturists of Ontario. Now, whilst the farmers are being struck right and left, having the duty reduced on their wheat, having the duty reduced on their flour, having corn placed upon the free list, and our markets being invaded by millions of bushels of a cheaply-produced American corn, depressing the value of all our coarse grains, injuring and destroying the quality of our pork, I say the time is come when we should call a halt. I think also that we should look carefully into the item of mutton, and see that the people living on the Pacific coast are not affected injuriously, as well as those in the province of Ontario. The farmers are called upon, although the duties

are reduced on the articles they produce in some instances, to submit to increased duties, which it is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite increase the price. Cotton goods are to-day subject to higher rates of duty than before, and they are used very largely among that class of the people. Farmers have to pay their share of the taxes of the country to give the bounty to the iron manufacturers, notwithstanding the fact that they receive no relief by a reduction being made in the duties on agricultural implements. In order to bring the matter to an issue, I move :

That clause 16 be struck out.

The effect of this amendment will be to put mutton and lamb in the same list as other fresh meats, namely, at 3 cents per pound.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. gentleman who said we in Manitoba do not want protection on wheat. I remember stating the session before last, I think, that we were bringing wheat from the west, and that the same quality of wheat which was sold in Duluth for 66 cents per bushel, realized in Manitoba 75 cents. It was the same quality of wheat.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). No.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no need for the hon. gentleman to say "no," because I took the figures from the "Globe," and that should be sufficient to satisfy him at any time. There is a difference of 9 cents a bushel in favour of the United States. But the duty was 15 cents a bushel and therefore you could not bring it into Canada. We could obtain 3 cents less freight rates, but even with that we could not bring it in. Hon. gentlemen opposite have now reduced the duty to 12 cents. Let me imagine wheat selling at the same relative prices at the two points I have named. The purchaser in the States would save 9 cents per bushel, being the difference in price between Duluth and Manitoba, and there would be a saving of 3 cents on freight, which would make the reduction 12 cents. Therefore, the purchaser would obtain an advantage if he imported wheat from Duluth instead of Manitoba, for he would get a little better freight rates. Of course, buyers would take advantage of this difference. Every bushel brought in from Duluth would displace the same quantity of wheat from Manitoba, and this hard wheat we have brought in to mix with the soft wheat of Ontario. Although wheat was lower in price at Duluth, it could not be brought in here on account of the 15 cents duty, but as the duty is now reduced to 12 cents, allowing the difference in market value to be the same as formerly, we would be able to bring it in and have a margin of profit.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Reference has been made to the iron industry of Nova

Mr. HENDERSON.

Scotia. I am bound to say that so far as this tariff is concerned, there is no part of it which strikes so heavily as the items referring to the iron duties. When an hon. gentleman says that advantage is gained under this tariff by the iron industry, he is altogether wrong in his statement. I might find a good deal to object to in the various items of the tariff, as a free trader. I recognize the difficulty in which the Government is placed in framing a tariff; but if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) thinks 35 per cent on mutton and lamb too low from the farmers' standpoint, and he has the idea that he is going to make the farmers rich by increasing it in order to give the farmers the home market, then let us see how the matter will stand. According to statistics, only 12 per cent of our population are engaged in manufacturing, and 60 to 65 per cent in agriculture. The hon. gentleman has been engaged in the past in proving that the farmers who compose 60 or 65 per cent of the population may become rich by supplying the 12 per cent employed in manufacturing. If so, the people employed in manufacturing must be gourmandizers indeed. The home market is the greatest delusion in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). It is good so far as it goes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Make it better.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). We should seek to bring in not only products but people from the outside countries. How are we going to make the farmers rich by having 65 per cent of the population labouring day after day to feed the 12 per cent engaged in manufacturing? I wonder if the Tories will ever understand the common-sense view of the question, namely, that the condition of the farmers is going to be improved by extending their market, and not by making them travel around a little circuit formed by 12 per cent of the people. It is because hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to make the farmers believe that they would become rich in this way and have thus led the farmers astray, that they find themselves with the small fraction of members now occupying the seats on the Opposition side of the House. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Oliver) offered some remarks in point when he said that the people of Manitoba and the farmers in every part of the Dominion desired the best opportunities for selling their products of the soil, which, after all, are only the products of the soil plus the labour of raising them. Fancy the folly of men who want all the products of our soil to be marketed here. I can understand that an hon. gentleman may urge the advantages of the home market when there are manufacturing industries in the locality, and when he is seeking to get votes. But if you take

all the produce of Canada it is evident that our prices depend on the markets of the world.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). When the Committee rose at six o'clock I was proceeding to point out that it was somewhat of an extraordinary spectacle to see hon. gentlemen opposite advocating the home market. My genial friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) with whom I have had so much converse, and who together with myself on so many occasions has stood up for the oppressed, he a real radical, possessing many of the qualities which make for that which is best and highest: I cannot understand how such an hon. gentleman is found allied to a system which does not depend upon wealth honestly gained, nor on strength given by the Creator, but upon the power of legislation to help one man as against another. When that hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) spoke about his representing the farmers, it occurred to me that the farming portion of his constituency refused to have him on account of his protectionist views, because I am sure they could not reject him from any other point of view. He therefore cannot pretend to speak for the farmers in this House.

I do not for a moment wish to minimize the importance of the home market. It is a good market, but it depends upon two things: first, the cheapness of transportation in favour of the man who produces the goods near by, and secondly, the freshness of the article, and the facility and rapidity with which it can be taken from the point of production to the point of sale. What can the home market be for the people of Canada? Why, I make bold to say that Ontario, and Quebec, and the lower provinces can produce far more than will feed the people of this Dominion. Therefore, all the products of the west could be exported and sold in the foreign market. The home market must depend upon our raising just enough to supply it, and in order to be successful in that respect, you must have a large number of agents taking the census of the country to know how many people there will be to eat the produce of the farmers in the ensuing year. If they find there are five million consumers, they will have to figure out that these people will use so much wheat, so much barley, so much oats, and so on, and then—according to the style that was followed by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends outside—they must say to the farmers: You shall only produce a certain quantity to feed exactly five million mouths. Sir, with our great producing country in the west we must have something more than the home market. For years the farmers

of Canada have been deluded about the extent of the home market, and at last they have learned the great truth, that the principle of wealth in any community, is to be found in the margin of profit between the cost of production and the selling price of the article produced. The proposition, that you can say, that by selling just in certain places you are going to have the largest margin of profit, needs only to be stated to be laughed at by intelligent men. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) objects to a duty of 35 per cent on fresh mutton and lamb as being too low. I presume the reason that he wants to increase that duty is, that when the preferential tariff comes into operation, his duty will be so high as not to leave a good margin. Now, so far, the preferential tariff can only refer to Great Britain, and just think of the enormous cargoes of fresh mutton and fresh lamb which are going to come from England to Canada. How we will be flooded from England with such products, and how we must protect ourselves with a high duty. It is true that Great Britain can only produce six weeks food supply for her population, but nevertheless, according to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), she is going to send us innumerable cargoes out of that produce, and therefore we must protect ourselves against Great Britain. And even if Belgium and Germany should come in, what difference does that make? Is the Canadian farmer with an average farm of 100 acres of good land to be afraid of competition from the Belgian farmer with an average farm of from two to five acres? Is he to be afraid of that competition, when the Belgian farmer must pay freight on his produce for over four thousand miles, must have his fresh mutton in as good condition on our market as the fresh mutton of the Canadian farmer, and in addition to that, must pay 35 per cent duty for the privilege of selling as cheaply as we can? Is it the character of the Canadian farmer to be afraid of just competition? Do not hon. gentlemen opposite see that they are placing our Canadian agriculturists in a humiliating position? With one hundred acres of rich loam soil in the province of Ontario, ten acres of which, with diligence and perseverance, would keep a family well, is the Canadian farmer afraid of the few sheep that the Belgian farmer can send over? Still less have we to fear this competition from Germany, where the soil is not so fertile as in Belgium. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Canadian farmers are not afraid of competition on equal terms with any country. And what of the United States? Think you that in the state of New York, with the Dingley Bill on his shoulders, the farmer can raise the mutton, pay 35 per cent to send it over here to compete with the Canadian farmer? But no one for a moment thinks that the preferential tariff is going to refer to the United

States, and so we have this 35 protection tariff against the farmer of that country. The farmers in my province, where the land is not so good as in Ontario, and where they have to work hard to secure a small margin of profit, are not afraid of that competition. To tell the farmers of this country that they need 35 and 40 per cent protection against Great Britain and Belgium and the United States is to teach them false doctrine. Our farmers succeeded in the early days when they did not have this protection. Generally speaking, it is my opinion, that this tariff is in the right direction, but I, perhaps more radical than others, believe that the tariff does not go so far as I would like it to go in the direction of reduced duties. I can tell the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that while he thinks 35 per cent too low a duty on fresh mutton, the protection on the iron industries in Nova Scotia has been reduced to 20 and 25 per cent. If the materials which the farmer uses in his industry have only 20 or 25 per cent protection, it appears to me that the farmers will see that 35 per cent duty on their products is sufficient. The iron which enters largely into the necessities of the farmer, will be much cheapened by the present tariff, and I am bound to say that the iron business in Nova Scotia has been struck right and left by the tariff introduced by this Government. We had every manufacturer in Canada saying: "Keep the protection I have got, but strike at the iron business; give me free iron, but keep the whole of the protection on my product";—so thievish had they become after eighteen years of protection. Now, I regret that. I believe that in reducing a tariff, we should reduce it as nearly as possible evenly on every article, considering its relationship to other articles. Iron is an article which more than any other manufactured article enters into the consumption of the people; so I suppose we have to bear the treatment we get. So far as I am individually concerned, this strikes me personally far more than the reduction on mutton and lamb strikes the hon. member for Halton; but in the meantime, I am not going to squeal about it. I recognize that the people have given this mandate to the Liberal party, and I am going to accept the result. But what is to be thought of an hon. gentleman complaining that 35 per cent is not enough duty on fresh mutton and lamb, when he gets his iron at less than 25 per cent—at a margin of from 10 to 15 per cent. If the farmer cannot get on with a margin of from 10 to 15 per cent, where are we to land? Without giving hon. gentlemen opposite an opinion of the principle on which they should act, I think they have either over-stated or under-stated the case. I submit that, having raised their objection and put the pleadings on record, that might do; but, instead of that, we have iteration and re-

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

iteration of the same thing continuously. Is this because the pure statement of the fact was not sufficient, or is it because they thought they should be heard on account of their much speaking? The one or the other must be true. I would not like to put them in the latter category, because I would have to designate them by a name to which they are not entitled. But it strikes me that having raised the objection, they should stand by it. Was it not amusing to find the ready and facile ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), in his first speech on this tariff, saying that we had all turned protectionists, and now saying that we are destroying every manufacturing industry in Canada? Has that been done since the tariff was brought down? The truth is there has been discovered in this tariff more dynamite than hon. gentlemen opposite thought at first to find in it; that is the explanation. It looked like a protectionist tariff at first, and they said we had turned protectionists. I do not deny that certain industries are going to feel the effect of this tariff very much—just as a man who may have an overcoat, provided by a friend, when he leaves home, and finds that the friend wants the overcoat and takes it from him, feels a little cold in consequence. I do not say that will not be the case with certain industries. But as against that it must not be forgotten that the country is feeling the effects of what they have been receiving for eighteen years, and it is only fair that the consumer and the producer should now change places. I do not think they appear to any great advantage, and really my bowels of compassion went out towards them. This posing first on one side and then on the other, was indicative of something which I did not expect. I felt like Burns:

O Pope, had I thy satire's darts,  
To gie the rascals their deserts,  
I'd rip their rotten, hollow hearts,  
An' tell aloud  
Their jugglin' hocus-pocus arts  
To cheat the crowd.

I would tell them that; of course, you know, it would not be fair. So far as this particular item is concerned, I do not think the objection that has been raised should be considered for a moment. If the proposal is bad, the hon. gentlemen are going to get the full advantage of it. Let them put their objections on record; then there is the court of appeal to which we all must go, and if the facts sustain the objection, that court will act on the record, as they did before. But why should we, day after day bring up and urge continuously the same facts? It may perhaps be said on the other side that we have not answered them. For myself I have felt, and I suppose others on this side have felt the same, that as time was the essence of our existence, we should not throw it idly away; and though I could wish every hon. gentleman to give a reason

for the vote he is to give, yet his vote is a better indication of his position than any reason he can give. I believe this tariff will strike deeper than hon. gentlemen suppose; and, with all due respect to the Government, I believe it will strike deeper than they anticipated at first; and I will tell you why. Because it reverses the position in which we stood before. I will not act towards hon. gentlemen opposite as they acted towards us. I believe they are loyal; but, like a countryman of mine, who, to show his love for a man, hugged him till he fell—

Mr. FOSTER. Are you sure it was a man?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman is a better authority as to that than I am. The man said: "You may be kindly disposed towards me, but you take a very strange way of showing it." I think hon. gentlemen opposite are taking a very strange way of showing their loyalty to the British Empire. I have sat here year after year to hear them express their loyalty. For myself, I do not need to express my loyalty. But I want to say, what I said before, that in no respect can we show our loyalty more than by copying the tariff and following the example of the only nation on this globe whose example is worth following. Hon. gentlemen may think that a country is made great by manufacturing, or by raising mutton. I am reminded of the fact that I was in Washington a couple of months ago, and I heard a man there rise in his place, and what do you think he said was necessary to make a country great? He said: "No country was ever great that did not make its own clothing." The same thing might be predicted of a country in several other respects. No country was ever great whose people did not wash their faces, no country was ever great whose people did not cook their food or black their boots or do the hundred other things which it is necessary for people to do. That country alone is great which gives to labour the greatest return, that country alone is great in which the margin is widest between the cost of production and what remains in the pockets of the producers in the shape of profits. There are gentlemen, I know, over there who are ready to die for their country as there are gentlemen on this side, and I heard an hon. gentleman who wished to attack the preferential clause reply, when asked how far he would go in giving a preference to Great Britain that he thought he could stand 5 per cent. For myself, I am not ready to trade with Great Britain where the advantage to Great Britain shall be 1 cent. If I thought that we were giving away 1, or 5 or 10 per cent to Great Britain, I would vote against these resolutions. I am for Canada first, last and always; but I am prepared to accept the tariff because I know we will get the

benefit as well as Great Britain, for no two people can trade together without both getting the benefit.

We are celebrating with pæans of praise the sixtieth anniversary of the reign of Her Majesty. One little fact will show what Great Britain has done. In 1837 Great Britain taxed 1,200 articles, and her whole trade amounted to \$700,000,000. In 1897 she taxed twelve articles, and her whole trade is \$3,500,000,000. And before some hon. gentlemen opposite get very gray, they will find that such an impetus will have been given to business by this tariff and a continuance of the course we have entered upon, that Canada will be far ahead in every respect of what she is to-day. You cannot make a country great by confining your attention to a few particular articles; it is by the whole sum of the trade of the country that it is great. I trust that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), who is one of the best-natured men in the House, will understand that the iron business is not unduly protected to the disadvantage of the farmers. We in Nova Scotia feel that it has not received as good advantages as other industries; but I defy any hon. gentleman to go through the tariff and so adjust the duties as to make each one nicely balance with the other. How could human skill or ingenuity do it? How could it be expected of any man, except one who lived before the days of Helpa and Shallum, and who lived to almost a thousand years, to make an equitable and evenly-balanced tariff, in which 480 articles were taxed? I know of one man in this country who tried it. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) tried it, he brought all his skill, and no doubt honest intention, to the task, and the result of all his efforts was that in some cases he did exactly the opposite of what he intended to do. I have the authority of the hon. gentleman's own friends in the iron business for saying that he struck one of the worst blows that could have been struck at that industry. I think that proves that the further we advance in the direction in which we have started the better; and, in the meantime, this instalment will teach the people a useful lesson. It will make them understand that trade under conditions less restricted than have hitherto existed is going to increase; and when men get a taste of liberty, whether it be against the bondage of man or trade, you will find them going in the same direction. I ask hon. gentlemen to take a note of that. They will find, if this tariff works as well as I believe it will, that if they still continue in their fossilized ideas of trade, they will find themselves so far behind in the march of progress as to be deaf to the loudest sounds of bugle and gun of the great host of the people in front, determined to have freedom in trade as well as in other matters. I am spoken of as being perhaps a little

too radical in this respect. I may not perhaps understand the conditions of trade as well as others, but I trust I understand general principles, and you can never have a trade that is not based on a general principle. We cannot put any number of facts together, as to the number of industries at work, the hands employed, the articles produced, and make a principle out of that. Yet that is the kind of argument we have had year after year. Hon. gentlemen have endeavoured to show our wealth by computation of figures that lie as often as they strike the truth. But when you start upon a well-recognized principle, you need not bother about the facts. The facts will take care of themselves. If you are right in principle, your facts will always bear that relation to it which every fact must bear to a truth.

I did not mean, when I rose, to speak at such length. I only wanted to say that I thought certain things in the tariff were struck unduly, but so far as the whole tariff is concerned, I do not think it has gone far enough. It has, however, gone very much further than the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, and is going in a direction that will produce in the people not only thought but, by experience, action. I welcome and shall, while here, continue to ask more and more for that broad liberty that makes the trade of a nation, and thus follow in the footsteps of that little island which, small as it is, has far greater trade and wealth than any other country in the world, and not only competes with the world, but surpasses all other countries year after year, in everything that tends to a nation's greatness.

Mr. MACLEAN. I desire to take up the time of the House but for a few moments in order to reply to one or two remarks of the hon. gentleman. As regards his reference to myself and my election in East York, I can only say that in those sections which gave a majority against me that majority has been reduced; but one township is Conservative which was formerly against me, and that another township is just on the verge of becoming Conservative, and I hope that in the next election we will even convert Markham Township. If that change of opinion has taken place in the county of York, it is because it has the finest home market of any township in Canada. It is because the National Policy has built up Toronto into a city of 200,000, and furnishes the finest home market we have in the province. Not only does that market make the prices of the county of York, but for the whole of Ontario. The principle of protection, if carried out and realized, as it ought to be, would build up cities all over this country and thus create home markets for our agriculturists. The hon. gentleman professed to speak for the farmers, but what do the facts of

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

history teach? First, that the protective principle is the most growing principle recognized in economics. The farmers of Ontario are protectionists; the farmers of the United States are protectionists; and, if there is a class of farmers in the world who are rapidly becoming protectionists, that class is the farmers of free trade England. It is a significant fact that in free trade England this is the tendency among the farmers. The farmers of Germany and the farmers of Russia are also becoming, more and more, protectionists; and the result will be that the farmers all over the world will set the example and be the most pronounced protectionists of all producers. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the other night said it was his intention and the intention of his party to eradicate the erroneous doctrine of protection. We intend to hold them to that. We intend to go to the country in the next election on the protectionist principle. They have their opportunity now, and they are trying to wipe out that principle, but they will find out that they have made the mistake of their lives. We know how they got into power; they certainly did not get into power with a mandate from the people to eradicate the principle of protection. I see my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor) waving his hand. I hope he will take occasion to tell us how the abolition of the duty on corn will affect his riding.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will take care of myself.

Mr. MACLEAN. Notwithstanding what these gentlemen say, as I have already stated, the principle of protection is the most pronounced and progressive principle of economics to-day. Cobden made the prophecy years ago that protection would be wiped off the face of the earth. But that has not been realized, but, on the contrary, men are becoming more and more protectionist all the world over. Protection is a principle for which a scientific reason can be given. It is the one principle which will build up a nation. Protectionists hold that you can regulate your tariff policy so as to keep your own markets for your own products and your own work for your own workpeople. That principle has been proven and vindicated by experience. The people do believe in it; and as hon. gentlemen opposite attack that principle and propose to eradicate it, they are writing their own death-warrant. To illustrate the point: we will call this country of ours a farm. The Conservative party put up good fences around that farm. Hon. gentlemen opposite have undertaken to throw down the fences and let in the foreign cattle. Not only that, but they have turned their dogs upon the flocks upon the farm in the shape of this combine clause, and in that way they propose to harry the sheep of national

industry. But when they go to the country, when the people understand what is being done, and especially, when the farmers of Ontario know that it is the deliberate intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to give the market of Canada to American corn and wheat and to Australian mutton—and they say that in this they have only begun the work—it will be found that their greatest opponents in this country, those who will condemn them most strongly will be the farmers, who do believe in a protective policy.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I rise simply to correct a misapprehension which grew out of an error on the part of some hon. gentlemen quoting the former protectionist tariff of New South Wales. It is well known that New South Wales was a free trade colony, but it relapsed into the mire of protection. But it did not stay there long, and the protectionists tariff which was inflicted upon the people, was soon wiped out. We were told a little while ago of the duty on various articles. Lumber and timber of all sorts and descriptions whether battens or boards, logs or deals, dressed or planed in any form or fashion are absolutely free.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. And other articles that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) mentioned as bearing heavy duties are also free.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friends seem to have got light during the dinner hour. But none of them knew these things before dinner.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is a good thing to know them after dinner.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We had not the document at hand at the time, and preferred to quote from that.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I will ask the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) or the Minister of Finance if they will give some information to the House. There will be very strong competition in mutton from Australia, and from New South Wales especially, as it has been practically decided to come within the category under clause 16. It might be well therefore if the Controller of Customs or the Minister of Finance would give the House a little information. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) went into a long and elaborate argument as to how much competition in agricultural products we might expect from Great Britain. But, on the other side of the country, it does not need even his argument to establish the fact. Great Britain may or may not compete with us according to the hon. gentleman's argument, in agricultural products. I do not think it was very necessary to speak about that in this House. But it is a certainty, a dead cer-

tainly, that in lines of agricultural products which are very important in this country, New South Wales and through New South Wales the whole of the Australasian colonies, will compete with us and be a formidable competitor. Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) told us that before they introduced clause 16 to the House, they had very carefully considered the whole matter, so carefully considered it that they were quite willing to take all the consequences that came—not blindly, but because they had considered the question and knew what the consequences would be. Now, I would like to know from my hon. friend if he will give the House some idea of how much competition, and in what articles, we shall have from New South Wales. That is a matter that we should know now. My hon. friends were very quick when they proposed to allow the one-eighth reduction in regard to Great Britain, to raise the duties on some articles, evidently because they were not prepared to leave the "mire of protection" that my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has spoken of so picturesquely. The hon. gentleman actually stands up here to-night and talks about the laudable example of New South Wales leaving the "mire of protection" and getting upon firm standing ground of free trade. But my hon. friend and his colleagues were so enamoured of this "mire of protection" that before they would allow Great Britain to compete in manufactured articles with the producers of Canadian industry, they added an overlapping stratum, so to speak, of this "mire" before they would allow it to be scraped off to a slight extent by the one-eighth reduction. Is it simply a play upon words with my hon. friend when he lapses into that expression the "mire of protection?" The hon. member for Guysborough said words were nothing, that you must judge a man by his acts. If that reasoning holds, we are compelled to believe that the words of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) mean nothing, because, in the case of cottons and several other articles, they made that "mire" deeper before they allowed a little of it to be scraped off by the reduction on British goods. Now, when you come to farmers' products and find yourself face to face with a competition in these products, ought you not take into consideration whether you should not raise the protection a little before you apply the one-eighth, and, by-and-by, the one-quarter reduction? Why, it is the singling out of one product and acting with regard to it so as to raise its vantage ground, and the singling out of another product and so acting with reference to it that you actually lower its vantage ground. What is the principle, the basis of action in the matter? Now we are upon this clause with reference to the farmers' products, we would like to know what

is the competition that we may expect from New South Wales, as that is the embarking point for our steamers that ply to this side. The question was well raised and has not been met, as to how you are to distinguish between mutton that comes from New South Wales, and mutton that comes from any other Australian colony, and which is put on board the steamer at Sydney. Practically, under the reduction, it is opening the market of the farmer, especially of the North-west and British Columbia, to a competition along the whole line of the farmers' products. You are taking off the reduction, you have not heightened the protection before you took off the reduction. Why was it not done in this case? Will the Controller of Customs be kind enough, as he has looked over the whole field and has come to his decision that New South Wales comes under this clause, to tell us what we may expect as the competition from New South Wales on our western border, in respect to agricultural products?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the worst misfortune that any country can endure is that the people are able to get cheap and good articles. If you want to help the farmers the way is to cheapen the cost of production to them, and by reducing the tariff so that they can produce cheaply.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend was so solicitous not to do it that he puts what he calls a high protective tariff on farmers' articles for the whole of eastern and middle Ontario, but he has not reduced the protection at all, with the single exception of corn and wheat. What is the use of my hon. friend trying to turn the argument by an ejaculation of that kind?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Controller of Customs was in conversation with an hon. member, and did not catch the question of the ex-Finance Minister, so I will reply to it. It is not correct to say that the Controller of Customs has decided that the tariff of New South Wales entitles the products of that country to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff. What I said this afternoon, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, was that the Government had not taken action on that point. No action has been taken to determine that the colony of New South Wales is entitled to those privileges. But I thought it was only fair to say to the hon. gentleman that my impression of the New South Wales tariff was such that it would probably become entitled, and therefore I did not object to their proceeding on that basis. But it is a fact that no formal action has been taken. I was surprised to find the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) dispute the statement that New South Wales was a free trade country, and to read from a book what

Mr. FOSTER.

might fairly be presumed to be evidence which was against my statement. I was surprised, and I thought that I had better turn up the tariff and refresh my memory in regard to it. Having turned to the tariff, I see that my hon. friend was misled, and that he did not have the latest tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of seeing this book, it was published in 1897 and gives the tariff precisely as he stated. But an Act was passed after the publication of that tariff, and I find that it is contained in this book that I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce to lay upon the Table. That Act provided that after a certain time these duties would disappear. That was really what has taken place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I made the statement off-hand, while at the same time saying that the Government had taken no action upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. You said you had looked over every country from pole to pole.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that New South Wales was a free trade country, and I heard the contradiction with surprise. However, I think the hon. gentleman will now admit that the latest tariff establishes the fact that New South Wales is practically a free trade country, that is not to say that everything is free, but that my statement is substantially correct. Now, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance wants to know how we are going to distinguish between mutton from New South Wales and mutton from some other part of Australia. I suppose we shall have to distinguish in the same way as we would if my hon. friends had their preferential tariff in force, according to their own particular ideas of what such a tariff should be. The leader of the Opposition said that by certain arrangements we might have obtained some concessions in return for this, and then we should have given them this privilege. The hon. gentleman must see that any objection he might take, arising from the possibility of confusion between the products of New South Wales and the products of some other country, would arise under any preferential treaty that you might attempt to establish, and if it is an objection to our proceeding, it would be equally an objection to the proceeding of the hon. gentleman himself. I admit it is the same question, in another form, as was suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in a previous discussion with regard to English and German goods. There are possibilities of that nature, but I do not think that because such difficulties exist, we should therefore withdraw from what we deem to be a sound policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The difficulty is very much increased in this case, because Sydney, New South Wales, is the point

from which, at present, our shipments come from Australia, it is the port of departure for the steamers to Canada.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. As London and Liverpool are the chief points of departure for our steamers from Great Britain and the continent, the same principle applies. I admit there is a difficulty which we may have to meet as best we can. The ex-Minister of Finance asked, what is the probable competition? Well, as I have already intimated, I have not gone into that matter at all minutely; but if my hon. friend will look at the statistics he will find that whatever danger, if you call it a danger—from our point of view it is not a great danger—but the chief danger would be the competition of animals and their products. He will find that the chief exports from New South Wales that are likely to come into Canada are animals and their products. But if my hon. friend will look at the figures he will find that, although fresh mutton and lamb are not advanced products in the way of manufactures—if anything can be called raw material, probably they can be—yet they receive their full share of whatever protection there is in the tariff. The rate of duty is 35 per cent, the highest rate that is imposed on any cotton goods. If you reduce this rate by the eighth and afterwards by another eighth under the reciprocal tariff, you still have 26½ per cent, a pretty high rate. Therefore, the idea that the farmer is not getting his fair share of protection is, I think, a mistake. If you are to consider the matter from a protective point of view, surely it is not too much to say that if the farmers of New South Wales can send their mutton across the ocean into Canada, and override a duty of 26½ or 26¼, I must say I think that is not a very illegitimate competition, and I do not think that our farmers are going to be very much alarmed by it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is my hon. friend able to tell us what the exports are of New South Wales in the way of those agricultural products that he thinks will compete with us?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I had the figures this afternoon, but I sent them back. They can be found in the library.

Mr. **FOSTER**. They must be immense, and the difficulty is emphasized by the fact that the cheapness with which they produce these, is so great that the price comes to be almost nominal, and the ad valorem duty of 35 per cent becomes, therefore, almost inappreciable as a protection. Will the Controller of Customs, who has looked into the matter, tell us what would be probably the average export price from New South Wales of mutton? Then we could come to a conclusion as to what the protection of 35 per cent would probably give us.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. In our trade returns it is not sep-

arated from the other. I think the Trade and Navigation Returns show something under 3 cents a pound. I suppose that will be the price at the point of shipment. I think that the imports for consumption from Australasia are not given separately in our tables here, they would come in among other goods, and the total from other countries is only \$413,000. Of course one large item of import from Australasia is that of wool, which the hon. gentleman knows, under his tariff, and which is maintained under this tariff, is free, and that would, perhaps, be by far the largest item of our imports. I think the hon. gentleman, though, is not saying what is improbable, that there will be importations of the article that we are considering now, and possibly some other articles that enter into competition with our farmers. But I repeat what the Finance Minister has clearly stated, that so far as the item is concerned, even with the eighth or quarter reduction when it comes about, the farmer will be in as good a position as the manufacturer, who, as he has pointed out, is receiving what, in his judgment, and correctly so, is about the highest amount of duty conceded to any article. Thirty-five per cent is about the highest rate we give, except on one or two specific articles of manufacture; and the hon. gentleman will see that this item is 35 per cent, subject, of course, to the reduction, which will also be applicable to cottons and other articles.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But the hon. gentleman does not grasp the point exactly. It is very well to say that 35 per cent is a good all-round protection; it is prima facie, but it all depends, in a case of this kind, as to the cheapness with which the product may be raised in the competing countries. I take it that the hon. gentleman will not, for a moment, traverse the ground that the cost of the production of sheep in New South Wales, as compared with the production of sheep in Canada, with our long winter season, is very different, and it is well known that sheep cannot be raised nearly as cheaply in Canada as in New South Wales. Would it surprise the hon. gentleman to learn that mutton can be put on board ship at point of embarkation in New South Wales or Australia at very little over 1 cent a pound? What is 35 per cent against that cheap price?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. The hon. gentleman is not taking his figures from our trade returns.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I take the rate, not from our trade returns, but from the returns of the sheep trade in Australia. 2 cents per pound at the point of shipment is a good price.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I give that price because I have looked into the question; that is the result at which I have arrived from an examination of the subject. The whole matter was gone into when the Australian conference was held here. We discussed the question a good deal. I know that in certain seasons, especially for export, the price of that article is very cheap indeed. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that 35 per cent is very good protection. It would be under equal conditions, and if the New South Wales farmer raised sheep under the same conditions, climatic and otherwise, as we do in Canada, but the circumstances are so different that 35 per cent amounts to very little protection. What I fear is that with the impetus that will be given by the one-eighth and later the one-fourth reduction, we will injure the position of the farmers in British Columbia and in the North-west who hope to supply the British Columbia market, and that they will find that this competition will throw them off their hope of supplying the miners' market in that province. I do not think it would be unwise to raise the protection upon this article before the one-eighth or one-fourth reduction comes into force.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will give the hon. gentleman some little information as to the course of trade. I have here a statement showing the amount of imports from Australasia during the last three years. This return includes butter, cheese and meats. In 1894, we imported from all Australasia, the whole five colonies, products to the value of \$43,000; 1895, \$22,906; 1896, \$10,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the ex-Finance Minister on this subject. He is wonderfully solicitous in regard to the interests of the farmers in the western part of this country, and he points out the dangerous competition which will ensue in case we accord preferential treatment to the Australian colonies. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has made a considerable right-about-face since 1894, at the time when he, together with other members of the then Government attended the Intercolonial Conference at Ottawa. The hon. gentleman, in welcoming the representatives from Australia dealt with this very question of giving them preferential treatment in our market, and at that time the hon. gentleman personally moved a resolution in the conference in which he proposed that there should be preferential trade with different members of the Empire, and he wound up that resolution with the following clause:—

That, impeding the consent of the mother country to such an arrangement in which she shall be included, it is desirable that the colonies of Great Britain, or such of them as may be dis-

Mr. FOSTER.

posed to accede to this view, take immediate steps to place each other's products on a more favoured customs basis than is accorded to the like products of foreign countries.

In the discussion which arose the hon. gentleman had pointed out to him by the representatives of the Australian colonies that mutton was produced in those colonies at a remarkably low rate. I think the hon. gentleman has practically quoted the references made at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One of the representatives stated that the wholesale price of mutton in Sydney market was 2 cents per pound. The hon. gentleman moved a resolution pointing in that direction, asking that the Australian colonies should have preferential treatment in our market, and, at that time, the duty placed on Australian mutton coming into our country was 35 per cent, exactly the same duty now placed on it by our tariff. The hon. gentleman proposed that those colonies should have preferential treatment just as we do now; but we provide that they admit our products at the same rates as we admit theirs. The hon. gentleman assumes an entirely different position from that which he held at that time, when he criticises the opening of our market and exposing our farmers in the western part of the country to this extraordinary and most hurtful competition, which he then was moving in favour of adopting.

Mr. FOSTER. The change of aspect is entirely due to the peculiar mental condition of the hon. gentleman. He has failed to grasp the difference between us. He is correct in stating that I moved the resolution and spoke in favour of preferential arrangements between Canada and the Australian colonies. What is the meaning of "preferential arrangements"? When the hon. gentleman says that my proposal at that time was exactly what the Government are carrying out now, my hon. friend will see that his ground is not tenable at all. Is this a preferential condition? Why, every country in the world gets into the New South Wales market with its products on exactly the same terms as Canada does.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher. That does not make any difference.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, does it not? That is, it does not make any difference as to whether my hon. friend and myself, having a large range of products, shall make a mutual bargain between ourselves that we shall give to each other certain concessions that shall solely belong to each, or, that I shall give certain concessions to my hon. friend in the course of trade which no one else shall have access to, provided he will give me certain concessions that every person

in the world with like products shall have access to. Is there no difference between the two? It only needs to be stated to show the difference. What you are giving is a one-eighth and a one-fourth reduction, without any preference in the New South Wales market, because every country in the world goes into that market on just exactly the same level of duties as Canada does. What I contemplated, and the whole essence of it was, that there should be an arrangement made between the other colonies and Canada, by which we should get a preferential position in their markets, in return for giving them a preferential position in our market. That is, that when Canadian goods went into the Australian colonies they should go in at an advantage as compared with the goods of every other country, and that when Australian goods came into our market they should come in at a preference over the goods of every other country in the world—Great Britain in both cases was exempted as being part of the Empire. I am not open to the charge of inconsistency, for to-day I hold just as strongly to that position as I ever did. But that is not the position which is assumed by the Government to-night. You are giving New South Wales a preferential position in our market, but New South Wales treats your goods in her markets just the same as she treats the goods of the United States. My hon. friend may think his proposition the better one, but neither of us is inconsistent in the matter. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the amount of our imports from New South Wales was so small, that it did not matter. That was a very good argument for my hon. friend the Patron representative (Mr. Rogers). He mentioned it to-day, but his chosen leader (Sir Richard Cartwright) has just burst that argument so to speak. It is not fair to suppose that under the protective tariff, for the last three years, that when you give them 25 per cent of an advantage you are not going to get a largely increased trade. It must also be remembered that up to this time the population in British Columbia was comparatively small. It was Canada, that is eastern Canada, that was looked upon as the possible market for Australian mutton, but the very moment you put an immense mining and consuming population on the western slope, that very moment you change the conditions, and you make it worth the while of New South Wales to take up the market. In view of that, and in view of the 25 per cent advantage, it is fair to suppose that the trade will be much greater. On meat worth 2 cents, or less than 2 cents a pound, 35 per cent is a very small protection, and I should very much like to see it raised.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much do you think the duty should be?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, considering that we all like the farmers so much now, I think

you ought give them at least as much protection as you give the cotton manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) lost sight of the fact, that the cold storage freight on this mutton will probably cost as much as the mutton itself, as I have been informed by those in the trade who are in a position to know. When we consider that we have the protection which nature has given us of that long distance, and that we have in addition 35 per cent, or even 26½ per cent under the preferential rate, we will have a very large protection which I think our farmers will find quite enough. We were, however, discussing the question with particular regard to the competition in mutton between Australia and Canada, and on that point, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is open to the charge of inconsistency, because it is quite clear that he had in his mind at the Intercolonial Conference, that we should admit the mutton of Australia into Canada. Therefore, if he admitted the mutton of Australia into Canada, the competition would be just as severe for our farmers as by its admission under our system. The farmer will not be one whit worse off under our arrangement than he would be had the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) been carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. Except this, and my hon. friend has forgotten that part of it conveniently, that it is all a matter of interchange, and if the Canadian farmer was subject to the competition under preferential trade, yet he would have a preference discriminating in his favour for products that he would send from Canada, and in that way he would have a compensating advantage. We had the compensating advantage then, but you have it not, and that is the difference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was willing then that we should take New South Wales mutton, if New South Wales would give us some concession. Well, since that time, New South Wales has swept away her tariff barriers, and given us everything my hon. friend could desire, except discrimination.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the whole thing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. New South Wales has since given us absolute freedom to her markets, and we in return are giving her a duty of 26½ per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. She has given us absolute freedom in her markets, and she has given it to the United States men, too.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In my opinion the farmers of Canada are not afraid of the competition of the United States in the markets of Australia.

Mr. OLIVER. Representing a constituency in which a large number of sheep are raised, and in which this is a serious ques-

tion with the people, I would like to point out certain facts in regard to this particular item as connected with other items in the tariff. It will be noticed that the protection of 35 per cent on mutton is practically the only ad valorem duty in the list of agricultural products of this class. While mutton and lamb are 35 per cent ad valorem, eggs are 3 cents a dozen, butter 4 cents a pound, cheese 6 cents a pound, potatoes 15 cents a bushel, hay \$2 a ton, and so on. A large proportion of these duties are therefore specific duties. I suppose they were made specific duties for some good reason, and those of the agriculturists who receive the benefit of these specific duties are, I presume, entitled to that benefit, if there is any benefit in it. When the late Government placed the duty on mutton at 35 per cent ad valorem, the idea that prevailed amongst the farmers in my constituency was, that the Conservative Government had made it ad valorem for the purpose of encouraging trade in mutton with Australia. They objected to it then, and I have every reason to believe that they object to it still. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in discussing these matters, but when the question is raised as to the propriety of a specific duty being placed on a certain article, in which a large proportion of my constituents are interested, I am bound to say that that proportion of my constituents are as much entitled to the benefits of that duty as the rest of my constituents or the constituents of any other member of this House are entitled to the benefits of any other duty. In my humble opinion, and in the opinion of those whom I represent, who are more largely interested in the raising of sheep than perhaps the constituents of any other member of the House, this duty on mutton should be a specific duty, for the reason set forth by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster)—because mutton in Australia is so very low in price that an ad valorem duty on that article is not any protection at all. I am not here to argue for protection; but I do say, as representing an agricultural constituency, that so long as we have a tariff that is a protective tariff, the agriculturists of the country are entitled to a share of any incidental benefit there may be under that tariff, and, so far as my vote goes, they shall have it.

**Mr. BOSTOCK.** A great deal has been said with regard to British Columbia in connection with this question. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) made a great point about the farmers of British Columbia losing the sale of their sheep by reason of mutton coming in from Australia. I am aware that my hon. friend has been in British Columbia, but I do not believe that he has been in the ranching country, or he would find that the people there are only too anxious to get rid of

**Mr. OLIVER.**

sheep. Very few of them raise sheep at all, and between the general run of the ranchers and the one or two men who are raising sheep, there is a continual fight, because those who are raising cattle desire to get rid of the sheep altogether. At the present time the greater part of the mutton brought in comes either from Washington or Oregon. The way the sheep are handled at present is a great hardship on the ranchers, because the sheep are brought in in herds, and being pastured on the land they eat up a great deal of grass that would otherwise be left for the cattle. As my hon. friend probably knows, you cannot run cattle on land where you have been running sheep. So that this reduction of the duty on mutton will really be a great benefit to the farmers and ranchers of British Columbia if it prevents those sheep being brought in from the United States, and results in the mutton being brought from the Australian colonies instead. My hon. friend, before six o'clock, in speaking of the quarantine regulations, said a large number of cattle were likely to go into British Columbia from the states to the south. Being interested in ranching myself, I naturally took a great deal of interest in this question, and I may say that at the time the Minister of Agriculture proposed to remove the quarantine, I was afraid that an injury might be done to the farmers of British Columbia, and I took the trouble to go through the state of Washington and make some inquiries as to the number of cattle in that state at the present time to be brought into the markets of British Columbia, and I was very agreeably surprised to find that the number of cattle in Washington has been largely reduced of late years, that cattle have become very scarce there, and that the farmers and ranchers of British Columbia have no need to fear any such competition as I expected, and I have since seen in the papers from that part of the country that the cattle men who have gone down there have found the same thing. They went there expecting to be able to buy cattle, and they found that they could not get them in the way in which they were accustomed to a few years ago. From reports which I have received from cattle men in British Columbia, they have not found that the removal of these quarantine regulations has been of any detriment to them in the sale of their cattle, and owing to the increase of population in that part of the country, they are getting better prices for their cattle now than they have been getting in the past. I do not wish to detain the committee any longer, but I thought it well to make these few remarks, because what has been said might cause the members of the committee to think that to allow mutton to be brought in from Australia, would be a detriment to the ranchers in the part of British Columbia which I represent.

Mr. HENDERSON. I simply rise to say why I made the motion which I have made. I did so entirely because I understood that New South Wales would come under the preferential clause of the tariff. Had it not been for that, I might possibly not have moved in the matter, although I do think that 35 per cent is too low a rate of duty for mutton and lamb. I am a protectionist on principle. I have always supported that principle. I am elected by the county I represent to support the principle of protection for the manufacturers as well as for the farmers, the labouring men, and all along the line. I am desirous that protection should be equally distributed, and that no particular interest should suffer at the expense of another. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who addressed the House at considerable length, claimed that in Ontario we were crying: "Give us free iron." I can assure the hon. gentleman that the protectionist party in the province of Ontario never asked for free iron. They have always been reasonable. They have claimed that the policy of protection was a give-and-take policy, and that if we wanted our agricultural products protected, we must protect the iron industry, the coal industry, and all the other industries of the maritime provinces, where we found a market for our agricultural products. The hon. gentleman said that the iron industry was not unduly protected. If the iron industry is not protected at the present time, the members on this side of the House are not responsible for that, but he and his friends on that side are responsible. He says that we are teaching the farmers of this country what is wrong in principle by saying that 35 per cent is not a sufficient protection for mutton and lamb; yet a few minutes before he made that speech, he voted for protecting fresh beef and pork to the extent of 50 or 60 per cent, showing that he was altogether illogical in his argument.

The estimate generally made of the agricultural products of this country is \$400,000,000. Of that amount we only export now about \$50,000,000, so that we have a home market for \$350,000,000. In other words, we have a home market for  $\frac{7}{8}$  the agricultural products of this country, and we only require to find an outside market for  $\frac{1}{8}$ . Now, the home market, I contend, is the best market we have. We cannot get the same prices for our commodities by sending them abroad as we can by selling them at home; and so long as that is the case, we ought to keep the wall of protection around our agricultural products and thus enable our farmers to get the best returns possible for their produce. It was in that mood that I moved this resolution. I am perfectly sincere, and I hope the House will see the propriety of deciding that our farmers, in the west especially, who raise large numbers of sheep should have their market in British Columbia

sufficiently protected. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said he was not here to advocate the principle of protection, but at the same time he was honest enough to say that if somebody else would advocate it, he was perfectly willing to take advantage of it. I believe there are more hon. members in this House who hold the same view. It seems to me that when an hon. member believes that a certain thing is right, he ought to be willing to advocate it, even if it be contrary to the principles of his party.

Mr. MAXWELL. I rise merely for the purpose of saying a few words regarding the consumer in British Columbia. A great many of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken this evening have expressed their solicitude for the interests of that province. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I feel deeply indebted to these hon. gentlemen for the concern they have been manifesting, but it seems to me that those who are so very anxious to protect the interests of British Columbia do not know very much about them. Now, what is required in British Columbia at present is cheap food. We are not a producing province to any extent at present. Our chief industries are lumber, mining and fish, and I do not care to whom you may happen to speak in British Columbia, that is interested in any one of these industries, you will receive practically the same answer from one and all, that what they want out there is cheap food. Each of these industries is now being crippled very materially because of the excessive taxes put upon British Columbia by excessive freight rates and excessive duties. We know that each consumer in that province pays far more for the necessities of life than the consumers of any other province of the Dominion, and just to the extent of that extra tax put upon each of us are we the poorer. I certainly would earnestly press the Government to allow the goods of New South Wales to come in under the preferential clause. What is the use of protecting mutton, so far as British Columbia is concerned, when we raise hardly any mutton at all? We have to bring our mutton from Alberta. The gentlemen who bring in the mutton have to pay excessive freight rates, so that when it appears in our markets we have to pay excessive prices. That is certainly not in the interests of the consumer of British Columbia. The reason why I press that New South Wales should be brought under this clause arises out of what hon. gentlemen opposite have done in the past. You have subsidized very largely a line of steamers which ply between Vancouver and Sydney. I commend hon. gentlemen opposite for their wisdom in establishing that line. It is not only a benefit to the city of Vancouver, but is of material benefit to a large portion of the people of Canada. Any one going to the wharf at Vancouver

would be amazed to see the large amount of Canadian products being put on these ships, but what is the common sense of our subsidizing large steamers to ply between Vancouver and Sydney, if there is no mutual concessions, no earnest effort on the part of those countries to trade with each other. To me it seems the very height of folly to ask the people of Canada to pay for a line of steamships, and then have these steamers going full one way and coming back empty the other. I consider it very material, not only to British Columbia but to Canada, that these ships should come back with the produce of New South Wales. We can only prosper as we are giving to other nations and other nations are giving to us; and so I would hail with very special delight the announcement that the Government, in their wisdom, had seen fit to bring New South Wales under this clause. I cannot say that I have any particular sympathy with the preferential idea expressed by the ex-Finance Minister. I believe in preferential trade, but to me the preferential trade idea which has been promulgated by the leader of the Opposition, that we should give preference to those who give preference to us, is the very incarnation of selfishness. And I do not believe that the human race is altogether dominated by the worst principles which can find a place in the human breast. If New South Wales opens her ports to the produce of Canada, if she gives us a fair field and no favour, the Canadian who thinks that she is not giving us fair enough terms is not one who is keeping up to the trend of the times. From what I know of the Canadian, there is no one on earth better equipped to hold his own in the great competition going on in the world, and there is no class in any part of the world who are better adapted to hold their own against competition than the farmers of this Dominion. All that Canada wants is a fair field and no favour, and I am perfectly certain she will get on the top before long. New South Wales opening her ports and letting us in, gives preference enough to my mind. We are not doing her justice by imposing this tariff on her, and I hope the time will come when we will admit her goods as freely as she admits ours. I hold it is only by free relations and inter relations with countries so well disposed towards us as New South Wales, that we shall become the mighty country which we hope Canada will become in the near future. I therefore support with my whole heart this clause of the tariff because I believe in the interests of British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that is a selfish argument.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) who has just taken his seat has not kept track of his own arguments. He said it was the very incarnation of selfishness to adopt the principle of

Mr. MAXWELL.

preferential trade which the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) proposed. But was the hon. gentleman himself at all selfish when he spoke of the tariff as applying to British Columbia? Was it the incarnation of selfishness that led the hon. gentleman to say that they wanted free and cheap food for the people of his province? He has completely answered himself and I think it is unnecessary further to discuss the arguments he brought forward.

Now, I am afraid that hon. gentlemen opposite have not taxed their memories as they should have done with regard to their past utterances. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) told us as to the iron duties, that the manufacturers from one end of the country to the other had cried out against the iron duties, and that these duties were struck at right and left. That the manufacturers were actuated by the thievish instincts engendered by eighteen years of protection, and that they were the ones who demanded the reduction of the iron duties. I wondered if that had any reference to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) or to the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) or to the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), all of whom are manufacturers. Have they these "thievish instincts," and was this a doubtful compliment paid to these gentlemen who sit on either side of my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser)? The cry for the iron duties was made a part of the campaign of hon. gentlemen opposite, and no speech made by any of them was complete without a denunciation of these duties. I think I have heard that the First Minister himself quoted the duties on iron at 80 per cent. If that interest has been struck and struck severely in the province of the hon. member for Guysborough he has to thank his own friends and his own leader. The hon. gentleman went further. He said it was a loyal thing on the part of Canada to adopt the tariff of Great Britain. I am not prepared to go as far as the hon. member for Burard (Mr. Maxwell) because I think it is no part of patriotism. I think that the Canadian who does not consider first his own country and its interests is unfit to live in Canada; if he has any loyalty to any country, it is not to his own. How loyal have hon. gentlemen opposite been in making this tariff with regard to Great Britain? We find that of the articles on which the duties were increased we imported from Great Britain last year \$10,867,000 worth, while from the United States we imported about \$2,215,000 worth, or about one-fifth. Of the articles the duties upon which were lowered, there came from England \$1,900,000 worth, while from the United States there came \$4,421,000 worth, or about four times as much. I shall not pursue that argument, for it seems to me that hon. gentlemen have been so inconsistent that to attempt to consider their course is simply to

make a comparison of absurdities. They seem to think that we should be loyal to England at the expense of Canada. I repudiate such views. They are wholly opposed to common sense and to our interests and unworthy of further discussion. Since we are discussing the matter of agricultural products, I wish to call the attention of the committee for a moment to the item of Indian corn. Perhaps it is as well that that should be discussed at this stage as at a later one. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in his place. I am afraid that he did not gain the information from the large body of farmers that he should have gained in order to advise his colleagues on the subject of the corn duty. I am certain that if the hon. gentleman had been thoroughly conversant with the subject he would never have consented, though not residing in the province of Ontario, to the removal of this duty. The putting of corn on the free list is a very serious matter for the province of Ontario, and it is a serious matter also for the other provinces, including the hon. Minister's own, for the effects of it are very far-reaching, covering not only corn, but other grain. Now, who are the persons who will profit by this change? The only persons who can profit by it are a few millers and a few persons engaged in cattle-feeding. My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) smiles when I make that statement. I hope I shall be able to make it clear to him that I am right in making that statement, though it is a pretty broad one.

I repeat that the only persons to be benefited by it are a few persons engaged in corn milling, and a few persons engaged in cattle-feeding. There are only a few corn mills in Canada, only twenty-four in all and, I believe, Nova Scotia has one-half of them, New Brunswick comes next, then the province of Quebec, and as far as I am able to learn, last year the cornmeal millers in Quebec if there are any did not import one bushel of corn for the purpose of human food. Then, in the province of Ontario, I believe there are one or two such mills in the city of Ottawa, one in the town of Chatham, and another in the city of Toronto. The whole number importing corn last year for the purpose of grinding it for food was twenty-four. Now, surely that could not have been an object. I am certain that the Minister of Agriculture must have had better reasons than that for making corn free. Now, I will turn to those who feed cattle. I venture to say that there is not one farmer in five hundred, from one end of Canada to another, who imports corn for the purpose of feeding cattle. There are some gentlemen in Canada, probably the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) among the number, who import corn for the purpose of feeding cattle. But I want to point out that while that is a very legitimate branch of agriculture, it is not a

branch of which it is possible for the masses of the farmers of Canada to avail themselves. They are not possessed of sufficient means, they are not properly equipped in buildings, and they are in no shape or condition to engage in that branch of business. Some hon. gentlemen may say: Well, the door is open, why don't the farmers of Canada engage in feeding cattle? The answer is just what I have given. I say the circumstances of the masses of the people are such that it is idle to hold out to them the probability of such advantages from that direction. Therefore, I say you have entirely lost sight of the great masses of the farmers of Canada when you have taken into consideration the two classes to which I have referred. Now, the hon. member for South Huron has argued previously during this session that he had profitably fed cattle. No one doubts that. But, I tell that hon. gentleman, and I tell those who are engaged in the same business, that any man can set up an establishment on the cross-roads, he need not necessarily be a farmer at all to engage in it. He may be able to buy cattle from others cheaper than he can produce them himself, he buys the feeds and fattens these cattle. But what is being done? Why, to favour those few persons who are engaged in a legitimate branch of agriculture, it is proposed to make corn free in order that they may have it for feeding purposes. I say it is idle to lay down such a proposition. Now, if there are any other reasons for making corn free, I am at a loss to know what they are, unless it may be said that in the maritime provinces and in Quebec, where little or no corn is grown, they should have corn cheap. I would like to ask on what grounds the people in any province should have corn cheaper than pork, why should they have it cheaper than flour, why should they have it made free as beside any other article in Canada? Will it be said that because it is produced alone in the province of Ontario, it should be made free? Let me say that in the province of Ontario to-day, and in every county in the province, according to the Bureau of Industries for the province of Ontario, prepared by the Agriculture Department of that province, corn can be very successfully grown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that we are now discussing the item of mutton and lamb. It will be the proper time to discuss the question of corn when we come to it.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall have to obey your ruling, but I desire to draw your attention to this fact, that hon. gentleman on the other side of the House have wandered from pole to pole. If you propose that I shall sit down, I shall do so in deference to your ruling. But is it proposed by the

Chair to follow one rule with regard to myself and another and different rule in regard to hon. gentlemen opposite? If it is, then I say I am placed in a very unfortunate position, and one that I do not think is right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Certainly I will not apply one rule to the hon. gentleman and a different rule to other members of the House. But I did not understand that the question of free corn was discussed by hon. gentlemen on the other side, though perhaps I may have failed to notice it. But I think the hon. gentleman is not in order in discussing the question of free corn now as he has been doing for several minutes.

Mr. KENDRY. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot take exception, Mr. Chairman, to the technical justice of your ruling, but I think you were certainly in the Chair when the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) was speaking. Now, the member for Guysborough went over the whole lot, discussing not only the question of protection, but general ethical principles, and everything of that kind, he went over the world, and you did not call him to order. If you are going to go by strict rule, I think we ought to have the same strict rule applied to both sides. You are right in this respect, but it seems an invidious distinction to draw between the member for Guysborough, who sits on that side of the House, and the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who sits on this side.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the hon. gentleman might have given a better illustration, for he himself surely diverged enormously from the item under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I daresay I did.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask hon. members of the committee to confine their remarks as much as possible to the item under discussion. Perhaps I have not made my ruling as rigid as it should be, but I now invite members of the committee to confine their remarks as much as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you, Mr. Chairman, would be so cruel as to shut off the hon. member who is now addressing the committee when he is in the midst of an argument; but when he has finished, no doubt you will be very rigid in your ruling.

Mr. CLANCY. I have to thank the Chair for acting in a generous manner. I do not desire to violate the rules, but as I observed that other hon. members were allowed latitude, I ventured upon the discussion in which I am now engaged. I was referring, when attention was called to the course I was taking in the debate, to the capability of

Mr. CLANCY.

the province of Ontario to produce sufficient corn to supply the whole of the Dominion. In 1885 there were 167,831 acres under corn in Ontario, giving a yield of 10,741,000 bushels; in 1890, 223,836 acres, yielding 14,011,000 bushels; in 1895, 302,927 acres, yielding 24,819,000 bushels. That is a most extraordinary increase, and it shows the capability of the province for growing corn. No doubt that quantity could be trebled, and if the encouragement were given to which we are entitled, we could grow without difficulty all the corn required in Canada. We were told by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that the only value protection could be to the farmers, the only home market they could have would be available when the production was not more than the people of Canada required. His words were: the home market can only arise when you only raise enough to supply that market. I think I can advance no better argument than that made by the hon. gentleman himself. First, we grow sufficient corn in Ontario for the whole Dominion; next, we say the home market is invaluable because, by excluding that class of grain, we have the home market to ourselves. If there is a single case in which the home market lies with ourselves it is in regard to the production of corn. If the argument of the hon. member for Guysborough be correct. Let me point out that there is an invidious distinction drawn between corn and other grain. I do not understand why corn should be made free any more than oats, barley, pease, or iron or any other product. I care not whether agricultural or manufacturing, except that a feeling might arise in some of the provinces that corn is only produced in one of the provinces and that for that reason alone it has been made free. Why should corn be made free and a duty placed on coal? I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who comes from the extreme eastern province of the Dominion, whether he thinks a duty should be placed on coal when no Nova Scotia coal comes west of Montreal, and comparatively little there; when not a pound comes to Ontario, and yet corn, which is produced by our farmers, is made free, and coal has a duty of 60 cents per ton. It may be said that our farmers do not burn coal. I say our farmers do burn coal. Wood is disappearing so rapidly that we must look to coal as fuel to a very large extent in the near future. I believe, however, that we must protect our coal interest, and I am strongly in favour of a duty on coal. I think the people of Nova Scotia must have their coal protected, but I object to singling out corn and making it free for the province of Nova Scotia or any other province. This has the effect of lowering the price of wheat, and I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) who is a miller, and

will be able to understand my argument, to the way in which mill feed is affected. The husks taken off the corn come into competition with the lower qualities of our coarse grains, and I am aware that all the millers, except those engaged in milling corn, are opposed to free corn. This imported corn, of course, enters into competition with our oats and every class of grain we grow for feeding purposes. I can find no better argument than that used by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who when he was discussing the question of the importation of Australian mutton into Canada, said that it would displace an equal quantity of Canadian mutton to that which was brought in and consumed. I apply that argument to corn, and I say that the American corn brought in free will displace just so much Canadian corn, and our Canadian farmers will be shut out of the market to that extent. Chatham is in the centre of the corn district, and there are no districts in the United States which produce a higher average of corn or of better quality than the counties of Kent and Essex. Let me show the quantities of corn imported into Chatham by Mr. N. H. Stevens. In 1892 he imported 107,611 bushels; in 1893, 107,603 bushels; in 1894-95, 122,771 bushels, or, in the three years there was corn imported at the doors of the farmers in that corn centre of no less than 327,985 bushels.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much duty did that gentleman pay on the 300,000 bushels?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell the hon. gentleman what duty was paid, and he can take out the rebate. The duty paid was as follows:—\$8,070, \$8,070, and \$9,207. He had a rebate of 90 per cent, which would be equal on the whole to three-quarters of a cent per bushel. The hon. gentleman is not in the dark as to the duty. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is a miller, should ask how much duty was paid. Dose he wish the committee to understand that it all went into the treasury. He is well aware that 90 per cent of the amount was returned as a rebate to Mr. N. H. Stevens. With respect to American corn coming in and entering into competition with our corn, in my opinion the first blow that our corn received was when it was allowed to be brought in at this rebate for feeding purposes. I must say to hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House, that whatever their intentions were as to how that would work out, it has resulted in making corn practically free since 1891. I may be asked, how so much corn came to be imported into the country when the duty was  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel; but in reply to that, I have pointed out that the regulations of 1891 made corn practically free, and as a result the farmers in the corn-growing districts held the corn in their cribs, and could not sell it to the millers and others. This free corn policy is

unfair to the corn growers of the province of Ontario. It will destroy one of the most important interests we have there. It is no argument to say that corn is as cheap in Canada as it is in the United States, because the farmers of Canada have a right to their own market first, and they have a right to demand that their grains shall not be displaced by the products of a foreign country. If there is any measure of protection to be given—and we on this side of the House believe it to be absolutely necessary—then that protection should be extended to corn as well as to wheat, oats, or any other grain. I can hardly believe that there is an hon. gentleman in the House who will say that such a distinction should be made. I venture to think that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) will not allow his selfishness to go so far as to cause him to say, that free corn is in the interests of the farmers of Ontario as a whole. In this case, and in the case of others engaged in feeding cattle, they have no common interest with the farmers of this country who do not feed stock, so far as that particular branch of the industry is concerned. I should be very glad to see those cattle feeders use the products of their own country first, and they have no right to expect that tribute should be paid to them by a class of farmers who are less fortunate than they are, and who cannot engage in the business of fattening cattle.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is it, that since corn has been put on the free list, it is selling higher in the county of Kent than when there was a duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel on it?

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman does not know much about the price of corn. I can tell him that I put some 700 bushels, shelled, on a car, and I was glad to take 19 cents a bushel for it on board the car.

Mr. COWAN. When was that?

Mr. CLANCY. About the first of January, 1897.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the duty was taken off.

Mr. CLANCY. One of these gentlemen is a miller (Mr. Campbell) and the other a lawyer (Mr. Cowan), and I fancy both of them have the same information about growing corn.

Mr. COWAN. We are all in the same boat.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, and probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will have an opportunity to justify himself, because I warn him that I am going to ask the House to assent to a proposition, that it is not in the interests of Canada to place corn on the free list. We are told that the home market is no use, and we have been told time and again by gentlemen opposite that protection

did not help the farmers in the least. In the town of Chatham, where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) resided so long, between the first of July, 1894 and the first of July, 1895, there were 47,500 bushels of wheat imported into that town which paid a duty of \$7,125. Now, that was because wheat was cheaper in the city of Detroit than in the town of Chatham, and the result was that the millers paid the freight from Detroit, paid 15 cents a bushel duty additional, and ground the American wheat for Canadian consumption.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How do the prices compare now ?

Mr. CLANCY. I have given the hon. gentleman one case, which is sufficient to illustrate my argument.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is ten cents a bushel higher to-day in Detroit than in Chatham.

Mr. CLANCY. That may be true, but I could point to the time when corn was higher than wheat in the city of Chicago. Would that be any argument ? I contend that the farmers have a right to have defensive tariffs against the products of foreign countries, and I say that we have a right to have a duty on corn as well as on other grains.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Finance Minister to this. He made corn free of duty and he reduced the duty on corn meal 15 cents a barrel, still retaining a duty of 25 cents on the latter. Those engaged in corn-growing will be most anxious to know, what was his guiding principle in that ? Was the object to protect Canadian millers, and not to protect the Canadian corn growers ? I do not object to the duty remaining on corn meal. I say that protection to farmers extends further than mere protection on the grain itself, and if the duty were taken off corn meal and still retained on corn, it would be a blow at the farmer as well as the miller. But the miller still has his protection on corn meal while the farmer is not protected. The only possible explanation is, that the miller had the ear of the Government and the farmer had not. There is neither rhyme nor reason, nor logic for the duty being taken off corn, and a protection of 25 cents a barrel retained on corn meal. Now, let us take the article of flour. I should not like to accuse the Controller of Customs of being selfish, but it is nevertheless a fact that the duty has been lowered on wheat from 15 to 12 cents a bushel, and the duty on flour has been lowered to 60 cents a barrel. There was a strong outcry, and some millers discussed in the press the unfairness of having no more than 60 cents a barrel on flour, while there was a duty of 12 cents a bushel on wheat. I do not wish to discuss that point now, but I wish to turn to the Controller of Customs, and again I will not say that he is selfish, but I will say to him that

Mr. CLANCY.

he has looked carefully after the business in which he is engaged. We will take the business in which he is concerned. Flour has been made cheaper to him and to every other person who consumes flour. I do not mean to say that was the object, but I do say the hon. gentleman has profited by it. I believe that on the whole under the protection of 75 cents a barrel on flour and 15 cents a bushel on wheat, both the miller and the farmer had a fair chance, and the consumer did not suffer. But I will take another interest in which the hon. gentleman is engaged. I see that the duty has been retained on sugar candy. The duty was  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per pound specific, and 35 per cent ad valorem. The specific duty was taken off but the hon. gentleman put it on again. I do not know whether he was influenced by others, or whether he overcame himself in the matter. These are some of the reasons why it seems to me that it is unfair to apply one rule to the farming interest, particularly in one portion of the Dominion, and another rule to another portion. We were told that the farmers would have their burdens taken off. Let me ask attention for a moment to the burdens that have been taken off the farmers. The duties taken off flour, corn, and corn meal, and wheat, on the imports of last year, amount to \$169,000, which is a loss to them and which they must keep up in taxes on coal oil, and lubricating oil to \$78,000, and on iron to about \$200,000 ; making \$447,000. The whole of the duties that have been lowered amount in round numbers to \$610,000, on these three items the farmers have to bear a great share of the revenue to make up, and the whole sum left, after deducting these three items, amounts to only about \$163,000. True, the hon. gentlemen say that they have taken the duty off coal oil ; but if they have taken \$68,000 off coal oil, they have put on an off-set of \$69,000 on rice. They have taken \$3,000 off barbed wire, but they have favoured another class much more ; they have taken the duty off dental and surgical instruments, amounting to \$7,000. When we sum all these up, we find that the farmers have had absolutely no substantial relief whatever under the present tariff. No one will say that the farming interests are so inconsequential or so paltry in the Dominion, that a reduction of 1 cent a gallon on coal oil or the removal of the duty on barbed wire and the duty on binder twine, which was at a price so low that it did not make any difference—no one will pretend to argue for a moment that these changes lifted the burden that rested on the farmers, or relieved them in the least. Now, I desire to offer my protest at this stage against taking the duty off corn. I say it is manifestly unfair ; it is a singling out a section of a single province to be made to pay tribute to other provinces and other interests ; and I hope hon. gentlemen will see their way to restore the duty of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel on

corn, I hope the sense of justice in this House will not sustain them in a course so manifestly unfair to the great agricultural interest in the province of Ontario as to place it on the free list.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would make a suggestion to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I do not want to cut short discussion unnecessarily, but it is now about a quarter to eleven, and suppose we leave this item, and take what I may call the unopposed items.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I think we are ready to allow this item to pass, or rather to object to its passing and allow it to be carried.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I desire to say a few words on this important question. I did not think of speaking to-night, and would not have done so had not the subject of corn been brought up; but it is a question of so much importance to the province of Ontario and to the Dominion of Canada, that it really requires to be dealt with.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I must ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is consistent. He asked that his friend might be allowed to deal with corn, and now he asks that I should not be allowed to answer him. Is that consistent?

Mr. **FOSTER**. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will show him where I am consistent. The Chairman ruled my hon. friend out of order in discussing corn at this stage. My hon. friend called his attention to the fact that gentlemen on the other side had been allowed to travel over the whole ground, and I suggested that my hon. friend should be allowed to finish his speech, and that after that he should keep all other recalcitrants in order.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. The hon. gentleman does not want an answer on that question.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. There is no desire to prevent discussion on this question; but when the Chair called attention to the fact that it was out of order to discuss the question of corn on a question of mutton, it was decided, as the discussion had taken a very wide range, not to prevent my hon. friend finishing his speech, but to enforce the rule from that time, and to keep both sides of the House to the discussion of the question before us. I think we are all disposed to support the Chair, and when the item of free corn comes up, my hon. friend will have an ample opportunity to discuss the whole question.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). I would suggest, then, that hon. gentleman allow us to run through the

items of the tariff until we reach the item of corn.

Mr. **REID**. I just rise to take issue with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). This afternoon that hon. gentleman, and also the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) said the farmers could take care of themselves, that they did not want any protection. I represent an almost purely agricultural constituency, and when the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) makes the statement that the farmers do not want protection, he makes an assertion that certainly the farmers of my constituency will not agree to.

Mr. **ROGERS**. I did not say the farmers do not want any protection.

Mr. **REID**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the farmers were not anxious for protection. Has the hon. gentleman looked over the Trade and Navigation Report for 1896? In that report he will find that during last year we imported \$11,746,649 worth of agricultural products into this country from the United States alone. The following are the items:—

Agricultural Imports from United States, 1896 :	
Animals, living—hogs, horses, sheep, swine and all other.....	\$ 757,606
Grain, Indian corn, oats, rye, wheat and all other grain.....	5,474,556
Flour, bran, corn meal and all other grain products.....	648,724
Fruits, apples, oranges and other green Fruits .....	1,072,934
Hides .....	1,771,641
Hops .....	37,733
Seeds for agricultural purposes.....	584,317
Vegetables .....	171,097

\$10,518,603

Provisions, viz.: Butter, cheese, eggs, lard, beef, pork, poultry, &c.....

1,228,041

Total.....\$11,746,649

It will thus be seen that \$11,000,000 worth of agricultural products have been brought from the United States into this country. I claim that the protection which the farmers have had in the past has not been too high, and that the reduction which this preferential clause will give is altogether uncalled for. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) commented on the fact that the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had restored the protection to the particular industry with which he is connected. Well, I would find no fault with the hon. Controller of Customs if he would put the duty back on every manufactured, and agricultural product. My policy is a policy of protection—protection to the farmers, the manufacturers, the mechanics and the labourers, and I think that one of the most serious mistakes which the Conservative party ever made was the reducing of the duties by them in 1894. I believe that was one of the things which drove them out of power,

and I am confident that if the Conservative party go to the polls at the next general elections with the tariff which our grand old leader, the late Sir John Macdonald, had in 1878, we will sweep this country from one end to the other.

The hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) said that the Liberal party was the party of loyalty now. Does the hon. gentleman remember the election previous to the last when he ran on the platform of unrestricted reciprocity?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not refer to a previous debate.

Mr. REID. I am referring to a statement of the hon. member for North Leeds, at a previous election, that if his policy of unrestricted reciprocity had been successful, we would have free trade with the United States in mutton.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville spoke the other night on the preferential clause, which we have passed, and consequently the debate on that clause is a previous debate, a reference to which is out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid we shall not be able to take that view. On this question of the tariff we cannot consider anything of a previous debate which has relation to the same subject, no matter at what stage or resolution. In fact there was a distinct understanding that we should have full latitude in the discussion of the question when we went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood that at the same time there was an understanding that the general debate would be made on the question of the preferential clause, but that after that clause was adopted the discussion should be restricted to the particular item before the House. The preferential clause having been adopted, the general debate which took place on that clause is now a previous debate.

Mr. REID. I merely wished to show that this preferential clause reduced the protection, not only on mutton but on every agricultural product, and the farmers in the constituency I represent protest against any reduction of duty on articles which they produce.

Mr. MARTIN. With regard to this item, while, as the resolution was first introduced, it might be considered fair, the duty being 35 per cent, the reduction which will be effected by the preferential clause will do away, to a large extent, with the protection which our farmers have hitherto enjoyed and to which they are entitled. This is a blow struck at a product of the farm in which the whole country is very much concerned. I see here an important distinction made in the tariff. Fresh meats

Mr. REID.

are charged a duty of 3 cents a pound, while mutton, and lamb fresh are only protected by a duty of 35 per cent. Now, the difference between these two figures is very large. Thirty-five per cent on mutton will not be very much more than 1 cent per pound, while the duty on meat is 3 cents per pound. I do not see why there should be this difference. The hon. the Controller of Customs told us that the duty on some other articles is 35 per cent. He might have told us that the duty on kerosene is 5 cents per gallon or nearly 100 per cent. I think this should be put on the same footing as item 14 which would make it 3 cents per pound. I do not see why the Government should object to do this, while pretending to be promoting the interests of the farmers. I do not see how the Patrons in this House can support them in this. Before they gave this preferential tariff to Great Britain, they increased the duty on cottons in order that that industry might not be crippled. Why not show the same consideration for the farmers? Hon. gentlemen opposite said they were the antagonists of the cotton manufacturers, but it seems to me that they are the antagonists of the farmers. There can be no doubt, as shown by my hon. friend who spoke before me that large quantities of agricultural products come in from the neighbouring country; and I think that the farmers should have protection. I will cheerfully support the resolution of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) to make this duty the same as the duty on other meats.

Eggs, three cents per dozen.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. Finance Minister tell us what is the proposed duty on eggs in the Dingley Bill?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is 5 cents per dozen, but I am not quite sure.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) think it would be well to put an equivalent duty on here, or take power to do so?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The view upon which we proceeded, except in the case of a few articles for special reasons, was that we would not disturb this schedule. If the principle suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) were accepted, there are a number of cases besides this to which it would apply with equal force. We thought it would be better to let the matter stand for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. It was very wise not to disturb this schedule, and of course, the Cabinet did not wish to take to themselves extraordinary powers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, we were very mindful of that point.

Condensed milk (weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty), three and one-fourth cents per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the old duty on that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) sure of that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Probably my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has before him the tariff of 1894. There was a change subsequent to that, but we have left the duty as we found it.

Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, seven and one-half cents per bushel.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Controller of Customs how he proposes to regulate this matter so that distillation shall not be made from corn imported free?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) sees as I do, that it will be a somewhat difficult matter. Regulations have not been framed, nor has any question arisen under this clause. Of course the Controller of Customs will endeavour to discharge his duty as set forth here as well as he can. In giving what thought I could to it with other matters, it has occurred to me this clause can be carried out in conjunction with the Department of Inland Revenue, the officers of which are stationed in every distillery. Under regulations that we may frame we shall certainly be able to enforce it much better than if the circumstances were different. I will not say that it can be enforced with absolute correctness, but I think it can be enforced satisfactorily. I give the hon. gentleman an outline of what has passed through my own mind on the subject. I recognize, as I am sure, as he does, the difficulties in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think that is quite satisfactory. My hon. friend says that no regulations have yet been made, that he is thinking over the matter. But the law has been in force since the 23rd of April. Has distillation stopped between that time and this?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Have not the distillers been buying corn since the 23rd of April?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No doubt they have been buying corn. The officers of the department, having this law and requiring to enforce it, are doing so, and seeing that the corn is paying duty.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend cannot allow a matter of this kind to go by the will or course of conduct of individuals. He knows, as head of the department, that he has to act under that clause.

It seems to me that during this month which has been passing without any regulations, and the Controller of Customs not having settled on any regulations, it is quite possible for the distillers to buy corn from any person that they choose. A man brings in corn, not for distilling purposes, and when it is in this country he sells to anybody that he chooses, and can sell to the distillers. My hon. friend has not warned his officers under the regulations so that his officers could take cognizance of the importations of corn coming into Canadian ports and being used for distilling purposes. But the distiller does not import, John Jones imports, the corn passes the custom-house as a free entry. John Jones has his corn brought in perfectly free, and the entry is passed by the customs as free. He has it and stores it. What is to prevent the distillers during all this time from buying from John Jones the corn that he has brought in, and has put in his storehouse?

Mr. WALLACE. In addition to that, as there is no duty on corn for all other purposes, the corn is exactly the same price on both sides of the line, it is the same price at the distillery in Windsor as it is on the other side of the river. Suppose that American corn is worth there to-day 25 cents a bushel, and Canadian corn is exactly the same commodity and the same price. Why should the distiller then import American corn? He can take Canadian corn and he does not require to pay any duty on it. The Controller says that the Governor in Council are to make regulations, but he says that for the last six weeks the Governor in Council have made no regulations, every officer of the customs at all the ports makes whatever regulations he pleases. There is nothing here to guide him, he only knows that corn for distilling purposes is dutiable at 7½ cents a bushel. Therefore, that clause in itself must be a dead letter during those six weeks until the Governor in Council choose to make regulations specifying something that can be done. In my opinion, they can do nothing.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman says they can do nothing. Well, if we can do nothing, certainly it would be a dead letter.

Mr. WALLACE. You have done nothing so far.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that we have recourse. If any of those gentlemen have brought in corn who are not entitled to bring it in, there is a recourse. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, in administering the department, has on more than one occasion found that the duties were not paid at the proper time, and he has had the recourse that the law provides. We have that recourse, and all I can say is that when

this item passes, if it does pass, we will make regulations and go on. Certainly, every entry that is made under this is subject to amendment. All corn that is brought in becomes liable to duty; if the importer has not paid the duty he is liable to be called upon. We have security in that respect, and we have in other respects. I do not think the hon. gentleman has proposed any way out of it. He can see the difficulty, I see difficulties myself, but I do not see that any harm has resulted or any loss to the revenue. In the enforcement of this clause, I propose to use, with the concurrence of the Minister of Inland Revenue, the services of his officers, in the way of being vigilant, so far as it is within their power, to ascertain whether the corn is dutiable or not. That there are difficulties surrounding it, I do not deny. But I want to know if hon. gentlemen opposite want the item struck out, or shall it be left in, and shall the duty be collected?

Mr. WALLACE. What is the use of our telling the hon. gentleman whether we want the item struck out or not? We want a lot of items struck out, but the Government never accedes to our request.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Do you want this struck out?

Mr. WALLACE. I want the hon. gentleman to prove that this is not a bogus clause. He says there are difficulties surrounding it. Can he tell us to-day, after six weeks, whether there has been any revenue derived from this clause? He says that if the distillers break the law there is recourse, they can be punished. I do not suppose they have been so foolish as to break the law. There was no necessity for them breaking the law. They can buy Canadian corn, and if they buy Canadian corn and use it in their distilleries, can anybody call on them for the 7½ cents per bushel?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly not.

Mr. WALLACE. I presume that is what they have been doing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We want them to buy our own corn.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, why do you permit Yankee corn to come in free? You are inviting Canadians to buy American corn with a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on it, which is put on to give an opportunity to Canadians to buy Canadian corn. But here that duty is taken off, and the consequence is supposed to be a continued duty upon the distiller, while I contend that it is not an additional duty upon the distiller at all. Then, as a matter of fact, the revenue would show that no duty has been collected at all. I ask the Controller of Customs whether any duty has

been collected under this item of the tariff, during these forty or forty-five days since this law went into force. I think he ought to give us the information for the month of May, at any rate, because there are only a few distilleries in the country, the corn that is imported for these distilleries come in at certain ports, he has the returns from those ports day by day, and I think that he should give us what information he has so as to guide us in deciding upon this clause.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman at the moment what revenue has been collected on particular articles during the past month. I shall be able to ascertain, but I cannot answer to-night. Now, great fault has been found by hon. gentlemen opposite because this article of corn has been placed on the free list. But when it is proposed to tax corn, of which there is a large quantity coming into this country for the purpose of the distilleries, now hon. gentlemen are asking us to strike that off.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I understand that to be the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from what the hon. gentleman has stated. An hon. member said this was a bogus resolution. A bogus resolution should not find a place on the Statute-book. We do not view it in that light, but the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite tend in the direction of making corn for all purposes free.

Mr. FOSTER. I must protest against that statement, and protest at once, and I do not think the Controller of Customs has taken a position which is fair either to himself or to this committee. I have never yet seen an exhibition of this kind over an item. I am not discussing it in a partisan or in a temperance way, but I want to treat the matter fairly. The Controller of Customs stands at the gate of the collection of duties in this country. When the House says that certain duties are to be imposed, he has the key in his possession, and he must collect them; he is responsible in the most grave way for seeing that every cent of duty is collected and that not one dollar of revenue goes to waste or is lost. On 23rd April he frames a law. The Minister of Finance reads it, and it becomes the law at that very moment. A month and more passes by, and yet when the hon. gentleman is asked the item involving a question of the gravest difficulty, as he has himself acknowledged, where the chances for fraud are very great indeed and loss of revenue may be involved, he gravely tells this committee, and asks us to listen and keep our faces straight when he states that he has not made any regulations, that he has not even a glimmering idea of what will be the regulations that will govern this matter, and

Mr. PATERSON.

yet without regulations there may be no duty collected. Is that the position a member of the Government ought to take in connection with the revenue, and gravely think that this committee will sustain such an explanation as that. It was his duty the very moment the clause became law to have his officers instructed, so that not one single ounce of grain should be brought in for distilling purposes without the duty being paid. The hon. gentleman has not done so, and he does not yet know what he intends to do. When asked the question he replied: Please tell me what I shall do, as you are finding fault. But the hon. gentleman and the Government have created the difficulty. They have changed the duties on corn, making it free in one case and dutiable in another. Are they to ask hon. members on this side of the House to help them out of their difficulty, when for more than a month the hon. gentlemen have neglected to make provision respecting the collection of duty on corn for distilling purposes? Why? The Controller says that none has been imported and passed for distilling purposes. Why should there have been? There are no officers looking after the matter. What is being done? John Jones comes to a customs port and says: I am bringing in 50,000 bushels of corn. In what capacity are you importing this, he is asked. He replies, I am a farmer, or a trader. Then the corn is admitted free; he passes an entry for 50,000 bushels, and it is afterwards put into warehouse. Do hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that they can go back of that entry? Anybody can come and buy that corn. Tom Smith comes and buys 20,000 bushels, and subsequently sells it to a distiller. There was no application made for an entry for distilling purposes; the whole of the corn came in free. The Controller appears to think that having officers is sufficient, without passing any regulations or giving them any instructions. These officers are practically powerless unless they receive instructions, and having received no instructions consequently no duty is collected. But distillation has been going on. The hon. gentleman having failed to perform his duty, and most woefully so, so soon as we find fault uses a most unfair argument, and he knows it is unfair. The hon. gentleman mentioned my name, and said that I asked for the admission of corn free for distilling purposes.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I said your argument was in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. As between man and man, I ask the hon. gentleman if he has the least idea that I asked for the admission of corn free for distilling purposes. Every man knows such is not the case, and no man knows it better than the Controller of Customs. That was a most unfair thing to do. I do not mind as regards myself, and it will have no weight in the country, but it was an un-

fair act. What we on this side argue for is a duty on corn right through; but if you are going to take the duty off corn for other purposes, it is an outrage if you do take it off for distilling purposes. The distiller has to pay the duty.

Mr. MCGREGOR. He does now.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

Mr. MCGREGOR. At Windsor.

Mr. FOSTER. He ought to do so, but there are no regulations at present and the officers have received no instructions. Does not the hon. gentleman know how wide the door is open to avoid payment of duties. The door was shut before and the revenue was ensured; but when the announcement was made by the Finance Minister on the 23rd of April in regard to these duties, they ought to have been collected from that day. The Controller has intimated that no regulations have been made and no instructions given to his officers, but that the necessary arrangements would be made after the item passed to-night.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Will not the duty be collected? Is not the duty provided for in the Act?

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman think the Controller of Customs has nothing more to do than to present an item in an Act and then sit down?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. When an officer finds an article dutiable for a certain purpose, he exacts the duty. If there was any trouble about the regulation, he would not pass the entry until he had made inquiries. There have been no inquiries made, and in regard to corn coming in, no doubt the officers have done their duty in that respect as in other respects.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is going to administer all the customs law on that principle, he will lose more than half the revenue.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The distiller has to account for every bushel that goes into his distillery. Distillers have been paying 7½ cents up to this time, and they are paying that rate to-day as they make their entries. The law is such that if an entry is made to-day, it is subject to the customs law. The country has not lost a single dollar of revenue in regard to corn.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very kind of the hon. gentleman to come to the rescue of the Controller of Customs in his hour of difficulty. The only weapon that hon. gentleman seemed able to wield was to take an arrow and poison it and try and stick it into some one on this side of the House, when he had no reason for doing so. I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that when a person comes to a port of Canada, Windsor or any other port, with

a cargo of corn, he enters it, not for distilling purposes, but as a farmer or a trader, and he does not say whether the corn is for feeding purposes or not. The customs officer takes his entry, and the corn is admitted free. If he comes there with a cargo of corn and says: This is for distilling purposes, the customs officer makes it pay a duty of 7½ cents a bushel, but unless that question is raised before the customs officer the duty is not paid. Does not everybody know that there is a very general tendency to get goods in at as little duty as possible, and does not my hon. friend see how easy it is for anyone to bring in corn free of duty for the common purposes for which corn is used, and how easy it is for the distiller to buy the corn from the storehouse to which it goes? Unless the officer is instructed that for every entry of corn that comes in, he has got to have an oath as to whether or not it is for distilling purposes, the duty cannot be collected on corn for distilling purposes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Corn is selling on the American side for 25 or 26 cents a bushel, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says it is selling on this side for 19 to 23 cents. They are not buying corn on the American side just now, because we have more corn than is required in the western district. If a man should come over with a load of corn the customs officer will charge him 7½ cents a bushel if he has got the order from the Department.

Mr. FOSTER. The customs officer does not wait for an order from the Department to collect the duty. He has this schedule of tariff rates in his hand, and he sees that corn is free, and unless that imported corn shows on the face of it that it is for distilling purposes, he will not charge the duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year 253,631 bushels of corn were brought in for ensilage purposes. Now, that corn was free under the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster) own tariff, and how does he know that all that corn was used for ensilage purposes? Is he quite sure that none of it was distilled? The very same conditions existed under the last tariff as exists now.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Governor in Council made regulations regarding the importation of ensilage corn, and besides that as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) should know, ensilage corn is quite easily distinguishable from other corn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Ensilage corn is distinctly a different article of corn, and I can tell it very easily if hon. gentlemen opposite cannot.

Mr. MCGREGOR. How could you tell?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. WALLACE. More than that, ensilage corn is usually five or six cents a bushel dearer than corn used for distilling purposes.

Mr. TALBOT. Would the hon. gentleman tell me how many kinds of ensilage corn are brought in for feeding purposes?

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman will produce different kinds of corn here I can tell one from the other. Suppose he produces samples of spring wheat or fall wheat or wild goose wheat, I can pick out one from the other, but cannot tell you how I do it. It is not a difficult thing to do for one who knows, but of course it is difficult for one who does not know anything about it. Now, suppose a dealer in corn buys Canadian corn and imports American corn free of duty, and puts them all in the ore warehouse. A distiller comes along and buys 10,000 bushels from him. How are they going to distinguish between the two and charge a duty on the American corn to the distiller. The corn grown on one side of the Detroit river is exactly the same as the corn grown on the other side of the river, and I am told by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) that his county produces enormous quantities of the very best corn.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is the best corn grown in Canada, but not equal to what is grown in the United States.

Mr. WALLACE. If corn is imported by a dealer into this country free of duty, under present circumstances, he can sell it to a distiller or anybody else, or do what he likes with it. Regulations are required in order to collect a duty from these distillers, and as this tariff has been in operation for forty days, we ask the Controller of Customs, what are his regulations and if he has received \$1 of revenue from this source. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) says he has, but that hon. gentleman does not know anything about it. He has no right to have access to the entries made by any gentleman in this country. The Controller of Customs has the right to inquire into all these things, and it is his duty to give the information we ask, while we are discussing this item. The hon. member for North Essex has no right to have any knowledge on the subject.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I have been in Essex for a time.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has no right to go to the customs-house in Windsor to ascertain who made the entries or whether there was duty collected or not.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I did not go into the customs-house.

Mr. WALLACE. The customs officer who would permit him to do that would

not be discharging his duty. I am quite certain that the hon. gentleman had not any such information, but the Controller of Customs had the information; he gets it every day from those ports, and we are asking him to say whether this duty has been collected under this item during these forty days or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I made the statement to-day, when discussing the corn question, that corn would come in free for all purposes except for distilling purposes, and that I thought most of it for that purpose would also be admitted free. Having been engaged in the grain business for the last twenty-five or thirty years, I know something about it. I know that corn was imported for ensilage purposes, and the party importing it had to make an affidavit to that effect when he made the entry. My hon. friend from Kingston knows that the firm of Richardson & Son have a large elevator in that city. They have brought in one or two cargoes of corn from the United States, and they have also brought corn from Essex, and they put it in all together into the elevator, and the collectors have been instructed to admit the imported corn free. Suppose an agent of Mr. Wiser went to Richardson & Son and made an arrangement to purchase 100,000 bushels of corn. The corn is sent down to the distillery, and no officer of the department interferes or can interfere with the transaction, and no duty is collected on the corn. This I know goes on, and no regulations can be framed to prevent it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest that this item stand until the Controller of Customs has an opportunity of communicating with his department and is able to give the House the necessary information after doing so. I think we are losing time in the absence of the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is another reason why I think the item should stand. There is no provision made with regard to corn imported for the manufacture of starch. The starch manufacturers had 1½ cents per pound protection when they had to pay a duty on corn, and now they will get corn free, while their protection remains. Some adjustment should take place, so that the starch manufacturers would be put on the same basis as before.

Item allowed to stand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is leading the House that it would be well to stop here as we have made good progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will not press for a longer sitting of course. But I would point out that I believe that the next schedule, header "Fish and products of the fishery" is

absolutely identical with the old tariff. Of course we will be guided by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we had better go through this next list if there is no change.

Salmon, fresh, n.e.s., one-half cent per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not a change in duty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was dutiable, but afterwards made free by Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When imported for special purposes.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 122) to amend the Acts relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Davin.)

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA-ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to a matter which, it is possible, may assume considerable importance. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to lay on the Table of the House, a few days ago, a report of the Governor General in Council adopting the memorandum with regard to the Alaskan boundary convention. I dare say that the attention of the hon. gentleman has been called to the fact that in the Senate of the United States, to which House that question has been referred, an amendment has been introduced. As these are matters of very considerable importance, and as we have had too much reason to know in the past how desirable it is to get the best information upon such a subject, I referred the terms of this con-

vention and the report of the Privy Council thereon to Major General Cameron and requested him to favour me with any observations he thought it desirable to make upon it. He has done so. I may mention that Major General Cameron, was, at the request of Lord Rosebery, detailed by the War Office, some time ago, when this question of the Alaskan boundary came up, to make a report on the subject for the information of Her Majesty's Government, and his elaborate report will be found, no doubt, in the Department of the Interior or in the Department of the Privy Council. He has given me his views upon the question with which he was already very familiar: and as it is a matter of some importance and as it is likely, in view of the proposed amendment, to come back to the consideration of the Government, I propose to hand these observations, in order to save the time of the House, to the Minister of the Interior, and would ask him to have the papers which he has already laid on the Table printed, as well as these observations, together with any other information that may be available.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Sir Sifton). I am under obligation to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) for calling my attention to the report that has been made. I desire, of course, as he suggested, not only to acquire all possible information upon the subject myself, but to afford such information to the members of the House as will give them an opportunity to acquaint themselves with this important question. The hon. gentleman is undoubtedly correct in his estimate of the importance of the question. The difference between the boundary line as claimed by the British authorities, and the boundary line as claimed by the United States authorities is very considerable, and the value of the territory which may be said to be practically in dispute, in view of the mineral discoveries in that region, is, of course, very great. We have a clear illustration how very important a small strip of territory may be in the fact that the most valuable of the Yukon placer mining locations that have been discovered are just a little on this side of the boundary line. A very small difference there would have placed the most valuable mines in United States instead of in Canadian territory, as we are very happy to say they are as things exist. I, therefore, most cordially assent to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that the papers should be printed.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called—I do not see the Minister of Railways in his place, and very often the hon. gentleman is not able to be here. I would be extremely obliged if some hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches would be good enough to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

call his attention to three or four returns which the House ordered some weeks ago, and which would be very useful, indeed, if we could have them before the railway Estimates are considered.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What are they?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will send a memorandum of them across. If we had them they would probably enable us to avoid a discussion which might otherwise take place.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will kindly send me a memorandum, I will see that it is sent at once to the Minister of Railways and Canals.

#### BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the Government to what I consider a very important matter; it is a despatch to the Halifax "Morning Chronicle," dated May 31, from Moncton, N.B.:

James E. Magee, J. J. McKenzie, H. H. Melanson and A. McNaughton, of Intercolonial Railway Offices, left Saturday night for Campbellton to audit the accounts of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. This railway, it will be remembered, was last fall placed for winter operation under the control of the Intercolonial Railway, but did not prove a very paying institution. Lack of traffic, combined with the serious trouble of Metapedia flood to the roadbed, which for several miles was actually washed away, has resulted in considerable loss to the Intercolonial Railway, approximating \$20,000. To-morrow the B. C. authorities will assume control, and it is understood that it will be under the management of a Mr. Armstrong, from Montreal.

I would like to ask the Government whether this despatch is in accordance with the facts, and what information the Government have to give to the House in regard to the extent of the loss sustained by the disappointment in the traffic, and also by this injury to the road while in the possession of the Government. I see the Minister of Railways is not in his place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think the matter will properly come up in connection with the Supplementary Estimates, when the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of bringing this question before the House. But if my hon. friend desires to deal with it earlier, I ask him to let it stand until the Minister of Railways is in his seat.

Mr. FOSTER. By the way, might I ask when the Supplementary Estimates for the current year will be down?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am in hopes that they will be down within a day or two.

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Cornmeal, including the duty on the barrel, twenty-five cents per barrel.

Mr. McMILLAN. I did not intend to take any hand in this debate, but as corn has come up so prominently before the committee, I think it well that I should say a few words on this question. But before speaking of corn, let me say that several other subjects in connection with it have been brought up amongst them the question of cattle being brought across the line under quarantine regulations. Let me say that these quarantine regulations have been of great benefit to the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, not to interfere with his speech—but I want to carry out what we agreed upon last night. The Chairman made up his mind last night that he was going to keep us in order. The corn question cropped up, and the Chairman was kind enough to let it go a certain distance, and after that we were to be kept in order. Now, the item to-day is simply for corn for distilling purposes, and I want to ask the ruling of the Chairman, whether we must confine our remarks to a discussion of corn for the purpose of distillation?

Mr. McMILLAN. Can we not discuss the question of free corn?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The understanding at which the committee arrived last night seemed to be that a discussion of this item should include a discussion of free corn.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It necessarily involves that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps this item does not fall entirely under the question which has been raised by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan).

Mr. FOSTER. All right. Then I will make a suggestion and the hon. gentleman can accept it or not. The question of corn will come up again under the item for free corn. Quite a large number of gentlemen on this side of the House are not here, and have left with the idea that the discussion would take place then, and I rather thought probably that would be the case, and I encouraged them in the idea that the discussion would come on then. I must say that if we take it up now it will certainly be re-duplicated when free corn comes up; and I suggest whether it would not be better to leave the whole discussion till we get to free corn.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What the Chairman objected to, and very reasonably, I think, was that the discussion should not go over the whole range of subjects in discussing the tariff. Free corn is so intimately bound up with this question that I think we might safely leave them together.

Mr. FOSTER. If you want to have two discussions on it, that is the way to do.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We must take our chances.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am willing to postpone my remarks now with the understanding that when free corn comes up we will be allowed to go back and answer the arguments that have been already given in this House on free corn.

Mr. FOSTER. Some information was asked for by myself and by my hon. friend the late Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), with reference to the duty which had been collected on corn since the 23rd day of April of this year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) asked if we could find the monthly returns. Under the arrangements prepared by himself, the accounts of all kinds are lumped together, and we cannot get at them until the end of June. But I have telegraphed to the different ports asking for information.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend yet telegraphed any instructions to his officers as to guarding these ports from the entry of corn free which may afterwards be used for distillation purposes?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have not telegraphed anything. If there is any corn coming in for distillation purposes, I have no doubt that the officers are doing their duty and collecting the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it possible that the hon. gentleman does not see the point involved. If he does not, I think the country will. My hon. friend has here an item in respect to corn. It is admitted duty free; that is the paramount rule of the tariff. There is only an exception when corn comes in for distillation purposes and it is entered for that purpose, when 7½ cents duty will be collected upon it. But does not the hon. gentleman know that on the border corn is coming in for distilling purposes which is not so entered, for simply by not entering it for distilling purposes the importer avoids the payment of 7½ cents duty. Is he not aware that corn is coming in at all ports, is being stored in warehouses, mixed with Canadian corn, and that when once entered it is outside the control of every officer of the customs. Does the hon. Controller think he is doing his duty in regard to the public revenue when he simply does

nothing for one month or two months and allows that state of things to prevail. Suppose it were a question of sugar. Suppose it were provided that raw sugar should come in free for every purpose except refining, and suppose forty days ago the House declared that sugar for all purposes, except refining, should be admitted free, and that sugar for refining purposes should pay one-half or three-quarters of a cent duty, would the Controller of Customs have been treating the revenue fairly and doing his duty if he had allowed the free entry of raw sugar, which might ultimately find its way to the refiners and be refined. This involves in some cases a tremendous loss of revenue, and in every case the principle of watchfulness of the revenue is entirely disregarded.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friend's idea that the Controller of Customs was bound to make these regulations referring to the tariff immediately after the tariff resolutions were laid on the Table, is a somewhat extreme contention. The Controller has many things to do, and it is not remarkable that some of the regulations should not be made immediately but be delayed. That there has been no loss of revenue would appear from the statement of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who declared that no corn was coming in for distilling purposes, consequently there was no loss of revenue. There is the further fact, that all the corn used for purposes of distillation passes through establishments which are subject to excise regulations, where there is an opportunity to discover the fact if duty has not been paid in any case, and certainly this would not apply to the case of sugar refiners. If corn comes in for purposes of distillation and does not pay duty, it is quite possible to discover the fact, and it may fairly be hoped to collect the duty. It may be possible to bring in an article for one purpose and apply it to another purpose, and I think this has happened in the past in regard to corn. No doubt corn was imported for one purpose and applied to another purpose under the old tariff. The ex-Minister of Finance, who shakes his head, does not think so. I am not arguing, however, that there should not be regulations made; but the Controller of Customs should be allowed a reasonable time within which to make them, and if possibly difficulty arose in regard to corn being imported free and subsequently used for distilling purposes, there would be a better opportunity of discovering the omission in case of distilleries than in any other line of business.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The remarks offered by the hon. Minister of Finance make the conduct of the Controller still more surprising, for the excuse put forward for the hon. gentleman not doing his duty regarding

**Mr. FOSTER.**

the public revenue is that he has been very busy. That is no excuse for neglecting the public revenue. My hon. friend, if he has not time enough to do this work and direct his officers to do it, is not the man who should be in that position. It is the most important department there is in this country so far as the finances are concerned, because it is a department that must collect most of the revenues, and my hon. friend's excuse is that the Controller has not yet come around to that part of his business, and he has not had time to do so. All the hon. gentleman had to do was simply to express his will to his officers, who are technical men and know how to secure the protection required. Never before has such an example been set before the House as this. It was the duty of the Controller to have his regulations prepared before the tariff items came down. He should have foreseen the condition that would arise. Is it any excuse when a man who has a department full of officers waits forty days to issue certain orders? As regards the position taken by the Finance Minister, that in the distilleries, there are inland revenue officers and they can collect the duties, I reply that they have no instructions to that effect, they have no rights in the case. The duty is collected or not when the article comes in, and when the entry is made.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** It can be collected at any time.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Not except it has been smuggled, or it comes in under an amended entry. Free goods do not come in under amended entry, and it is not smuggled in, for the importer takes his invoice to the custom-house and says that he has imported a carload of corn, and then that corn is admitted free. The Controller of Customs has no excuse whatever to offer. He has proved his incapacity or neglect, and he has shown that, if that is the principle on which he proceeds, he is not the man who should sit at the receipt of customs.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I confess I was very much struck by the statements made last night by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) in respect to this matter, and it seems to me that they entirely destroy the arguments of the Finance Minister that the officers in the distilleries would be able effectually to prevent loss of revenue in this event. What did that hon. member say? He said there had been an immense quantity of corn grown in that part of Canada this year, and that the price is lower than that of American corn; and the hon. gentleman said there was no necessity in view of the abundant supply of corn in that part of Canada, to secure the importation of corn for distilling purposes. What follows? It follows that these distilleries are perfectly at liberty and within their right under the law when they supply themselves by pur-

chasing from parties who have grown corn in this country, and that being the case I cannot see how any officer of the inland revenue service can go behind the fact that a distiller shows him that he made certain purchase of a large quantity, say 10,000 bushels, from Canadian producers. The fact that purchases were made from Canadian farmers at once prevents any attempt to collect the revenue owing to the corn having been used for distilling purposes, because that purchase is perfectly legal, and thus it prevents any action on the part of inland revenue officers, and in fact they have no right to interfere in such a sale. The Canadian corn having been purchased by the distiller, and subsequently American corn having been purchased by the farmer or merchant to take the place of that sold to the distiller, an inland revenue officer cannot raise any question in regard to it. I want to know what there is to prevent farmers who have raised corn selling to the distillers, and importing American corn free to take its place. The corn raised in Canada is sold to the distillers free of duty, and there is nothing in the law to prevent any Canadian farmer or merchant importing as much corn as he may please free of duty. It appears to me to be an extremely difficult question, and one that certainly does require the most careful attention on the part of those members of the Government who are charged with carrying out the intent of this law.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). It is impossible to prevent attempts at fraud, but it is possible to make such regulations as shall make fraud more easily discovered. This morning I took some trouble to find out how far the excise officers can help the customs officers in protecting the public revenue against the importation of corn free of duty for distilling purposes. I find that the following is the excise regulations: All grain entering a distillery must be recorded at once by weight in the distillers' stock-book, with the name of the party from whom it is bought, his residence, and the mode of conveyance, whether by car, by boat or otherwise. All such grain is weighed on its delivery at the distillery by the officers of inland revenue, and the distiller is required to state in his book whether the corn is of foreign or domestic production. It may be said that notwithstanding all these precautions, with which my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) is acquainted, fraud may still continue. However, I believe that the penalty is so severe that I do not think many distillers would incur the risk. The entry in the stock-book of the name of the seller of the corn, and the other particulars, would undoubtedly help us to discover fraud on the slightest suspicion. It would appear, anyway, if these regulations are strictly followed, that it is

impossible for the Excise Department to take more precautions than they have taken. The penalty for fraud by any distiller is extremely severe, and the ninety-second section of the Inland Revenue Act provides:

Every person carrying on business subject to excise, who fails to allow any person acting for him or in his employ, or shall neglect to keep a stock book or such other books as are required by this Act and the regulations under it, to make true and correct entries, shall for the first offence incur a penalty not exceeding \$300 and not less than \$50, and shall for each subsequent offence incur a penalty of \$500, together with double the duty payable under this Act.

Every article or commodity in respect to which any fraudulent or inaccurate entry has been made, shall be forfeited to the Crown and shall be seized by any officer of inland revenue and dealt with accordingly.

With such a law as this, and with such regulations as have been made under it, it would be tremendous risk for any distiller to incur to make a false entry in his book as to where the corn came from. I look upon this law as a guarantee of safety for the revenue.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the Controller of Inland Revenue to explain a case which I will submit to him. I have a warehouse and am purchasing grain at my home in Gananoque on the River St. Lawrence. The American farmer three miles across who grows corn, puts his corn in bags, places it on the boat, brings it to Gananoque, enters it free, and I buy 100 bushels from him and store it in my elevator. The Canadian farmer comes along immediately after and I buy 500 bushels from him and put it in the same bin. I keep on doing that until I have accumulated say 20,000 bushels.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) pretend to say to the committee that the American farmer can bring his corn to Canada free of duty?

Mr. TAYLOR. Why, certainly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think he can under the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, my friend (Mr. McMullen) has not read the Act which his friends have placed before him. Time and again when there was no duty on barley I have bought it from the American farmers and stored it in my warehouse. The American and Canadian farmers sell their produce to me and I put it in the same bin. Now, this corn which I buy has not been imported for the purpose of distillation at all. It is entered free of duty, and it is sold to the grain merchant by the American farmer the same as the Canadian farmer sells it. I have accumulated 10,000 or 20,000 bushels and the agent of the distillery comes along and buys that corn from me, and I load it on the cars or in the vessels as is most convenient—

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) think that I would believe that he would be capable in that case of defrauding the revenue by assisting the distillery to defraud it, and selling them the American corn that paid no duty. I do not believe my hon. friend would do that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quite sure my hon. friend would not believe that, but he has not seized the point which I am making. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), who has been the Premier of a province, would come down to this Parliament and submit a law which actually encourages people to perpetrate frauds on the revenue.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) gives himself as an instance of the fraud, and I say I cannot believe he would do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has no right to impute to any man in Canada the desire to perpetrate a fraud. I am dealing in an article of commerce—corn. Under the law, it is entitled to come in free. I may sell it to a miller to be ground into food, or I may sell it to any one else. A distiller's agent may come along and make me an offer for the corn. I sell it to him, and he loads it on to a vessel or a car and sends it to his distillery. I ask my hon. friend how he is going to collect any duty on that corn?

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. I will come down on my hon. friend for helping the distiller to defraud the revenue.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has put the case exactly, and it is a case which will inevitably happen unless this clause is altered in some way, or unless the Controller of Customs can devise some means by which it can be carried out. In the case put by the hon. member for South Leeds, the owner of a warehouse, who purchases corn indiscriminately from Canadian and American producers, would have a perfect right to sell any portion of that corn to a distiller, and all the machinery of the Customs Department and the Inland Revenue Department combined, and all the procedure of all the courts in Canada could not touch it.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. I say that no one who respects the law and wants to help it to be respected, has any right to sell to a distiller American corn which has not paid duty. That is an illegal act.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I will submit another case, and I want to ask my hon. friend how he will get round it. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) made the statement last night that there was corn enough grown in Canada to supply the distillers of Canada. Now, the corn

Mr. TAYLOR.

crop comes in, and the distillers say: "We are going to evade this duty of 7½ cents a bushel; we will send our agents up to Essex to buy all the corn which is necessary for distilling purposes." They purchase the Canadian crop, and that is replaced for feeding purposes by American corn which is imported free. The Canadian corn has gone to make whisky, and the American corn is brought in free and fed by the farmers to their stock. How is my hon. friend going to meet that case?

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. There is no harm in making whisky with Canadian corn, but there would be harm in doing what my hon. friend suggests, namely, getting American corn, which he knows has not paid duty, and selling it to a distiller. That is an illegal act, and when my hon. friend gave himself as an instance, saying that he was keeping a warehouse and was going to buy Canadian and American corn and mix the two together, and, if an agent of a distiller came along, was going to sell it to him irrespective of its origin, I am persuaded he would not do that, because in selling to a distiller American corn which had not paid the duty, he would be committing an illegal act.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that however much respect we may have for my hon. friend, and we all have a deep respect for himself, we cannot have much respect for his law. I think the case may be stated in this way. I am sorry that we have not the Minister of Justice in this House, but we certainly have some lawyers on the Treasury benches, and I would ask them whether this proposition is tenable or not? Your enactment does not impose a penalty upon any man for either buying American corn for distillation, or selling American corn for distillation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It does for using it for distillation.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend goes too fast. So far as I go, he agrees with me that there is no law against any man either buying or selling American corn for distillation.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. He can only buy it on certain conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no legal penalty against any man buying or selling American corn for distillation purposes. The only thing there is, is a tariff item which says that when American corn, for the purposes of distillation, comes to a Canadian port, it shall be dutiable at 7½ cents per bushel. A man who deals in corn has a large warehouse at Kingston, and he advertises that he will buy all the American corn which he can get at a certain price. One million bushels comes across the border, is entered for general purposes, and is taken to this man's warehouse and stored there. It has passed the customs, it has now a legal

status, and is in the warehouse of a Canadian citizen. He sells the corn to Mr. Jones, Mr. Smith, or anybody else. There is no law which tells him that he shall make an inquiry as to the purpose for which it shall be used, or which says that he shall sell it for certain purposes, and not for other purposes. In the course of sale, that corn may pass through a dozen different hands before it ultimately finds its way into a distillery. The distiller has his record book, of course, but what does the record show? It shows from whom he bought the corn, and if he is told that it is domestic corn, he so records it, but more than that he has no possibility of knowing. So his first record is that he bought it from John Jones; next, that to the best of his knowledge it is domestic corn; and, next, that it was brought to him in a wagon to which a pair of horses were spanned. These are the conditions imposed by the law, and every one of them has been complied with. Everything is perfectly legal, and the hon. gentleman who controls the Inland Revenue Department and his officers can go no further than that record. There is no penalty against the man who sells, and it seems to me that if the Government propose to get any revenue from American corn, which either immediately or mediately, by displacing an equal quantity of Canadian corn, virtually finds its way to the distilleries, they will not get it under this clause. Some other clause or some efficient regulations will have to be framed in order to make sure that the revenue will be collected, because if the worst comes to the worst, how easy it is to carry out what my hon. friend said. If a distiller buys 50,000 bushels of Canadian corn, and then has the Canadian seller simply bring in 50,000 bushels of corn from the other side and put in the place of that he has sold, what will the Government be able to do? What I am arguing is not whether it is best to buy the one corn or the other, but whether, under this tariff, you are going to get a single cent of duty from corn for distilling purposes. I take it to be the purpose of the Government that corn for distilling purposes, brought in from another country, should pay a revenue. Do they expect to get any revenue from it? If they do, they will have to frame another clause or so surround this clause with such regulations that they will be certain to get the duty from the American corn or from the Canadian corn used in its place.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). My hon. friend puts the case of a Mr. Jones who imports directly American corn and does not declare that he has imported it for the purpose of selling to distilleries, and then sells it to a distillery. Well, if Mr. Jones should do this, he would hear from me, and I will do my best to have him pun-

ished for helping the distiller to defraud the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. You might have a very good intention, but you would lack the power.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The great objection which my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) makes is that no regulations have been made. It is the bounden duty of the Controller of Customs, he argues, to issue his regulations the very day the resolutions are tabled, and he says that any Controller who does not do that, does not know his business. Well, I may tell the hon. gentleman that if I felt myself lacking in business qualifications, I should not accept him as my professor. Let us see if what he has said I should do has always been done by the head of the Customs Department. I venture to say that it has never been the custom of that department to do what the hon. gentleman says should be done. Let me point out what Sir Mackenzie Bowell did, when he was head of that department. True, my hon. friend placed in writing his lack of confidence in Sir Mackenzie Bowell, but none the less I have greater confidence in that hon. gentleman as a business man than in the hon. member for York, and I think the community has too. He certainly administered the Customs Department with great vigour. Under Sir Mackenzie Bowell's administration, corn for ensilage purposes was placed on the free list, under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council, as now. According to the hon. gentleman, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, if he did not, on the day his resolution was tabled, issue his regulations, he was unfit to administer his department. What are the facts? Sir Mackenzie Bowell tabled his resolution on the 28th of March, it was not until the 31st of May that he submitted his regulations to Council, and the Privy Council did not act on them until the end of June. I shall not say anything as to the manner in which the duties of the head of the Customs Department were performed when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was Controller of Customs until that hon. gentleman makes his objections.

There is difficulty, I know, and it may be worth while to consider whether this clause may be made somewhat plainer. I have simply addressed myself to the fact whether it is the bounden duty of the Controller, the moment these resolutions were tabled, to have issued regulations, and before the resolutions were adopted by the House. I do not think it would be wise to make regulations, while the resolutions are before the House, subject to amendment, and before I know what the sense of the committee and the House is with regard to them, and I do not think any business man would think otherwise.

With reference to the preferential clause, general instructions were given, as the hon. gentleman knows, to the officers of the department to satisfy themselves as to the British origin of goods; but, in the meanwhile, until the tariff becomes a law, until we know what the sense of the House finally is, and what is ultimately determined upon, I do not think it wise to make regulations which may be required to guard the interests of the revenue.

I am following what has been the course invariably taken, as far as I have been able to ascertain, by the Customs Department, since it has been a department; and if the hon. gentleman is in a position to show me any case in which, when the head of that department has tabled resolutions, he has simultaneously issued regulations under Order in Council, I should like him to point it out to me now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely glad to hear the statement which the hon. Controller of Customs made, and which I think a very wise and judicious statement, that he thinks it would be well, in view of the great difficulties of administering this law, to give further consideration to this clause, in order to see if it can be amended in any way so as to facilitate the collection of revenue. Perhaps, therefore, it would be well to let this item stand for the purpose of careful consideration of that point by the Government, and I am not without hope that the Government, finding the difficulties so great, and seeing that this is a matter on which public opinion is very much divided, will come to the conclusion to strike out free corn and leave the duty upon all corn. I think that will be the simplest and most efficient way of guarding public revenue and avoiding the many difficulties which, I am sure, will be encountered in the attempt to administer this clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has asked whether any member of the Cabinet of the legal profession would give his views on this question, I humbly submit that while his mind is very analytical and that while he and his friends around him are very clever in discovering difficulties, and while there are difficulties surrounding the importation of corn in this way, those difficulties are by no means insuperable or as great as the hon. gentleman imagines. What is the House trying to do? It is trying to declare that all American corn imported for certain purposes shall be liable to a duty. I am told by these gentlemen who took part in the debate last night and who spoke again to-day that there is no difficulty whatever in distinguishing between American and Canadian Indian corn. I am told, secondly, that there is an officer of the Inland Revenue Department in every distillery watching the operations of that distillery. I am told, thirdly, that the dis-

Mr. PATERSON.

tillers have to make a sworn return of the quantity of corn they use. Very well. If this House declares that all Indian corn used for the purpose of distillation—

Mr. FOSTER. But it does not declare that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Wait a moment; I say "if." If this House declares that all Indian corn used for the purpose of distillation shall pay a duty, it reduces the difficulty to a minimum. Then, if the distiller chooses, instead of importing corn direct himself and paying the duty, to run the risk of buying it from somebody else who imports it, he will still be liable to pay the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. On that assumption.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On that assumption. The agents of the Inland Revenue Department would have certain knowledge, which he would report, that a certain quantity of corn was used for distillation. The distiller would have to pay the duty and there would be no difficulty as to the revenue. The only thing that is stated is that this mythical person, John Jones, may have imported the corn and it may have passed through ten or twelve hands, but the distiller, when he went to buy it, would know that he bought it with the legal obligation to pay the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Under this clause?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the word "used" is put there. The regulations are framed to prevent the possibility of fraud, but that fraud will be practiced to some extent, of course, we all know; that cannot be avoided. But I should have no reasonable doubt, as the matter presents itself to my mind, that if Parliament declared that all Indian corn used for the purpose of distillation is liable to pay a duty, that the revenue will not suffer. The distiller might as well import the corn direct and pay the duty, for, if he attempted to buy it from John Jones, or Brown, or Robinson, he would have to pay it anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) would not suggest that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman would not suggest putting an import duty on an article produced in this country?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. American corn.

Mr. FOSTER. You said "all corn."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All foreign corn, of course. I started with the proposition that American corn is easily distinguished from Canadian corn. Then, there are officers in each dis-

tillery who ascertain, in a proper way, how much American corn is used for distillation. So, the quantity of American corn being absolutely and accurately known, there is no possible doubt of our being able to recover the duty upon it. So, what will be the result? The distiller will say: I might as well import the corn direct and pay the duty on it, because if I do buy it from anybody else, even though it has passed through fifty hands, when it is used for the purpose of distillation, I have to pay the duty upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you put such a clause into a tariff law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That foreign corn used for purposes of distillation shall pay a duty?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should have no hesitation in doing so. There is no difficulty or wrong in it.

Mr. FOSTER. That would meet the difficulty, if you can make the distinction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) has suggested an improvement, no doubt. But he has not met one point, to which I would draw his attention again. The statement is made by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) that there is enough corn now raised in Canada to supply all the distilleries.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I meant all the distilleries in Canada. The Walkerville distillery is the only one that buys corn from the wagon, and we supply enough corn to supply that distillery. It requires 3,000 bushels a day when the distillery is running, but it has not been running for the last eight or nine months, so that there would be very little difficulty about American corn coming into Windsor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the point I want to make, and it is important. I want to know how the Minister would deal with this case: There is nothing to prevent the Canadian distiller buying corn from the Canadian producer. Any person who raises corn in Canada is as much entitled to sell it to a distiller as to sell it to anybody else, and the distiller has as much right to buy Canadian as to buy imported corn. Therefore, the distiller will buy corn raised in Canada. There is nothing in the suggestion that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) made to prevent Canadian producers selling their corn to the distillers or to the merchants, who will undertake the business of supplying the distillery, while importing corn to be used not for distillation, but for other purposes. This would be a means of effectually evading the law, even with the improvement suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) made a statement that American corn could be easily distinguished from Canadian corn—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will understand that I made that statement on the authority of my hon. friends. I do not pretend to know anything about the matter myself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was going to say that the hon. Minister, no doubt, made that statement on the authority of his friends behind him. I have been in the grain business for many years, and I make the statement here that I will bring three samples of corn here on Monday, and you cannot find a gentleman on that side of the House who will say that this is Canadian or that is American corn.

Mr. CLANCY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is from Essex, and he knows that what I say is correct. If the Government want to give employment to a horde of hungry followers who are seeking offices, they can establish these men at the American ports of entry and stamp every grain as it comes in. In that way they would be able to follow it and identify it, but in no other. I want to submit another statement to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and let him get around it if he can. He has acknowledged that the Canadian distillers can purchase Canadian corn. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) said there was enough corn to supply all the Canadian distilleries—

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, I said that—

Mr. TAYLOR. I know he has qualified that by saying that he referred to the Walkerville distillery. But after they bought their supply there would be a large surplus to be used by other parties. If you let in corn free for other purposes, Canadian corn can never come into competition with American corn for feeding and milling purposes. Is the Canadian distiller going to buy American corn when he has to pay 7½ cents duty on it? He will say to the grain merchants: Pick up the Canadian corn for me and you can import American corn for other purposes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would not that be a good thing for the Canadian farmers?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, for this reason—the Canadian farmer will get no more for his corn than the American, because the American corn can be imported free for all purposes except distilling. I can only look upon this in one way—that the Government are placing this item in the tariff admitting corn free for all other purposes except distilling knowing that the distillers can get their corn without paying the duty, and that

this is being done in the interests of the distillers more than in the interest of the farmers, because it is a distinct injury to the farmers. I think the distiller will reap the benefit. The hon. Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) said that he would like to find that fellow "John Jones," referring to me, when I sell corn out of my warehouse in Gananoque. I want to submit a case. I have ten or fifteen thousand bushels of corn, some Canadian and some American, the American corn having been brought in free—bought from an American farmer whose place is a few miles from the warehouse. I say to a vessel owner: I have ten or fifteen thousand bushels of corn, what will you give me for it? We make a bargain. He has a vessel going to Toronto. He buys it and puts it in his vessel and takes it down to Toronto. He goes to Gooderham & Worts and says, I have got ten or fifteen thousand bushels of corn that I brought in a vessel from Gananoque, what will you give me for it? They make a bargain. How are the revenue officers going to get a duty on that ten or fifteen thousand bushels of corn? My hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor) won't say that he can go into court and prove that this is Canadian corn, or that it is American corn, and no other man in this House or country can do it. I know as much about corn as any hon. gentleman in North Essex who raises corn. You cannot tell the difference between American or Canadian corn.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman says that he cannot tell the difference between American or Canadian corn. Is it not a well known fact that the principal species of corn grown in the United States is the dent or horsetooth corn? That three-fourths of all the corn raised in the United States is of that variety, and none of it grows in Canada? I have lived on corn plantations, and know whereof I speak.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend may know something about Quebec, but I can tell him that all these species are grown successfully in Ontario.

Mr. TALBOT. I have lived fifteen years where corn is grown, and I know something about it. You cannot grow dent corn to maturity in the province of Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. member for North Essex if that statement is correct?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that these regulations have not been made by the Controller of Customs because the Controller is a very busy man, and that it is impossible to have all these regulations made at once. Now, I would like to ask him whether they have made any regulations with regard to any of those different commodi-

Mr. TAYLOR.

ties for which it is provided by the Act that the Governor in Council or the Controller of Customs shall make regulations. Have any regulations been made, and if so, what regulations have been made during these forty days that the tariff has been in force? I hear no answer, and I presume that means that no regulations have been made. Now, the Controller of Customs himself says, Oh, if I am a sinner in this respect, I am in good company. When Sir Mackenzie Bowell was Minister of Customs the tariff containing this article became law on the 28th of March, and there was no regulations made until the 31st day of May, and then it did not pass the Council until the 11th of June. And the hon. gentleman also held a threat over my head that if I dare say anything he could mention something about me, too. Well, I cordially invite him to do so. I challenge him to tell one case where, if regulations were not made when I was in office to make them, and to submit them to Council, I did not take immediate steps to protect the revenue and to instruct the officers in charge, in advance of any regulations by the Governor in Council, how to proceed. But in this case the Controller does not tell us—in fact he does tell us that he has given no instructions whatever to any officer in this Dominion how this law is to be administered so as to collect the revenue. There were changes made in the last tariff which may have required the regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, or by the Controller of Customs. Now, we will take one case that occurs to me at the moment. Goods for dyeing purposes were to be brought in at a lower rate of duty. Regulations were not made, because there was no establishment in Canada ready to proceed with the manufacture of the dyeing of those goods, and until one establishment was started and was in running order, there was no necessity for making any regulations. Then I will take another case, that of rubber goods, to which the same statement applies. Then there was another important case, books under certain conditions were to come in free under regulations made by the Governor in Council. The duty on books was changed from 20 per cent to 6 cents per pound, and a large class of books were admitted entirely free of duty that had before been dutiable, for instance, those for the use of mechanics' institutes, free libraries, universities, colleges, law libraries or organized law associations for the use of its members. Before I made those regulations and submitted them to Council, I found it necessary to communicate with the importers of this country, because I was desirous that they should have the handling of those books, and that these institutions that I have mentioned should not have to do their business through merchants in a foreign country. Now, when we made these books free it was necessary for the

protection of our Canadian merchants that we should give them the opportunity of buying those books and furnishing them to the universities and other institutions—

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** Were they not made free in the resolution?

Mr. **WALLACE.** They were made free in the resolution.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** Then it was your duty, according to the ex-Finance Minister, immediately to have issued your regulations.

Mr. **WALLACE.** I am trying to explain with regard to that, that the books became free of duty the very day the new law came into force, but any institute, any law association, or any university could import those from a foreign country and have them free, and they did have them free. But I was anxious that the merchants of this country should have the privilege of furnishing those books, instead of the merchants of some foreign country, and I wanted to make regulations by which that could be done, with no loss to the revenue, and without those books coming in on the free list for general distribution. Before I did that, I had communications with the merchants to see what safeguards could be provided and what regulations should be made so that they could have these in free. But in that case there was not a moment's loss in permitting the universities or the law associations to bring in their books free, direct from foreign countries. But I was delaying to make regulations so as to permit our Canadian merchants to have that business, and I succeeded in doing so very satisfactorily, I believe. In that instance, as the only one that occurs to me, there was a delay, and a proper delay, but there was no delay in admitting the books free for those who were entitled by law to receive them, there was not a delay of one hour, and there was no loss to the revenue. But in this case what are the facts? The Controller himself tells us that there are great difficulties, and he asks advice from this side of the House. He says that he is beset with difficulties on this question, and that statement was repeated by the Minister of Finance. The Controller himself said: I want advice from that side of the House.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** No, I did not want it.

Mr. **WALLACE.** You don't want it to-day, but you did yesterday.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** No.

Mr. **WALLACE.** Then I will give him advice gratis. Put all corn on the dutiable list.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** Has the hon. gentleman any alternative to that?

Mr. **WALLACE.** Oh, I thought the hon. gentleman did not want any advice.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** But as you are volunteering it—

Mr. **WALLACE.** I volunteer my advice.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Advice gratis is not usually valuable.

Mr. **WALLACE.** Advice free is not considered so, I admit. But I give it only in response to the invitation the hon. gentleman gave yesterday, but which he repudiates to-day. So I say, in case that may be quoted, there was no loss whatever to the revenue, but I did it in the interest of our Canadian business men so that they might import those books instead of obliging our Canadian institutions to get them from foreign countries. There was not an hour lost in permitting universities to send to England, or to send to the United States, to have those books imported, so that they might bring them in at once, entirely free of duty. That is not a parallel case. Regulations should have been made at once. And while the Finance Minister truly stated that the Controller of Customs had many other matters on hand—I know that the Controller of Customs has many matters of importance constantly before him—his paramount business is the protection of the revenue and exercising care that the laws of Parliament are not disregarded, but are carried into effect at once. I think it is quite clear from the statement made by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) that the province of Ontario could supply the distillery at Walkerville with corn. The statement was made by the hon. gentleman that the counties of Essex and Kent could supply, I understand, 7,000,000 bushels. If they could supply only six, five, four, or two, or three million bushels, that quantity would be more than was required for making all the whisky for Canada. Only one million and a half bushels of corn are used here for the manufacture of whisky. One bushel makes three gallons of proof spirits, and there are only 4,000,000 gallons of whisky made in Canada, and that would require less than one million and a half bushels of grain. So the counties of Essex and Kent can supply four times as much corn as is required for making all the whisky manufactured in Canada. If that be the case, where is the revenue to come from? No hon. gentleman opposite has stated that Canadian corn is not equally as good for manufacturing whisky as American corn. The hon. member for North Essex has stated that farmers come with teams to Walkerville and sell Canadian corn for the purpose of making whisky. If that were not the case, I should ask the Minister of Inland Revenue to state why our corn is not suitable for making whisky. But such is the fact, and the hon. member for North Essex

has given proof that it is so used by stating as a fact that farmers bring their grain to Walkerville, where whisky is being made from Canadian corn. Those two counties producing three or four times as much corn as is required for distilling purposes, it follows that Canadian corn will be used by distillers, and, of course, will pay no duty; thus the Government will get no revenue, and if further corn is wanted it will be brought in from the United States for other purposes for which corn is used in this country. There were only 1,600,000 bushels of corn imported from the United States into Ontario during the past year. It may be that one-half or one-third of that quantity was used for distilling purposes, but, of course, we do not know that any quantity was used for distilling purposes; all we know is that the corn paid the duty, and corn used for distilling purposes paid the duty the same as corn used in any other way. This proposition is admittedly beset with many great difficulties, and it does not appear under it as if any revenue was going to be collected. I understood the hon. Controller would give the committee some information as to whether any duties had been collected on corn at the different ports during the last forty days, because there may be some cargoes on their way or some grain may be coming in for distillers and be liable for duty. As to the future, it appears to me that distillers will use Canadian corn, on which no duty is paid, and therefore this clause is only a buncombe resolution, intended for some particular purpose.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Since I took my seat, the officers of my department have furnished me with some information bearing on this question. There has been imported at Hamilton, 523 bushels of corn; Belleville, 8,487 bushels; Prescott, 10,597 bushels; or a total of 19,607 for those three ports, this corn being for distilling purposes.

Mr. WALLACE. I have just stated that I supposed there were some cargoes on the way.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If distillers, or other people, are importing corn, they are paying duty on it under this proposition, and every entry is being taken subject to amendment, and the Customs Department has a right of recourse if any corn or anything else does not come in properly and pay duty. I hope the hon. ex-Minister of Finance heard the statements made a few moments ago by the late Controller of Customs, and he will apply them to his remarks as to a dereliction of duty on my part in this regard. No doubt he heard the late Controller, who began to call his sins to remembrance, confess that as regards item after item—

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. WALLACE.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No orders were issued. The hon. gentleman went on to state that there were reasons therefor. But they were in the tariff when it was introduced, and those items or resolutions became part of the law. If this item as regards corn is in the law and it is my bounden duty to act upon it, it was also the bounden duty of the late Controller of Customs to act on similar items. He asked me in regard to item 43, and he wanted to know if I had done anything in respect to it. I referred to an item in the tariff dealt with by the hon. gentleman, and I asked what had been done in regard to it—goods in a raw or unfinished state for the purpose of dyeing, 7½ per cent. The ex-Minister of Finance prepared this resolution, in connection with the late Controller of Customs, and according to the statement made by the late ex-Minister of Finance, the late Controller should have had his regulations ready to submit to Council for Council to act on them in order to protect the revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. There were no dyeing establishments.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. According to the ex-Minister of Finance that resolution became the law when it was laid on the Table, and it was the bounden duty of the Controller to have acted by regulation on the next day. I ran across this item in the old tariff, and I sought to find regulations established in regard to it by the then Controller. This was in 1894, when the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was Controller of Customs. What regulations were established in Council in regard to that item? There have never been any regulations established from that day to this, and I have to take hold and do work that should have been performed by the late Controller two or three years ago. I challenge the hon. ex-Finance Minister to quote a single instance where they have issued their regulations to the officers of a department and passed an Order in Council immediately dealing with tariff resolutions. I am free to admit that there is more or less difficulty with items of this kind. We know it, and we are anxious to make the tariff as workable as we can. The Government took the idea of putting corn upon the free list, but they wanted to make corn used for distillation purposes pay a duty. That is the object of this item. The discussion may have shown the difficulty more clearly, and it may be possible that some words might be inserted which would help to remove that difficulty. If hon. gentlemen opposite think it desirable, my colleague (Mr. Fielding) perhaps would consent to let this item stand over until the item of free corn comes up, and then we can discuss it. Meanwhile, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) will admit, that it

is perhaps just as well I did not issue regulations, if there is going to be an amendment to the clause which might change these regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be wise for my hon. friend to have done exactly as he did in the case of English goods under this reciprocity business. He immediately took occasion to advise his officers, that they should make themselves certain of the British origin of the goods. That was his duty. He gave caution to the officers that they should take precautions in this respect. I would not find fault with my hon. friend, if he did not at once make regulations and have them endorsed by Order in Council with reference to British goods under the one-eighth reduction, but he did do the essential thing when he immediately telegraphed the officers that they were to see that the goods were of British origin. In this case nothing of the kind has been done. In reference to fabrics brought in for dyeing purposes, the thing was carefully guarded, but the best safeguard of all was that there were no dyeing establishments in the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Up to to-day there is only one establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) see, that in that case there was no dyeing establishment.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Now you see you were wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. There was no dyeing establishment, and it made the matter perfectly safe.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. But the resolution was laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not a case of free goods. It was a case of where there had to be a dutiable entry, and the dutiable entry was subject to amendment. There was no dyeing establishment, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) had such a precaution as that around the distillation business, we would not complain.

Mr. SPROULE. This item will of course be allowed to stand. Before we pass from the question, I wish to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) which is so erroneous that it should not be allowed to go uncontradicted. That statement was, that dent corn did not come to maturity and ripen in Ontario. I can tell him, that that corn has been grown in my district for the last fifteen years, and it ripens every year. There are about eleven or twelve varieties, and they ripen every year. You go further west and further south, and there are a great many more varieties and they ripen right along.

Wheat flour, including the duty on the barrel, sixty cents per barrel.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Before the item in reference to wheat passes, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject. Yesterday afternoon the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made some statements in regard to the price of wheat in Manitoba, and the price at Duluth. Nobody knows all the ins and outs of the wheat business except those who do not want to tell. Now, the wheat that the hon. gentleman alluded to was doubtless No. 1 hard. It is a well known fact that No. 1 hard wheat that comes from Duluth, while it goes by the same name, is an entirely different article from No. 1 Manitoba hard, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) understood the manner in which the wheat market is manipulated, he would know why it is that people are willing to pay so much more for No. 1 hard in Manitoba, than they are willing to pay for No. 1 hard in Duluth. It has been one of the greatest drawbacks to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, that they have not been able to get the full price for their wheat. No. 1 hard wheat in Manitoba is really worth all the way from 5 to 15 cents a bushel more than the No. 1 hard which comes out of Duluth, and more than that, which comes out of Fort William—or at any rate which came out of Fort William until this last season. Under the old regulations No. 1 hard in Manitoba, was brought to Fort William and mixed with No. 2 hard, and No. 1 Northern, and scoured wheat, and was graded out of Fort William a different wheat from what it was when graded into Fort William. There is great room for reform in this matter of wheat grades. The No. 1 Manitoba hard is quoted at the same price as No. 1 Duluth all over the world, but that is an entire mistake, because as I have said, the Manitoba article is infinitely superior to that which comes from Duluth.

We have heard a great deal about the injury that would be inflicted upon farmers by the removal of the duty on wheat. The fact of the matter is, that the duty upon wheat is no benefit whatever to the great wheat-producing areas of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It is simply a means of working into the hands of these great corporations—two large milling companies and a combination of grain buyers up there. As a matter of fact we have only three buyers on our market. The duty on wheat is a means whereby these three corporations, each possessing very large capital, can purchase their wheat at low prices. They purchase that wheat when the farmers in the North-west have to sell it, and as is well known because of the burdens the farmers labour under and the hard times they have experienced up there, the majority of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, have to sell their wheat as soon as they thresh. Now, these three great corporations buy when wheat is at a low price, in many cases at from 40 to

50 cents a bushel, and just as soon as they have got all the wheat they want for their own purpose, and that means when they have got the great bulk of the wheat, then up goes the price. They put up the price in many cases 25 cents a bushel, and the consequence is, that the small millers who have not got the capital to lay in a large stock of wheat, are either forced to stop their mills running, or are compelled to buy wheat at these enhanced prices. As a result, they cannot compete in the markets of the world with Americans, or with the large flour millers, because they have not been able to manufacture their flour at an export basis. These are facts, and I am prepared to prove them. As I have said, nobody understands all about this flour business, but I believe I understand it a great deal better than the majority of eastern men. There is no question but that what I have stated is one chief result of the duty on flour. It throws the wheat market into the hands of these great corporations.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Rutherford) to refer to the duty on flour, or to the duty on wheat.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Both; they act in the same way exactly.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask my hon. friend to name the three great corporations?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The Lake of the Woods Milling Company, the Ogilvy Company, and the Syndicate of the Grain Exchange in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the duty on flour?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes. I was going to say that there was a petition presented to the Controller of Customs in Winnipeg when he was there, supposed to be signed by farmers of the North-west, asking for the retention of the duty on wheat and flour. I have here a letter from Mr. Leech, the secretary of the Farmers' Institute of Manitoba, who was surprised to find that such a petition had been presented, because the great majority of the farmers who attended the convention were opposed to the duty on wheat and flour. Here are a few facts, as stated by Mr. Leech, showing the manner in which the signatures to that petition were secured:

I have it upon the authority of one of the canvassers, that misrepresentation, lying, humbug and debauchery were the means employed to secure signatures, and money without stint was supplied for the purpose. The same authority tells me that the instructions to canvassers were to get signatures from any and all who could by any means be induced to sign, not by any means confining the canvass to farmers, and I find, upon investigation, that those instructions have been pretty faithfully carried out, for every class, calling and profession appears to be represented upon the petition, even to the Chinaman, whose farming

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

operations are within the walls of a 10 x 12 laundry. Of the 1,789 names to the petition, I have been able, in the two or three days spent inquiring into the matter, to obtain information as to the callings of 858, and find of that number only 411 are bona fide farmers, and 447 are bogus, with callings as indicated in the annexed list. According to my information, canvassers were paid all expenses—

This I am prepared to substantiate from my own personal observations.

—(of which liquor bills were an important item; and 25 cents per name, \$4 per day, \$40 for two weeks' work, \$260 for two weeks' work, \$100 per month, &c., were the prices paid to canvassers for getting signatures to this petition.

Now, the question naturally arises why were these moneys paid, why was this canvass undertaken, and who put up the funds for these gentlemen who were canvassing for names? The answer is very simple. There is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of any one who has given any attention to the subject, that it was the three great corporations or their agents who took this means of endeavouring to work up an apparent sentiment on behalf of the farmers in favour of retaining the duty on wheat and flour. I am sorry that any duty is left on wheat and flour, because the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west do not want it; they have no use for it; it is of no good to them; and there is no way in which the Government could do more good than by inquiring into the details of the grain trade in Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend said that no man knew all about this question or any other.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I said, except those who did not want to tell.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, perhaps my hon. friend is one of that class.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No, I do not belong to that class.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I accept that statement. My hon. friend also made the statement that there were only three corporations who purchased wheat in the North-west.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I did not say that.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that they controlled the market. I want to inform my hon. friend that the firm of James Richardson & Son, of Kingston, at the earliest opening of the wheat market of the North-west, have agents all over that country to buy wheat to supply the millers of Ontario. I see a miller sitting in the gallery whom they supply almost every week.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am quite aware of that, and if the hon. gentleman will talk to Messrs. Richardson & Son and their buyers in the North-west, he will learn some of the difficulties under which they labour.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps I am as well acquainted with Messrs. Richardson & Son as the hon. gentleman. He also made the statement that the duty on wheat and flour will not help the farmers. Then I want to ask him why it is that before the duty on flour was lowered from 75 cents to 60 cents a barrel, there was no American flour imported into the maritime provinces, but that since then two or three vessel loads of American flour have been sent from Boston to St. John.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that under a duty of 75 cents a barrel no flour was imported into the maritime provinces?

Mr. TAYLOR. Practically none.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman has much to learn.

Mr. TAYLOR. A great deal of Ontario flour was brought through Boston, but one of the maritime province papers makes the statement that that was the first American flour brought from Boston for many years, and the statement is not contradicted. I wanted to correct the statement about these three milling corporations being the only purchasers of wheat in the North-west.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I did not say that. What I said was that those three corporations controlled the market, and I say that any one who knows the condition of the wheat market in Manitoba and the North-west will bear me out in making that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say they do not control it.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I am glad to hear my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) asking that this duty be removed. I may say that the great desire of the whole province of Quebec is that there should be no duty on wheat or flour. We do not produce nearly as much as we consume in that province. I understood that the North-west wanted protection on these commodities, and I am really very glad to hear that the hon. member for Macdonald sides with us on that point. We are certainly willing to grant protection for our friends in Manitoba and the North-west as well as our friends in Ontario. But we have been put to very great expense to settle that country, and we think the interests of the older provinces should not be overlooked. I may tell the Ministers that not very long ago, before this tariff came into force, I met one of the travellers of the Ogilvys, and he himself did not expect that they would be treated so well. He expected that the duty on flour would be decreased at least 25 or 30 cents a barrel, whereas it has been decreased only 15 cents. I believe the maritime provinces also are very much interested in this question. I may say that in the section of country where I reside, probably

not one farmer grows wheat enough for his own family; not only the workingmen, but all the farmers have to buy flour, and I believe that duty should be reduced, if not removed altogether. I am very much pleased that hon. gentlemen coming from the west share that opinion. It would be a great boon to both the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces, and I hope the Government will see their way to lower if not entirely remove this duty.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to add something to what my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) has said with regard to this question. I may say that I took a very deep interest in the proceedings of the farmers' delegates before the tariff commission, which commission was composed of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Controller of Customs, when they appeared in Winnipeg, and I can bear out very heartily the assertions made by my hon. friend from Macdonald regarding the sentiments of the farmers on the question of the duty on wheat and flour. It is my earnest conviction that the farmers of Manitoba, as a body, do not want the duty retained on wheat and flour. A meeting of this delegation, composed of 100 of the most representative farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories and of delegates representing the Farmers' Institutes, was held in the Manitoba legislative assembly chamber to arrange a programme for their conference with the tariff commissioners. The opinion of that delegation, as I gathered it from the speeches made by its members, who spoke one after another, was that the duty on wheat and flour was of no value whatever to the farmers of Manitoba, but many of them did not make any representations to the committee on that point, because they had other things to press and were not so interested in bringing this particular matter before the commissioners.

Now, a great deal was said before the commission with regard to a petition which was circulated throughout the province of Manitoba and which was gotten up and circulated, I have no hesitation in saying, by these milling corporations and possibly by the syndicate mentioned by the hon. member for Macdonald; 1,789 names appear on that petition, but I may say that I have a communication from Mr. R. E. A. Leech, secretary-treasurer of the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute, and a representative of that institute on the delegation, which I shall read to the House and which will show how utterly unreliable this petition is. So astonished were the delegates to find this petition presented to the commission that they set on foot an inquiry in order to ascertain how it was farmers could have been so foolish as to sign a petition of that kind, and if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I shall read the letter which I received recently from Mr. Leech. Mr. Leech says in that letter:

I am satisfied that if the investigation had been completed, even a worse showing would have been made. Under another cover I send you the petition which I have marked "C," "L," "T," indicating the politics of those who signed.

An hon. MEMBER. What do these letters mean?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No doubt, Conservatives, Liberals and Patrons. Mr. Leech also sent me a copy of the letter which he had sent to the Minister of Finance, which, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read:

Brandon, Man., March 30th, 1897.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,

Minister of Finance, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Re the petition of "Farmers, residents in the province of Manitoba," which was presented to yourself and Hon. Mr. Paterson in Winnipeg, February 8th last, praying that the duty now imposed upon wheat and flour coming into Canada be retained, I beg to intimate that I have inquired carefully into the matter and have information as to the parties instituting the circulation of the said petition, and those most active in perpetrating in the most unscrupulous manner what to my mind is one of the rankest frauds upon your Government, Parliament and an intelligent people. I have it upon the authority of one of the canvassers, that misrepresentation, lying, humbug and debauchery were the means employed to secure signatures, and money without stint was supplied for the purpose. The same authority tells me that the instructions to canvassers were to get signatures from any and all who could by any means be induced to sign, not by any means confining the canvass to farmers, and I find, upon investigation, that those instructions have been pretty faithfully carried out, for every class, calling and profession appears to be represented upon the petition, even to the Chinaman, whose farming operations are within the walls of a 10 x 12 laundry. Of the 1,789 names to the petition, I have been able, in the two or three days spent inquiring into the matter, to obtain information as to the calling of 858, and find of that number only 411 are bona fide farmers, and 447 are bogus, with callings as indicated in the annexed list. As to the total amount spent in this nefarious business, I am unable to say definitely, but it doubtless runs into the thousands. According to my information, canvassers were paid all expenses (of which liquor bills were an important item) and 25 cents per name, \$4 per day, \$40 for two weeks' work, \$260 for two weeks' work, \$100 per month, &c., prices calculated to make the work interesting. Inclosed find statutory declarations as to two forgeries upon the petition, and a glance over the petition would convince one that there are perhaps scores of forgeries. Further comment upon the subject on my part is scarcely necessary. If your Government is disposed to appoint a committee to inquire into the matter, with power to send for persons and papers, I will be glad to supply names.

Faithfully,

R. E. A. LEECH.

Mr. Leech, as I have said, is the secretary-treasurer of the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute. Now, I shall read a list showing the occupations of those who signed the petition in order that the committee may judge for themselves what value should be attached to this petition:

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Labourers.....	100
Boarding-house keepers.....	4
Bartenders....	7
Barbers.....	5
Boys (1 Barnardo).....	7
Bankers.....	2
Bus driver.....	1
Blacksmiths.....	8
Bummers.....	5
Butchers.....	10
Carpenter and cabinet.....	13
Coal and wood dealers.....	2
Cattle buyers.....	3
Clerks.....	11
Creamery man.....	1
Chinese laundry (Li Chong).....	1
Doctors.....	5
Druggists.....	3
Forged.....	4
Draymen.....	3
Grain dealers.....	3
Gentleman.....	1
Hotelmen.....	16
Horse dealers (Ont.).....	2
Hostler.....	1
Harnessmaker.....	1
Implement agents.....	14
Insurance agents.....	9
Indian agents.....	2
Jewellers.....	2
Land agent.....	1
Livery and hands.....	19
Liberal, of Leeds, Ont.....	1
Lawyer.....	1
Left country.....	3
Merchants.....	36
Millers and mill hands.....	17
Masons and bricklayers.....	4
No such men.....	32
Not farming at present.....	2
N. W. T.....	2
Photographer.....	1
No occupation.....	2
Painters.....	3
Plasterers.....	3
Printers.....	2
Postmaster and clerks.....	5
Pool-room keeper.....	1
Pumpmaker.....	1
Railwaymen.....	9
Real estate agent.....	1
Reporters.....	18
School teacher.....	1
Swamp hand.....	1
Scavenger.....	1
Teamsters.....	2
Thresher.....	1
Tinsmith.....	2
Tax collector.....	1
Milkmen.....	11
Theatrical manager.....	1
Wheat buyers and elevator men.....	16
Shoemaker.....	1
Veterinary.....	3

This list does not include 31 French petitioners, with residence designated Notre Dame des Lourdes, and fourteen others, Rathwell (who, possibly, don't grow as many bushels of wheat); nor 27 others, resident in Lake Winnipeg district (fishermen, 200 miles from a wheat market); nor the towns of southern and north-western Manitoba which have generously helped to swell the entire list of, said to be farmers, to 1,789 names.

I have another point to make in regard to this matter. There appeared before the tariff commission a constituent of my own whose name was Culver. He represented

that he was the delegate of the Mennonites—I forget how many thousands he said he represented—and he read a typewritten statement, which the commission afterwards ascertained to have been prepared in the office, I think it was, of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, of Winnipeg; and although he represented himself as a farmer delegated by these Mennonites and asked that the duty be retained, it transpired that he was the buyer for the Lake of the Woods Milling Company. And if my memory serves me correctly, he was questioned by the commissioners and it turned out that the document he had read was never submitted to the men he said he represented, and that he was in no way authorized to speak for these people. Now, let me give the committee an instance of the prejudicial effect upon the settlers of this duty. I think it was two years ago that a wholesale merchant in Winnipeg, Mr. A. Macdonald, was able to bring from Minneapolis a carload of flour all the way to Winnipeg, pay the duty of 75 cents a barrel, and the freight for about 500 miles, and still sell that flour in Winnipeg at the rate charged by the Manitoba manufacturer, or 5 cents below. And let me add a word to what has been said by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) with regard to how the small local millers suffer. They, as he pointed out, are unable to purchase large quantities of wheat, and the wheat is nearly all bought up at low prices by these three large corporations. Then, when they have cornered the wheat, so to speak, they put it up to such a price as to practically shut out the small millers at these local points. The farmers also suffer, because in very many cases even the farmers buy their flour. Many of them being hard-up sell their wheat early in the season, and before the next year's crop is available, they must buy flour and are obliged to pay a very high price for it.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I would like to ask these representatives of Manitoba and the North-west one question. If you take the duty off wheat, who is going to supply the lower provinces with flour? Do they not want that market? All our Ontario millers send their flour to the lower provinces. I understand that for the last three or four years the price of wheat has averaged from 12½ to 13 cents per bushel less in Detroit, Buffalo and other American points than in Ontario points. With the duty off, the Americans will get the market in the lower provinces.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think about three-fourths of the wheat at present raised in Manitoba is sent via the United States, through the Erie Canal and Buffalo and is manufactured.

Mr. KLOEPFER. We in Ontario use chiefly half of North-west hard wheat,

to mix with our own wheat, and the greater part of our flour goes to the maritime provinces. I am surprised that the North-west farmers want to lose the trade of the lower provinces and allow the Americans to supply that market. In the last election the only trouble I had with the party of hon. gentlemen opposite was that they said that the Canadian farmer was not enough protected. But now they want to have the protection taken off.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to amend my statement. If I said that the bulk of Manitoba wheat was manufactured in the United States, I must have been unfortunate in the choice of the words employed to convey my meaning. I did not mean to say that the grain is manufactured in the United States; it is exported in bulk, I believe.

Mr. SPROULE. Even if the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is right in the analysis of the petition, what does it amount to? There are some 1,700 names on that petition, and he accounts for only 300 or 400. So, it would appear, that the great bulk of the signers of the petition must be farmers. The hon. gentleman avoided stating to the House how many farmers had signed the petition.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will understand that I made no statement of my own, but read the statement of the secretary of the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) in reading the statement practically fathers it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe it to be true.

Mr. SPROULE. He fathers it when he founds an argument upon it and now he says he believes it to be true. Does it not appear that the man who made that analysis is not a fair man and did not wish the proper deduction to be drawn from that petition, otherwise he would have given all the signers and shown the class to which they belonged, and then we would have drawn our own inferences. If I were the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) I would not read a petition of that kind to the House again without being fair enough—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not charge me with being unfair. In what way was I unfair? I gave the statement as given to me by the secretary of the Central Farmers' Institute. I did not wish to give any unfair impression of the case.

Mr. SPROULE. No, the hon. gentleman may not have intended it. But, if not, he is unfortunate in the way in which he presented it to the House. He based an argument, and so did the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), upon the im-

pression conveyed to the House that the petition was neither reliable nor fair. The hon. gentleman said that the people of Manitoba do not want the duty on wheat or flour. If so, and the wheat and flour is allowed to come in free, it will assuredly come in from the United States. Is that the fact? Who supplies the mills of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell)—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not say that the flour goes to the United States, but the bulk of the wheat exported goes through that channel.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman, as one who has been engaged in the business, in a very limited way for some time, that we depend largely on Manitoba for the wheat we use. It is mixed with Ontario wheat to make a grade flour that is used largely in the maritime provinces.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. gentleman give the House an idea of how much Manitoba wheat he uses?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot say on the spur of the moment, but I can tell the hon. gentleman in a short time. But it makes no difference for the purposes of this argument how much we use. Suffice it to say, that there is scarcely a mill in Ontario but is using Manitoba wheat. I have here the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1896. They show that with the duty on flour at 75 cents a barrel and that on wheat at 15 cents a bushel, very little flour came into the maritime provinces from the United States. In Nova Scotia the imports of flour from the United States were 2,030 barrels. Where did the rest of the supply come from? It must have come from Ontario, Manitoba and the North-west. Imports into New Brunswick from the United States amounted to 936 barrels. Into Manitoba itself there were imported 1,991 barrels. Did not the parties in Manitoba who imported that flour displace so much Manitoba grain? Then into British Columbia, the imports from the United States were 27,130 barrels. Manitoba and the North-west Territories should have supplied British Columbia; it is a part of their own country and is their natural market. This import takes place in face of a duty of 75 cents a barrel and 15 cents a bushel on wheat. If you take that duty off, is it not reasonable to suppose that a much larger quantity would come in? This is proven by the fact that even with a slight reduction in the duty American flour is already pouring into the maritime provinces in large quantities. The hon. member for Macdonald said, with reference to some remarks that I made the other night, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not know anything about the wheat question, that No. 1 hard in Duluth was one thing and No.

Mr. SPROULE.

1 hard in Manitoba another thing. I am well acquainted with the subject, as a man who is interested in the buying and selling of wheat, and knowing where the profits come in. Then he went on to say that Manitoba No. 1 hard, in Manitoba and Fort William, were two different things. Where is the difference? One difference is this, that when the wheat reaches Fort William they have what they call scouring machines, and they take scoured smut wheat, under the regulations made, and mix it with No. 1 hard. But it deteriorates very little, it makes but slight difference. It is practically the same wheat, and there is very little difference in value, so far as the quality of flour is concerned, between that and the wheat turned out in Manitoba. Now, with regard to these three milling companies monopolizing the wheat market, all I can say to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is, that they may now call on their friends under that provision in the tariff, giving power to take the duty off of any article where combines affect the prices. Will they do it? I would like to see them do it, and like to see what would be the result. I think they would find that the farmers would protest against it in a tangible manner, and petitions would come in in large numbers. But if I am operating as a miller in Ontario to-day, and if I can get better freight rates from Duluth, and can buy wheat there that will turn out as much flour and as good a quality as wheat that I can buy in Manitoba, and thereby save the duty, and if I can make a little saving, is it not the most natural thing in the world that I should buy it in Duluth? My hon. friend beside me hands me the Trade and Navigation Returns so that I may answer the argument of the hon. member for Lisgar, who said that the great bulk of Manitoba wheat went to the United States. I find that by these returns the exports from all Manitoba to the States last year was only 1,115,000 bushels.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I said the bulk of our wheat sent to Great Britain went via the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. That is quite another thing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not mean, of course, that it was consumed in the United States; if my language conveyed that impression, it is not what I meant.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has been unfortunate in many lines of his argument.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like the hon. gentleman from Lisgar to furnish proof of his statement that three-fourths of the Manitoba wheat is exported via the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have been so informed, and believe it to be the case. I will make an effort to furnish the proof.

Mr. SPROULE. To take the most charitable view of the hon. gentleman's statement, I must say it was one made entirely at random. But I say now that any Ontario miller who wanted to buy wheat from Duluth, if that wheat will make as good a quality of flour, and as much flour, as wheat he can get from Manitoba, and if he can save the duty, would he not buy there if he could make a little more on it? In the condition of the wheat market at Duluth and the market at Manitoba, he could have done so many times during the last three or four years, to his own advantage. Now, with regard to the classification of wheat, I have nothing to say because it is not exactly as I would like it to be. I would like to keep all scoured wheat from being mixed with any other; I would make a grade of scoured wheat by itself. These are the reasons why the duty is beneficial to us, because it keeps out American wheat and flour. In Ontario to-day we are really grinding a large bulk of the wheat. Except the Ogilvie and the Lake of the Woods Milling companies, Ontario is grinding the largest bulk of the wheat raised in Canada, and the best market we find outside of the home market is the maritime provinces. We have been doing an interprovincial trade with them for years, and we are practically furnishing them with their entire supply; because, as I said, there were last year only 41,000 barrels of flour brought into all Canada from the United States, upon which duty is paid, and this shows that we supply largely the home consumption of the country. If it was not for that duty, we would not supply it, and it would come in from Boston as it did before the duty was put on. In my judgment, any farmer in Manitoba or the North-west would be very shortsighted if he wanted the duty taken off. I will not say whether there is a combine or not, it may be as the hon. member for Macdonald said; but I would suggest another remedy for it rather than the one that he proposed, that of taking the duty off, because, in my opinion, that would not be a suitable remedy.

Mr. ELLIS. The effect of the hon. gentleman's argument is that the people of the maritime provinces are paying taxes to Ontario makers of flour for the flour which they use. That is the legitimate result of his argument, and it is of that that we complain. The impression in the maritime provinces is that we pay between \$800,000 and \$1,000,000 a year more for our flour than there is any necessity for doing, by reason of the tax which is imposed. Now, if the people of the North-west and the people of Quebec are not anxious for this duty, I am sure that we in the maritime provinces are not at all pining for it. While I do not

propose to interfere with this item, yet if hon. gentlemen who feel more aggrieved will move for a reduction, I will certainly support it, particularly after the statements made in the House by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule). He brings clearly to my mind the fact that this tariff is making us use flour that we do not care to use, and when it would be more beneficial for us to get American flour.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman accept the statement made by his late leader (Alexander Mackenzie) in Halifax, to the effect that when you have a surplus of wheat, the tax don't raise the price to the consumer?

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Mackenzie is not here, and I am accepting the hon. gentleman's statement, as he is in the flesh.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not directing my argument to that point; if it was necessary to do so, I might go into the reasons why it does not, to my mind, raise the price to the consumer.

Mr. McHUGH. I would ask the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) on what basis the millers of Ontario fix the price of wheat that they buy from the North-west farmers. Is it not fixed by the quantity of wheat that is sent over to the British market?

Mr. SPROULE. No, because they have often paid six and seven cents a bushel more for wheat than they could realize on it in Liverpool—for Winnipeg and Brandon wheat.

Mr. McHUGH. Was not that during seasons when all the wheat was in the hands of the millers and of the large buyers?

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. Last month nearly 700,000 bushels of wheat were bought in Manitoba from the farmers, showing that there was that much left on their hands.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I sympathize with the view of those gentlemen who regret there is to be a duty on flour at all. I would be very much pleased if we had found it possible to make the duty lower than it is. The tariff is a tariff of compromises, essentially, as I suppose most tariffs are. I do not imagine that in this item we have gone so far as some hon. gentlemen would wish. I know that many would like it if we could have gone a little further. May I say a word as to the meeting that took place in Winnipeg with the farmers' representatives? I have a very agreeable recollection of that meeting, for I am sure it is no word of flattery to say that I never saw a better representation of the people of Canada, of the farming population of Canada, than were assembled that day in the city hall in Winnipeg. Nothing gave me such a favourable impression on my first visit to Manitoba as that gathering of the representative farmers of Mani-

toba and the North-west country. I think the general line those gentlemen took was this: They were in favour of lower duties; they wanted a reduction of the tariff all along the line. Now, I think my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), and my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), are quite correct when they suggest that there were certain interested parties who had sent out a number of petitions, which were signed for the purpose of making it appear that the farmers regarded the duty on wheat and flour as essential. I did not understand the farmers who came before us to say that they wanted the duty on wheat and flour abolished, but what they did say was this: You must not, under plea of the duty on wheat and on flour, impose high duties on other articles. We want general tariff reform, just as much of it as you can give us; and if it is necessary to get that to take the duty off or to reduce the duty on flour or on wheat, we are perfectly content to have that done. That was the spirit of the Manitoba farmers. I do not think that the Manitoba farmers would be anxious to come here to-day and strike the item out. I think they would probably say: If you could have made your reductions all along the line greater, we would be willing to have the flour duty and the wheat duty cut down lower; but since you still have to have duties on various articles which are higher than we desire, why, then, incidentally, we will take whatever advantage there may be from the duty on flour and the duty on wheat. I could not help but admire the spirit in which Manitoba farmers acted at that meeting. When gentlemen came before the commission and presented those petitions as representing the views of Manitoba and the North-west, there was a general expression of disapproval among the farmers present. What I understood them to ask was, that they should be given tariff reductions as far as possible, and that even if it were necessary to reduce the duty on wheat and flour, they would be perfectly content. But as we were able to take only a moderate step in that direction, we did not propose to abolish the duty on wheat and flour. This is a tariff of compromise. We have endeavoured to consider the representations made by the different sections of the Dominion and their different interests, and we tried to be considerate to them all.

Mr. DAVIN. As to the duty on wheat, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) said he represented the views of the farmers of the North-west. I have not up to the present moment met a farmer who wanted the duty taken off wheat. I do not think that hon. gentleman speaks for the farmers of the North-west. I can confirm everything that has been said by the Finance Minister as to the feeling in Manitoba. I understand the feeling there to

Mr. FIELDING.

be that we are already to abandon the duties on certain articles if the Government will remove the duties on certain other articles; but I did not understand, and I read carefully the representations made before the commission, that Manitoba farmers want the duties on agricultural products taken off without regard to the duties, for instance, on implements. However, I can say in regard to wheat, that I have talked with many north-western farmers, and up to this moment I have no other instructions from them than that the farmers in my constituency want the duty to remain on wheat. I should like to have heard the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, who has unfortunately left the Chamber, as he represents the North-west in the Cabinet.

Mr. ROCHE. I am sure the farmers of the North-west will be glad to receive this "taffy," for that is about all that is given to them under this tariff. The Finance Minister has spoken very highly of the delegates that waited on the commission, and I can certainly on the whole endorse his statements, although I doubt the wisdom of the Greenway government, which paid all the expenses of the representatives, in some of the selections they made. For instance, one representative was reported in the press as having said that the average farmer of Manitoba lived during his first year on faith, during his second on hope, during his third year on charity, all of which is a libel on the province. As I was unfortunately not in the House when other members from the North-west spoke on this question, I am therefore somewhat handicapped in replying to their arguments and can only take as my text the few remarks made by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) yesterday, and add a few observations of my own. I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman state that the farmers of the western country were entirely careless as to whether the duty was retained on wheat, and that substantially no benefit was derived from that duty. In view of the experience of the last few years, this was a surprising and alarming statement for the hon. gentleman to make. The hon. gentleman reiterated the old doctrine that the markets of the old country rule over the world. In theory that may be correct, but in practice its fallacy has been proved on many occasions. The hon. gentleman surely knows that during recent years prices of wheat in Manitoba have on many occasions been largely above the export prices, on account of the demand by local millers for Manitoba No. 1 hard to mix with soft wheat. The price in Manitoba has been above that obtained by Dakota farmers by the amount of the duty on more than one occasion, and I was therefore surprised to hear from the hon. gentleman that our farmers are not interested in the duty on wheat. If that Liberal doctrine be correct, why not

abolish the duty entirely? If 15 cents duty was no use, why not wipe it out? Why place 12 cents a bushel on it? If it is not kept on in the farmers interests, in whose interest is it? Then, at all events, hon. gentlemen opposite would have been consistent with their professions, instead of which they have reduced the protection—for protection I claim it is to Manitoba and North-west farmers by making a reduction of 3 cents per bushel, in order to compensate the millers. Certainly this was not done in the interests of the farmers, but it was done simply to compensate the millers for their reduced protection on flour, the duty being reduced from 75 to 60 per cent per bushel. One of the best arguments that the duty is of service to our North-west is the fact that during the past week carloads of flour have been loaded at Boston and shipped across the boundary line to the maritime provinces, and this in my opinion is the beginning of changed conditions which will result in the loss of our eastern market to our millers who are supplied with our western wheat. If Liberal principles are to be carried into practice in regard to our wheat duties, I would ask whether it is not a fact that the harvest in the North-western States is earlier than our harvest in the Canadian North-west. Their grain is therefore marketed earlier, and it is much the same quality as that raised in the North-west; those states are thus able to dispose of their grain in advance of our North-west, and with the abolition of the duty, or any appreciable reduction they would supply our eastern millers, displace so much western grain and be a consequent source of injury to our North-west farmers. When the hon. gentleman declared that he spoke in the interests of the farmers, I admit he may have been voicing the sentiments of a few farmers, but he assuredly was not giving expression to the views generally held in the North-west, for while I have met many farmers who stated they were willing and anxious that duties should be reduced or abolished on manufactures, yet they were living in an agricultural portion of the country and had to pay possibly an undue share of the duties, were not willing to see the duties reduced on any of the products of the farm. If hon. members from Manitoba were representing large city constituencies, consisting of a consuming population, who had to purchase their bread supply, I could understand their position; but they, like the representatives of other agricultural constituencies, produce their own bread supply, and by the reduction of the duty on agricultural articles and allowing products to come in from foreign countries, certainly injury would be done to our farming population. Our farmers object to any reduction in duties on wheat or the products of the farm. It is paying a very poor compliment to the intelligence of the farmers when

their representatives declare that the farmers do not desire any protection on their farm products, when it is well-known that when those articles were permitted to come into Canada, free of duty, it was the farmers of Canada, to the number of 100,000, who petitioned this Parliament to impose duties similar to those imposed on our products going into the United States markets, and when the representatives spoke on these lines, they were practically telling the farmers they did not know what they were talking about. I have more confidence in the judgment of the farmers than I have in the opinions expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite from Manitoba. I object to any reduction in the duties on wheat or any other products of the farm, which would allow foreign products to be brought in, and which would be followed by a reduction in the prices of our home products. The people of our country who engage in agriculture have very many drawbacks to contend against, and are deserving of every protection which can be afforded them by this Government, and to every assistance which the Government can lend them in the prosecution of their industry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) has specially referred to my views as stated before the committee last evening, I desire to offer a few remarks. I represent a constituency which is almost entirely composed of farmers; I endeavour to voice their sentiments in this House, and I trust that I succeed in doing so. From our standpoint, the matter of the duty on wheat is one of indifference, nor do we care whether you increase it or remove it altogether. We raise such a large quantity of wheat that the home market to us is of very little importance. We look more to the foreign market, and, therefore, the quantity of wheat that may be used in Manitoba is of comparatively little concern to our western farmers. Whether you have a duty on grain or not, affects the western farmers to no great extent. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I would be right in saying that the people whom I represent ask that the duty on wheat be removed, but, at the same time, they are not at all asking that it should be increased, and if their condition can be bettered by lowering the duty, and securing a lower rate on other articles which they use, then they would be quite willing that this House should take whatever action it may think fit in reference to the duty on wheat. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has, I think, voiced very correctly the sentiment of the farmers in the west, when he stated, that they were very much in a state of mind which might be described as indifferent, on this question. The market for the North-west grain is in Great Britain. There may be some of it used in Ontario, but we look upon Great Britain as our market, and we know that Great Britain is

also the market for United States wheat. We do not anticipate that the Americans are going to send wheat over to us, or that they can in any way affect our price. I state again to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche), that we do not ask that the duty on wheat should be removed, but if the removal of the duty would in any way help the Government to reduce the duties on other goods necessary to the prosperity of the people in the west, then our people would be quite willing to let the duty on wheat go. These are my views on this question, and now that I am on my feet, I wish to endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Richardson) with reference to the grading of wheat. I had the privilege of looking into this whole question last session, and I was able to get a good deal done to clear away the difficulties which then existed. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) who called in question the facts stated by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), is himself astray. He speaks about scoured wheat being mixed with wheat of a superior quality, but he has entirely overlooked the fact, that during last session, an Order in Council was passed declaring that it should be unlawful to mix scoured grain with No. 1 hard, and that scoured grain should be sold on its own merits. That is the law to-day, so that there can be no mixture of scoured grain with No. 1 hard.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there with No. 2 ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nor with No. 2. Scoured wheat is to be sold on its own merits.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no separate grade for scoured wheat that I am aware of. I wish to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) if there is any standard on scoured wheat, because that is what we pressed for ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not aware at this moment if we made a special grade for scoured wheat, but I will get the information. I do know that we made the regulations asked for by which we forbade the introduction of scoured wheat in first and second grades.

Mr. SPROULE. I am almost sure that your department did not make any regulation fixing a standard for scoured wheat. When scoured it was originally mixed with No. 1 hard, and afterwards it was mixed with No. 2 hard, but it must now be mixed with some other wheat, whether that be No. 3 or less. There is no special grade for scoured wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to the Order in Council which states specifically, that scoured wheat should be sold upon its own merits and not mixed with No. 1

Mr. DOUGLAS.

hard. The Ontario farmer does not get No. 1 hard as a matter of fact, and I wish to reiterate that one of the chief difficulties under which the western farmer labours is, that he does not get the full price of his grain. That is a well known fact. In my own district on the Qu'Appelle River, you will find numbers of farmers to testify that they grow wheat which will weigh 64 and 65 pounds to the bushel, and the commercial value of grain weighing that heavy is much greater than that of grain which only weighs 60 pounds. The farmer does not get the advantage of the superior quality of his grain. The buyer mixes the superior grade with an inferior grade, and brings it up to standard, and then puts the mixed article on the market as No. 1 hard. The grain that is bought from the farmer and manipulated by the buyer goes into the Fort William elevators as one grade, and we know and can testify from gentlemen who are in the business, it goes out on another grade. The fact is that to-day, on the British market, our western farmers are getting a third-class price for a first-class article. There is a great deal of reform needed in connection with the whole wheat business, and I hope that by next session all the circumstances will be searched into very closely. I trust that matters will be set right, so that our farmers will get justice, and obtain a price for their grain commensurate with its value.

Mr. DAVIN. As the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is in the House now, I should like to ask, whether he agrees with the views that have been presented by some of his supporters. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) have represented, that the duty on wheat and the duty on flour are of no use whatever to the farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I have no objection to answer the question. My hon. friend ought to know that the tariff as brought down expresses my views. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knows that, being a member of the Government the tariff expresses my views.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will allow me, I may explain that in his absence, the Minister of Finance informed us that it was a compromise tariff.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very good ; and I think the compromise is generally considered a very satisfactory compromise.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

## After Recess.

### AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

The House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Belcourt for third reading of Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.

Mr. BENNETT. The other evening, when this order was reached, I was addressing myself to the House in regard to the Bill for the incorporation of this company. When the general discussion was proceeding a week or so ago, I did not make any remarks owing to the fact that another opportunity would be afforded, and I propose now to address a few remarks to the House on the question. Objection has been taken to the name of this company, and the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill has had ample opportunities to endeavour to make a change. It must be clear that the similarity of the names of the two companies must in the usual course of business, particularly in connection with the correspondence which may be addressed to either company, cause considerable confusion and trouble. In this country, as in every country where names are copyrighted, a great deal of care is exercised by the Department of Agriculture to prevent a similarity of names. When this Bill was first before the committee, this was made a ground of very strong complaint on the part of the British American Bank Note Company. Therefore, I submit to the House that the Bill should for the present be withdrawn, and some arrangement should be made to change the name of this company when incorporated by this Canadian Parliament. I believe there is also a great deal of objection to granting this company the same rights and privileges that are accorded to the American company in the United States. It has not been made known to the House, nor to the committee, I believe, who the incorporators of this company are. It is a broad principle generally established in this country that the names of the incorporators of joint stock companies should be submitted to Parliament, and I deferentially submit that this is not a case in which an exception to that rule should be allowed. There is in the Bill this very sweeping clause, that the company shall be entitled to all the powers, privileges and rights as a corporation necessary to the carrying on of their general business in the city of Ottawa. Now, I submit that there is not before the House to-day anything to show what the rights, powers and privileges are which are enjoyed by the American Bank Note Company in the United States, and which will be extended to the company in carrying on their business in this country, if this Act of incorporation is granted to them. It is further provided that all the privileges and rights which this company has in the United States shall be recognized and confirmed

by the Parliament of Canada. I have heard the objection taken—and to my mind there is a great deal in it—that this company should not seek incorporation in this Parliament, but that, owing to the nature of their business, which is of a mercantile kind, they should have sought the ordinary incorporation afforded in the different provinces. As to the general question which has been discussed in this House, why this company has been brought to do business in this country, before I resume my seat I wish to enter my protest against all that has been done in the premises. From the very large amount of correspondence that has been printed and laid before the House, it is clear to my mind that rights and privileges of a very large and sweeping nature have been accorded to this company. In view of the fact that the Canadian company, which had for a great many years enjoyed the privilege of doing the business which is now sought to be done by this company, and were willing to carry out the terms of the contract for which the Government asked tenders, the first chance should have been given to that company, which had been doing business for so many years to the satisfaction of the country, and to the great credit of that company. I believe that in the ordinary routine of life every opportunity should be given to men who deal fairly and squarely; and the Government should stretch a point to renew contracts with companies who have endeavoured honestly to carry them out. I know that in the Post Office Department, it has been the custom in past years—and I have no doubt that after a time we shall have a return to it—where persons have had contracts for carrying the mails for the short term of four years, after there had been fair competition and tendering, to grant a renewal of such contracts. Though I know that the present Postmaster General has seen fit to cancel some contracts of that nature, which should have been renewed, still I believe that before his tenure of office ceases, so great will be the pressure of party friends or so strong will be his own sense of fairness, that he will come to see that it is not altogether wrong to grant renewals of such contracts. Applying that principle to the present case, what do we find? We find that this British American Bank Note Company, after having established premises at great expense in the city of Montreal, erected at the request of the then Administration, very extensive premises in the city of Ottawa for the carrying on of this very business of printing the notes of the Dominion and the revenue and postal stamps. In this connection, I would ask the Postmaster General if the Jubilee stamps, which I understand have been printed, have been printed in Canada under the contract, or have they been printed in the United States?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). They are being printed at this

moment. Every one of them will be printed in the city of Ottawa. I have seen them in the process of printing, and the hon. gentleman can see them himself in the process of printing down on Wellington street.

Mr. BENNETT. As to the preliminary work in engraving, is that to be done in Canada or the United States?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I asked the contractor how many days of one man's time was represented by the preparation of the plates and engraving. I forget now the exact number of days he told me, but it was most trifling. I think he said it represented altogether two or three weeks of one man's time. That is the total work done outside Canada. He said also that instead of this agreement causing loss to Canada, it would cause the transfer of a great deal of work to Ottawa which is now done in the United States. He said that his company had a very large custom in Canada in printing bank notes for the banks of Canada, all of which work will now be transferred to Ottawa and done in Ottawa instead of being done as heretofore in the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know whether the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has introduced that plea as a slight advertisement for the new company, but I do trust, for the benefit of the Canadian company, that they may be still afforded by private parties in this country the same fair measure of support and patronage that has been hitherto extended to them, despite the vigorous advertising which the American company is getting at the hands of the present Administration. I do submit that when the late Government asked the Burland Lithographic Company to establish their premises in the city of Ottawa, the object was not to enable them to conduct the business of a mercantile nature solely, but it was rather to have the business of the Government done under the very eyes of the Administration, and when we consider the very serious nature of the business, the publishing of the bank notes of the Dominion and its postage stamps, it must be plain to every one that it is highly important that this work should be done in the city of Ottawa. Of course, under the present circumstances, there can be no complaint on that score, as the American company propose to carry on their business in this city, but I do say that the past Administration having made it a condition precedent of their contract with the Burland Lithographic Company that the business of that company should be carried on in Ottawa, and that company having gone to very great expense erecting a handsome edifice in this city, decided preference should have been given them. True, the hon. Minister of Finance justified his refusal to grant to the Burland Lithographic Company the con-

Mr. MULOCK.

tract on the same figures as the offer of the American company, on the ground that when two persons have made their offer, it was not a business-like proceeding to make known the lower offer to the higher tenderer, and then give him the preference at the lower figures. What I have to say in reply is that the main object of the Government was to secure the tender at the lowest possible figures; and that could have been done by giving the contract to the Burland Lithographic Company, because they had offered to take the contract on exactly the same terms as the other company.

The hon. Finance Minister also spoke of the Burland Company as having apparently considered themselves a monopoly. In reply to that, I may say that it is evident by the papers before the House that the late Administration did not at all regard the Burland Lithographing Company in that light, because when application was made for a renewal of the contract sometime before its expiry, the late Finance Minister refused point-blank to renew it, but told the company they would have to wait for the expiry of their contract. That does not evince any very deep interest in the Burland Lithographing Company by the Finance Minister of the late Government.

Although this Government had received a most polite invitation to visit the premises of the Burland Company, if I mistake not the discussion which took place a few days ago, the hon. Minister of Finance refused to in any way countenance the invitation which Mr. Burland had extended to him. The business was of a large nature, a large amount of money had been invested in the enterprise, and I think if the Minister of Finance had shown much interest in what was a large Canadian industry, he would at least have visited the premises and seen if it was not possible for him to come to some terms with the Burland people, instead of treating them in the cavalier way he did. I believe that fair-play would have been dealt out had the Burland Lithographing Company had the same privilege extended to them as was extended to the American company, namely, of taking the work at the same figures. There would have been nothing detrimental to the interests of the country if that had been done, and better faith would have been kept with the Burland Company.

I trust that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill will, before he presses it to a final reading, have the name of the company changed, so as to prevent the possibility of a conflict between the two companies in point of name in the carrying on of their general business. I trust furthermore, that the clause which confers upon this company very large rights, which gives them not only the right to carry on their business in this country, but confirms all the rights and privileges given them under

their American charter, will not become law, but that the Bill will be relegated to the proper forum for decision, which is the provincial government, where the company could be incorporated for the purpose of carrying on their general business in the country.

Motion agreed; and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate La Mutuelle Générale Canadienne.—(Mr. Madore.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 53) to revive and further amend the Acts respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change the name of the company to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. Laugelier.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

122. Books, viz.:—Novels or works of fictions, or literature of a similar character, unbound or paper-bound, including freight rates for railways and telegraph rates, bound in book or pamphlet form, but not to include Christmas annuals or publications commonly known as juvenile and toy books, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. With regard to this item, I would ask the Finance Minister if he would be kind enough to allow it and the next item to remain over until Tuesday, as I am obliged to leave for Toronto by train in a few minutes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is any special reason why my hon. friend wishes this item held over, I would like him to mention it. I understood he was

particularly interested in the copyright question, but that does not come up under this item.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I was prepared to say something on copyright in connection with this item, as well as on the tariff as it relates to books. I understand the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) also desires to speak on this item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had a conversation with the hon. member for York with regard to the business of this evening, and agreed to hold over several items, but this is not one of them. Of course I would like to accommodate any hon. gentleman who desires an item left over; but unless there be some particular reason for it, I think the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity at a later stage to present his views.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that my hon. friend is anxious to deal with this item apart from the copyright question. I do not think that any time will be lost by holding this item over until Tuesday.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But the hon. gentleman might as well state what he wants to do. Has he any objection to the change proposed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand my hon. friend is anxious to leave.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a full hour, and if it is likely to be a protracted discussion, we can adjourn it. But it is probable that a few minutes' discussion would settle it.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I desire in connection with this item, No. 122, to call the attention of the House to a subject that is very important to the people whether as book readers or as book makers. The industry of paper making, of printing, and of bookbinding is one that should not be prejudiced by tariff enactments. The earnings of thousands of bread-winners, men and women, boys and girls, should not be allowed to remain in jeopardy when there is an easy way out. Injustice has darkened the Canadian printing trade for the last fifty years of this century, and it is high time that its wrongs should be righted and its rugged pathway brightened by a measure of fair-play. Copyright is a question that ordinary men shrink from discussing. They hesitate to grapple with a question that has been threshed out letter by letter in former Parliaments. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Edgar) who presides over the deliberations of this House has perhaps more than any man in Canada helped to clear the mind of Parliament on this subject. The truth is that there is no intricate problem involved in connection with the discussion of the copyright question. The trouble is that hon. members when spoken to concern-

ing copyright think it but a matter of minor moment or of no importance. They think that only a handful of paper makers, printers and publishers in Toronto and Montreal are concerned. They are not aware that legislation on copyright affects hundreds of manufacturers and thousands of operatives. I am speaking of this subject as it affects the paper maker, the typesetter, the electrotyper, the pressman, the bookbinder, and finally, the publisher. Numerically, thousands of mechanics are affected by this legislation on copyright. Financially, the amount involved in the different manufactures used in connection with book publishing and in wages paid reaches the million dollar mark. A knowledge of these facts impels me to stand up in this House of Commons to-night and ask that the Liberal party, some of whose leaders, when in Opposition, aided the Canadian printer, will not, now that the Liberals are in power, desert the Canadian printer in his fight for common justice. I am not going to inflict on this House a long talk on copyright. I would be the last man to waste the time of Parliament in sowing the seeds of a discussion that would be without result; but the position of the printer and publisher is a serious one, and it is absolutely necessary it should be considered before this tariff becomes law. In a few brief sentences let me give this House an outline of the question. Copyright is the right to exclusive publication on certain conditions for a number of years, of books and other publications. In Canada the number of years is forty-two. In 1842 the Imperial Government or rather the Parliament of Great Britain passed a Copyright Act, known as the Copyright Act of 1842. By this Act the British dominions were covered; British copyright books alone could be sold and the importation or sale of foreign reprints of British copyright books were forbidden either in Britain or any of its colonies. From 1843 to 1847 the Canadian legislature protested and objected most vigorously to the exclusion of those reprints, for the Canadian publishers were few and far between and British books were expensive. The authorities at Westminster or rather at Downing Street, seeing the necessity for action, in 1847 amended the Act of 1842 and allowed the importation of foreign reprints on payment of a 12½ per cent royalty duty, to be paid to the British copyright owner. This was collected in Canada from 1847 to 1895. By the British North America Act of 1867 the subject of copyright was entrusted to the Canadian Parliament, as was everything else in connection with the Government of this country. We can legislate with intelligence on all other subjects, but when it comes to copyright the Governor General has standing orders to refuse his assent to all copyright Acts without special permission from Downing Street. In 1872 Canada

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

passed a Copyright Act. It would have given us full control of copyright, but this Act was reserved and the royal assent was refused. The essence of this Act was publication by license. The Canadian publishers thought that if the American publishers could supply the Canadian market by paying a 12½ per cent royalty duty, the Canadian printer was entitled to the same privilege. In 1874 the Canadian Parliament in an Address unanimously asked the royal assent to the Act of 1872. But Lord Carnarvon said: No, your Act overrides the Imperial Act of 1842, and I will not allow legislation that affects the British author. In 1875 the Canadian Parliament eliminated the objectionable clause, which was the license clause, and passed the Act of 1872, which of course still continued to give the American publishers and printers the Canadian market. This is the Act of to-day. In 1888 the Canadian Copyright Association was formed, and as a result of its efforts, the defects in the Act of 1875 were remedied, and a Copyright Act was passed; but the Governor General stayed his hand, and the royal assent was withheld. Sir John S. D. Thompson was truly the friend of the Canadian mechanic and the Canadian publisher. He thoroughly understood the question of copyright. He saw the difficulty of the position, but always maintained, yes, up to the very day of his death, that the Canadian Parliament had a perfect right to pass a Copyright Act for the Dominion. The official record shows the position he took, and he emphasized his action by, in July, 1895, directing that the royalty duty of 12½ per cent paid to British authors should no longer be collected at the custom-houses. I need hardly state since 1895 this duty has not been collected. This action carries us back to the Imperial Act of 1842 and places us under that Act. Under the Act of 1842 the importation of foreign reprints is strictly prohibited, so that such importations are to-day illegal, and importers are liable to the penalty. The Canada Copyright Association, representing the paper makers, and the printers, the bookbinders and publishers, urged further action by the Government. In September of 1895, Mr. Hall Caine, representing the Incorporated Society of British Authors, met the Copyright Association in Toronto, and at a conference they had a very frank and ample exchange of views on both sides of the question. An agreement was entered into as a basis of legislation, and a draft Act was prepared for submission to the Government. In December of 1895, in the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, a conference was held between Mr. Hall Caine representing the incorporated authors, Mr. Dady, representing the publishing interests in England, the Canadian Copyright Association and the Government. The Hon. Mr. Ouimet, the acting Minister of Agriculture, presided. This draft

Act was submitted, discussed, and adopted, as a suggestion for future legislation by the Government. In a word—now I ask hon. members to mark this, it provided that if the British copyright holder declined to issue an edition of his work in Canada, then the Canadian publisher, under a special license and by the payment of 10 per cent on the retail price of the book, could publish that British copyright book in this country. The details were agreed to by all parties, and here we are face to face with the tariff of to-day. Having refused any longer to collect the 12½ per cent royalty as provided by the Imperial Act of 1847, the Government may be compelled to replace this order on the custom-house books, and direct that the 12½ per cent shall continue to be collected. Something must be done, however, to show the book trade of Canada exactly where they stand, because to-day, the book trade may be pounced upon and fined for the violation of the Imperial Act of 1842. The Canadian importer brings these foreign reprints into the country, under the impression that when the Government collects in the ordinary way the ad valorem duty, this importation is legalized. Such of course is not the case. Personally, I think that the course the Government has pursued in this matter, is the only course it could have taken. There is just this point, that I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance and Controller of Customs to: that in 1847 when the Imperial Government passed the Royalty Duty Act, the British author was not protected in the United States, to-day the British author is protected in the United States. I certainly do not think the British Government will do anything to interfere with the privilege that the British author has of obtaining copyright in the United States. The natural sequence, however, of this tariff legislation is, a new Copyright Act for Canada. The Government has the Hall Caine Act of 1895, and it has the Act prepared by Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, and assented to, I understand, by the Colonial Office. In referring to that Act, let me say, that there is no one who is better up on the subject of copyright than the present Deputy Minister of Justice. I understand that he has also a third Act, so that there is every opportunity for the introduction of proper legislation that would meet the case. Any of these three Acts would be acceptable and would give relief. The Canadian reader would certainly be satisfied. He would get his books as cheap, and in some cases more cheaply than he does at present, and the Canadian mechanic, the paper maker, the typesetter, the electrotyper, the pressman, the bookbinder, the Canadian publisher, and all connected with the production of books would receive an enormous amount of work that is denied them to-day. I hope that the Government will not only take this matter

into their serious consideration, but that at the earliest possible moment, they will prepare for next session, an Act that will right the wrong which the Canadian mechanic and the Canadian publisher have laboured under for the last fifty years.

Now, with regard to this particular item in the tariff. The new tariff is 20 per cent, and 10 per cent ad valorem, which is to replace the old tariff of 6 cents per pound. Under the old tariff of 6 cents per pound a paper novel, weighing, we will say, one pound, would pay a duty of 6 cents. The book would cost 10 cents, so that the duty would be 60 per cent. Under the new tariff of course, the duty on such a book would be 2 cents or 20 per cent, and if these books come from England there would be a further reduction, under the preferential clause, making the duty on such a book 15 per cent. Take a bound book that will weigh, say one and a quarter pounds—I allow one quarter of a pound for the cover. The cost of the book would be \$1, and the duty might vary from 7½ to 10 cents. Under the new tariff the duty will be 10 per cent ad valorem, and under the preferential tariff in two years later, it will be 7½ per cent. I do not think myself that a duty of so much per pound is the proper form of tariff for literature. I do not think that literature should be charged so much avoirdupois; we should not look on it as ordinary commodities such as tea, tobacco and sugar. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs now, which of these two items, No. 122, or 123 refers to books in printed sheet form? I have been reading the two clauses, one having a duty of 20 per cent and the other a duty of 10 per cent, and I do not see any reference to sheets.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am inclined to think that the 20 per cent would include books in sheets. They would be regarded as unbound books and would come in under that. The point has not previously been brought to my attention, but at first view I think the sheets would come in at 20 per cent.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I am very glad to hear the Finance Minister make that statement, because I understand that the ruling already given in the Toronto custom-house has been, that they come in under the 10 per cent tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the matter has already been ruled upon, I would not care to set my opinion against the ruling, but I promise the matter will be inquired into. My hon. friend the Controller (Mr. Paterson) will, I am sure, give it his early attention.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The old duty on sheets was 6 cents per pound, or about 25 per cent ad valorem. The new duty—I am speaking as if 10 per cent were the duty—would be 10 per cent ad valorem, and

under the preferential clause it would be 7½ per cent. If the hon. Minister states that sheets are under the 20 per cent duty, then they come under the same tariff as the cheap paper, bound books.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is any doubt about it, we might make that item read "books, unbound, or parts thereof," which, I think, would carry out the hon. gentleman's idea.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I am not now speaking with any idea of putting the Minister in a corner; but this is a matter which has been the cause of considerable discussion among the trade in Toronto and in the Copyright Association, and I desire to know exactly where we stand. We pay a duty of 25 per cent on white paper, and print our books in Canada, but under the present tariff, we could buy the same paper in Holyoke, get our books printed in Boston, and bring them in under the 10 per cent rate. The hon. gentleman will see the inconsistency of the position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will undertake to have the item so read that there will be no doubt on that point, that the books or parts of books shall be included in the 20 per cent rate.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. That is all I have to say on that paragraph. But I suppose the Finance Minister will indicate whether this copyright matter will occupy the attention of the Government during recess, so that the long and weary discussion of the past ten years shall be ended, so that the Canadian printer and publisher may secure at least some of the rights he is entitled to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has rightly said that this is one of the most difficult and complicated questions that have come before Parliament. Indeed, there are few members, I imagine, on either side who have given it very close attention. The Government have had it under consideration recently, and I am inclined to think that it is one of the subjects which will receive attention during the visit of the Prime Minister to England. Without giving positive assurance, I hope and expect that before the next meeting of Parliament we may have a clear understanding in the direction the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I am advised that no objection has been raised by the Colonial Office. The Act on the lines assented to by Mr. Hall Caine and Mr. Daldy is in the Department of Justice, and all that we are waiting for now is that it be put in proper form and placed before Parliament. I would like to ask the hon. Controller of Customs what will be the position of the book trade to-day in reference to importations. Foreign reprints are allowed to be imported without the payment of 12½ per cent

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

royalty. Of course, that is a violation of the Act of 1842. I think the position taken by the Government is the correct one. It is unfair on the part of the Home Government to expect us to collect the royalty of 12½ per cent on American reprints, while they refuse to allow our Canadian publishers to print the book in Canada on the payment of a similar royalty, but the importers in this country are under the impression that when the Government collect the ad valorem duty, the importation is legalized.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not collect the 12½ per cent for the benefit of the author, as in former times; we simply collect it for the benefit of the Canadian treasury; and if that impression exists in the mind of the Canadian importer, perhaps this discussion will remove it from his mind. We simply leave the copyright question where it is at present, until we can look more fully into it. In the meantime, if the importers subject themselves to penalties, they will be penalties under the Imperial Act, and, while it is open to others to impose the penalties, we do not make the Customs Department the instrument of imposing them. The matter still remains in the position in which we found it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think you go further than that. By collecting a duty on the importation of an article into the country, you legalize the importation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think we exactly legalize it. We preclude ourselves from prosecuting for violation of the Copyright Act, but I fancy it is open to others to prosecute.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The Finance Minister has just stated that the Government collected the 12½ per cent royalty for the benefit of the Canadian treasury. He must refer to the 20 per cent, not to the 12½ per cent royalty duty for the collection of that has been suspended since 1895.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not collect the 12½ per cent; we leave it where it was.

Mr. POWELL. I do not know what is meant by "novels or works of a similar character," if it has any meaning at all. I suppose that would include works of poetry and Æsop's Fables. The amendment would simply apply to novels. I understand you want to apply it to all books of a similar character to novels. It cannot refer to historical or scientific works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In nine cases out of ten, books of that character will be bound.

Mr. POWELL. I will mention a case which is not met by the tariff at all. Law reports come in unbound in monthly instalments. What duty are they going to bear?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not suppose a law report would be regarded as a work of fiction.

**Mr. POWELL**. The Minister of Finance is simply establishing the point I am making. These reports are neither works of fiction nor works of a similar character. Where do they come in under the tariff?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. At 10 per cent.

**Mr. ELLIS**. I think the 10 per cent rate should apply to books of a high character, which are sometimes imported in sheets. But the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) only applies to the poorer class of books.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is all it was intended to apply to.

**Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON**. Do I understand that a customs appraiser will decide as to whether these books in parts will come in under the 20 per cent or the 10 per cent duty?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Every question has to be decided for the moment by a customs appraiser, but these things will be reported at Ottawa, and after a little while there will be such rulings as will remove all doubt. At the beginning, the customs appraiser will have to exercise his best intelligence.

**Mr. POWELL**. Take the Franklin Square Library, which publishes, in the main, works of science, history and philosophy but which also publishes a few works of fiction. The Franklin Square Library books would not come in under section 22, because they are not works of fiction or literature of that character, but still they are unbound. Where do they come in?

**Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON**. I would just call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to this point. There can be no doubt that the proper duty for this class is 20 per cent ad valorem. They are paper covered books, and the importation of the class of literature, such as law reports and works in parts, is so small that it is not a drop in the bucket as compared with the entire importation, and it would be better, to say at once paper-covered books shall come in under 20 per cent. As the hon. member for Westmoreland said with regard to the Franklin Square Library. That and all libraries, whether they publish works of science or fiction or not, should come in under the 20 per cent tariff. The safer way would be to bring them all in at 20 per cent.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** moved in amendment that after the word "pamphlets" the following words be added: "or parts thereof."

**Mr. MARTIN**. Before this item is carried, I wish to point out that the duty on this class of books is altogether too low, and I consider the committee are greatly indebted to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) for bringing this matter so prominently before the House. This country has been flooded with novels of a not very high character from the country to the south of us. We find that the American newspapers offer books of this class as prizes to their subscribers, and the result is we are flooded with a cheap worthless class of American newspapers and novels. I would like very much to see the duty on those trashy novels increased at least to the old rate, more especially because the American newspapers are offering such books as gifts to promote subscription. I think if we were to go back to the old duty of 6 cents a pound, we would be doing a very good thing.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

123. Advertising and printed matter, viz.:—Advertising pamphlets, advertising pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals; illustrated price books, catalogues and price lists; advertising almanacs and calendars; patent medicine or other advertising circulars, fly sheets or pamphlets; cigar box labels; advertising chromos, chromotypes, oleographs or like work produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, and having any advertisement or advertising matter printed, lithographed or stamped thereon, or attached thereto, including advertising bills, folders and posters, or other similar artistic work, lithographed, printed or stamped on paper or cardboard for business or advertising purposes, n.o.p., fifteen cents per pound.

Labels for fruits, vegetables, meats, fish, confectionery or other goods or wares; shipping, price or other tags, tickets or labels; and railroad or other tickets, whether lithographed or printed, or partly printed, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS** moved that the words "labels for cigar boxes" be struck out of the first clause, and that at the beginning of the last clause the words "labels for cigar boxes" be added.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. WALLACE**. I think the Government might explain to us why they have changed this rate since the introduction of their first tariff. Under the resolution first presented these goods were dutiable at 35 per cent. The ad valorem duty is done away with now, and that very obnoxious thing, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, a specific duty is imposed. Why was the change made?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It was represented to us that a considerable portion of this printed matter that comes in has commercial value and it is difficult to fix a value for an ad valorem duty. For instance, patent medicine manufacturers in

the United States send in medicines and send also printed matter, which printed matter has no commercial value—it is to be distributed free. This printed matter is invoiced at very low figures, and the ordinary ad valorem duty would fail to collect any considerable amount upon it. Believing that to be a fair representation we decided to put a specific duty upon this class, and upon the other, the value of which can be more readily arrived at, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Photographs, chromos, chromotypes, artotypes, oleographs, paintings, drawings, pictures, engravings, or prints or proofs therefrom, and similar works of art, n.o.p. ; blue prints, building plans, maps and charts, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ERB. Before that item is passed, I desire to ask for a little information. It will be observed that in this item appear the letters signifying "not otherwise provided." Now in looking through the tariff, I find among the articles on the free list "paintings, in oil or water colours by artists of well known merit, &c." On looking through the old tariff, of 1894, I find that these were on the free list then also. I would like to know why the present Government has not seen fit to make these paintings dutiable. We know that our tariff is supposed to be for the purpose of collecting a revenue, in the first place, and, in the second place, of providing for whatever incidental protection it may afford. We also know that our tariff is supposed to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessities of life, and we have the right to infer, I think, that such articles as are not necessities of life, should be taxed. I do not think that oil paintings and works of that kind are anything but luxuries pure and simple. They are purchased only by the wealthier classes, and I fail to see why we should not legislate in such a way as to compel those who import them to contribute their fair share to the revenue. Some claim that pictures of this kind have a refining influence, that people admire them and get a great deal of satisfaction and comfort in looking at them. I will admit that. But we also know that there are some people who get a great deal of comfort, a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction out of a pipe and a plug of tobacco ; yet we do not for this reason put these things on the free list. Then there is this inconsistency : The man who is wealthy and able to buy a handsome picture hangs it in his drawing room where he and a few intimate friends can see it. He gets it free. But the poorer man who wishes to improve the external appearance of his home, who wishes to beautify his lawn or his grounds or yard by planting ornamental trees or shrubs, has to pay a duty upon those trees or shrubs. On looking through the tariff I find that ornamental trees or shrubs—which are planted outside where everybody

Mr. FIELDING.

who passes by can see them and enjoy looking at them—are taxed 20 per cent. The Trade and Navigations Returns show that the imports of that class of trees and shrubs last year amounted to \$29,412, the duty collected upon which amounted to \$5,882. Oil paintings were imported to the value of \$213,810, on which there was no duty collected. I claim that for the sake of consistency and to increase our revenue—and we know that we need the money—these works should be taxed. I hope that the Government will see their way clear to make an amendment providing that all paintings shall be taxed at least to the same extent as pictures of a cheaper kind. Of course some will say that it is difficult to place a value on an oil painting. I think that difficulty can be overcome to a large extent. I do not see why the case should present greater difficulties than that of other classes of pictures.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The principle upon which paintings of a high class are admitted free is pretty well known. They are regarded as works of an educational character. A man who imports a good painting, even though he be a wealthy man, does not, as a rule, import it for his own gratification alone ; he wants to exhibit it, and the influence of it on the community is often widespread. That, at all events, is the theory. The importation of these works has been regarded as an encouragement to refinement and education in the community ; and I think that, on the whole, the reasons in favour of placing these works on the free list are good. Even across the border, in the United States, with all their high protective tariff, they admit paintings of this class free of duty.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) his opinion upon this matter. I heard him making an excellent disquisition in a by-election campaign. I am quite sure that he shares the sentiments of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Erb). The Ministers must be in agreement. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Finance has changed his mind or whether the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has changed his. It is important that we should have that made clear at this time.

Mr. ERB. In reply to what has been said by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I would like to say that it is an easy matter to make a provision, the same as we find made under other tariff items, that when these pictures are imported for educational purposes they should be allowed to come in free. Works of art that are imported for the use of schools of art should be allowed to come in free, but when these works are imported by private individuals for the purpose of hanging them up in their own houses, I claim that they should be taxed ; and that a tariff that makes no pro-

vision for such a thing is not a consistent tariff.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say that I support the views of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Erb). I think there are also a number of other items besides paintings that should bear a higher duty.

143. All medicinal, chemical and pharmaceutical preparations, when compounded of more than one substance, including patent and proprietary preparations, tinctures, pills, powders, troches, lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniment, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences and oils, n.o.p.; provided that drugs, pill-mass and preparations, not including pills or medicinal plasters, recognized by the British or the United States Pharmacopœia of the French Codex as official, shall not be held to be covered by this item; all liquids, containing alcohol, fifty per cent ad valorem; and all others, liquid or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a very large increase in that item; it is from 35 and 25 per cent to 50 and 25 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the old tariff the duty on liquid medicines was 50 per cent and 25 per cent on what I may call dry medicines. In introducing our tariff at first we made the 50 per cent rate 35 per cent. We have since, however, on reconsideration, come to the conclusion that the proper line of division is, whether spirits have been used in these medicines. Therefore, we provide that in the case of medicines which are in part made of spirits, the duty shall be 50 per cent; all other liquid medicines and all dry medicines, 25 per cent. The line of division is the use or the non-use of spirits, which I think the hon. gentleman will say is a reasonable line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a still greater recommendation that it is nearer the tariff we had before.

148. Articles, viz.: Antiseptic surgical dressings, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings, plain or medicated; surgical belts and trusses, electric belts, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Surgical and dental instruments, and surgical needles, (not being furniture) ten per cent ad valorem,—until 1st January, 1898, and thereafter to be free.

Mr. ROGERS. I cannot see on what grounds surgical instruments are to be put on the free list after January, 1898. These professions are pretty close corporations, and they can charge what rates they like for any services that they perform, and we have no way to help ourselves. I think these gentlemen can well afford to pay their share of revenue by paying a duty on these instruments. I know that the general feeling in the country is that they should be made to pay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there is a reason for putting them on the free list that my hon. friend has overlooked, and that is that this is a relief to a profession who do more work without remuneration than any other profession.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. gentleman is no doubt quite right that they render a good deal of service to the poor without pay, but those who are able to pay they charge pretty well for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) will see, on reflection, that this concession is really in the interests of the poor. To the average town physician with a comfortable practice, the question of duty upon his kit of instruments is not a matter of consequence; but to the young physician beginning in a country where he does not get much pay, but has to do a great deal of work at low rates or no rates at all, I think it is desirable that we should place it in his power to obtain an outfit of instruments at the lowest possible cost. In doing so you are not only conferring a benefit upon him, but you are better fitting him to benefit others.

Mr. BRITTON. There is another thing the hon. member for Frontenac has overlooked. This is a day of hospital extension, and in every place of any considerable population they are establishing a well-equipped hospital, and in order to equip it they are getting the very best instruments that can be obtained. It is desirable that every facility should be given to these institutions as well as to the new beginner, to procure the best instruments that are made.

160. Putty, of all kinds, n.e.s., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have made a change in the duty on linseed oil, which will necessitate a change on putty. I propose that the duty on putty be raised from 15 per cent to 20 per cent, which will retain the same proportion between putty and linseed oil as in the old tariff.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

168. Oils, coal and kerosene distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum, and products of petroleum, n.e.s., five cents per gallon.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move that this article be placed on the free list, for the reasons which I stated in the speech I delivered on the tariff.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is lost, and the item is carried.

Mr. DAVIN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is proceeding very rapidly. You have declared the amendment lost, and I think that now discussion is in order on the item itself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the proper way to put such a motion is to take the vote on the item itself, because this is not properly an amendment. The practice which is followed in England, and which has been followed here, so far as I understand it, is that the item itself shall be put.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman moved his motion so curtly that I had not an opportunity to speak to it.

Mr. ELLIS. I intended to offer a resolution, but I will do so on Concurrence. I will then move that the duty be reduced to 3 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Chairman is willing, I think it would be better to allow the hon. gentlemen to make their speeches now.

Mr. ELLIS. I regret very much that the Finance Minister was not able to reduce the duty on this article to a lower rate than that embodied in the tariff. The reduction of 1 cent per gallon on coal oil, which is an article very largely used, is not sufficient, as the present duty is felt to be a severe burden throughout the country, and there is a very strong feeling against the duty now imposed. Wherever the Ministers went throughout the lower provinces they found a general expression of opinion against the high duty on coal oil. Taking the maritime provinces, I find that New Brunswick imports 1,440,000 gallons, for which they pay \$120,000, and on which there is a duty paid of \$80,000. In Nova Scotia there is also a very large importation of American oil. I will not trouble the committee by giving the figures, for they are contained in the blue-books. In order to give the committee an idea of the way in which the duty operates, I may say that at Calais, on the American side of the St. Croix River, the price of American oil is 12½ cents per Imperial gallon by the barrel; at St. Stephen, on the Canadian side, the price is 19½ cents by the barrel, or 7 cents higher on the Canadian side than on the American side of the river, which is very little wider than the Rideau Canal, and there is an increasing rate the further you go from the American line. There is no reason why the people of the maritime provinces should pay such a high tax on this article, and therefore I move that the duty be reduced 3 cents a gallon.

Mr. ROGERS. I second the motion, although our farmers feel that coal oil should be free. As I have said, however, we want to proceed gradually and be reasonable, and we will therefore be satisfied for the time with a reduction to 3 cents. That is a reasonable and fair proposition, and there is no reason why the coal oil industry should be seriously injured by that reduction. I hope the Finance Minister will see his way to make this reduction.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. TALBOT. As a representative from the province of Quebec, I find myself in duty bound to be in favour of the motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). I am consequently in favour of the reduction of the duty to 3 cents.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I shall be forced to come to the support of the Government on this occasion. The object of some hon. gentlemen opposite would not be obtained by the passage of the motion before the Chair. Every hon. gentleman who has taken the trouble to investigate the subject must come to the conclusion that the reduction of the duty on coal oil to 3 cents a gallon would completely wipe out that Canadian industry. A large amount of capital has been invested in that industry, and my impression is that instead of consulting the interest of the people in the maritime provinces or any where else, by extinguishing the Canadian industry, all that would be accomplished would be to destroy that industry which employs a great deal of Canadian labour, and in which a large amount of capital is invested, and to replace it by the building up of a gigantic monopoly in a foreign country. I believe further, that after having extinguished this Canadian industry, you would find that the price of coal oil would be higher than it is at the present time under this moderate duty proposed by the Government. If I thought it were possible to render a great service to the people, I would be quite ready to support the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis), but I believe that the adoption of the motion would have a result the very reverse of that which is aimed at, because I am of opinion that the United States monopoly would increase the price of coal oil to the consumer of Canada the moment you wipe out the Canadian oil producers.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). As I have given considerable attention to the coal oil industry during the last two years, and have made several speeches upon that question, I want to put myself right before the amendment is submitted to the House. After considering the question as closely as I possibly could, I am of the opinion that to reduce the duty to 3 cents would have a very bad effect upon the industry. A few years ago when I spoke upon the question, I thought a reduction from 7 1-5th cents to 5 cents would be a very fair reduction. I would not have cared if the Government had now reduced the duty a little lower than they did, but I think that bringing it down to 3 cents would result in injuring a large industry which has been established in western Ontario. Believing that the duty fixed by my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) is too low, I will be constrained to vote in favour of the resolution of the Government. There is one thing I would like to know just here, and that is: If the Government

have made any arrangements in regard to the distribution of oil in tank cars and tank vessels? I think that is more important than if the duty were reduced 1 or 1½ cents more. I never could conceive the justice of curtailing the distribution of a commercial article such as coal oil, any more than you would curtail the distribution of dry goods or hardware. I think the oil should be allowed to be sent in such a way as to meet the demands of the consumers in every part of the country, and to place before the consumers as cheaply as possible this necessary article. If there is any protection in not sending the oil to the consumers in tank cars, then it should be put in the form of a duty which the people can see and know and understand what they are paying. I trust that the Government will see their way to allow the consumers of oil in this country to import in tank cars or tank vessels throughout the various parts of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to support the amendment. I will not delay the committee by making any elaborate argument in support of the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis), because this question has been so frequently discussed in past years, and the view taken by the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) has been so eloquently enforced by hon. gentlemen who are now enthroned in power. To use the language of the Prime Minister, they have become the gods upon Olympus and their wills are now law; they can do what they please and of course they can carry out that wish which a few years ago was dearest to their hearts, of placing this necessary of life—to use the language of my hon. friend the Postmaster General—at a lower rate of duty than that provided for in the present tariff. Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret that either through your fault or mine—I must assume out of parliamentary politeness it was my fault—that I was debarred from making an argument in favour of the motion too succinctly proposed by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). As brevity is the soul of wit, in that case brevity was the heart and soul of patriotic attachment to the interests of the farmers of Manitoba on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson). However, as the next best thing, we have the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ellis) in favour of reducing the duty on coal oil considerably. My hon. friend behind me who spoke at an earlier period of the session, showed that on grounds of public policy, and on grounds of justice to the poor man and the farmer, the duty on coal oil should be abolished. At the present time, coal oil is essentially the light of the poor man. The rich have gas and they have electric light, but on the farm they have still to burn coal oil, and I say we should place this necessary of life as cheap as possible in the hands of the poor man and the farmer. I shall therefore

support the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Before the vote is taken, I would like to ask the Controller of Customs if anything has been done to meet the wishes of the people of the west, by permitting the introduction of coal oil in tank cars. I have already stated to the House my views on this question, and I do not propose to detain hon. gentlemen by discussing it again. With us in the west, it is more a question of the method of transportation than the duty. We have no desire to injure the industry if our wishes can be met and the difficulty overcome by the mode of transportation. It is stated that the lower provinces are to have their oil carried in tank steamers, and as a matter of justice to the west, I hold that we should have the privilege of getting coal oil into our country in tank cars. If the Government can assure us that this arrangement will be carried out, we shall be satisfied without taking any stronger ground—at least as far as I am personally concerned, I shall be satisfied. I would therefore ask the members of the Government if they are prepared to satisfy us on the point that they will allow coal oil to come into our country in tank cars, and thus obviate the payment of enormously high freight rates upon it. It is out of reason that our people should be asked to pay 40 and 45 cents a gallon for coal oil. I may state this much in favour of tank cars, that we would get rid of the re-barrelling in Winnipeg, and the warehousing and reshipping, which means 5½ cents a gallon, and we would get the advantage of a through rate instead of a local rate, which means a very large amount. If the members of the Government can satisfy us that this arrangement can be carried out, I would be quite willing that the motion should be withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Government have in course of preparation a Bill dealing with that question, with the intention of removing some of the restrictions now imposed on the transportation of oil to the North-west. The precise terms of the Bill I am not in a position to state tonight, but it will certainly be in the direction the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. TAYLOR. I regret that the Government have seen fit to make a reduction of even 1 cent a gallon in the duty on coal oil if it is likely to jeopardize the Canadian industry. I am quite satisfied that if the motion now before the House should prevail, the industry in this country would be wiped out, and who would receive a benefit? The farmers, about whom my hon. friend is so anxious, would perhaps have a saving of 2 cents a gallon, which, on ten or twelve gallons, the average yearly consumption of a farmer, would amount to about 20 cents a year; and I do not think there is a farmer

in this country who, for the sake of that saving, would like to see the Canadian industry wiped out. I regret that the duty has been reduced even 1 cent, because I believe it will have the effect of allowing the Standard Oil Company to interfere with our Canadian industry. I hope my hon. friend will not secure from that side of the House enough supporters for his motion to lower the duty to 3 cents, to jeopardize the oil industry in Canada. If the importation of oil in tank cars and tank vessels is going to injure the Canadian industry, I hope the Government will stay their hand before putting such regulations into force.

Mr. FLINT. I regret very much that I do not feel at liberty to support the proposition of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis), although I am in hearty sympathy with the desire his motion indicates. At the same time, I am of opinion that those who support the Government proposition are not taking a ground inconsistent with that which they took when sitting on the other side of the House. During the closing hours of one session, I think the session of 1894, I had the honour of endeavouring, to the best of my ability to induce the Government and legislature at that time to permit the introduction of coal oil in tank cars and vessels as a fair means of relieving the people of the maritime provinces of some of the burdens which the heavy duties on coal oil imposed upon them. We were unsuccessful at that time; but I am gratified to know that the discussions which then took place, and the pressure from the public, which the Ministry have felt, have resulted in the concession which has been made in this tariff measure. Although somewhat disappointed that the Government have not felt at liberty to reduce the tariff on coal oil more than they have, yet I feel it a duty to support the Administration in the effort they are making to meet the popular wishes and feelings in the portion of the country which I have the honour to represent. We must bear in mind—as has been stated many times during the progress of the tariff discussions here—that we on this side of the House are not at liberty, in the present circumstances of trade throughout the Dominion, to legislate in an ideal way. While the debates and speeches made by ourselves when in Opposition had a freedom, looking to an ideal state of things, which they do not have when we are called upon to administer and to propose reform in the tariff laws, at the same time, I believe there is no inconsistency in the positions which were taken then and which have been taken since; because, coupled with all these single propositions, made from time to time, in which we enunciated our views as to the ideal tariff, there was always the proviso—for which we were taunted at the time, on the platform and in this House, and to which the Liberal party were faithful—that they did not desire to lend their power and

Mr. TAYLOR.

influence to the destruction of any legitimate industry in the Dominion. Here and there, there may be industries which claim to be adversely affected; but, proceeding on the lines which the Liberal party laid down in the formal statements of their position, and proceeding on the lines of all our discussions, I believe the Administration have done all that could reasonably be asked in the present circumstances, in the way of reducing the burdens on the people of the maritime provinces, and the consumers generally throughout the Dominion. We have had able speeches on this side of the House, and able correspondence on the oil question in the press from technical experts who have shown that a very large reduction such as would meet our wishes might, and probably would, very disastrously affect a large interest in one portion of this Dominion; and I for one, although heartily in favour of a much lower reduction of the tariff on coal oil, if these interests would not be so affected as to be practically destroyed, yet I believe we ought to watch carefully the practical operation of the tariff as proposed by the Government before reducing it any further; and if, after the experience of one year, it is shown that these industries can stand a still further reduction of the tariff, then I for one will heartily support a still further reduction on the lines indicated by the Government. But after careful investigation which has been made into all these questions by the Government, I do not think it would be quite fair to seriously alter the conclusions which they have reached in regard to this matter. Therefore, although sympathizing with the views of my hon. friend, yet, under all the circumstances of this case, I do not feel at liberty to support his proposition.

Mr. DAVIN. I just want to call the attention of the House and my hon. friends on the Treasury benches to their utterances on this subject. Take my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who is a most influential man in the Cabinet, and properly so, and whom we all greatly admire.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did I speak on coal oil?

Mr. DAVIN. "Did I speak on coal oil?" What a short memory my hon. friend has. As late as the 28th of May, 1895, my hon. friend said:

Now, I want briefly to show the House how the public have been fleeced in the matter of coal oil. I will not speak of the amount the Trade and Navigation Returns show was paid by the people in direct taxes. I will show from certified invoices which I hold in my hand, that the rate of taxation we pay in the maritime provinces is over 150 per cent. These invoices, which were made last October, were handed to me by the importer, and they are certified by the customs officer with the seal of the Customs Department upon them; and what do they show? Four tanks of refined oil were imported, valued at \$791, on which the

amount of duty was \$1,130.28, a duty of 150 per cent. Another invoice, two or three days afterwards, was for six tanks of refined oil, valued at \$1,077, on which the duty paid was \$1,538.70, a duty of 150 per cent. If there are gentlemen in this House who can uphold or defend the continuance of such a wrong as that, I have nothing more to say. I say it is unjust, and they know it is unjust; it is taxing the people unduly and unfairly on one of the most ordinary necessities of life.

I only wish that I could use language as eloquent, strong and expressive, but happily I am able to adopt the language of the hon. Minister of Marine. Let his language speak for me, but it has a double force because it not only represents my views, but because it comes from one who is enshrined in power now, and is one of the most influential men in the Cabinet. I ask him, therefore, not merely in the name of the maritime provinces, for which the hon. gentleman then spoke, but in the name also of the farmers of the west to carry out his views now that he is in office.

But there is in the Ministry even a more weighty man than my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. Sitting next to that hon. Minister now is not merely a man of historical position in our Canadian public life but one who is the acting Premier (Sir Richard Cartwright), and here is what he says on this very subject. And if I cannot do full justice to these eloquent words, attribute my failure to my defects of elocution:

Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessity of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operation. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community in the depth of the Canadian winter. It is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people through the other provinces. It will form a standing grievance. It is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia.

**THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I do not think that is on coal oil.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I find it was on coal. but all that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce said with regard to coal applies equally to coal oil, because if coal is a necessary of life for the poor, so is coal oil; and if high-priced coal presses especially on the poor in the depth of winter, so does high-priced coal oil. I wish I had here the utterances of the present Postmaster General. In fact I could get utterances of every member of the Government, who has been in a previous Parliament, in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from St. John. Under those circumstances, I think that if the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), who is a distinguished member of the Liberal party and has spoken eloquently in favour of the proposal, will

only press his influence on the executive, we may be able to carry his resolution.

Mr. FRASER (East Lambton). In view of the fact that my speeches have been fewer in number and of greater brevity possibly than those of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I may be pardoned, Mr. Chairman, if I ask your attention for a few moments while I attempt, in a feeble way, to give some reasons why the duty on coal oil should be retained. Hon. gentlemen who have previously expressed themselves upon this subject sought to create the impression that the consumer of petroleum is suffering great injustice at the hands of the oil men of Canada. That notion has been inculcated in the minds of the people of Canada, for the past three or four years at least by a powerful organization which has its headquarters in the city of New York. Some of my friends in the town of Petrolea, where I reside, have counselled me, time and again, to be very careful as to what I said about this organization. It is, they say, exceedingly powerful and revengeful and a very dangerous organization to attack. I do not share the fears of my friends in the town of Petrolea. I have no hesitation whatever in raising my voice against what I consider one of the most powerful monopolies of modern times. Indeed, I am confident it is the most powerful, and while I have the honour of a seat in this Parliament, I should be remiss in my duty were I to remain silent when speeches are made in this House which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would have no other result than to place the entire oil industry of Canada in the hands of the Standard Oil Company of the United States. It is also known by many other names. It is well known that it does business in Canada now under four distinct names. In Toronto, it is known as the Queen City Oil Works, and the supposed proprietor, it is known—he will not himself deny it, because he is a truthful man—is paid a large salary by the Standard Oil Company of the United States for the purpose of looking after its business in this Dominion, and he himself told me, in this very city of Ottawa, that his company proposed taking possession of the Canadian market at an early day.

I do not blame them for that, providing they do it by fair means. The oil men of Canada, if they could, would go and take possession of their market. These movements are the outcome of as old a principle as human nature itself. But I may be pardoned, if, representing as I do, to some extent at least, the oil industry of Canada, I file an objection to the methods of the Standard. I take the ground that no greater wrong could be done to the consumers of petroleum in Canada than to lower the duty on the article to the rate proposed by the

hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) viz., 3 cents per gallon and thereby place them at the mercy of a combine. That hon. gentleman, I am sure, cannot by argument sustain the position he has taken in asking the lowering of the duty to that point. It is, I am aware, a difficult matter for a member of the Liberal party to advocate high *ad valorem* duties. Indeed, many Liberals are firm believers in the principle of free trade. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am a believer in the absolute soundness of the principle of free trade myself, if we could have a universal application of it. But unfortunately for the consumers, and I believe, for the manufacturers as well, the universal application of that principle cannot be looked for during the life of the present generation.

Mr. DAVIN. Then you are a protectionist.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), to whose eloquent speeches I have listened, on more than one occasion, with some pleasure, is much more at home in the realm of fancy than he is in the realm of fact. He is much more at home upon the summit of steep Parnassus, communing with the Olympian gods, than he is in discussions upon economic questions. Why, the hon. gentleman, I am told, used to court the muses in his occidental home; he used to strike the lyre, if I may use the expression. And, Sir, I fancy I can see the gopher stealing out of his hole at sun-down and listening entranced about the city of Regina, whilst the hon. gentleman poured forth the soul-stirring strains of his music. I am not of those who believe that the buffalo was swept from the western plains by the hon. gentleman's melodious verse. No, Sir, this calamity was due to other causes entirely. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, knows nothing whatever from personal knowledge of the oil question; indeed I am sure that the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution (Mr. Ellis) knows nothing from personal knowledge of the oil industry of Canada. I respectfully invite these gentlemen or any other member of this House to visit my town of Petrolea. Every effort will be made to give him information on the subject, and, I assure him, it will be a pleasure to every person there to afford him the means of studying the question. And I am very sure that, after having visited the oil district, he will not come here and propose to reduce the duty on oil below 5 cents per gallon.

At the outset of my remarks, I stated that there had been an agitation, cultivated in this country against the continuance of the duty upon oil. Now, I hold in my hand a work entitled "Wealth against Commonwealth," one of the most noted books which has recently appeared, a book which I commend to the serious consideration of

Mr. FRASER (Lambton).

any gentleman of a literary turn of mind, such as the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I shall take the liberty of reading a short selection from this book. The author is Henry Demorest Lloyd, and the book is published by Messrs. Harper Brothers, of New York, one of the most reputable publishing houses in the world. This book is described as being an "epoch making book." It appears that in 1888 a commission was appointed by the legislature of New York to inquire into the subject of trusts and combines, and the president of the Standard Oil Company testified before that commission. In the course of his evidence, speaking of the concern of which he is the head, he said:

We are pushing into every part of the world, and have been doing so.

Then the writer goes on to say:

Their tank steamers go to all the ports of Europe and Asia, and their tank wagons are as familiarly seen in the cities of Great Britain and the continent of Europe as of America. An agitation of extensive proportions was begun in 1883 in the press of Canada—

I ask the special attention of the committee to this, Mr. Chairman.

—and in the Dominion Parliament to admit American oil at a lower duty. There was no popular demand for such a step.

I assert without fear of successful contradiction that there was no popular demand for the reduction of this duty.

No general reduction of the tariff was proposed. At that time the majority of the electors of Canada were supposed to be in favour of a highly protective policy.

The movement was simultaneous in the press of different parts of Canada. \* \* \* \* \* It was resisted with desperation by the 20,000 persons employed in the Canadian oil industries, the growth of thirty-two years—"not a rich, gay, bloated population, rioting with the plunderings of the farmers, revelling in all kinds of luxuries, making merry with their friends," says a newspaper correspondent, who visited them in December, 1892, "but a hard-working community, in which all live comfortably; few are rich." I know that the statement which I have read from this standard work is substantially correct.

The oil industry of Canada has, for many years, been in a struggling condition. If ever there was an industry in this country which may be said to have been tempest-tossed and to be still tempest-tossed, it is the oil industry. It has been fighting with its back to the wall for the last fifteen years at least, possibly longer, against the most powerful monopoly of modern times. The organization that I refer to, the Standard Oil Company of the United States, has recently purchased two refineries, one in Petrolea, the town in which I reside, and the other in the town of Sarnia in which my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) resides. And they are at the present

time, I am informed, making an expenditure of \$250,000 in enlarging the capacity of these refineries. But there is no evidence whatever, no sign whatever, that they have invested one dollar with a view to developing the natural resources of this region, or with a view to producing crude petroleum from the earth.

Their sole object apparently is, I have no hesitation in stating it, to gain possession of the Canadian market in order that they may bring here their own oil from Ohio and Pennsylvania, especially Ohio, where they have a very large field, a very large acreage at all events, and also a very large quantity of oil. Their sole object is to bring that oil into Canada in order that the consumers of petroleum in this country may contribute to the large dividends which they pay to their few shareholders. It is perhaps not generally known, but for the information of the hon. member for Assiniboia I may say, that the shareholders number possibly eight, not more; and last year they divided in dividends no less a sum than \$44,000,000. That is a sum almost beyond belief, but it is a fact nevertheless, and that vast sum is extracted from the consumers of petroleum in Canada and in the United States, in Great Britain, in Australia, in Germany, and in almost every other country in Europe; for this organization is not content with the market of the United States by any means. Now a great cry, emanating from the organization referred to, has been raised against the Canadian oil industry on the alleged ground that high prices are being exacted from the consumers. In answer to an enquiry as to the wholesale price of oil, I hold in my hand a telegram from my own town of Petrolea quoting 8½ cents per gallon for good prime white oil. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all that goes into the pockets of the manufacturer of petroleum—8½ cents. In some sections of the country, oil, I am told, is being sold as high as 50 cents retail; but I submit that all the man engaged in the petroleum industry in Canada should be called upon to answer for is the 8½ cents which he receives; the balance of it must be accounted for in some other way. It is utterly unfair and unjust—and I am sure there is no hon. gentleman in this House who has any disposition to be unfair or unjust—it is utterly unfair and unjust to hold the oil man responsible for any more money than he gets. He possibly has sins enough to answer for, and he should not be called upon to answer for the sins of others. In some remote points of the North-west I find that the carrying charges—the question of transportation comes in here—I find that the cost per gallon to carry it to some of those points, is 150 per cent more than the oil man gets for his oil, in fact in some cases nearly 200 per cent. It costs over 16½ cents to send it to some points in the North-west, and in addition to that the retail man

getting at the present time, and better than in some places gets a pretty good round profit upon refined oil. But having regard to the difficulties that the retail merchant usually has in struggling through to meet his bills as they mature, I have no disposition, neither have the oil men in Canada any disposition, to find fault with the store-keeper if he tries to get as good a profit as the market will afford. All I desire to say is that the oil man should not be called upon to account for more money than he receives, and all he receives at the present time is 8½ cents, and for several months the price has not been higher than 9½ cents per Imperial gallon.

Now, be it remembered—and I think the hon. gentleman is aware of this too—that the gallon used by Canadian oil men is a fifth larger than the gallon used by the Americans. American oil is invariably quoted at so much per wine gallon, which is one-fifth smaller than the Imperial gallon that is used in Canada.

Mr. ELLIS. In the figures I gave, I used the Imperial gallon.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). Yes, I think the hon. gentleman did. He has instituted a comparison between the price of oil on one side of the line, and the price on the other side. I take it of course that he meant that there was only an imaginary line and that the only difference was the duty, taking no account of transportation charges.

An hon. MEMBER. And the smuggling.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). The hon. gentleman suggests that they smuggle it through, but I would not like to go so far as that. I am sure if they did, the hon. member for St. John would condemn it most severely in his powerful organ, the St. John "Globe." The cost upon one side of the line is so much, and upon the other side so much; so I submit that there is no possible reason why the cost upon the Canadian side of the imaginary line should be any more than the cost upon the American side, plus the duty, assuming that there is no question of transportation. Of course if there is a charge for transportation, that must be added. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have heard hon. gentlemen state that the price on one side of the line is only 12 cents and upon the other side of the line it was 35 cents. I can see no reason for that difference. All a man on the Canadian side of the line needs to do is to take his can and walk across and get 12 cent oil, pay the 5 cent duty on it, and that would only make it 17 cents under the new tariff.

Now, an impression is sought to be created at the present time on behalf of the Standard Oil Company of the United States, that if they get entire possession of this market, the Canadian consumers will get better oil for less money than they are

getting at the present time, and better than they have been getting hitherto. I admit that the oil sent in by the organization I have referred to, is usually of a good quality.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Sometimes.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). The hon. gentleman undoubtedly has some information upon that point that I have not. He comes from a section of country where more American oil is consumed than in my vicinity. But I was saying that an impression is sought to be created that if the organization I have referred to only succeed in getting possession of the Canadian market, the Canadian consumer would be supplied with a better article at a lower rate than he is at present, and a great deal has been attempted to be made of this argument. A great deal also is made of the question of transportation and distribution—that is the string that they are harping on at the present time. Now let me say that the idea they have sought to create in the minds of some hon. gentlemen in this House, and in the minds of some men outside of the House, would, if carried into effect, result in driving the trade completely into the hands of the Standard Oil Company of the United States. They are the only organization on the continent who would be benefited by the changes that they are seeking to bring about. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that if some of the changes that are sought to be brought about were effected, especially the change that the hon. gentleman from St. John is now seeking to bring about—that is, to reduce the duty to 3 cents—I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the result would be very speedily to wipe out the entire Canadian oil industry. I desire also to say that the Canadian oil industry does not now, and never has, feared legitimate competition, but they do fear illegitimate competition, and that is the competition that they are at the present time, and have been for many years, confronted with.

Coming from a county upon every farm of which perhaps oil may be found, and from a county where most of the oil industry of Canada is located, I deem it to be my duty to trouble the House with these few remarks. I have a large mass of statistics at my command with which I do not care to trouble the committee. It is very difficult, I am sure, for hon. members to assimilate matter of this kind in such a way as to catch the salient points off hand, so I will not trouble the House with statistics. Suffice it to say that the Government, through the tariff commission, devoted much attention and consideration to this question, as I am sure they have to every other question they have dealt with, and the outcome of the investigation

Mr. FRASER (Lambton).

by that commission has been the fixing of the duty at 5 cents per gallon. Those engaged in the oil industry were strongly of the opinion that the tariff should be allowed to remain as it was formerly, but they now feel that in deference to the great cry which was raised against this industry they must submit to as large a reduction as possible and be able to exist. The present rate having been fixed by the Government, the industry will go on and flourish, or, at all events, will develop to some extent; and I am very sure that if it is allowed to go on, it will continue, as it has in the past, to give such competition to our American competitors as will result in giving to Canadian oil consumers a very much better service than they would otherwise receive, and no people have been better served during the past fifteen years—for, during that time Canadian oil refiners have made a first class article—than have the consumers of oil in Canada.

The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is very solicitous for the farmers' interest. There is method in this attitude on the part of the hon. gentleman. His microscopic majority renders it necessary that he should be solicitous for the welfare of those who have votes. He has sought to create the impression that the burden of the duty on coal oil falls on the farmers. By no process of reasoning can it be shown that the farmers consume the bulk of the oil. I have received a mass of letters from all parts of the Dominion dealing specially with the quantity of oil used by each family. Of those letters, only two give the quantity as being possibly 20 gallons per family; many of them place the quantity at eight gallons.

Mr. TAYLOR. Twelve gallons would be the average.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). Twelve gallons no doubt, in many cases, and by actual computation the average consumption per family, on the farm, ascertained in this way—and it is the only reasonable way you can ascertain it—is under fifteen gallons. Assuming that the farmer pays the entire duty of 5 cents—which he does not pay, as I can prove—and assuming that the consumption of his family is fifteen gallons, the entire cost per year would be only 75 cents. But let me lead the committee back to this point, that the competition, as regards price and quality, given to our American competitor has given the Canadian consumer a much better article and a lower price than he would otherwise have obtained.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who is a great friend of the farmers, has left the chamber.

Mr. OLIVER. I entertain only the best feelings towards the coal oil industry of Canada, as well as towards any other legitimate industry in the Dominion. I am pre-

pared to give the coal oil industry, as a legitimate industry, such share of incidental protection under a revenue tariff as may be right and reasonable and fair to all classes of the community. Under these circumstances, I am perfectly willing to concede a duty which will be in the nature of protection to the coal oil industry. It is only a question of what is a fair duty. As I stated before in this House, with the people of the Northwest it is not a question of duty so much as it is a question of transportation, I do not just now quarrel with a duty of 5 cents, 4 cents or 3 cents, but when the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) emphasizes as strongly as he does the desire of the oil refiners of Petrolea to prevent the privilege of transportation in tank cars throughout the Dominion, I certainly must protest as strongly as possible. It is the lack of that privilege, if I understand the matter aright, that makes coal oil in the Northwest so high in price; and if, as the hon. gentleman says, it is only worth 8½ cents per gallon at the point of production in any case, the hon. gentleman and the coal oil industry can have no objection to concede such reduction in the transport rates as would accrue to us from the transportation of oil in tank cars as compared with transportation in barrels. I would not have spoken except for the fact that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Fraser) made such a strong point in that regard; which I see is on a line with other influences that are at work throughout the country. This makes it desirable and necessary that the strongest protest should be made against the argument of the hon. gentleman; not that we have the slightest desire to injure the coal oil industry or take away any part of its legitimate protection, but if in any way reduction in the cost of transportation to distant points can be secured, we are entitled to that reduction. That is a fair proposition, and I take this opportunity of presenting it. The hon. gentleman conjured up the idea that some mysterious influences were at work to slaughter the industry.

An hon. MEMBER. The "Globe" said so.

Mr. OLIVER. The "Globe" does not always tell the truth, I am sorry to say. We have had experience of the "Globe" in respect to other monopolies, and I do not propose to allow its word to go in regard to the coal oil monopoly just now. It is evidently part of an organized scheme to delude the people to be content to suffer under the conditions that exist at present. I for one am not deluded by that scheme. I want fair play for the people whom I represent. I want to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, East Lambton) and the House, that, speaking for myself and for members who desire to see the cost of coal oil to the consumer reduced

as much as possible, we are not actuated by any instigation from the Standard Oil Company or from anybody else.

Mr. FRASER (East Lambton). I do not wish to be understood as intimating that any hon. gentleman in this House was instigated by the Standard Oil Company. I distinctly disavow any intention of saying that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly satisfied to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser), but the House will bear me out in saying, that his words might have borne that construction.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. OLIVER. To my mind it is absolutely necessary that this question should be settled fairly and squarely. I may say that although we do not know about the production of oil, we do know about the paying for oil, and that is the part of it that interests us. It is the price of oil that we want reduced, and it does not require any instigation from the Standard Oil Company to make a man believe that 50 cents a gallon is too much to pay for oil, and to make him take all reasonable measures to have that price reduced. There is another reason why there is a feeling against the protection that has been given the oil industry, and that is, that the oil put upon the market by the Canadian producers is not good oil. It is known from one end of this country to the other that it is an inferior quality of oil, and there is no earthly use of any gentleman here trying to contradict such a notorious fact. It is because of the high price and the inferior quality of the oil supplied by the Canadian producers, that we object to the present duty and restrictions, and it is not because of a feeling for the Standard Oil Company, or because of any other company. The plea is made here that the producer only gets 8¼ cents a gallon. If that is all they get out of it, and if they are afraid of the competition of the Standard Oil Company, then they had better wake up and do business on business principles, and not depend upon the tariff to enable them to do business upon principles that are behind the age. Not only the oil industry has been run on such principles, but almost every other manufacturing industry in the Dominion of Canada has been depending upon the tariff rather than upon business methods. Nothing better could be done, than that the Government of this country in its new tariff, should give the manufacturing industries to understand, that hereafter they must stand on their own basis, and not depend upon legislation for their profits. One hon. member tells us that only 50 cents a year will be saved to the individual farmer and another tells us that \$1 a year will be saved. I do not know whether their figures are correct or not, but whether it is 50 cents or

\$1, it is just as good in the pockets of the farmer or artisan as in the pockets of the oil producers. The farmers are at least as much entitled to it as they are, and we as the representatives of the farmers are here to protect them in saving that 50 cents or \$1, as the case may be.

Mr. GANONG. I represent a county that is very much interested in the oil duty, and it is all the more interested on account of statements that have been made over the county in regard to this question, by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as other Liberals in this House. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) talk about incidental protection in connection with oil, which to-day bears a duty of 80 per cent. If that is the class of incidental protection the present Government are giving us, they are subjecting the consumers to a pretty good dose of the incidental. During the earlier part of the session papers were distributed among the members intimating that the oil industry in Canada was capitalized at \$20,000,000. If that is the case, it represents a good many of dry holes that were bored in the western part of Ontario, and if there is \$10,000,000 actually invested, it is a pretty large investment. The member from East Lambton (Mr. Fraser) has made a statement to us in regard to the Standard Oil Company. I wonder if his oil friends are running this business just for fun, or on patriotic grounds. If this immense monopoly that makes \$44,000,000 a year is coming into this country to scoop up the oil men, there is not a man of them who would not sell out if he gets 6 or 7 per cent on his investment. To-day the duty on oil is at least 80 per cent. The old duty was entirely too high, and I am in favour of the reduction proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis). The quality of the Canadian oil, as referred to by the hon. member for Alberta, suggests the idea that we have a good many principles of protection. We have had the protection of convenience, we have had that of patriotism, and we have now the protection of poor quality. I might ask the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether he proposes to use Canadian coal oil in the lighthouses along the coast. The late Government did not do so, and it was brought out in evidence at the inquiry into the wreck of the steamer "Warwick" in the Bay of Fundy, that American coal oil was used at the Gannet Rock light-house.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The contracts were let a short time ago, and the lowest tender was from a gentleman in the Petrolea oil region. He got the contract, and is to supply oil up to a certain test.

Mr. GANONG. I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FRASER (East Lambton). And it may be well to say that that was in competition with American oil.

Mr. GANONG. I trust that the Canadian oil will be satisfactory for such use in the future, because in the past it has not been, as has been proved by the report of the inquiry into the "Warwick." I am very pleased that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has seen fit to move this amendment and I shall heartily support it.

Mr. PETTET. I wish to say for my part, I shall support the motion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). No one wants to injure this native industry, but if it cannot stand on its own basis, why does not the Government bonus it the same as they bonus the iron industry. I can see no difference between the two cases. Free binder twine and free barbed wire are of little use to the labouring classes of the country, but free coal oil would be a benefit to them. I shall therefore support the motion to reduce the duty to 3 cents.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. GANONG. I move, in amendment, that 5 cents be struck out and 4 cents be substituted therefor.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What becomes of my motion that coal oil be made free? I refrained from voting for the amendment to place the duty at 3 cents, because I understood that I moved in amendment that coal oil be placed on the free list.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must tell the hon. gentleman that his motion was not properly an amendment, and, therefore, could not be put. According to the rules, that question would come on the main motion itself.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIN. I move that the duty be 1 cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the hon. gentleman wants a seconder, I will second that.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

China and porcelain ware, also earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured, and Rockingham ware, white granite or iron stoneware, "c. c." or cream-coloured ware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ROGERS. I think the duty on cheap crockery ought to be reduced. Common stoneware, which is largely used by the poorer classes, nearly all classes from the old country, and such a heavy duty on it is a great imposition on them. I would think the duty might be left on china and porcelain ware, but on earthenware and stoneware I think it should be reduced to 15 per cent.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend will notice that that is subject to the English cut, so that there will be a reduction in the duty on the English ware.

Marble and granite, sawn only ; flagstone and all other building stone, dressed ; and paving blocks of stone, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. **ELLIS**. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he would make some statement why there is an increase in the duty on marble. I have received from some of my constituents a very strong remonstrance against the alteration which appears to have taken place in this item. I am informed that the effect of it is to increase the duty to 20 per cent where it formerly was 10 per cent, on gravestones of the cheaper kind. All the marble, I think, has to be imported into this country, and it is really a raw material.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). I beg to tell the hon. gentleman that we have splendid marble quarries in the county from which I come, and I have no doubt that has had something to do with the readjustment of the tariff. But whether it has or not, the fact remains that we have an excellent marble quarry in the county from which I come.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. Rough marble was on the free list previously, and we thought it only right that it should be placed in the same position as other stone. That necessitated somewhat of an advance. There was a distinction in the old tariff between marble sawn on two sides, and marble sawn on four sides. We put all sawn marble under the one head.

Mr. **ELLIS**. I have an entry which was made at the custom-house at St. John a couple of days ago, and the man who made it informs me that formerly the duty was 10 per cent, whereas it is now 20 per cent. It appears from the statement of the hon. member for Inverness that it has been done to protect his marble factory.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). I merely offered the opinion.

Mr. **ELLIS**. Unfortunately I come from a province in which protection on coal oil or flour, is not of the slightest benefit ; and our headstones and grindstones ought to escape duty under the circumstances.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. This is a reduction of 5 per cent from what it was a month ago.

Mr. **ELLIS**. It is 10 per cent increase on the old rate.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). The hon. gentleman said that we had no marble in this country at all, and I simply declared that we had very valuable quarries.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. On one class of marble there will be a slight in-

crease ; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the scale, he will see that it is arranged on reasonable grounds. Why granite should have been dutiable and marble free, it would be difficult to explain. We have put all rough stones at the lowest rate of duty, 15 per cent, which on most is a reduction ; on the next stage of manufacture we make the duty 20 per cent, and so on until you reach the highest duty on finished granite which is imported from Aberdeen. While on one particular class of sawn marble, there is an increase, the whole duties have been arranged systematically, and, I think, on a sound basis.

Marble and granite, n.e.s., and all manufactures of marble or granite, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. **GANONG**. Representing a county which produces a large amount of granite, I think it only just to the people I represent that I should protest against this duty. We have in our county at present five concerns working in the red granite business. It is the only red granite in the country that is of such quality that it pays to work it at all. We have unlimited quantities so that the cost of the raw material amounts to very little. The whole outlay is for labour. There are 250 to 300 employed in the business, and notwithstanding the fact that we have water power convenient to the quarries and all other facilities, our manufacturers have found it very difficult to get the trade of the Canadian market. Aberdeen granite can be imported, even under the old rate of duty, and command a large portion of Canadian trade. Last year the returns show that some \$45,000 worth of granite was sold in this country, that is including the duty, so that nearly \$45,000 worth of labour went to foreign countries which should have been given our own men. The extremely low rate of freight, of course, facilitates this. You can freight granite from Aberdeen to the western points of Canada at lower rates than our people can from our quarries. This was proved conclusively in a recent interview between the Government and a deputation with regard to the Trent Valley Canal. The mayor of Orillia said that the freight from St. George, N.B., to Orillia was more than it was from Scotland to Orillia. We are so placed down along the border that it is almost impossible to keep our own workmen from going into the industrial centres of the United States. A few hours journey will bring them into some of the large manufacturing centres of the United States, where the rates of wages are such that it is utterly impossible for us to cut down the wages of our workingmen with any expectation of keeping them in our own country. We have, therefore, to depend, to a great extent, on the protection afforded by the Government. This Scotch granite that comes in is not sold direct from Scotland but through New York houses, so that the commission comes through New

York, and the recent advance in the United States tariff will do still more to affect our workingmen, for the Scotch granite will be forced on this country at the 26¼ per cent tariff still more than it was in the old tariff, more particularly as it will be very difficult to sell it in the American market. It really looks as if this was an intimation to our men to go out of the business.

There is another feature and that is with regard to the Quincy granite. I am reliably informed by one of the largest manufacturers that the New York agents who are attempting to get control of the Canadian market, ship Quincy granite to Scotland and have it polished there and brought to Canada at less than our men can bring the rough stone to St. George and polish it. Last year the amount of this granite imported, duty paid, was about \$17,400, and it is anticipated by our manufacturers at St. George that this will be doubled under the preferential clause, if that clause is made to apply to this granite. I certainly do not consider that the hon. Controller has given me a definite reply as to whether the rough stone sent to Aberdeen would come under the preferential clause and be in the same position as raw cotton sent to Great Britain to be manufactured. Our workingmen down there are entitled to some consideration. We have a great many artisans, many of whom have large families, so that not only are the workingmen themselves interested in this matter, but their families who have settled among us, and I trust that the Government will see their way to giving these people some consideration. Certainly the duty ought not to be any less than it was under the old tariff.

Item agreed to.

214. India-rubber boots and shoes ; rubber belting, rubber cement and all manufactures of India rubber and gutta-percha, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

215. India-rubber clothing and clothing made waterproof with India rubber ; rubber or gutta-percha hose, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber ; rubber mats or matting, and rubber packing, thirty per cent ad valorem.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. At the request of an hon. gentleman opposite, I have agreed that these items should be held over.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. I think I must ask the hon. gentleman opposite to be content with the labours of the day.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I must admit that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has been extremely considerate, and I cannot possibly decline to accede to his request.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Mr. GANONG.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**Mr. CASEY** moved, with the consent of the House, that Bills (Nos. 2 and 3) reported from the Select Committee to which they were referred, be placed on the Orders of this day for consideration in Committee of the Whole. He said : I may say in support of this motion that these Bills have been delayed by the necessary inquiry carried on by the Select Committee to whom they were referred, which had to be conducted to suit the convenience of the railway employees and railway employers concerned. I think we have reason, therefore, in asking the consent of the House to allow these Bills to be placed upon the Order paper for this evening, especially as this is the last day for considering public Bills this session. It would be a pity if the careful and strenuous work of the committee should be wasted by the postponement of this Bill for another year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). On Public Bills and Orders ?

**Mr. SPEAKER**. As I understand, the effect of this motion will be to place them on the Public Bills and Orders immediately after other Bills now on for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. McMULLEN**. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are a number of very important Bills on Public Bills and Orders. I myself have twice postponed the second reading of a Bill at the request of the First Minister, owing to the absence of the Minister of Agriculture. Now I do not want to stand in the way of any other Bill, but I would like to know what opportunity will be given to reach these Bills, of which there are quite a number of important ones. This is the third session at which Public Bills and Orders have been virtually ruthlessly choked off. The last session of the last Parliament the entire time of the House was taken up with Remedial Bills ; the first session of this Parliament there was nothing done but to pass the Estimates. Now, owing to the Queen's Jubilee—and of course no person wants to stand in the way of the First Minister getting away in good time—still, after all, I do think that some fair opportunity should be given for the purpose of reaching matters on the Public Bills and Orders. For my own part I have twice allowed the second reading of the Bill that

I have on the paper, to stand, owing to the absence of the Minister of Agriculture; and I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to give me an opportunity of reaching that Bill. It is understood, of course, that this is the last day which is to be given to private members, therefore if this resolution passes, I shall have no further opportunity of bringing this Bill up.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** These Bills will not be put on the top of the list at all; it is not proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) to alter the list at all; they will simply go on at the foot, and they will stand their chance of being reached.

Mr. **SPEAKER.** I must say, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, that if this resolution carries, they will go on after the other Bills which are on the list for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** At the foot of Public Bills and Orders?

Mr. **SPEAKER.** No, not at all—they will be placed at the foot of those which are now on the Order paper, near the top, for consideration in committee. If this motion passes, that is where these Bills would go, and it requires the consent of the House.

Mr. **McMULLEN.** That was the conclusion that I came to, and it is for that reason I wished to draw the attention of the House to the fact. If this resolution passes these Bills will be placed in advance of other Bills now on for second reading, and the query is whether these Bills for second reading will be reached at all this session. I would like to know therefore what the Government intend to do about it.

Mr. **INGRAM.** Should this motion carry. I do not think it would advance these Bills one iota, because, if they are placed on the Order paper in the manner suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as this is the last day for private members, they would not be reached, therefore I do not see any necessity for a motion of that kind. If it is simply to say that they should be placed on the Order paper, without any prospect of proceeding with them, all right. I would suggest that it be placed on the Government Orders.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** It is perfectly plain that the Government are very largely in the hands of hon. members. The Government hope that from the strong disposition apparently felt on both sides to close the business of the House, they would be able to press forward the measures deemed essential, and if time did not permit public Bills to be carried through, they would be

allowed to stand over. But hon. gentlemen know that the Government may propose but the House will dispose. We can do nothing more than suggest, and if the House determines that Parliament shall sit beyond Jubilee, the Government are helpless. Every facility will be given, so far as time permits, to facilitate the passing of Bills, but it is quite apparent that much will depend on the view taken by the House. The acting leader of the House is not present this afternoon, but will be here to-night, and I should not like to make any promise until he is here, when, indeed, he can speak for himself, but it is perfectly plain that if it is the wish of hon. members, the House may sit in July. The Government hope, however, to be able to close the business in time for the Jubilee; but it may not be possible to realize that hope, and if hon. gentlemen are determined to consider all the public business on the Order paper, the Government are not going to use any brute force in regard to the matter. The hope was, however, entertained, from the general expression of opinion given by members on both sides of the House, that there would be such a general disposition to facilitate the public business as, after proper discussion, to enable prorogation to take place at a reasonably early date.

Mr. **FOSTER.** I am a little surprised at the statement made by the hon. gentleman leading the House. The Government has already disposed of this matter, for they came down to the House several days ago with a proposition, which was adopted by the House, that all the days should be Government days with the exception of this day. Private members have to-day allotted them, and they can get as much as possible out of it. If hon. gentlemen opposite think it will serve some purpose to place Bills on the paper, let this be done. The House cannot, however, withdraw from its own action, and now take from the Government certain days to be used as private days.

Mr. **DAVIN.** I think the Government might make some arrangement which would meet the wishes of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and other hon. gentlemen who have Bills on the paper, to which I understand there is no objection. Take, for instance, Bill No. 5 in regard to alien labour. That Bill passed through a special committee, and I understood the Government were going to take hold of the Bill, and it was so heralded throughout the country, and great praise was given to them on that account. I saw it so stated in the "Globe."

Mr. **SPEAKER.** The hon. gentleman must not discuss this matter at length.

Mr. **DAVIN.** I will not discuss it, but I may discuss what is in the "Globe."

Mr. **SPEAKER.** No.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Government should put the Alien Labour Bill on the Government Orders. Then there is Bill No. 22 regarding Controverted Elections, the hon. introducer of which asked me to move the second reading this afternoon, if it were called. He assures me that hon. gentlemen opposite agree with his amendment. I have looked at it cursorily, and I cannot see any objection to it. Why should not that Bill be placed on Government Orders? If I may say a word in regard to one of my Bills, Bill No. 107, is to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, and its aim is to cause tenders to be invited when large quantities of supplies are needed, just as is now done in regard to public works. Hon. members are generally under the impression that such supplies at the present time are called for by tender. I suggest that this Bill be placed on Government Orders. In regard to the general view, I support the hon. member for North Wellington. It is a reprehensible thing that a time comes in the course of a session when business is closed for reasons other than public reasons. I remember that seven or eight years ago Parliament had to be prorogued because an exalted personage wanted to go fishing on a certain day.

Hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. I have only incidentally referred to the matter. No doubt a large number of members will wish to go away, but a number of members have public Bills which they wish to have passed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We can meet early next January.

Mr. DAVIN. That is what was said before. I entirely sympathize, as regards the general question, with the view represented by the hon. member for North Wellington, and I ask the Government to place the Bill to which I have referred on Government Orders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Until the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is leading the House, is in his place, I shall not be in a position to say what the course of procedure will be. The matter, however, will be properly considered.

CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, GRETNA.

Mr. ROCHE asked :

1. Has Mr. J. F. Tennant, for several years sub-collector of customs at Gretna, been dismissed?

2. Were any charges made against him? What was the nature of the charges and by whom preferred?

3. Was Mr. Tennant given the opportunity to defend himself?

4. Is he entitled to any allowance under the Superannuation Act?

5. If so, how much?

Mr. DAVIN.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. Yes. 2. Charges to the effect that he took an offensive and public partisan part in the last Dominion general election, were preferred against him by the hon. member for Lisgar, and were supported by other gentlemen. 3. Mr. Tennant was notified of the charges and his reply thereto was received. 4. This question is still under consideration. 5. The answer to question No. 4 applies to this.

PREVENTIVE OFFICER McNEILL.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

Is the following a true copy of a letter addressed by the Commissioner of Customs to the customs preventive officer at Grand Narrows, Cape Breton :—

“ Customs Department, Canada,

“ Ottawa, 20th May, 1897.

“ Michael McNeil, Esq.,

“ Acting Preventive Officer, H.M.C.,

“ Grand Narrows, C.B.

“ Sir,—I am directed by the Honourable the Controller of Customs to advise you that your services as an acting preventive officer in Her Majesty's customs at Grand Narrows, under the survey of the port of North Sydney, C.B., are dispensed with, to take effect from the date of receipt of this notice.

“ I have the honour to be, sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) “ JOHN McDOUGALL,

“ Commissioner of Customs.”

Through the collector at North Sydney, C.B.

If so, what reasons have the Government to give for dismissing the preventive officer?

Was there any complaint against him? If so, by whom, and what was the nature of the complaint?

Was there an investigation? If so, by whom? Was there a report of such investigation, and, if so, will the Government lay a copy of the report on the Table of the House at an early date?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. 1. Yes. 2. For taking an active partisan part in the last Dominion general election. 3. The charges were preferred against him by Dr. Arthur Kendall, of Sydney, and S. C. Campbell, of Baddeck. 4. An investigation was held by commissioner Captain Bloomfield Douglas, and a report was made by him to the Department of Customs. A copy of the report can be laid on the Table if the hon. gentleman so desires.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then I wish to have a copy of the report laid on the Table of the House.

MARINE HOSPITALS—MRS. LE CAIN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. How long was Mrs. John LeCain keeper of the Marine Hospital at Bunker Island?

2. When were her services dispensed with, and on what grounds?

3. What notice was given her?

4. Did she or her late husband, at their own cost and charges, erect fencing and buildings on the hospital grounds?

5. If so, has she been paid for this expenditure?

6. Did she supply bedding and furniture for the hospital?

7. If so, has the Department of Marine made any allowance for this?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). 1. Mrs. LeCain was never appointed keeper of the hospital, but allowed to continue in charge from the death of her husband in 1892. 2. On the 2nd January, 1897, on the ground that her services were no longer required, as a new keeper was appointed. 3. Mrs. LeCain was notified on 2nd January, but allowed to remain on the premises till 1st March. 4. Yes. 5. No, but it is proposed to allow her a reasonable sum for this expenditure; \$100 for an addition to the building and \$10 for fencing. 6. Yes. 7. The department proposes to make allowance. The value of these articles per inventory is \$23.55, and it has been agreed to allow this amount.

#### THE ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Mr. **MORRISON** asked :

Is the Government aware officially of the action of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs in making the following amendment to section 1 of the treaty for determining the Alaskan boundary line, signed by Sir Julian Pauncefote and Secretary Olney, viz. :

"Inasmuch as the summit of Mount St. Elias, although not ascertained to lie in fact upon said 141st meridian, is so nearly coincident therewith that it may conveniently be taken as a visible landmark whereby the initial part of said meridian shall be established" ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The quotation in the question is not from a proposed amendment, but from the treaty itself as signed by Sir Julian Pauncefote and Mr. Olney, and submitted to the United States Senate. Article 1 of the treaty gives the commissioners who may be appointed power to use Mount St. Elias as a visible landmark if they see fit. The Government is not aware officially of any action of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs looking towards any amendment to the said article 1, but, according to newspaper reports the committee proposes to add an amendment to the effect that the provisions in article 1 of the treaty for the acceptance of Mount St. Elias shall not operate as a concession of any claim on that portion of the boundary line which, extending south-easterly from Mount St. Elias, parts off the "Coast Strip" of Alaska from the province of British Columbia.

#### BANK NOTE CONTRACT.

Mr. **FOSTER** asked :

With respect to the bank note contract —

1. How many plates (not tint plates) will require to be engraved in order to furnish the quan-

tity estimated as necessary for one year in the call for tender of \$1, \$2 and \$4 notes respectively?

2. How many tint plates will be required to be engraved for the same supply of these notes respectively?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The answer to the first question is : \$1 notes—18 plates—two of them not retouched ; \$2 notes—6 plates—two of them not retouched ; \$4 notes—2 plates—neither retouched. The answer to the second question is : \$1 notes—9 plates—one not retouched ; \$2 notes—3 plates—one not retouched ; \$4 notes—2 plates—no retouching required.

#### THE PLEBISCITE BILL.

Mr. **DAVIN** (for Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Is the promise made by the Premier to the temperance people and to this House, viz. : "That at the present session he would introduce and pass a Plebiscite Bill," to be fulfilled, and will such a Bill be introduced and passed at the present session?

2. If so, when will the said Bill be introduced ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to pass a law enforcing prohibition in the provinces in which the plebiscite has already been submitted by the Liberal Governments, that is to say, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, with the distinct understanding in each province that if it carried a law would be passed giving effect to the will of the people?

4. It is the intention of the Government to submit the same question again to those provinces which have already pronounced in its favour?

5. And if when submitted, are there to be other questions asked, such as, "Are you in favour of direct taxation to make up the loss of revenue." or "are you in favour of compensation to the manufacturers whose business would be ruined by the enforcement of such an Act" ?

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in whose name this question is placed on the Order paper, not being present, the question had better stand as I wish to refer to the form of it.

Mr. **DAVIN**. If there is any objection to the form it might be amended.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. It is obvious that the first part of the question makes an assertion, which may or may not be controverted. If the question were put in the form "was such and such a promise made by such and such a person" it would be more in order.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I will put the question in that form as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is very anxious to have the question answered.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The Premier's compulsory absence from Parliament attending the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty will necessitate the postponement of several measures which it was the intention of the Government to recommend to the Parliament this session. Amongst these are the Franchise and Plebiscite Bills. The Gov-

ernment has concluded that as the former Bill ought to determine the franchise on which the plebiscite should be taken, and as the Premier was personally desirous of being present when they were under consideration by the House it was necessary to postpone further action with respect to them till next session. The details of the Plebiscite Bill will be pronounced on its introduction.

#### U. S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint an immigration agent at New York, U.S. ?

2. How many agents have been appointed in the United States, and at what places?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. 1. The question of appointing an agent at New York is under consideration. 2. The Department of the Interior has appointed immigration agents at the following places in the United States :—

One at Detroit, Michigan.  
 One at Reed City, Michigan.  
 One at Watertown, South Dakota.  
 One at St. Paul, Minnesota.  
 One at Salina, Kansas.  
 Four travelling immigration agents.  
 Total number of salaried agents, ten.

The department has 61 immigration agents, employed at the following places, who are paid by results :—

Cadillac, Michigan.  
 Kalaska, Michigan.  
 Evart, Michigan.  
 Midland, Michigan.  
 Luther, Michigan.  
 Fife Lake, Michigan.  
 Alba, Michigan.  
 Elmira, Michigan.  
 Petoskey, Michigan.  
 Ludington, Michigan.  
 LeRoy, Michigan.  
 Reed City, Michigan.  
 Grafton, North Dakota.  
 Port Huron, Michigan.  
 Mount Pleasant, Michigan.  
 Coleman, Michigan.  
 Howard City, Michigan.  
 Paris, Michigan.  
 Omaha, Nebraska.  
 Gaylord, Michigan.  
 Clare, Michigan.  
 Cooks, Michigan.  
 Chicago, Illinois.  
 Cheboygan, Michigan.  
 Lakeport, Michigan.  
 Henry, South Dakota.  
 Watertown, South Dakota.  
 Frankfort, South Dakota.  
 Redfield, South Dakota.  
 Ipswich, South Dakota.  
 Aberdeen, South Dakota.  
 Clark, South Dakota.  
 Levering, Michigan.  
 Duluth, Minnesota.  
 Boise City, Idaho.  
 Donaldson, Michigan.  
 Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIES.

Chambers, Nebraska.  
 San Francisco, California.  
 Salina, Kansas.  
 Hoquaim, Washington.  
 San Beach, Michigan.  
 Port Austin, Michigan.  
 Brown City, Michigan.  
 Marlette, Michigan.  
 Sanislas Centre, Michigan.  
 Deckerville, Michigan.  
 Canboro, Michigan.  
 Bad Axe, Michigan.  
 Parisville, Michigan.  
 Caro, Michigan.  
 Carsonville, Michigan.  
 West Superior, Wisconsin.  
 Hubbard, Iowa.  
 Lafayette, Michigan.  
 Verner, Ont.  
 Mount Carmel, Pennsylvania.  
 Mackinaw City, Michigan.  
 Grayling, Michigan.  
 Pinconning, Michigan.  
 Mount Pleasant, Michigan.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman any explanation of the expression "paid by results?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the answer sent to me by the department.

#### PARIS EXHIBITION IN 1900.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

1. Has the Government decided whether Canada should take part officially in the Universal Exposition at Paris in 1900?

2. What are the intentions of the Government in this matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Government has decided that Canada shall take part, and the Minister is making arrangements for space.

#### A JUBILEE MONUMENT.

Mr. TALBOT (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to call for competition for the erection of a monument commemorative of the Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria?

2. Is the monument to be limited to Canadian artists?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes ; if the necessary funds are voted by Parliament. 2. No.

#### BIRD ROCK CASUALTY.

Mr. TALBOT (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

What steps were taken by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to save the unfortunate woman abandoned last winter on the Bird Rock ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). As soon as the department was advised of the casualty, a telegram was despatched to the collector of customs at North Sydney, inquiring whether he could obtain a steamer to go to Bird Rock, but the collector replied that no

steamer could be procured for any purpose. At the same time a telegram was sent to Mr. Peter Bourque, Amherst Harbour, instructing him to render assistance if possible, at once, and a reply was received from Mr. Bourque on Saturday, 13th of March, stating that temporary assistance would leave the Monday following. It would appear, however, that a crew of five men left Bryon Island on the 8th of March for Bird Rock to seal, that these men reached the Rock, and attended to the light from the 8th March until the regularly appointed keeper took charge.

#### C.P.R.—CARRIAGE OF GRAIN.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

What number of bushels of grain of all kinds did the Canadian Pacific Railway carry east from the North-west Territories and Manitoba in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897? What number of bushels of grain did that railway carry east from the North-west Territories in each of the above years? How many from Manitoba in each of the above years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The information is not in the department; but if the hon. gentleman desires me to get it, I will endeavour to procure it for him. I had not noticed until this moment that he had made the inquiry.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall be very glad. I was told it was in the Railway Department.

#### AZARIE BIBAUD, VETERINARY SURGEON.

Mr. DUGAS (for Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Has Azarie Bibaud, veterinary surgeon, been an employee of this House during this session?

What is his salary?

How much has he received up to date?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No information has been placed in my hands which will enable me to answer this question. It is one affecting the internal economy of the House, and I suppose the Speaker will furnish the information.

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as the Chair is able to furnish the information, there is no such person in the employ of the House.

#### SALE OF HAY ON "INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Was any other notice in 1897 than the following given for the sale of hay on the Indian reserve known as "Indian Gardens," county of Antigonish, N.S.?

"To be sold at public auction on Saturday, 22nd day of May, this summer's hay of the Indian Gardens, sale to be held at Heatherton Church."

2. On what day and at what hour did the sale, if any, take place?

3. For what amount was this hay sold in 1895 and 1896 respectively?

4. For what did the right to cut this hay sell in 1897?

5. Who was the successful bidder?

6. Will the successful bidder be allowed to cut the hay this season, and if so, will a license be granted therefor?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The department has no information whatever respecting the sale of hay on this reserve at any time, nor has any money ever been received by the department on account of the sale of such hay. If hay has been disposed of it has been sold by the Indians themselves or by the local agent without communication with the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman to request his colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), to ask for a report on that from his agent, as to what really was done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will.

#### RAILWAY LANDS AND TAXATION.

Mr. OLIVER moved :

That the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, the Regina, Long Lake and Qu'Appelle Railway Company, the Manitoba North-western Railway Company and the Alberta Railway and Coal Company have become entitled to large areas of land in the North-west Territories.

That only a part of these lands have as yet been scheduled as the property of the companies, and only a much smaller part has been patented.

That only the part which has been patented is taxable.

That no intent was expressed by Parliament in the Act under which these companies became entitled to these lands, that they should be exempt from taxation for municipal and educational purposes.

That by failing to patent to the railway companies their lands as soon as earned, the Government has given them an exemption from taxation contrary to the intent of Parliament, and greatly to the detriment of the settlers of the North-west, who are thereby compelled to bear that share of the necessary municipal and school taxation which should be borne by these railway companies.

Therefore, in the opinion of this House, measures should forthwith be taken by the Government to issue patents to those companies for all the lands to which they are entitled, so that these lands may become taxable at the earliest possible date, according to the intent of Parliament when the Act granting the land was passed.

He said : In preparing this motion for presentation to the House, I have tried to set out the case as fully as possible. The facts herein stated were placed before the House last session as the result of certain questions asked of the Government by my-

self. There is no dispute as to the facts. I only wish to state to what extent these facts affect the country at large and the people of the North-west Territories in particular. The quantity of land involved is about 5,000,000 acres. This land being granted to railways built specially for colonization purposes is, to a very large extent, situated in more or less settled parts of the country, where the people find it necessary to have schools, to build roads, to support churches and to carry on the ordinary affairs of life as they are carried on in other civilized parts of the world. To support these schools and build these roads, taxation must be levied on the land of the country. The people then find themselves in this position—that half of the land of the country that is benefited by the establishment of these schools, which is improved by the building of these roads, is not liable to pay one cent towards the expense of schools or roads. That was not, so far as I can learn, any part of the intent of Parliament in making these grants of land. There was no exemption from taxation expressed or implied. The companies were given these lands in consideration of certain work done; that is to say in consideration of the roads being built. The railroads having been built, the land belongs to the railroad companies and should be in the same position as any other land in the country which is private property, in bearing its fair share of the burdens of the country. But this land is not subject to taxation. I am not able to explain to this House the reason it is not made available for taxation, nor can I explain fully the method by which it has escaped taxation so far. But I will go as far as I can to explain this fact, which, no doubt, hon. members will consider strange. While the railway companies have earned this land and while the Government acknowledge their right to the land to such an extent that certain lands are marked on the map as belonging to these companies, these lands are not registered in the names; in fact, in regard to one of the companies, the land has not even been selected by the company. In every case the land is held in the hands of the Government, while nominally held by the company. The company, having a private understanding, as it were, with the Government, that certain lands belong to the company, suppose that Smith, or Brown, or Jones comes along and wants to buy a piece of this land. He goes to the agent of the company and says: Is this your land? The agent says: Yes. What is the price? They give him the price and he makes the purchase. He pays to the company the price agreed upon, and when he has completed the payment to the company, then, and not until then, does the title of the land pass out of the hands of the Government, and into the hands of Jones. In the meantime, even the land that is actually

Mr. OLIVER.

in occupation by the settler, as well as the land that is not in occupation but has been actually sold by these parties, is in some cases held not to be liable to taxation. It is simply a system whereby the companies escape their fair share of the burdens of the country. I do not know that that was the intent of the late Government in making these arrangements with the railway companies, but I want to take this opportunity to tell the House how very unfair this arrangement is to the people of the North-west Territories. Let me give one case that has come to my knowledge. A man bought land, completed his payments, and is unable to-day to get his patent because the land is still held in the hands of the Government, and the company has not yet completed its arrangements with the Government to get the patent for the land. I know of another case where a settler was established on land before the railway company acquired its charter, even. The railroad company claims the land that that settler occupies, and it is a question yet whether he or the railroad company is going to get it. Notwithstanding that the man who has been there and has had his improvements there for years, still that land is not taxable. In the interest of the settlers of the country—the people who have to provide the schools, who have to build the roads, who are doing everything that is done directly to improve the country—this burden that they are compelled to bear for the benefit of these railroad companies should be lifted, and these railroad companies should be compelled to take the position it was the expectation of Parliament they would take when they received the charters—instead of being parasites upon that country, they should help to build it up. If they are not willing to build up the country, if they are not willing to do their fair share in the way of improvements, I say that it is a fair subject for this House to consider how to make them do their share, as far as they can be made to do it. As showing the effect upon the people of the country let me read a few figures. There are 5,000,000 acres affected, and this land is valued at \$3 per acre, so that it represents a total value of \$15,000,000. The ordinary rate of taxation upon land in that country is say ½ cent on the dollar. At the rate at which these lands of the railroad companies would be taxable, were they owned by settlers, they would yield \$75,000 a year. The possibility of having to pay this amount or a part of it is escaped by a secret understanding with the Government of the country. Now, as to how it affects the individual settler:—Suppose that a school district is five miles square. That is larger than a school district should be, but, on account of the sparse settlement of the country, it is necessary to take that amount of land in order to get enough taxes to run the school, largely on account of so

much of the land not being available for taxation. In the school district there are twenty-five square miles of land, or 16,000 acres which, at a value of \$3 per acre would be \$48,000. But only half of this land is taxable, so, instead of the people being able to raise \$480 at one cent on the dollar, they are only able to raise \$240 by the taxation of the land in the district. It is easily seen that if half the probable revenue of any municipal institution of any kind in this country is cut off, it renders the difficulty of carrying on that institution very much greater. These people in each school district escape the payment of \$240 actual cash each year, which they actually owe to the district for the support of its institutions. In that country each quarter section is also supposed to contribute to the extent of two days' statute labour each year to improve the roads; so, in a district, say, four miles square, where there are sixteen sections, eight of these sections would be exempted from statute labour under this arrangement; that is to say, in a district four miles square where there should be 128 days of statute labour, there would only be sixty-four days of actual statute labour available, and the other sixty-four would not be available because these companies cannot be compelled to contribute their fair share of the labour which improves their property. All I wish to do is to bring this matter to the attention of the Government in its different bearings, in the hope that they will turn their attention to it, understanding how important it is in the aggregate, and in the individual case. It is simply a case wherein certain parties are getting an advantage that the Parliament of Canada did not consider they were entitled to at the beginning, which certainly people of the Territories do not consider that they are entitled to now, and in regard to which the people of the Territories appeal to this Government and to this Parliament for protection and for justice.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad to support the motion of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). In my opinion, he could not speak too strongly of the hardships that the settlers in the townships suffer in consequence of the exemptions in regard to these railways. This matter, I may say, was brought before the attention of the predecessors in office of my hon. friends. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) put a question to the Minister of the Interior asking when the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be liable, and how long the exemption lasted, and the Minister answered:

As to the second part of the question, the exemption runs from the date when the patent issues.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But there is special legisla-

tion, is there not, with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway lands?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, but the question is the general question of patents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not, of course, as well up in this matter as the hon. gentleman; but what I understand is this: The Government's hands are tied by legislation with respect to certain lands, and I understood from the statement of the hon. gentleman behind me, they were not tied with respect to lands about which he is speaking.

Mr. DAVIN. Quite so. But if the Government failed to issue patents in the case of this five million acres of land, which have been given these railway companies mentioned in the motion of my hon. friend, the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, the Regina, Long Lake and Qu'Appelle Railway, the Manitoba and North-western Railway, and the Alberta Railway and Coal Company—if the Government does not issue patents for these lands until the land has been sold by the railway companies, the Government will place these lands in precisely the same position as they are placed by the special arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. So although there is special legislation in regard to the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, these companies can practically do almost the same things. I know what I am talking about, because we have had this thing up since 1887. One of the first things that we from the North-west did when we came up here in 1887, was to go on a deputation to the then Minister of the Interior, the Honourable Thomas White, a record of which will be found in the Department of the Interior, and represent to him the hardships that the settlers in the North-west suffered in consequence of exemptions. Let me point out that in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, they do not take conveyance of lands from the Government until they sell them. The consequence is that if you were now to do, either by order in council or legislation, what we urged the former Government to do, make them select their lands and have those lands conveyed to them, then, according to this opinion of the Minister of the Interior, the time at which those lands would be taxable would not come until twenty years after the issue of the patents. But the hon. gentleman will see that by delaying to take over the alienation of these lands from the Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway can, after twenty years from the date of the contract has run, avoid bringing the twenty years within computable limits. Suppose the twenty years expired, then all the lands will not be in the same position as the land of these railways, but if the Government does not compel these railways to take over the lands and to take patents for the land as given them, then these lands will not be

taxable, because they are still in the hands of the Government, and you cannot tax the Government land. So that the conclusion of this resolution is one that this House should affirm :

In the opinion of this House, measures should forthwith be taken by the Government to issue patents to those companies for all the lands to which they are entitled, so that these lands may become taxable at the earliest possible date, according to the intention of Parliament when the Act granting the land was passed.

I may say that for some reason or other it is a most difficult thing to get the Department of the Interior to take the course which is urged by this resolution. The answer of the Minister of the Interior to which I refer, was given on May 26, on page 2,978 of the unrevised "Hansard," and on page 2,883 of the revised "Hansard." What I fear is that we shall find ourselves face to face with a power of which Mr. Bright speaks in one of his speeches. Mr. Bright says he was once talking to a Minister of the Crown, and Mr. Bright asked him a question. The Minister said to him : Mr. Bright, if you become a Minister of the Crown, you will find there is always some power which you cannot define and cannot grasp that is preventing you doing good, and you will find it the hardest thing in the world to do right or to do good. I do not know what Mr. Bright's experience was when he became a Minister ; but Mr. Bright goes on to dwell upon it, and to point out how difficult it was in the English Parliament for a Minister to do right, even when he knew that the Ministers themselves probably meant well, and would like to act from good motives. I hope that the Government will turn their attention vigorously to this question raised by my hon. friend from Alberta, and in regard to every acre of that five millions to which he refers, and that they will insist on this Government issuing patents, and so relieve the settler in regard to roads, and in regard to statute labour, and in regard to schools. At present the settler is treated, in my opinion, very badly, in other ways that are cognate to this. Here you will find sixteen sections bearing the whole brunt of thirty-six sections, all over the North-west Territories, and that is what we want to get rid of. All these sections are odd sections that are, of course, untenanted, and then there is the Hudson Bay land and the school sections, so that sixteen sections have to do the work of the thirty-six. I had hoped that there would have been an opportunity to discuss that whole question this session. However, this part of it is a very important one, and I give my hon. friend's motion my hearty support.

Mr. DAVIS. I am very glad to hear that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had already brought this question before the House some years ago, as he

Mr. DAVIN.

says he must have done so, because we have heard nothing about it this session; and I am surprised that if he brought it to the attention of the late Government something was not done in the matter. However, it is a very important question, and as reference has been made to the land grants given to the Regina and Long Lake and Qu'Appelle and the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company, I should like to say a few words in regard to it. A difficulty under which settlers are labouring arises from the fact, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, that there are only a few sections in a township six miles square which they can tax for school and parochial purposes. That hon. gentleman made a mistake in stating that the Hudson Bay Company was exempt from taxation so far as regards their lands. The company pay taxes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend misapprehended what I said. I did not say they were exempt from taxation. What I did say was that this was part of a general question of great importance—the whole land question ; and what I pointed out was that sixteen sections have to do the work of thirty-six sections ; but I did not say the Hudson Bay Company's land was exempt from taxation.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). They are not exempt from taxation, but the company own only a small proportion of the land in the Territories, the larger part being held by the railway companies. They have taken up lands wherever there are any large settlements. They pay no taxes, and the sections which have been homesteaded have to pay all the taxes. As the hon. member for Alberta has pointed out, the question of the construction of roads will arise, as new ordinances have been passed. The time will soon arrive when the settlers will have to build the roads, and this will place another burden upon them. It is not fair that these railway companies should be able to hold their lands free of taxation until they prove valuable. Every settler who comes in makes the land more valuable, and at the end of ten or fifteen years, when improvements have been made on adjoining lands, the railway companies will receive the benefit. I do not think that is fair in a large territory like the North-west, into which settlers are coming, it is frequently found that settlers cannot obtain school advantages on account of the land being largely held by the railway companies, which are not liable for taxation for school purposes. The Government should take some action in connection with this matter. If the companies wait for twenty years before taking out patents, and are exempt from taxation for twenty years this matter will be almost indefinitely postponed. I am very glad to have the opportunity of endorsing and supporting the resolution.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I observe that this resolution makes the assertion that :

Therefore, in the opinion of this House, measures should forthwith be taken by the Government to issue patents to those companies for all the lands to which they are entitled, so that these lands may become taxable at the earliest possible date, according to the intent of Parliament when the Act granting the lands was passed.

It appears to me that this matter resolves itself very largely into a question as to what was the intention of the Act. If the intention of the Act when passed was apparent, and if the agreement with those companies were based on the understanding that those lands were to become taxable before patents were issued and before the companies knew to whom the patents were to be issued, it would become a very serious question for the House to change the spirit of the law. But there is another question, and it is one of some little importance from a public point of view, and I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman leading the House to it, because it requires to be taken into consideration before any action is adopted by this House, and that is that the policy of Parliament has always been to utilize the public lands for the purpose of securing the construction of railways in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I am afraid that the effect of making these lands taxable, before the companies have been able to dispose of them, will be to render railway construction on these terms impossible for the future. I am afraid if it was found that lands which were supposed to be exempt from taxation until they were disposed of, were now held to be liable to taxation, two results would follow : first, it would be impossible to secure the construction of railways in the North-west and Manitoba to any extent by land grants, which has been the policy hitherto pursued ; and second, it would create an impression of bad faith on the part of Parliament. The parties that have undertaken the construction of these roads on the understanding that the lands would not be taxed until the companies were able to dispose of them, would then find that the principle on which they acquired the lands and proceeded to build the roads had been overruled and a different principle, and one opposed to their interests, had been adopted. It must not be forgotten that all parties in this House long ago arrived at the conclusion that there is nothing so important to the North-west and Manitoba as the opening up of those lands by railways. Every effort to make considerable progress or development in the prairie section of the western country, apart from providing railway facilities, had resulted, speaking in general terms, in failure. Railways have become, from a variety of causes absolutely indispensable to any great progress and development in that great prairie region. No one will question the fact that this road connecting at Calgary with

the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending to Edmonton should have been constructed. It has been the means of opening up one of the most valuable and important sections of the North-west, and the lands thus opened up are exceedingly fertile. Settlers are going upon them, which would not have been the case except for the construction of the road. I am not looking at it exactly from the local standpoint of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House and who are greatly interested in spreading as broadly as possible whatever taxation falls upon that section of the country ; but I want to call the attention of the Minister to the point, that the construction of this road—I take as an example the road to Edmonton which opens up an important section of the North-west Territories—has been of great value to Canada generally, and of great importance to that section of the country especially. I also want to call attention to the fact, that the money found for the construction of that road was to a very large extent based upon the supposed value of these lands, and yet, notwithstanding all that was done to aid in the construction of the road by the Government, the fact remains, that the bonds sold in London at or near or above par, are now only worth 40 or 50 per cent. That is a very dark outlook for the English capitalists who furnished the money to build this road. If in addition to that, this Parliament introduces new and different legislation, imposing obligations on these lands that hitherto have not rested upon them, I am afraid that the effect would be very disastrous so far as obtaining loans in England based upon land grants, is concerned, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads in the North-west Territories, and the development of that country. I just draw the attention of the hon. gentlemen to that, because it strikes me that we have to look upon it from a national point of view, as well as from a local point of view.

**Mr. RUTHERFORD.** Were it not for the statements of the leader of the Opposition, I would not have felt it necessary to add anything to the remarks made by my hon. friends from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) on this very important question to the North-west, because they have very fully explained the grievances under which the people of that part of Canada labour in this respect. While endorsing their views, I wish to take issue with the leader of the Opposition in regard to some of his remarks. I do not believe that any member on this side of the House, any more than any supporter of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), would desire to in any way repudiate any obligation which the Dominion of Canada has assumed in respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a matter of regret, however, that when hon. gentlemen opposite made this contract or bar-

gain with the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, they did not realize to what extent they were bartering away the birthright of the people. The map of the North-west, with the railway lands coloured in it, is an object which must be exceedingly painful to any true Canadian patriot. The enormous territory which has been sacrificed in the interest of that railway, and in the interest of railroad building generally, is a disgrace to the late Government. After all that, I was surprised to hear the leader of the Opposition saying, that he was afraid that perhaps we would be unable to obtain further railway building in the North-west Territories if there was any question of taxing the lands granted in this way. Sir, I hope and trust, we will never have any more railroads built in the North-west Territories at the same sacrifice of public territory as has been experienced in the case of the railways already there. Why, in portions of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the prices which the Canadian Pacific Railway were able to obtain for their railway lands totalled up to an enormous sum; in some instances, as high as from \$14,000 to \$20,000 per mile; whereas, the Manitoba Government, when they made their contract with the Northern Pacific, got many miles of railway built for a cash subsidy of \$1,750 a mile, and they also had a great deal of the line built for \$1,500 per mile. Where there is a necessity for a railroad which is really going to benefit the country, it is not at all necessary to give away the territory belonging to the people in order to have that railroad constructed. I do not propose to take up the time of the House by discussing this question further. As I have said, I do not believe there is any desire on the part of members supporting the Government, nor on the part of the gentleman who moved this resolution, to act in bad faith with the Canadian Pacific Railway; but it is the desire of every one who is interested in the welfare of the North-west, and who realizes the tremendous sacrifices which the present system has inflicted on the people of the North-west in regard to taxation, that the Government should take steps in some honourable way to come to a definite conclusion in regard to this matter, so that the people of the North-west may be relieved from the unjustifiable burdens which they are now bearing.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say to the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that the entire fault lies at the door of the late Government in not calling upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to take a conveyance of their lands. I will read to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) the clause of the statute which clearly provides as follows:—

Upon the construction of any portion of the railway hereby contracted for, not less than 20 miles in length, and the completion thereof so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon,

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

together with such equipment thereof as shall be required for the traffic thereon, the Government shall pay and grant to the company the money and land subsidies applicable thereto, according to the division and appropriation thereof made as hereinbefore provided.

Now, had the Government, on the completion of that work, called upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to accept patents for their lands, as each twenty miles were constructed, every acre of the 25,000,000 would have been patented years ago. The Government should have forced the Canadian Pacific Railway to accept their patent, as the law provided, and then the land would have become taxable immediately after the expiration of the twenty years. This Government put it off from year to year, this important duty, and so the time for the taxation of these lands has been unduly and unnecessarily prolonged. There is no doubt that if the lands are sold and occupied they are taxable, but while they remain the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway they are not taxable until twenty years after the patents issue. If the Government had complied with the provisions of the law, these lands would now be approaching a period when they would be subject to taxation. I am sorry that our North-west Territories have been burthened and their settlement so seriously delayed by the manner in which the late Government dealt with the question of the sale of lands. More information has been given to this House, as to the unfortunate manner in which the North-west lands have been manipulated, since my hon. friends now representing North-west constituencies have come to this House, than has been given during ten years in the past. My hon. friend from Western Assinibola (Mr. Davin) says he has brought up this question. I can say from my recollection that he has never before plainly and distinctly stated the grievance which the people of Manitoba and the North-west are subjected to with regard to these lands. I contend that the present Government should move in this matter at once. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not selected the balance of the 25,000,000 acres of lands coming to them, and I am further informed that of the total quantity they have not received patents for over 2,000,000 acres. This is a most unfortunate and deplorable state of things, which has seriously interfered with the settlement of the North-west; and for this state of things hon. gentlemen opposite are wholly responsible. They have enabled railway companies to play ducks and drakes with the lands of the North-west, and to hold a large portion free of taxation that would otherwise become subject to the conditions which would at the end of twenty years make them subject to taxation. What my hon. friend has stated with regard to schools, roads, and other improve-

ments indicates that the people of that country are suffering very great inconvenience from this condition of things. I hope the Minister of the Interior will give his personal attention to the matter at once, with the view of relieving the people of the inconvenience under which they labour, owing to the neglect of hon. gentlemen opposite to discharge their duties in the premises.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). There is no doubt whatever of the very great and grave importance of the question underlying the hon. gentleman's resolution, and I am pleased that he has brought it to the attention of the House, and in this way forced it upon the attention of the Government. I appreciate the motive which has prompted him to move the resolution, and I understood from him that his great desire was to get the assurance that the matter would receive immediate attention at the hands of those responsible for the government of the country. I deeply regret that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) cannot be present this afternoon. He was suddenly called away on business to Montreal, otherwise he would be able personally to give the assurance that it becomes my duty to give, that the question is already receiving very earnest consideration at the hands of the department. A memorandum which I have received states that the department is seized of the importance of the question, and that the Minister for some time past has been giving it his consideration. There are two questions which must not be mixed up—the patenting of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, and the patenting of the railway lands of other railway companies. Whether the legislation was wise or unwise, provident or improvident, it is needless now to discuss. The fact remains that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not liable for taxation until twenty years after they are patented. I understood from the Minister of the Interior the other day that a million and a half acres in round numbers had been patented by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company out of the large quantity to which they were entitled, and the twenty years which must elapse before these lands can become liable to taxation must run from the date of those patents. The question with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway lands is not on the same footing as the question respecting the lands ceded to the Calgary and Edmonton and other railway companies mentioned in the hon. gentleman's resolution. There can be no doubt, from the statements made to-day, that this question is important from a local standpoint. To obtain sufficient funds to educate children and construct roads it is necessary that the largest area possible should be subject to taxation; and that the

vast areas held by railway companies should not be tied up, and all the burdens of education and road-making placed on the shoulders of the existing settlers. The argument from that standpoint is a very strong one. On the other hand, as the leader of the Opposition says this question is a very large and broad one, which has to be looked at from a national as well as a local standpoint. Hon. gentlemen know that to a very appreciable extent the funds for carrying on the government of the North-west are provided by the Dominion of Canada, and, therefore, every taxpayer in Canada has a special and direct interest in the solution, on a national and honest basis, of this intricate question. I admit all that. I shall take very great pleasure in calling the very special attention of the Minister of the Interior to the very interesting facts which have been brought to the attention of the Government by my hon. friends and to the debate which has taken place; and I can promise that the matter will not be pigeon-holed, but will receive earnest consideration on the part of my hon. colleague. That, I believe, is the object my hon. friend has in view—not a mere academic discussion of this question, but to have it practically dealt with by the department. In that respect his object has been achieved, and I was glad to hear him say that, having succeeded that far, he would leave the matter in the hands of the Minister of the Interior, and withdraw his motion.

Mr. OLIVER. I will accept the promise and suggestion of the hon. leader of the House, and I would like to say, distinctly and clearly, on my own behalf, what has been said by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford), that there is no intention or desire on the part of myself, in moving this resolution, nor do I believe on the part of the hon. gentleman who seconded it (Mr. Davis), to repudiate in any way any agreement or understanding legally entered into by this Government or by the Parliament of Canada with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other corporate body or individual in the country. I did not include the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain in this resolution, because I looked upon that as a different affair. Last session I put a motion on the paper with regard to these companies, and another motion with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I thought it desirable to bring this question before the House in its present shape this session, because it stands alone, and without the slightest justification by any agreement contained in any Act of Parliament. There is no foundation for the assertion that there is any public understanding that these companies should be relieved from taxation on their lands. If Parliament had any understanding of the kind, it has never been expressed in any public document. I have reason to believe that Parliament never had

any such understanding, and I will go further and say I do not believe that Parliament would have agreed to any such understanding at the time the subsidies were granted to these companies. I want to distinguish the position of the Hudson Bay Company's lands from these railway lands. The Hudson Bay Company were the original owners of the country. They did not receive a grant of lands from any Government; they retained out of their total lands 7,000,000 acres. That was their land without a patent. That land has always been subject to taxation, and the Hudson Bay Company, have, in all cases, paid any taxes assessed against their land; once it was clearly proved that any part of their land was liable to taxation, a cheque was forthcoming. It is the railway companies that are in default, and it would not be parliamentary for me to give here expression to the opinions held in the North-west with regard to them and their transactions in that country. These companies may be set up to be philanthropic institutions, which have opened up the country and to which we are indebted to such a great extent, but that is not the opinion of them held in the west. I shall not further detain the House, but merely wish to allude for a moment to the question of the bonds of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company. I think it is unfortunate that it should have been brought before the House in this discussion. Here is a company which has issued bonds to the amount of \$5,500,000 on a railway which they themselves allege only cost \$3,717,000, and which competent railway experts say did not cost anything like \$3,000,000. On these bonds, which they have issued, an interest of \$300,000 a year is supposed to be paid, and all the money which the company have available, including the subsidy granted by this Parliament, is \$117,000, leaving nearly \$200,000 of a yearly shortage in the payment of interest on these bonds. This deficit cannot fail to discredit the company, and thereby hinder or prevent the floating in Great Britain of other railway enterprises for the development of the North-west. I do not know whether that was the intention when these bonds were issued and this arrangement made, but certainly that is the result and a most unfortunate result.

Let me repeat what my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) said, that we in the North-west do not want any more railways at the price we have had to pay for them in the past. It is freely alleged that it was the money that was realized out of the bonds of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway and the Regina, Long Lake and Qu'Appelle Railway over the actual cost of the roads, that went to buy up the Toronto, the Montreal and the Winnipeg Street Railways.

Mr. DAVIN. Would it not strengthen the hands of the Government to pass this motion?

Mr. OLIVER.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are statements in this resolution to which the House would be very chary to commit itself without full inquiry. Then the legal aspect of the question would have to be inquired into by the Minister of Justice, and I am sure my hon. friends do not want to commit themselves to a general statement until they know exactly where they stand. I have given an assurance, which the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution is willing to accept, and, under the circumstances, I think he should be allowed to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

#### DISMISSAL OF WILLIAM BATEMAN.

Mr. HUGHES moved for:

Return of all correspondence, reports and papers in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Wm. Bateman of Port Perry from, and the appointment of Mr. Williams to the position of agent to the Scugog Island Indians.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The other day there was a slight error made in the reply which the hon. First Minister gave to a question put by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and I desire, before this resolution passes, to give the correct reply, so that the hon. gentleman will be in possession of the correct information. On the 22nd of last month, the hon. member for North Victoria asked the following questions:—

1. Has Mr. Wm. Bateman, of Port Perry, Ont., been removed from the position of Indian agent to the Indians on Scugog Island?

2. Was there an official inquiry into Mr. Bateman's conduct before he was dismissed from the position of Indian agent?

3. Who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Bateman, late Indian agent to the Scugog Island Indians?

4. What were the charges preferred against Mr. Bateman, late Indian agent for the Scugog Island Indians?

5. Who is Mr. Bateman's successor as agent to the Scugog Island Indians? Can Mr. Bateman's successor (whose name, I believe, is Williams) write or read?

6. Was Mr. Williams, in his recent visit to pay the Scugog Island Indians, accompanied by his brother who sells liquor in Port Perry?

7. Did Hon. John Dryden communicate with the Government, or any member thereof, regarding the dismissal of Mr. Bateman or the appointment of Mr. Williams as agent to the Scugog Indians?

In my absence the Prime Minister made the following replies in accordance with a statement furnished him by the department:—

1. Mr. William Bateman has been removed from the position of Indian agent to the Indians of Scugog Island. 2. There was an inquiry, a departmental inquiry, not by commission. 3. As to who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Bateman, this is a question as to which the Government does not feel bound to answer. 4. The charges preferred against Mr. Bateman was offensive par-

tianship. 5. Mr. Albert Williams is the successor of Mr. Bateman. The department has no reason to doubt that Mr. Williams will discharge the duties of his office efficiently. 6. The department has not yet received any report of the visit referred to, and has no knowledge of any one accompanying Mr. Williams on that occasion. 7. The department has no knowledge of any such communication having been made.

Unfortunately, the memorandum furnished the Prime Minister was incorrect, and the replies to the questions of the hon. member for North Victoria should have been as follows: —1. Yes. 2. No. 3. The member of Parliament for the district in which the Indian agency is situated. 4. Active political partisanship. The answers already given to questions 5, 6 and 7 are correct. There is no objection to the papers asked for being brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### COASTING LAWS OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BRITTON moved for :

Return showing the correspondence, if any, between this Government and the Government of the United States in reference to an equalization or readjustment of the coasting laws, rules and regulations in force in the two countries ; and in reference to any arrangement or proposal for any arrangement under which Canadian vessels shall be granted by the American Government and officials the same privileges as those accorded to American vessels by the Canadian authorities under the laws, rules and regulations now in force.

He said : This motion has reference to an international arrangement with regard to the coasting laws of the two countries, and the International Wrecking Law, which was passed in 1893, and brought into force by proclamation in that year. I should judge, from the importance of this subject, that there must have been some correspondence between the two Governments regarding points to which I shall call the attention of the House, but I must confess that I have been unable, on inquiry, to find out any such correspondence, and the whole matter of the inland shipping seems to be in an unsatisfactory condition at present. In the first place, as I understand it, the registration is with the Controller of Customs. In the second place, the correspondence hitherto has been with the Minister of Marine or through his office, but I understand that lately correspondence or negotiations have been with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, so that it is a little difficult to find out what has taken place between the representatives of the two Governments on a subject which I regard as most important. If these arrangements are reciprocal, according to the letter of the law, they are not reciprocal at all, in actual practice. For example, the American steamers trading with our inland Canadian ports are not subject to inspection. Our Government in-

spectors, as a matter of practice, accept American certificates and allow the American boats, which have American certificates, to carry passengers and be equipped according to these certificates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That may be the case, as a matter of international practice and courtesy, but if American steamers started from our ports with Canadian passengers, they would be liable to inspection and could not carry passengers without conforming to our law.

Mr. BRITTON. As a matter of fact, they do. The American certificates are always accepted. I am quite correct in saying this, because, in general practice, when the American certificate is accepted the boat is allowed to carry passengers according to the American certificate. And this is important because, according to the American regulation, a steamer of the same tonnage as a Canadian steamer, is allowed to carry a considerably larger number of passengers. The difference is about one-quarter. For instance, an American steamer of a certain tonnage will be allowed to carry a thousand passengers, while a Canadian steamer of similar tonnage is allowed to carry only 750 passengers. There would be nothing to complain of in that, as fixed by our regulations, if the Americans in any other respects allowed our vessels to go according to the Canadian certificate. But they do not. For instance, according to our regulations in Canada the equipment is different from the American ; it is not based on tonnage altogether. When I speak of equipment I refer to life-boat, fire appliances, and that sort of thing. Nor is it based on the passenger capacity of the steamer, but on certain other things which are furnished by the department. Now, the American Government will not accept the Canadian certificate, but will have a Government inspection of the steamer and will compel a Canadian steamer carrying passengers from an American port to comply with the American law in reference to its equipment, which is greater, as I said before, than the Canadian regulations require, while, on the other hand, they will limit the Canadian steamer to the reduced number of passengers, that the Canadian Government require. So the House will see that this is an unfair carrying out of reciprocal regulations, if there are such. In short, our Canadian steamers are subject to two distinct inspections and are bound by the laws of both countries whichever one is most against the steamer. I suppose we ought not to complain of it if it is for the protection of life and property. Still, these arguments ought to be reciprocal and there ought to be some understanding in regard to the matter. So far, I have spoken in regard to the inspection and the carrying of passengers ; now, I want to call the attention of the House to another point.

According to our coast regulations, we permit an American steamer to come to a Canadian port and carry excursion parties out of that port to another Canadian port, on condition—the hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) shakes his head, but he will see that I am right and that what I say is done in practice—on condition that the American steamer calls at one American port between two Canadian ports.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Just so.

**Mr. BRITTON.** But the Americans will not allow a similar thing to be done by Canadian vessels. I will give you a case in point, because what is done in actual practice better illustrates and proves what I have to say than anything else that I can bring before the House. The steamer "North King," a Canadian vessel, makes weekly excursions from the port of Charlotte, which, as hon. members know, is the port of the city of Rochester, to Alexandria Bay, during the excursion season. But, in order to send her American passengers from Charlotte to Alexandria Bay, notwithstanding the fact that she touched at Brighton, Colborne, Belleville, Picton and Kingston, she is not allowed to carry her passengers herself to Alexandria Bay, but must take them to Rockport, a Canadian port, and employ an American steamer to carry her passengers from Rockport to Alexandria Bay. After the passengers have had their day's outing, the American steamer must carry them back to Rockport and then the "North King" may take them on board and carry them back to Rochester. This, as it will be seen, is a greater restriction than the Canadian Government have placed on American vessels. They have allowed American steamers to carry from one Canadian port to another, if they call at an American port between. This is not reciprocity; it is not fair. The matter should be put upon some basis fair to Canadian vessels; and, at this particular time, when there is a little jealousy between the two countries and there is an unfair discrimination against Canadians, when they go over there to work, these matters should receive the attention of our Government, and, as I said before the regulations should be reciprocal. Further than that, under the law which is popularly known as the International Wrecking Act, it is provided that Americans may come into Canadian waters to carry on wrecking, and Canadians may go to American waters for the same purpose. But in the carrying on of this arrangement another piece of unfairness is daily practiced. When a Canadian vessel goes into American waters to do wrecking, raises an American wreck and tows it to an American port, no objection, I believe, is raised. But, in connection with wrecking, perhaps, floaters are used, American property. The Americans have been so jealous of their rights in this

**Mr. BRITTON.**

matter that in case these vessels, the one raised and the other accompanying it, or in case of two vessels raised—as may happen in case of collision or anything of that kind—they would not allow one to be left by the Canadian wrecking boat at one dock and another at another dock of the same city. I say that is something we ought not to permit, and the attention of the Government having been called to this matter, it should see to it that the regulations are reciprocal in fact and in practice. It is well known that in case of wreck there are generally more than one vessel, as the wreck is occasioned, perhaps, by storm or fog which affects a number of vessels. The matters to which I have called attention are important in the actual carrying out of the terms of the International Wrecking Act. I would ask for the correspondence, if there is any, or if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) who is leading the Government to-day thinks that it is enough to have called attention to the matter, I should be content. But these are matters of unfairness which Canadians ought not to submit to.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** There can be no objection whatever to the passage of the motion of my hon. friend. So far as I am personally concerned, I have not had my attention called to this matter by correspondence since I became Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not mean my statement to imply that there may not be such correspondence in the department carried on by my predecessor. With respect to the two distinct matters to which the hon. gentleman has called attention, I wish just to say that as regards the limit placed upon the carrying of passengers by the Canadian statutes, that is not an international matter. Parliament has repeatedly determined that vessels of a certain size going from our ports should be permitted, when surveyed by the inspector of Hulls and Boilers, to carry a certain number of passengers. Whether our decision accords with the decision of the American Government or not is a matter with which we have no concern, it is not a matter of international agreement, we decide for ourselves.

**Mr. BRITTON.** In mentioning that, I referred to carrying American passengers from an American port and taking them back again.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** So far as the number of passengers is concerned, the limit of this number and the regulations under which they are to be carried, are now fixed by Canadian law, altogether irrespective of the number of passengers fixed by American laws, or the regulations under which they should carry them. This is not a matter of international agreement at all, it is perfectly open for us to provide that an American boat should not carry passengers be-

yond that limit from an American port to an American port, if she touches a Canadian port in the interim. We can provide that if desirable; that is a matter which we can discuss, but our law does not compel us to do that. With reference to the other matter of international wrecking, that is a matter of statute law, the rules and regulations are international, and any discrepancy that exists as pointed out by my hon. friend, may be discussed, and it should not be continued. The same regulations which the Americans have in force and are carried out under international law ought to be, so far as they are reasonable, adopted by Canada in carrying out our side of the matter. The matter will be called to the attention of the officers in my department.

Mr. COWAN. I desire to say only a word or two with reference to the statements of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) regarding coasting regulations and wrecking privileges. I desire to state a case which arose near the city of Detroit a short time ago. The tug "Home Rule" was employed to assist two American vessels that were in distress, and tow them to the city of Detroit. The vessels being laden with different kinds of merchandise, the owners desired to land one at the foot of 24th street and the other at the foot of 1st street. Mr. Frank Hackett, the owner of the Canadian tug "Home Rule" was unable to take the vessel to the foot of 1st street, and was compelled to hire an American tug at an exorbitant price for the purpose of bringing the vessel up, on account of being barred by the coasting regulations of the United States. On the other hand, if American tugs should relieve Canadian vessels, as they have done to my personal knowledge, the tug may land one vessel at the town of Sandwich on the Canadian side of the river, opposite 24th street, and tow the other up to the city of Windsor without any violation, or at all events, without any complaint being made of any violation of the Canadian restrictions. I simply desire to rise in my place and say that to my personal knowledge that sort of thing has gone on and is going on every day.

Motion agreed to.

#### PHYSICIANS TO THE INDIANS OF BRANT COUNTY.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Clancy) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and any parties in the county of Brant relating to the dismissals of Dr. J. A. Langrill and Drs. Walter and Ashton Langrill from the position of resident physician and assistant physicians to the Indians on the reservation in the township of Tuscarora, county of Brant.

He said: I move this motion on behalf of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I take a great interest in it, because I know

all these parties, and I know Dr. J. A. Langrill to be an officer of ability and trustworthiness.

Motion agreed to.

#### INDIAN AGENT, HAGARSVILLE.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Clancy) moved for :

Copies of all telegrams and letters between the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, and Mr. Charles B. Heyd, M.P. for South Brant, and Mr. Davis, of the county of Haldimand, relating to the appointment or otherwise of Mr. Daniel Lynch, of the village of Hagersville, or Dr. Stuart of the same place, as Indian agent in the room and stead of Dr. Jones of Hagersville.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) who this Daniel Lynch is? Is he a livery-keeper in Hagersville?

Mr. HEYD. I think he is a general merchant, and not a livery stable keeper.

Motion agreed to.

#### SCRIP FOR THE HALF-BREEDS.

Mr. DAVIS moved for :

Copies of all petitions, letters and other papers respecting scrip for the half-breeds in the North-west Territories, and to approve of claims of half-breeds born in the North-west Territories between 1st July, 1870, and 1st July, 1885.

He said: I was given to understand that when a question of the same kind came up before in the House, the Prime Minister stated that the question of scrip in the North-west Territories would be taken up during the recess. If it is the intention of the Government to take the matter up and consider it during the recess, I shall be perfectly satisfied to withdraw the motion. If not, I desire to proceed with it. I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of Marine, who is leading the House, on this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am not in a position to make any authoritative statement on the matter. I was under the impression, as was the hon. gentleman, that the Premier had made a statement in regard to it; but in the absence of the Minister of the Interior, I am not in a position to say how the matter stands, or as to what is the intention of the hon. gentleman. I have no objection to the adoption of the motion, and when the papers are brought down the hon. gentleman can ascertain from the Minister of the Interior what is the policy in regard to this subject. On any motion to go into Committee of Supply the hon. gentleman can ascertain exactly what the Government policy is.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). This is a very important question, and it should be settled one way or the other. The people in

my district are dissatisfied with the supposed settlement of seven years ago. That dealt with our half-breeds on the same basis as with the half-breeds of Manitoba, and under it the Government gave scrip to all children of half-breeds up to 1870. The half-breeds of the North-west complain that the settlement made with the half-breeds of Manitoba did not apply to them, and believe they are entitled to be paid for every child born up to July, 1885. The Government have not seen the question in that light, and an agitation is going on in the Saskatchewan district for the settlement of the difficulty. My attention was brought to the matter during the last election. In the half-breed settlement there is an agitation going on, and during the election I promised that I would call attention to the matter and have the Government deal with it one way or the other. The Government should end the difficulty. And if justice is to be done to those people it should be done at once; if not, the people should be informed that they have nothing to expect in this regard. A petition has been sent here setting forth the half-breed claims. It is as follows:—

Dominion of Canada,

To wit :

The 1st day of June, 1895.

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council :

The petition of Her Majesty's half-breed subjects residing in the North-western Territory of Canada humbly sheweth :

Whereas, it has always been the invariable and fixed policy of the British Empire, when acquiring any territories, to treat with the native inhabitants, and make them compensation in order to extinguish their natural title to the soil ;

And whereas, it was, in fact, stipulated by the Imperial Government and undertaken by the Government of Canada that such a policy would be pursued with the aborigines upon the transfer of Rupert's Land to Canada, as is evidenced by the Imperial Acts, the Addresses of the Houses of Parliament of Canada, and the Order of the Privy Council, authorizing the transfer, from which the following extracts are quoted :—

Imperial Act, Cap. CV., 31 and 32 Vic. (31st July, 1863) :

" And whereas, by the British North America Act, 1867, it was (amongst other things) enacted, that it should be lawful for Her Majesty, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on address from the Houses of Parliament of Canada, to admit Rupert's Land and the North-west Territories, or either of them, into the union on such terms and conditions as are in the Address expressed, and as Her Majesty thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of the said Act."

Ibid, Sec. 2.—" For the purposes of this Act the term Rupert's Land shall include the whole of the lands and territories held or claimed to be held by the said governor and company."

Ibid, Sec. 3.—" Provided, however, that such surrender shall not be accepted by Her Majesty until the terms and conditions upon which Rupert's Land shall be admitted into the said Dominion of Canada shall have been approved by

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

Her Majesty, and embodied in an Address to Her Majesty from both the Houses of the Parliament of Canada in pursuance of the one hundred and forty-sixth section of the British North America Act, 1867."

The following conditions were embodied in the first Address of the Senate and Commons of Canada, 31 Vic., clause 7, and also in their second Address, which was approved by the Imperial Privy Council :—

" That upon the transference of the territory in question to the Canadian Government, the claims of the Indian tribes to compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement, would be considered and settled in conformity with the equitable principles which have uniformly governed the Crown in its dealings with aborigines."

There is also embodied in the said second Address of the Houses of Parliament of Canada a memorandum of 22nd March, 1896, being the details of agreement between the delegates of the Government of the Dominion and the directors of the Hudson's Bay Company, of which the eighth clause is as follows :—

" 8. It is understood that any claims of Indians to compensate for lands required for purposes of settlement shall be disposed of by the Canadian Government in communication with the Imperial Government, and the company shall be relieved of all responsibility in respect to them."

There is also embodied in the said second Address the following resolution :—

" That upon the transference of the territories in question to the Canadian Government, it will be our duty to make adequate provision for the protection of the Indian tribes whose interests and well-being are involved in the transfer, and we authorize and empower the Governor in Council to arrange any details that may be necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of the above agreement."

The Order of the Imperial Privy Council of 23rd June, 1870, authorizing the transfer, approves of the terms and conditions recited by the Address, as follows :—

" It is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, in pursuance and exercise of the powers vested in Her Majesty by the said Acts of Parliament, that from and after the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, the said North-western Territory shall be admitted into, and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the terms and conditions set forth in the first hereinbefore recited Address, and that the Parliament of Canada shall from the day aforesaid have full power and authority to legislate for the future welfare and good government of the said territory.

" And it is further ordered, that without prejudice to any obligations arising from the aforesaid approved report, Rupert's Land shall from and after the said date be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the following terms and conditions, being the terms and conditions still remaining to be performed of those embodied in the said second Address of the Parliament of Canada and approved by Her Majesty as aforesaid."

Ibid, Clause 14.—" Any claim of Indians to compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement shall be disposed of by the Canadian Government in communication with the Imperial Government; and the company shall be relieved of all responsibility in respect to them."

Ibid, Clause 15.—" The Governor in Council is authorized and empowered to arrange any details that may be necessary to carry out the above terms and conditions."

The Dominion of Canada proceeded to carry out these conditions by the Manitoba Act (12th May, 1870), confirmed by an Imperial Act :

"Sec. 31.—And whereas, it is expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the province to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands, to the extent of one million four hundred thousand acres thereof for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents, it is hereby enacted that, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant-Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the province at the time of the said transfer to Canada, and the same shall be granted to the said children respectively, in such mode and on such conditions as to settlement and otherwise as the Governor General in Council may from time to time determine."

The British North America Act, 1871, clause 6, provides that it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last-mentioned Act.

Afterwards, under the authority of the Manitoba Act, Orders in Council were passed, authorizing the issue of scrips instead of land in satisfaction of the claims of half-breeds, and they have since been compensated in that way.

These Acts are quoted to repel the argument, that such compensation is an act of grace on the part of the Crown in Canada, and may at any moment be dispensed with.

It would appear, rather, that the transfer was an act of grace on the part of Her Majesty, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, in permitting it, and that such permission was granted upon the terms and conditions hereinbefore stated, which remained to be performed by the Parliament of Canada. That, in fact, the transfer was a solemn act of contract and treaty between the Dominion of Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company, through the intermediation and sanction of the Imperial Government, which the Parliament of Canada undertook and bound itself to perform. And that the policy of issuing scrip to the half-breeds in settlement of their claims to be compensated for lands, was in accordance with this contract and a performance of its terms.

This policy was pursued in Manitoba from the time of the transfer until May, 1886, when it ceased by proclamation, after having been continued for about sixteen years.

Early in the conduct of this matter in Manitoba, the question arose as to whether children living, but unborn at the time of transfer, the 15th July, 1870, should be entitled to such compensation.

It was then, after due deliberation by the officers of the Crown, decided that such grants of land or scrip should be given to the half-breed children born after the transfer, up to the expiration of the year 1870.

The Government prescribed the same policy for the North-west Territory by the Dominion Lands Act, 1883, sec. 81, clause E, as follows:—

"The following powers are hereby delegated to the Governor in Council:—

"(e.) To satisfy any claims existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title preferred by half-breeds resident in the North-west Territories, outside of the limits of Manitoba, previous to the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, by granting land to such persons to such extent and on such terms and conditions as may be deemed expedient."

And by the following Order in Council:—

Privy Council, Ottawa, 30th March, 1885.

"Notice is hereby given that His Excellency the Governor General, on the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, has this day been pleased to approve of the appointment of the following commissioners for the purpose of making an enumeration of half-breeds resident in the North-west Territories, outside of the limits of Manitoba, previous to the 15th of July, 1870, who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba previous to the transfer, with a view to an equitable settlement of their claims, &c."

The intention of the Government was to pursue the same policy to the North-west half-breeds as had been adopted in Manitoba; it was so stated by the commissioners, and by a letter from the Department of Interior published in the public press. Yet the commissioners issued no scrip to half-breed children in the North-west born after the transfer and within the year 1870, owing, it was said, to some technical defect in their instructions which was expected to be remedied.

Notice was given by proclamation that such claims should determine and cease on the 1st day of May, 1894, after having been continued for about nine years.

Your petitioners respectfully submit:

That a proclamation that such claims should cease and determine is not "a consideration and settlement in conformity with the equitable principles which have uniformly governed the Crown in its dealings with aborigines," such as was promised by the Parliament of Canada; that, in fact, it is no settlement at all, as far as the individual half-breed is concerned.

The proclamation is a breath which would extinguish the Indian title, as it were a candle, contrary to the spirit of the agreement stipulated by the Hudson's Bay Company, wherein "It is understood that any claims of Indians for compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement, shall be disposed of by the Canadian Government," that is, disposed of by compensation. Any other stipulation is a contradiction in terms repugnant to the understanding.

It is well known that in the North-west the settlements are more sparse, distances greater, and means of communication less than they were in Manitoba, so that fully as much time should have been given the half-breeds in the west to file their claims as in Manitoba.

It is submitted, too, that the same equitable principle should have been carried out, by which children born after the transfer and within the year 1870, should have been paid, as was established in Manitoba.

Your petitioners would point out, that, in conformity with the resolutions embodied in the aforesaid Address or the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, a policy has been pursued with the Indians totally separate and distinct from that taken with the half-breeds. The latter have been dealt with and compensated individually as having personal political rights, which, indeed, they did have, and exercise, prior to the transfer. Whereas the Indians have been treated with in bands and placed on reservations under the immediate protection and guardianship of the Government.

The distinction was a natural one, founded upon the fact that these two classes were in reality separate peoples, and was established in practice by the Government.

So that, though half-breeds may have been residing in territory not yet ceded by the Indians

under treaty, their claims were nevertheless recognized and paid, under the authority of Orders in Council made from time to time.

This seemed to be a just performance of the conditions undertaken by Canada at the time of the transfer.

The reasons used in the last Order in Council for this purpose, justify the advisability of such a course in very clear and apt language, as follows :—

“ On a report, dated 6th February, 1894, from the Minister of the Interior, stating that, since the date of the Order in Council of the 11th April, 1892, thirty-one claims to share in the North-west half-breed grant of scrip, under sub-clause F of clause 90, chap. 54 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, have been preferred by persons whose names appear on the subjoined schedule, such persons having been resident on the 15th July, 1870, in a portion of the Territories or the district of Keewatin which has not yet been ceded by the Indians under treaty.

“ The Minister is of opinion that it would be advisable in the public interest, that these claims should be finally disposed of, notwithstanding the residence of the claimants at the time of the transfer in territory not yet ceded by the Indians under treaty, on the same terms as were the claims of half-breeds who were residing on the 15th July, 1870, in territory that had been ceded, and he (the Minister), therefore, recommended that he be empowered to deal with the claims in question in the manner suggested, and to issue scrip in satisfaction thereof to such of the claimants as may be proved to be entitled thereto.”

This was approved on the 23th February, 1894, and the claims mentioned were paid. Other similar claims were paid up to the 1st May, 1894. The Government then cited the proclamation as the reason why no further claims of this kind could be approved.

It was, however, pointed out that the proclamation was expressly limited in its application to residents in the ceded territories. The Government then took the position that the claims could not be approved because the territory was not yet ceded by the Indians.

Manifestly, this is no answer. It has never been suggested that it is the duty of these half-breeds to secure treaties by the Indians with the Government. They have, as yet, no representation in the House. It is the duty of the Government to proceed and finally dispose of these matters, as the Governor in Council is authorized and empowered to do. No reason is given to alter the value of the opinion of the Minister already quoted : “ The Minister is of the opinion that it would be advisable, in the public interest, that these claims should be finally disposed of, notwithstanding the residence of the claimants at the time of the transfer in territory not yet ceded by the Indians under treaty.”

That opinion must, therefore, be as good now as then. It is so ; because it is founded upon the very core and essence of the whole matter, namely : “ the transference of the territory in question to the Canadian Government ” by the Hudson's Bay Company, that is (we have nothing here to do with ceded or unceded territory). “ Rupert's Land,” which “ term ” the Imperial Act says, “ shall include the whole of the lands and territories held or claimed to be held by the said governor and company.”

Your petitioners, therefore, pray :

That Orders in Council be passed to dispose of claims to half-breeds in unceded territory.

To approve of claims of half-breeds born in the North-west Territories after the transfer and within the year 1870.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

And to give further time for the filing of applications in the North-west Territory.

Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

This is a very long petition and I am sorry I had to weary the House by reading it, but it is a matter of great importance to these people, and it was expected that I should bring the question before the attention of Parliament. I hope the Government will take some action during the recess in connection with these very important claims in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. At an earlier part of the session I brought a cognate matter before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) is quite right in saying that the Prime Minister gave assurances. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries then moved the adjournment of the House because the Prime Minister was absent, and on May the 10th the Prime Minister was present and this is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said :

We have received numerous petitions from all parts of the territories, and especially from the seat of the rebellion, stating that many of Her Majesty's subjects who suffered at the time grievous losses, have not yet obtained the satisfaction which they sought to obtain. Another class of claimants are also pressing their views on the Government. My hon. friend is aware that the half-breeds have petitioned for the extinguishment of the Indian title and to be treated as the Manitoba half-breeds were treated. The Manitoba half-breeds were treated in this way : In 1870, when we took possession of the country, the law which was then passed was to the effect that all those half-breeds at that time, that is all the heads of families and all the children born before 1870, were entitled to scrip. The head of a family received 120 acres of land, and a child born before 1870 received 240 acres. A commission was issued in 1885 to settle the half-breed claims. Shortly after the opening of the rebellion, they were settled with under that law, that is to say, the half-breeds of the North-west were treated in the same manner as the half-breeds in Manitoba had been treated, and arrangements would go back to 1870 and not before that year ; whereas, the claim now put forward by the half-breeds of the North-west is, that the date of their claims should go back to 1885—that fathers of families and children born since 1885 should receive scrip. I am not prepared to say whether it would be fair or unfair, just or unjust to accept these claims made by the half-breeds. But one point I want to press on the attention of my hon. friends is this : It is the intention of the Government during the recess to investigate all these claims, those of the Wood Mountain Scouts, those of the half-breeds for additional scrip in order to extinguish Indian claims arising out of rebellion losses, and, in so far as possible, to acknowledge all these claims for scrip. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) not to press his motion further at the present time. I may add this : My hon. friend is aware that the scrip which has formerly been given to compensate half-breeds or others, has not been a source of profit to those in whose favour it has been issued. My hon. friend will, I think, agree with me, that the scrip issued in the settlement of claims has been squan-

dered, and that it would perhaps be advisable for the Government to endeavour to find some method by which the scrip thus issued should be more profitable to the parties receiving it than has been found to be the case up to the present time. That is a question as to which also the Government intend to have some investigation. I repeat, that it is the intention of the Government, during the recess, to investigate all these claims.

Having that assurance from the Prime Minister, I withdrew my motion, because nothing could be more direct and positive than that assurance that all these claims, including those now put forward by the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan, would be inquired into.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The matter which the hon. member has read from "Hansard" is, of course, new to me, as I was not in the House at the time. As the Prime Minister has made a promise that these claims will be investigated during the recess, I beg to withdraw my motion. I hope that the matter will be investigated at the very earliest moment, because it should be settled one way or the other without delay.

Motion withdrawn.

#### RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all applications or recommendations for positions as mail carriers in the city of Brantford, in connection with the free postal delivery promised by the Postmaster General.—(Mr. Davin, for Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all correspondence and papers cancelling the contract with S. E. Turner for carrying the mail between Tottenham and Athlone, in the county of Simcoe, province of Ontario.—(Sir Charles Tupper, for Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Copies of all correspondence of record in the Department of the Interior in regard to the keeping of Government horses by S. J. Donaldson, of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, from October, 1894, until May, 1895, and referring in any way to the transferring of the keeping of said horses from Joseph Letellier de St. Just to the said S. J. Donaldson; together with all accounts received from S. J. Donaldson in connection with keeping of said horses and caring for other Government property.—(Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan.)

Copies of all petitions, letters and documents respecting the claims made by the veterans of the rebellion of 1837-38 for pensions or other compensation, and for all departmental replies thereto, and all other papers connected therewith.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Copies of all correspondence, recommendations, demands or orders relating to the dismissal of Michael Behan, storeman of Lachine Canal at Montreal.—(Mr. Quinn.)

Copies of all correspondence, recommendations, demands or orders relating to the dismissal of Michael Enright, an employee on Lachine Canal at Montreal.—(Mr. Quinn.)

1. Copies of all correspondence relating to or in any way connected with the resignation of His Honour Judge Jones from the office of County Court Judge of the county of Brant.

2. Copies of all correspondence relating to or in any way connected with the pension or retiring allowance granted to or to be granted to the said Judge Jones, on his retirement from the said office of County Court Judge of the county of Brant.

3. Copies of all correspondence relating to or in any way connected with the appointment of Alexander Hardy, Esq., of Brantford, to the county court judgeship of the County of Brant.—(Mr. Bennett.)

Return of the number of tons of bituminous steam coal and of bituminous slack coal imported from the United States in 1896, at several ports of entry, and amount of duty collected at such ports, and duty paid by Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railways.—(Mr. Roche.)

Copies of all tenders opened the 24th day of April, 1897, for works on the Cardinal section, Galops Canal, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended; also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all tenders opened the 30th day of April, 1897, for works on the Iroquois section, Galops Canal, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended; also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all tenders opened the 7th day of May, 1897, for works on the north channel of the St. Lawrence River, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended; also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Return of all correspondence, reports and papers in connection with the line of demarcation of the Alaskan frontier.—(Mr. Morrison.)

Copy of the advertisement recently published calling for tenders for the carrying of the mail between Danville, in the county of Richmond, and St. Camille, in the county of Wolfe, province of Quebec, and of all tenders sent in, giving the names of the tenderers and the amount of the tender in each case, the name of the successful tenderer, and the amount at which the contract was let.—(Mr. Ives.)

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams and replies thereto, between the Minister of Agriculture or any member or official of the Government and any person in reference to the withdrawal, or proposed withdrawal, of Government aid or control from cheese and butter factories in Prince Edward Island. Also all correspondence, &c., between any member of the Government and any person representing or on behalf of any cheese or butter factory proposed to be erected and operated in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and any parties in the county of Brant relating to the appointment of Dr. Levi Secord, of Brantford, Dr. McKee of the same place, and Dr. Beer, formerly of Plattsville, in the county of Oxford, to the positions of head physician and assistants to the Indians on the reservation in the township of Tuscarora, county of Brant.—(Mr. Davin, for Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and any parties in the county of Brant, or statutory declaration relating to the dismissal of Chief A. G. Smith, chief clerk in the

Indian Office at Brantford; Chief Josiah Hill, clerk of the Six Nations Council, Ohsweken, in the county of Brant; Mr. Wm. Reep, interpreter of the Six Nations Indians, in county of Brant.—(Mr. Davin, for Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the appointment of one David Hill to the position of chief clerk in the Indian Office, Brantford.—(Mr. Davin, for Mr. Clancy.)

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

### After Recess.

#### PILOTAGE BILL.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Pilots serving between Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. Guay.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that nearly every clause in this important Bill has been amended and redrafted in committee, and as it is a very long Bill, we would require to have it reprinted in its amended form in order to be able to understand it thoroughly. The Bill will not stand in danger of being slaughtered by being held over until reprinted, as there are at least four or five opportunities remaining for it to come up. Unless the general feeling of the House is otherwise, I would move that the committee rise and report progress, and that the Bill should then be reprinted for the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. SCRIVER. I may say that the Bill was very thoroughly discussed by the Private Bills Committee, and that by the amendments to it, many of the objections of the shipping interests of Montreal and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have been removed. In a conversation which I had with an official representative of the shipping interests of Montreal, he admitted that these amendments had removed many serious objections which they had to the Bill. Of course they objected to the principle, but as that was sustained by a large majority in the committee, he had nothing else to say on that subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as I am concerned, the statement of my hon. friend is very satisfactory, so far as it goes, and I would be the last one to make any captious objections to the measure. But there are four or five opportunities still available, and it is absolutely impossible to properly consider these amendments unless the Bill be reprinted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I do not think the request of my hon. friend is at all unreasonable. The Bill is a very important

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

one and received very great consideration at the hands of the committee. There are many controversial points in it. It affects very largely the pilotage law which has been in existence for many years, which gave the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal exclusive control of matters relating to pilotage, and this Bill takes a very large slice of that control from them. The Bill is one which we could not ask hon. members to accept without deliberation, and as there will be several opportunities to bring it before the House again, I would ask the House to accede to my hon. friend's request in order that the Bill may be reprinted in its amended form before being put through the committee.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

#### INTERCOLONIAL EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to two or three matters that will perhaps materially expedite the closing business of the House. I want, in the first place, to draw attention to the fact that the arrangement which we were informed at the beginning of the session had been concluded for bringing the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, which is a very important measure, would be greatly facilitated in its consideration, if the papers connected with that matter were laid on the Table. This is desirable in order that we may be able to familiarize ourselves with the position the question occupies, which is of very considerable importance. I shall be glad if that course is followed and the papers laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have made a note of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the next place, there is a matter which I conceive to be of great importance, and that is the alterations made in the administration of the Royal Military College at Kingston. In the absence of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt), who obtained an order of the House for papers, and which order has not yet been complied with, I ask that those papers be brought down. It is of the greatest importance to every one in the country who takes an interest in the institution that we should know what changes have been made, and what the proposed organization of the college is to be in the future; and it is just possible

that a still wider question may be raised, and that is how far it is desirable to maintain the institution, if the changes have been such as to radically alter the whole principle on which the Royal Military College was founded. It was established by the Government of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie with the view of providing the means of obtaining a military education for the young men of the country. So far as I am able to judge from the best knowledge I have been able to obtain, the changes proposed are not at all such as to retain the principle on which it was established, but rather to depart from that principle; and the general question may be raised, whether under such circumstances the House should spend public money for the purpose of maintaining an institution that practically is competing with institutions of a higher and a better class for the purpose of affording education, outside of military education. I merely throw out these points in order that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Militia Department may bring before the House the necessary papers for the purpose of giving the information to the House and the country to enable it to discuss the effect of the changes proposed. In the third place, I want to ask if the hon. gentleman leading the House will comply with the order issued for:

Copy of Schedule B, showing recommendations of the Treasury Board as submitted by report of Council to His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th and 7th July, 1896, and intended to be approved by him, laid upon the Table of the House last session, with a statement of the action taken by the Government on each of these appointments as made by the said Order in Council approved by His Excellency, or, where no such action has been taken, the reason for such a course.

The hon. gentleman will agree with me that this order having been made as long ago as 3rd May, I am not unreasonable in asking that the papers be laid on the Table of the House.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I will see that these matters are attended to forthwith. I might say by way of removing misapprehension, that I think erroneous ideas have gone abroad respecting the Royal Military College. The alterations to be made are not intended to destroy its military character, and will not have that effect. The college had, however, fallen to a low ebb; not more than eight or nine candidates presented themselves for examination under the old system.

Mr. **HUGHES**. I hope the remark made by the acting Minister of Militia in regard to the changes not being such as to interfere with the military character of the institution are correct, because as a literary educational institutions at the present time. I hope that under no consideration will it possess a less military character than at

the present time, because that is its only recommendation.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. In my judgment, the acting Minister of Militia is entirely mistaken. The Royal Military College never occupied a higher position than it did at the time these changes were proposed. When the time for discussing this subject arrives, I shall be able to show that the standing of the college, both here and in England, never was higher than at the time when these changes were made.

#### PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. **SCRIVER** (for Mr. Charlton) moved that the amendments made in committee on Bill 13 be concurred in. He said: These amendments consist in striking out the second and third clauses of the Bill, leaving only the first clause, which provides for raising the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years. I may add that the Bill as it now stands has met with the approval of the leader of the Government.

Mr. **BRITTON**. Is it desirable to have double legislation on this matter? I think a similar provision is contained in a Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice in the Senate. If that is so, it certainly is better to have one Bill dealing with this among other subjects, than to have a separate Bill on this subject.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) would do well to consider whether he should proceed with the present Bill. The First Minister gave his consent to this provision, and it was incorporated in this Bill, a public Bill introduced by a private member; and he not only assented to the Bill, but he took steps to have it incorporated in a Government Bill introduced in the other Chamber. That Bill contains the same provision. We have, of course, no official knowledge of what has taken place in the Senate, but this matter was dealt with by the Government in a Government Bill, and the Government has no power to compel one Chamber or the other to adopt it. It does seem to me, and I would submit, whether it would not be wrong and wasting what has now become very valuable time if, while this matter is under discussion at the Government instance in that Chamber, we put it in another Bill and send it up from here.

Mr. **SCRIVER**. But we are not supposed to know what the other Chamber are going to do; as a matter of fact, we do not know.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, but I was telling him what the Government did. The Government, through the Minister of Justice, introduced this very clause in a Bill of their own, and presented

it to the Senate as a Government measure. Now, that Bill will come before us at a later stage as a Government measure. The Bill before us with this clause cannot be carried at this stage of the session as a public Bill; as a Government measure, if passed through the Senate, we will have it before us, and if a majority of the House consents to it, it will no doubt be carried.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is another grave reason why we should stop action on this matter. In the first place, as the hon. gentleman points out, this clause forms part of a Government measure which will, no doubt, come before us in due time. The subject is a very serious one indeed, and it requires a great deal of thought and consideration. In 1892 this House will recollect this subject, having been previously discussed, was very carefully considered by a competent committee. The measure went through both Houses of Parliament and became the Criminal Code of the country; and this particular clause was adopted and discussed. The subject, of course, is a very delicate one, indeed; and my reason for urging that no particular haste should be shown in this, lies in the fact that leading men on both sides of the House, accustomed to the administration of criminal justice in Canada, expressed very serious doubts as to whether anything whatever could be done in this direction by proceeding hastily, or going in advance of the provision now in the Criminal Code of 1892. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, assisted me when I held the position of Minister of Justice, in defeating a measure of this kind in 1895; and when the Government proceed to bring that measure into this House, they will no doubt be able to meet any objection which prevailed when this subject was under consideration in 1895. I was able then to state, as Minister of Justice, that up to that time there was no reason urged by the Attorneys General in the different provinces in connection with criminal prosecutions, and there was no reliable information in the Department of Justice which would indicate that there was occasion to proceed in this direction. In regard to that question there were obvious dangers that, in seeking to do right, and in seeking to meet what no doubt is a very strong sentiment in many portions of the country, Parliament, by acting at all hastily, might be doing a grievous wrong to Her Majesty's subjects, and putting honest and law-abiding citizens in a position of peril. There have been leading members on both sides of this Chamber who have great experience in connection with the administration of criminal justice, and who have protested in the strongest way against any measure of this kind, or against proceeding too hastily with a laudable enough desire to meet what might be a public sentiment among a class of people who are in no way

Mr. DAVIES.

accustomed to the courts, or in no way have experience in connection with these matters as they come up in the courts of justice. I may perhaps be permitted to read the views I expressed in 1895, and also to call attention to the views expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was especially able, from his knowledge of his part of the country, to give a valuable opinion. I said—

This whole subject was very carefully considered by this Parliament in 1892, and it is my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that I find, further, that from no attorney general connected with the administration of criminal matters in the provinces, or any of the judges—

That is a most important point.

—who watch these matters and take interest in them, has there been any statement or representation which would warrant me in coming to the conclusion that there was a desire on the part of those concerned with the administration of criminal law, to secure the changes proposed. In England, it was not till 1885 that the age was placed as it is in our code of 1892. The Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons in that year gave much attention to this subject. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in his place at that time:

For my part, I concur in the reasons which the Minister of Justice has given that this House should not assent to the Bill. When the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill, some years ago, to make seduction a criminal offence, punishable by this Parliament, he had my sympathy and support. The question of the arbitrary age at which Parliament should make the offence a criminal one, is one which aroused much discussion, and the matter was thoroughly threshed out at that time. The principle adopted at that time was, that a child below a certain age ought not to be held, in the eyes of the law, responsible in the sense of giving consent; and Parliament fixed the age at sixteen years. We must fix some arbitrary age, although no one can say that it is absolutely correct; but the general consensus of opinion was, that sixteen was about the age at which the line should be drawn. Nothing has occurred in the part of the Dominion from which I come to induce me to vote to alter the age. Government should not be tinkering with these laws every year. When we have a law which works fairly well, and the general consensus is that this law is working fairly well, and requires no amendment, we would be taking a leap in the dark and moving in a wrong direction, if we altered the age.

I offer no apology for reading either of those statements, because, in 1895, they were sufficient to induce the House to pause. It is of particular importance that this should have the mature consideration and deliberation of the present Minister of Justice, if he has looked into this subject and, subsequently, the opinion of the department, as represented in this House by the Solicitor General, who is well able to give the opinion of the Department of Justice, and so guide us in this matter. The hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill would have great difficulty himself, as any one else would, for instance, in meeting that sentiment

which is behind the Bill, and which might say: Why not fix the age of consent at twenty-one instead of eighteen? Therefore, in that matter there is, as it seems to me, a safer guide than merely catering to the sentiment of very respectable people, as I said before, earnest people, who have looked into this subject, but who, from the very nature of the case, are not in a position safely to guide us in connection with legislation relating to crime. The age has to be fixed somewhere, it has been fixed, and unless Parliament is given substantial proof and satisfactory evidence that that has not prevented the crime that we are attempting to repress, I think there is every reason now for pausing, as we did in 1895.

Mr. SCRIVER. After what has fallen from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and from the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I do not think it advisable to press this motion further, and, with the consent of the House, I beg leave to withdraw it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 16) to again amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Casey.)

#### IMPORTATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 5) to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, with which is consolidated Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. Cowan.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. TAYLOR. Clause 3 has been amended by the special committee to which Bill No. 5 and Bill No. 6 were referred. As the House is aware, a special committee was appointed to which both Bills were referred, and of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was chairman. But when the report of the committee was presented it was signed by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) as chairman.

Mr. COWAN. No, for the chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was signed by the hon. gentleman as chairman. I notice by the Order that Bill No. 6 is stated to have been consolidated with Bill No. 5. But Bills

Nos. 5 and 6 as passed by the committee are word for word and line for line the same, and I do not understand how they could have been consolidated. The committee have reported that the Bills were the same. Last year the Prime Minister promised the House that if any Bill were passed here, it would be a Bill word for word with the American Act. The Bill I have introduced during six successive years was an exact copy of the American Act, and it was a Bill I intended, if this Parliament passed any Bill, should be enacted. However, Bill No. 5 was placed on the Order paper this year, and it was an exact copy of my Bill up to section 7, after which three or four additional sections were added. Those sections the committee struck out, because they were not in the American measure, and therefore the Bill as brought down is practically the identical Bill I have introduced year after year. But the committee has seen fit to mutilate it, so that it is not workable. It is not a Bill applicable to the United States as their Alien labour law is applicable to Canada. The Bill as introduced by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) was a different Bill, but in committee the hon. gentleman yielded to the wishes of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and other hon. members representing the Government, as hon. gentlemen opposite had four members on the committee as compared with three members from this side of the House. I object to any change being made in the Bill I introduced, which was word for word a copy of the American Act, and which the First Minister promised to adopt. As now presented, the Bill will be worthless, and so I will oppose its passage through committee, unless we go back to the original Bill I introduced, and adopt a Bill word for word and line for line the same as the American Bill. I think this Bill should be reprinted and placed in the hands of hon. members of the House. The American Bill, section 3, reads as follows:

For every violation of any of the provisions of section one of this Act, the person, partnership, company or corporation violating the same by knowingly assisting, encouraging or soliciting the immigration or importation of any alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners into Canada, to perform labour or service of any kind under contract or agreement, express or implied, parole or special, with such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners previous to becoming residents or citizens of Canada, shall forfeit and pay for every such offence the sum of one thousand dollars, which may be sued for and recovered by the Dominion of Canada, or any person who shall first bring his action therefor, including any such alien or foreigner who may be a party to any such contract or agreement.

All the words from "which may be used for" have been struck out, and provision has been made that suit must be brought by the Attorney General of Canada or some person duly authorized by him. In the

United States, either the United States Government or any person can bring the action. Here no person except the Attorney General or some person authorized by him can do so.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that not better ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. This is not a copy of the American law, There any person can set the law in motion ; here no person is able to do except the Attorney General or some person authorized by him. In the American Bill there is a provision similar to this embodied in my Bill "at the expense of the Dominion of Canada." That has been struck out. That is struck out altogether. Then there is a new section added, section eight, which is not in the American Bill at all.

No proceedings under this Act, or prosecutions for violations thereof, shall be had or instituted without the consent of the Attorney General for Canada, or some person duly authorized by him.

Another clause of the Bill says :

This Act shall only apply to such foreign countries as have enacted, and retained in force, or may enact and retain in force, laws and ordinances applying to the Dominion of Canada, of a character similar to this Act.

That section has no business here, because the United States law is made against every foreign country, and ours should be a copy of theirs. Such a law was promised by the Premier last session, but it has now been departed from, and there has been much injury done to such an Act as I am satisfied this House was in a temper to carry when this Bill was introduced. Before the Bill was referred to the committee, the general expression of opinion was that we should pass a Bill similar to the law of the United States in every respect. This Bill is not similar, and therefore I am opposed to the report of the committee. It is true I was a member of the committee, but I was in the minority there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has not made very clear to the House the reasons for his objection to this Bill. The Bill was not one which had much personal sympathy from me.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amendments made in the committee were not amendments which I promoted, or which met the views I entertained, but they were amendments which were the result of a compromise. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was the gentleman who made this very amendment which my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) objects to. The House will understand in one moment the reason for the amendment ; although my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) not being a lawyer may not see it. The United States Bill provided that it should be the duty of the county attorney

Mr. TAYLOR.

in all cases to prosecute. Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) had had his way, and had a Bill passed which was a verbatim copy of the American Bill, it would have been a dead letter, because we have no such officials as county attorneys in the maritime provinces, and therefore there would have been no one to prosecute. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) sees that that clause in his Bill had to be amended. You have county attorneys in the province of Ontario—I cannot speak for the province of Quebec—but in the maritime provinces we have no county attorneys.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the expression "Attorney General" mean in the Bill. Does it mean the Dominion Attorney General ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, my lord.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think any of us would be very sorry if it turned out that I was right.

Mr. SCRIVER. Coming events cast their shadows before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The third section of the Bill was amended to meet this condition of things which exists in Canada, but does not exist in the United States of America. We were not on the committee to hold a tea party, but we were there to amend this Bill so that it should be workable, and to carry out the pledge which the leader of the Government gave. I therefore think that there is not an hon. gentleman on the committee, but who will assent to my view, that it was necessary to amend the Bill in that respect. Here was a Bill the effect of which might be seriously to imperil the international relations of two great Christian nations, and the question was : whether any individual, without responsibility, and without incurring a dollar of cost, was at liberty to enter prosecutions under this Bill, and to compel the law officers of the Crown at the public expense to carry his prosecution on. Such a person may not have had any ground whatever for his prosecution ; his object may have been simply to throw the two countries into turmoil,—even war if need be—he may have been a scalliwag not possessing \$5 in the wide world ; a person without reputation ; yet, as the Bill was originally drawn, such a one had the power not only to introduce proceedings of an international character, and throw the two countries into conflict with each other, but to invoke the powers of the county attorney and put the public to the expense of carrying out his will. The Attorney General of the province, the whole public opinion of the province might be opposed to his object, but still, if the

Bill had not been amended in that regard, it would have been at the power of any one to imperil the kindly relations which I am pleased to know exists so far between these two great nations. The amendment provides, that Her Majesty's Attorney General, or some person duly authorized by him shall bring the law into effect in every case. I am quite sure that every one who thinks over it for a moment, will assent to that amendment as being a reasonable and fair safeguard, so that the law shall not be made use of as a political engine by those politicians who would not scruple to invoke its aid, even if it did imperil international relations.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has not answered my objection altogether. He simply referred to the last section that is struck out and which read :

And it shall be the duty of the county attorney of the proper county to prosecute every such suit at the expense of the Dominion of Canada.

The excuse he gives for that is, that they have no county attorney's in the province whence he comes. That could easily be amended by saying "the county attorney or other official." The hon. gentleman overlooks the great fact, that the few lines preceding that in the American Bill, says :

It may be sued for and recovered by the United States, or any person who shall first bring his action therefor.

The Bill that I introduced read this way :

It may be sued for by the Dominion of Canada, or any person who shall first bring the action.

That left it open to any person to bring the action, and the United States Bill does the same thing.

Mr. COWAN. We have improved this Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan) will have an opportunity of speaking by-and-by and I trust he will not interrupt me.

Mr. COWAN. Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR. The 6th section of this Bill provides that the Attorney General of the United States or any citizen of the United States can bring an action.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hardly think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is in order in discussing the 6th section, when we are only on section 3.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well, I will deal with that afterwards. I am afraid the Bill is so mutilated in this section 3, that it is practically unworkable. If any person wants to bring an action he has to approach the Attorney General and get his consent, and no matter how good the case may be, if the Attorney General does not give his consent, it falls to the ground.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is undoubtedly right, so far as my recollection is concerned, that during last session the leader of the Government, not only stated that he was prepared to support a measure of this kind, but that he was prepared to adopt precisely such a measure as existed in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see very great force in the statement made by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies); that if we adopt verbatim the United States Bill, the result would be to render our Bill a dead letter, because of its inapplicability to the conditions in some of the provinces. I think that furnishes a good reason for making the amendment in the Bill. There is no doubt a good deal of force in the objection which is also taken by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies), that it might perhaps open the door to ill advised action, if we were to retain that feature of the Bill which enables any person to take action without reference to the law officers of the Crown. I think that perhaps will not create an insuperable difficulty, because I am inclined to think that if any person is able to establish a clear case in which this Bill should be brought into operation, the Attorney General would not take the responsibility of refusing to carry out the law. At all events, I should be sorry, if my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) went so far as to reject this Bill in consequence of the amendments that have been made by the committee which carefully considered it. I think a step will be taken in the right direction by the passage of the Bill, and if it be needed at a future period we can press for carrying the Bill further than it goes now.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman. I had not an opportunity, when this Alien Labour Bill was up for its second reading, of expressing my opinion upon it. To-night, at first view, I felt much inclined to agree with my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor); but, after the explanation made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), I think the position taken is the proper one. We should surround this Act with every safeguard, so that it will not be used indiscriminately, and at the beck and call of irresponsible persons throughout the country who may desire to put its clauses into operation from, perhaps, not the best of motives. If there ever was a time in the history of Canada when it is obligatory to uphold our self-respect and protect the interests of Canadians it is on the present occasion when we are called upon to determine the measure of self-defence—call it retaliation if you please—which we shall take against the operation of the American labour law. What is more, I can tell the Government that there never was a time when a Canadian Parliament could with more certainty feel that its legislative action

would be more unanimously endorsed by the Canadian people than in connection with the Bill now before this House. With regard to retaliation against the aggressive law-making of our neighbours to the south of the lakes, if I ever had any scruples based on a refinement of international courtesy, I have none now. For ten years past, permanent domicile has been necessary before a Canadian could get employment in the United States. During that period every Canadian seeking employment there has been subjected to insult, indignity and hardship at the hands of American officials, whose rabid zeal seemed to be intensified in a determination to enforce to the very letter this obnoxious alien labour law. Yes, and this in face of the fact that for the past century this country has kept its doors wide open for every alien to come in and compete with Canadian labour, without restriction, and earn the wages their talents entitled them to. This American alien labour law was not the outcome of business necessity, nor was it designed permanently to protect the wage-earners of the United States? No, Mr. Chairman, it was designed as a studied and merciless attack upon the labour interests of Canada, aimed specially at our workmen and against the general interests of the people of this Dominion. The enforcement of this law has been so brutal, its operations so dishonest, and its results so disastrous, that the people of this country insist—yes, they demand—either that the Americans should wipe that Act from their Statute-books or that our Parliament return like for like by enacting a similar law. If our mechanics or workmen are excluded from working in the United States because they are Canadians, surely it is our duty to see that they are not excluded from working in Canada by reason of the competition of American labour. Since 1885 Canada has been keeping in line with the scriptural injunction and has been turning the other cheek to the smiter on the south side of the Lakes. Our patience, however, I think is exhausted, our long-suffering at an end, and our memory is refreshed by another maxim well known to our forefathers, “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.” If a Canadian finds American legislation a bar to employment south of the frontier line, let him not find an American citizen a bar to employment north of the frontier line. If it is a crime for a Canadian to carry his dinner-pail in the United States of America, let us see whether we cannot get along without American dinner-pails in the Dominion of Canada. If our axemen cannot contract to cut down the forests of Michigan, shall we not surely preserve to them the forests of our own Ontario? By the enactment of this law, we shall have meted out to the United States the same measure that has been meted out to us; and what our American friends proclaim as only justice for the American mechanic at Wash-

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

ington, can surely be deemed no more than justice for the Canadian mechanic at Ottawa. Let us show the world by our legislation that we can respect ourselves, and then other nations will respect us. The country demands from this House an Alien Labour Act for Canada aimed at the United States, as nearly as possible, similar to the Alien Labour Act of the United States aimed at Canada. This Act should not be less wide in its application, nor less restrictive in its provisions. Our dignity and self-respect must be preserved. Outrageous as has been the treatment accorded to us by the American people for the past ten years, we are neither vindictive nor revengeful. But an Alien Labour Act for Canada we must have as similar as possible to the Alien Labour Act of the United States.

Mr. BRITTON. Coming from a frontier town, I know that the sentiments which have been expressed by the last speaker (Mr. Ross Robertson) are those that prevail almost universally on this question; and I only want to ask my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to see what exceptional legislation it would be if the section were left as he wants it left, and as he says would conform to the law passed by the United States. The administration of the criminal law by the provincial officers in the different provinces is always at the expense of the province, the county attorney being the prosecuting official. You would have to recognize, if this section were passed as it was originally introduced, that it would be legislation of a very exceptional character. Speaking of it merely in reference to the administration of justice or the punishment of offences, I do not know that there would be any real objection to allowing what lawyers call a *qui tam* action to be brought; that is, an action brought by any person, with perhaps half the penalty going to the informer and half to the Crown. That action could not be brought by every Tom, Dick and Harry, because when an action of that kind is brought, one of the conditions is that the person bringing it must give security for costs. However, I submit that it would be in the interest of the Dominion to allow the section to pass as it has been sent to us by the committee. It would probably meet the case, and would not be open to the objection I have mentioned of being exceptional legislation in providing that a provincial official in a particular county should take action at the expense of the Dominion—something that has not been done in any other case with which I am acquainted.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, interested as I am in any legislation affecting workmen, and particularly interested in what is known as the alien labour law, I regret very much that this change has been made in the Bill, or that the members of the special committee who support the Government thought it necessary either to protect the

Government or to obscure their views by making all prosecutions subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Attorney General for Canada. I think with my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that it will be found that there will be very few prosecutions, indeed, taken under this Act, and I do not think it was the intention that there should be any prosecutions. I think the object is probably to pacify, in some way, the labouring classes in Canada by leading them to believe that it is the intention of the Government in perfect good faith to allow a Bill of this kind to be submitted; at the same time inserting a clause which makes it absolutely impossible for the labourer to protect himself. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it would be absurd to allow any citizen, except a man of means, to take proceedings in a matter of this kind. But, Mr. Chairman, we make no such distinction in our criminal law. The highest citizen in the land is not protected from prosecution by the most obscure.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If my hon. friend will pardon me, I did not go into details, because I knew that he, as a lawyer, would thoroughly appreciate the force of my position, by drawing his attention to the section which the Attorney General is called upon to enforce. It has no relation to any specific act of immorality or wrongdoing, but to a breach of an express or implied contract. The hon. gentleman will see, on reading the section, that it deals with a very delicate matter. The clause reads:

Any person encouraging or soliciting the importation or immigration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners into Canada, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada, under any contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied,—

So that this refers to an agreement, the effect of prosecuting for a breach of which might imperil international relations. The hon. gentleman will appreciate how necessary, therefore, it is that men skilled in the law should have authority to supervise the proceedings, and that it should not be left to anybody to bring action just as he pleased.

**Mr. QUINN**. I do not think that the pleading of the hon. Minister meets the case I put, because I am satisfied that any prosecution would be taken under the supervision of a qualified barrister. There can be no question that proceedings would be only taken by some labour organization, which would be properly advised as to the precise means to adopt. My hon. friend from Kingston suggested that proceedings might be taken by way of a *qui tam* action, and I do not see why such proceedings as those required in such an action should not be taken in this matter. I fail to see why authorization of the Attorney General of

Canada, or somebody appointed by him, should be required. Take the case of a breach of this law in the city of Montreal. It would be absolutely necessary for anybody like the Knights of Labour either to send a delegation to Ottawa to interview the Attorney General or otherwise communicate with him, in order to get his authorization to institute proceedings. I do not think that ought to be necessary. If this be a good law, the procedure of carrying it out should be so simple that the most humble could benefit by it. If it be the intention of the Government to give practical effect to a law, which is generally recognized as necessary, no difficulties should be thrown in the way of citizens taking advantage of it, and there should be certainly no necessity for a trip to Ottawa to interview the Attorney General or even for communication with the Attorney General by mail, before entering a prosecution. This is special legislation introduced in fulfilment of the promise made to the labour organizations of Canada by the First Minister, but evidently the intention of the Government is, while having the appearance of carrying out the promise, to prevent any practical effect being given to it, by hedging the law around with a procedure which will render its being operated extremely difficult. To show that such is the intention let me refer to clause 6, which reads, as amended:

The Attorney General of Canada, in case he shall be satisfied that an immigrant has been allowed to land in Canada contrary to the prohibition of this Act, may cause such immigrant, within the period of one year after landing and entry, to be taken into custody, &c.

The clause as originally drafted had the word "shall" instead of "may," but as amended there is nothing compulsory in it at all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I object to discussing a clause which is not now before the committee, and which relates to a different offence altogether. The first provision of this Bill relates to contracts, express or implied, to bring immigrants into the country. That is declared to be an illegal act, and provision is made to punish it; and the only question before the committee is whether the prosecution may be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General. That is distinct altogether from the clause to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which provides for the punishment of the captain of the vessel and the immigrant himself. The hon. gentleman should keep the clause before the committee.

**Mr. QUINN**. I was only reading clause 6 for the purpose of showing that it is discretionary on the part of the Attorney General to institute proceedings or not. It was with that view that I was reading in clause 6 with clause 3. The hon. gentleman is providing that it shall be absolutely neces-

sary for a person residing, say in British Columbia, and who wishes to institute proceedings under this Act, to obtain the authorization of the Attorney General of the Dominion before he can do so. It is simply absurd to say that any person in the extreme end of Canada would institute proceedings under such circumstances.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman leaves out the words, "or authorize some one to act for him." We provide for obtaining the consent of the Attorney General or somebody whom he may authorize to act for him.

**Mr. QUINN.** If the Government will provide that Her Majesty's Attorney General shall be bound to authorize some one to act for him in the different centres of the Dominion, the law would be workable, but he is not bound to do so. There can be no doubt that this amendment is intended to defeat the object of the law and break faith with the working people.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I am sure that there is no greater demand for any kind of legislation than there is for legislation of the character we are seeking to obtain at present by this Bill, and I am confident the country will be disappointed if, in enacting legislation of this character, we fail to make it answer the whole purpose which the Bill was originally destined to cover. Last session the First Minister promised this House that in the event of the Government failing to induce the American Government to withdraw the obnoxious legislation which they have placed on the Statute-books, he would cause legislation to be enacted by this House which would be, word for word and letter for letter, that in force in the United States. That is the kind of legislation our country demands, and we should be extremely careful not to give the country any half-measures, but something that will be effective. The Bill, as amended, places the whole power of putting it into force in the hands of the Attorney General, and to my mind this gives one man too much power. It is another of the cases to which we have had to refer during the past few days of one-man power, which seems to be a kind of legislation popular with hon. gentlemen opposite. They have given to one man the power of saying what the tariff of the country shall be, and now they propose giving another man the power to say when a certain law shall come into operation or decide whether any punishment shall be meted out under it. I think that is a dangerous power to entrust to any one person. The inconvenience referred to by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) of having to travel to the capital in order to secure the consent of the Attorney General to put the law into operation is one that would be felt very much. I think the power is more than should be confided to one person. The Minister of

**Mr. QUINN.**

Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) said, that this might be used as a political engine. Well, that is one of the things I fear, and it is one of the reasons why I would oppose this power being vested in the Attorney General. That the Alien Labour Bill has been used as a political engine, is a matter that we have the fullest evidence of. I had occasion during the last session of Parliament to give this House an illustration of the manner in which the American Bill was used as a political engine, and I then read a letter sent to a gentleman who wanted to come from Buffalo to vote for me, and who was prohibited from doing so by reason of the threat of the American officer. The letter is as follows:—

Buffalo, June 20th, 1896.

My Dear Sir,—I have received a list of names of parties who work in this state and are about going to Canada to vote in the coming Dominion elections; your name appears on the list.

Now, I would advise you to remain where you are, as steps will be taken to prohibit you returning to New York State, should you go to Canada and cast your vote at this election.

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) J. DeBARRY.

Now, if during the last general elections in the Dominion, a man on the outside like Mr. DeBarry, was willing to use his influence on behalf of the Liberal party in this country, to prevent Conservatives who came over to vote, from returning; if that was the case then, is it not a dangerous thing now to place in the hands of one of the present Government, the power to say whether our Alien Labour Bill shall be put in force or not. That would be an instance where such a Bill could be made use of as a political engine. I for one do not feel that we are doing justice to the demands of the labouring people of this country, when we insert a clause which to my mind has the effect, very largely, of destroying the Bill. I am in favour of an Alien Labour Bill. I will vote for almost anything the Government would be willing to give us, in order to carry out the promise made to my constituents to support legislation of this kind, but I hope the Government will do nothing that will cripple the Bill or destroy its usefulness. I want a Bill that will be effective. We feel in our part of the country to-day, that American citizens are coming over, displacing Canadian citizens, doing work that ought to be done by Canadians, and we want this Bill passed in such a way that it will be worth something. I trust, that before the Bill receives the assent of this House, everything will be eliminated from it that tends in any way to destroy its usefulness.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I wish to say a word or two in order to show how in my opinion section 3 of this Bill will apply. Section 3 provides the penalty that may be inflicted for the infraction of clause 1, and clause 1 reads as follows:—

1. From and after the passing of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership or corporation, in any manner whatsoever to prepay the transportation, or in any way to assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners into Canada, under any contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada.

Let me give to the House a case that may happen. There is a large contractor, or some large corporation, employing a great number of men; they are squeezing these men in their wages to such a limit that the men cannot stand it, and this corporation, or this contractor, may say: Take that wage or leave. The men have to leave, and that contractor brings over from the United States a shipload of Italians to take their place. If some person on behalf of these Canadian workmen approaches the Attorney General, and says: I want to prosecute that corporation for having imported foreigners to take the places of our Canadian workmen, the Attorney General may reply, or if he does not reply he may act on the principle of saying: Oh, that corporation contributed funds to help to run our elections; they are our supporters, and I will not put the law in motion as regards them. Under such circumstances how could this law be enforced? In the United States, the United States itself or any individual is authorized to institute the prosecution.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Evidently you do not want the Bill yourself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do want the Bill, and I want it on the lines promised by the premier. I want the whole Bill. I want it to be a copy of the American Bill which is workable, but I do not want it to be made a machine to bolster up the present Government in whom I have no confidence. I think it ought to be in this country, that when the Prime Minister pledges his word to the House and to the people of Canada, his word shall be respected and carried out, and that his promise should be crystallized into legislation this session as he said it would be.

Mr. CRAIG. No one in this House can say, that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) does not want this Bill, because he has been trying to get it passed for a number of years, and in fact he has been the mover in it when a great many members of the House, myself among the number, were entirely opposed to a law of this nature. There is no doubt that at the present time this Bill is asked for by a great many of the people of this country; notably by Canadian workmen and men employed by large corporations. They have asked for it because they find that a great many Americans have been imported into this country,

and because Canadians going into the United States have been sent back without much ceremony, and without much chance of saying anything in their own defence. There is no doubt, therefore, that there is a strong feeling in favour of this Bill all over the country. For my part, I regret, and I am sure we all regret, that there is any necessity for such a law. I regret the cause of this Bill, which cause is the action of the United States Government and the people of the United States in this matter. I regret very much that the neighbouring republic, which in many ways is a great nation, is in this matter a very small nation, and I am in hopes that after a while the people of the United States may see their folly in this respect, and may repeal their law. If this Government can induce the United States to repeal the law, I would give them great credit, and I hope they will continue their efforts in that direction. While we may regret the necessity for our having to pass a law of this kind, yet there is no use in our having such a law at all unless it is an effective law. I am not sufficiently posted in legal matters to give an opinion as to whether this Bill, as introduced originally or as amended by the committee, is the more effective. However, I agree with what the Minister (Mr. Davies) has said, that this is different from a great many laws. It assumes international importance, and we do not want any Canadians to take such action as might stir up angry feelings in the United States. The people of that republic are not quite as patient as we are, but we must remember after all that Providence has placed us alongside of them, and we have to get on with them as best we can. We may think that in some things they do not treat us very well, but we have to put up with it, and do what we consider best for ourselves. While we feel constrained to pass a Bill of this kind, at the same time we must be careful of the manner in which it is to be carried out. Now, I am willing in this matter—I am not willing in every matter—to trust the Government. I am willing in this matter to place the responsibility on them. The objection is raised, that if we leave this matter to the Government, and if the Attorney General is to be made responsible for taking action, then perhaps action will not be taken. Sir, I will place that responsibility on the Government. I say to the workmen all over this country: I supported this measure, and they say: Why did you leave it in that way so that action cannot be taken without the consent of the Attorney General, without he is the mover in this matter? I will say: The Government wished to have it that way, and I am satisfied to place the responsibility on the Government of taking action in this matter, and if you are not satisfied, you can blame the Government and not me. I want to have this Bill effective, and I think it will be more effective this way than to leave

it as it is in the American Bill. I am willing to take them at their word, and let them take the responsibility of enforcing this measure, and of giving satisfaction in this matter to the labouring men of this country.

Mr. QUINN. If this were a matter in which the members of the House were simply suiting their own convenience, it would be very easy for us to leave the responsibility on the shoulders of the Government. But we are dealing now with a Bill which affects a class which must be protected, and which ought to be protected in this House. I think under the circumstances, when it is shown so conclusively, I believe, that it is very difficult to work the Bill as it stands at the present time, we ought at least to have the assurance of the Government that the wording of this Bill is not altogether a sham, and that it is the intention of the Government to appoint a representative of the Attorney General of Canada in the different cities or towns for the purposes of that Act as soon as this Bill becomes law. Otherwise I think the provisions will be a perfect sham, because I think the Bill will be utterly unworkable, and impossible ever to be carried into effect. It would be impossible to collect from anybody, in the name of Her Majesty's Attorney General for Canada, any penalty under the Act as it stands. I think it is only fair that the Government should give us some assurance that there will be appointed in the different important towns and cities in the country, some representative or some person duly authorized for the purposes of the Act, immediately after it is passed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### BUILDING AND LOAN SOCIETIES.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 12) further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the province of Ontario, be now taken into consideration and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Will my hon. friend state the exact nature of this amendment?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Simply leaving out the words in the title of the Bill "carrying on business in the province of Ontario," and making it apply to the whole Dominion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to make it general instead of provincial?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG.

#### SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 2) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. This is the Bill that was put on the Orders this afternoon by special order of the House, and is, therefore, written, but not printed, on the Order paper. The House will remember that when this Bill obtained its second reading, I asked that it be referred to a special committee instead of to the Committee on Railways and Canals. That Select Committee has since been sitting on the Bill, and on the Bill of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), which was referred along with it; has had a large number of sittings, and heard a great deal of evidence. It has heard the evidence of railway employees and of railway employers, and the counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway, Judge Clark, and has had laid before it a vast deal of outside evidence, railway statistics and quotations from the legislation of other countries. After a long consideration, which was protracted to suit the convenience, sometimes of witnesses, sometimes of the railway counsel, we only this morning succeeded in coming to a conclusion to report these Bills with certain amendments.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think any person who looks at this Bill will see the impossibility of this committee undertaking to deal with it unless it is reprinted. It is simply Hebrew characters so far as it looks at present. Any person who looks at it, will see at once that it is all written over.

Mr. CASEY. It looks a little bad, but if the clauses are read individually, the difference is very clearly seen, and I think the committee will have no difficulty in understanding either the original clause or the amendments made to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This Bill must be reprinted.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is no denying the position taken by the leader of the Opposition, and we must have the Bill reprinted before us. My hon. friend has given great attention to the subject, and so has the Railway Committee. I was not aware that it was coming up to-night, and it was not on the Order paper.

Mr. CASEY. Before the acting leader of the House decides this matter, I should like to press this point. This is to all appearances the last occasion, unless the Government relax their grip on the remaining days of the session, on which this Bill can be considered. If the committee will hear the

clauses read, they will find the matter a much more simple one than it appears from the manner in which the amendments have been written in. This subject has engaged the attention of the House for two sessions. It is one which concerns the interest of many thousands of the best class of our population, it has been demanded year after year by the railway men, and it is a Bill which is only following British legislation. Mr. Asquith, in 1893, proposed the Employers' Liability Bill, which goes further than the present one, and Sir Matthew White Ridley has got through the committee stage a Bill which goes a great deal further than this Bill. I have the means of showing this from the reports of the London "Times" of May 4th. I should not feel inclined to press this Bill in its unprinted form except for the fact that this is possibly the last chance that will be afforded me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think you may get another opportunity.

Mr. CASEY. If the acting leader of the Government will hold out any hope that there will be another opportunity offered, I have nothing more to say to-night. I would urge on him, however, that this is an important Bill, that it is one demanded by a large and important class of the people, that it is one which has engaged the attention of the Railway Committee and select committee, including a legal gentleman, one of practical railway knowledge, and a number of members who possess at least common intelligence. This special committee has elaborated the Bill now under consideration, after hearing all the facts and arguments. There is no doubt great force in the argument urged already that this is the third session in which we have had no legislation. This is a case in which legislation is demanded, and I am anxious to have the Bill passed this session.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman has only to glance around the Chamber to see that the House is exceedingly thin from various causes, and certainly this Bill is one that should be considered in a full House, and after reasonable notice. The reason I object to proceeding is that in common with the vastly greater number of hon. gentlemen present, I am in utter ignorance to what these amendments are, and it is not possible to give them due consideration on hearing them read from the Chair. A member must have a Bill before him for some days in order to consider it properly. My hon. friend has given great attention to the subject, his mind is full of it and his judgment ripened; but our minds are not so full of it and our judgment is not ripened, and I desire an opportunity to have our judgment matured and made more mellow. I cannot make any promise in regard to this Bill, but I will consider the matter,

and I now ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I should like this Bill to be considered in a full House. Considering the promise of consideration given by the acting leader, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention to have the Bill reprinted?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. It will be well to do so, because between this and another session we will have time to consider it.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### INTEREST.

Mr. QUINN moved second reading of Bill (No. 15) to amend the Act respecting interest.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Will the hon. gentleman explain the Bill?

Mr. QUINN. I understand there is a Bill introduced in the Senate covering this subject—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For that reason I ask the hon. gentleman to allow the Bill to stand. The Government Bill will come down in due course.

Mr. QUINN. Then the whole subject will be considered when the Government Bill comes down, for I do not think the Government Bill covers the point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let the Order stand.

#### GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. McMULLEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 47) in further amendment of the General Inspection Act. He said: This is a Bill for the purpose of amending the General Inspection Act. I have already stated to the House the object of this measure. The cheese industry in Canada is an exceedingly important one, and during the last year or two very serious disputes have arisen between buyers and sellers. There are certain boards throughout the province of Ontario where manufacturers or their representatives meet buyers. At those boards the principal cheese factories are represented by persons for the purpose of selling the cheese they have manufactured. A large number of buyers usually attend for the purpose of making offers for whatever is on the market; each buyer has his own inspector, and he buys the cheese subject to inspection. The seller asks a certain price, and eventually he and the

buyer come to terms, and the cheese is sold subject to inspection. In the course of a month the buyer sends around his inspector, and after looking over the cheese he declines to pronounce it of that quality he anticipated, and will not take it. In several cases in western Ontario that has been done during the last two or three years, and cheese factories have been submitted to serious loss in consequence. Between the time that the Board meets and the inspector of the buyer comes round to take the cheese, he may if he likes take advantage of that peculiar provision in the bargain which says: "The cheese is bought subject to inspection," and he may say that it is not up to standard, and decline to close the bargain at the original price. He may perhaps offer a lower price, and the result is that the seller may be forced to sell the cheese at a reduction of half a cent a pound, or he may hold his cheese in the hope of getting a better price. During the last season, in cases where the price fell from the time the bargain was made until the inspector came to inspect the cheese, I know that such a thing has happened, and I know of a factory which lost as much as \$500 on one transaction. The result is, that the patrons of the cheese factories are getting exceedingly suspicious that they are being taken advantage of. Whenever the market goes up there is no complaint, but when the market recedes it is said that the inspector finds fault and tells the seller: You must come down in price because your cheese is not so good as I anticipated. It is desirable, Sir, to restore confidence. I am not prepared to say that the buyers all take advantage of the parties who have sold cheese, but the general impression is that they do, and the patrons of these factories are disposed to withdraw their patronage. In one or two cases which I personally know of, the factories are closed simply because the patrons are under the impression that advantage is taken of them and that they do not get the full value of their cheese. Every member in this House will admit, that the cheese industry is an exceedingly important one, and if any legislation will secure to the makers of cheese that measure of justice and equity to which they are entitled, I am sure this House will be willing to pass it. I believe that the result of the passage of this Bill will be to do away with disputes, because then the buyers will be afraid to grade cheese below the proper standard. They will hesitate to run the risk of the Government inspector being called in, for if his decision is against the buyer, that buyer will be looked upon with suspicion. I have no doubt that in some cases the makers of cheese have been responsible for the difficulties that have arisen. All that is asked for by this Bill is, to secure that which is absolutely necessary to keep

**Mr. McMULLEN.**

the cheese industry on a solid and permanent basis. I admit that in some sections of the Dominion the Bill has not been asked for, but as I have already stated, I attended a meeting in western Ontario at which the representatives of 57 cheese factories unanimously passed a resolution demanding legislation of this kind. The difficulty is overcome to some extent in the province of Quebec, and in those districts of eastern Ontario which sell their cheese in Montreal. Although there is an inspector in Montreal under the Government, he is not clothed with all the power which this Bill gives the inspector. His decision is not declared to be final, but nevertheless I understand that the decision of the Montreal inspector has generally been accepted and consequently in Quebec and in eastern Ontario, the cheese makers have a certain measure of relief, but in western Ontario they have none. It is said by some cheese buyers, that each section has a board of arbitration to settle disputes of this kind. That may be true, but it takes two or three weeks to get this board of arbitration into working order, and it does not pay the cheese factory to wait so long for a settlement. There should be some person to decide immediately any question with regard to the quality of the cheese. I contend that an arbitrator of the kind provided for in the Bill is the proper person to act in such cases. It is said, that the patrons of cheese factories give their cows vegetable food which should not be given under the circumstances, but I may say that the factory to which I have referred, and which last year lost \$554 in one sale, issued a circular to each one of its patrons, which circular distinctly outlined what food should be given to the cows while they were supplying milk to the cheese factory, and made other provisions. That factory also passed a by-law to the effect that any person known to violate the rules should be fined \$10. They put forth every effort to keep the milk pure, and to insure that cleanliness and care should be exercised in every way. Every effort is made, but after all, in this one factory, as I said last year, they lost the amount of money I have stated by the refusal of the buyer to take the cheese. I therefore move that this Bill be now read a second time.

**Mr. MACLAREN.** Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the time of the House at any great length; but as I happen to have grown up with the cheese industry of Canada, having been connected with it for twenty-eight years, I think I should say a few words upon this Bill. In the first place, as a cheese maker, a cheese buyer and a cheese seller, I do not think there is any necessity for a Bill of this kind at all; and after I read the evidence which I hold in my hands from the different cheese boards, I think the House will be convinced

that there is no necessity for a cheese inspector appointed by the Dominion Government. When this Bill was first printed, I sent copies of it to the different cheese boards in Canada—London, Ingersoll, Woodstock, Listowel and Brockville; and in every case they voted against it, with the exception of four men at Listowel. At the first meeting of the London Cheese Association held a few weeks ago, at which twenty-seven salesmen and six buyers were present, after the election of officers, this Bill came up for consideration. This is a clipping from one of the London papers:

Mr. J. S. Pearce, at the request of A. F. MacLaren, M.P. for North Perth, and president of the Western Ontario Dairymen's Association, brought up the matter of the McMullen Bill, an amendment to the general Inspection Act relative to the appointment of a Government inspector of cheese, which passed its second reading on April 23.

Of course that was a mistake as it had not passed its second reading.

Mr. Pearce said the Bill in its present form was not practical. There was no recognized Government standard of cheese, and until there was, a Government inspector, so far as Ontario was concerned, was of no use whatever. If the Government graded cheese by standards, the same as wheat, it would be a different thing.

Mr. Scott, a salesman of Sparta, wanted to know how disputes between buyer and seller had been settled in the past.

He was informed, that when differences arose, the buyer appointed one arbitrator, the seller a second, and these two a third, and whenever these boards of arbitration had officiated, they had given the greatest of satisfaction.

Mr. Decker, also a salesman of Delaware, was strongly opposed to the Bill.

D. McMullen, of Evelyn, said he had never known buyers to reject cheese that was all right. The London board had a standard of cheese for its own use, and the makers knew what that was, and they were prepared to stand by it. "We want," he said, "to make cheese that will suit the English trade, and be hampered by as few restrictions as possible. Some Tories have been trying to make capital out of my opposition to the Bill, because I am a red-hot Grit; but it doesn't make any difference to me. I am opposed to anything that will hurt the cheese trade, and I think this Cheese Bill will."

The following resolution was then carried unanimously:—"Resolved, that this meeting does not approve of the McMullen Bill respecting the appointment of a Government inspector of cheese."

The resolution was carried unanimously, there being twenty-seven salesmen and six buyers at the meeting. At the Ingersoll meeting, which took place on the 12th of May, this Bill was also discussed, there being something like thirty salesmen and five or six buyers present; and they also voted unanimously against the Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) represents that riding and no doubt has a copy of the resolution that was passed at that meeting. At Brockville:

Mr. Derbyshire spoke with reference to that provision of the McMullen Bill relating to inspection, putting himself on record as opposed thereto for the reason that it was not practical, and also because in the person of Inspector Publow the factorymen on this board already had an arbiter.

Remarks in the same strain were made by Messrs. J. H. Singleton and R. G. Murphy, after which the following resolution was placed before the board:—

"Moved by D. Derbyshire, seconded by J. H. Singleton, and resolved, that the Dairymen's Board of Trade, having seen the Bill introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. McMullen, 'An Act in further amendment of the 'General Inspection Act,' considers it unnecessary, as this Board has such an officer in Mr. Publow, one of our instructors, who is competent, and conveniently located for settling any disputes that may arise in regard to quality. We would respectfully recommend that each Dairymen's Board of Trade in the Dominion manage its own affairs in regard to any disputes that may arise between buyers and sellers of butter or cheese."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

I also sent copies of this Bill to a great many of the cheese makers throughout western Canada. Here is a telegram from Mr. George E. Goodhand, who was one of the most active speakers at the meeting to which my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) refers. I think the meeting was held at Harriston. Mr. Goodhand, who is a cheese maker and salesman, wired me to this effect:

Milverton, Ont., May 5th, 1897.

A. F. MacLaren, M.P., Ottawa.

Trade generally considers McMullen's legislation re inspection between buyer and seller unnecessary. All cheese board trades in western Ontario have already made provision for this in appointing their own arbitrators. We wish no interference.

(Sgd.) G. E. GOODHAND.

I have also a telegram from Mr. John W. Cooke, a buyer at Ingersoll, and one of the largest cheese buyers in western Ontario:

Ingersoll, Ont., May 5th, 1897.

A. F. MacLaren, M.P., Ottawa.

All buyers to whom I have mentioned Mr. McMullen's Bill, are opposed to it and consider it unnecessary legislation. You are aware that the various cheese boards provide for arbitration in the event of disputes, which should be sufficient between buyer and seller. In the event of the Bill passing, in my opinion, buyers will decline to buy upon any other basis than subject to their own inspection, and, therefore, the Bill will serve no purpose, unless the Government are prepared to supply the inspector with the necessary funds to pay for the cheese he inspects, and finds a market for him in which to place them.

(Sgd.) JNO. W. COOKE.

In other words, this gentleman means that he will not buy any cheese subject to the Dominion Government inspection; he will himself inspect the cheese he buys, or will not buy at all. At the annual meeting of the Listowel Dairymen's Board of Trade,

held on the 27th day of May, it was moved by M. Crowley, Kinkora, seconded by S. Bennet, Newry, who are both salesmen in two of the best factories in the Listowel section, close to my hon. friend's own riding, as follows :—

That, in the opinion of this association, the appointment of a cheese inspector by the Government, as proposed in the Bill now before the House, is wholly unnecessary, and that this association desires to express itself against the principle of the Bill, and that a copy hereof be forwarded to the mover of the Bill and to Mr. MacLaren and to Mr. Sutherland.

After discussion the motion was carried on a vote of 15 for to 4 against.

Now, all of these five boards of trade were unanimously opposed to this Bill, with the exception of the board at Listowel, and of that board only four members voted in favor of it. It must be evident therefore that this Bill is totally unnecessary. I have another telegram here from the Ingersoll Packing Company, a very large packing firm who do a very large business in cheese. They say :

Re the Cheese Inspection Bill. We think the Government are acting unwisely, if they entertain this Bill, as we do not hear of any one who wants it, outside of a few factories in the neighbourhood of Harriston. We fancy, if there were some legislation passed to prohibit farmers feeding turnips, &c., it would be far more beneficial to the cheese industry on both sides of the Atlantic. If you wiseacres could legislate the farmers into taking proper care of their milking utensils, return no whey in milk-cans, allow their cows only pure feed and water, then to regard cleanliness next to godliness, your time would be much better spent in the interest of this fair Dominion than in tinkering up something to settle disputes after the cheese are spoiled. The Britishers want cheese, and will laugh at our legislators when they have to accept cheese because some fortunate Government officials, clothed in authority, says they are all right. We fear, when claims come back from the other side, and we are asked to settle it, it will not be sufficient when we reply : The Government inspector says they are finest cheese. We don't think the good old Grit Government are so anxious to court trouble as to pass any such legislation.

INGERSOLL PACKING COMPANY.

As far as my experience goes, and I have been for over twenty years inspecting and buying and selling cheese, I do not think there is any trade under the canopy of heaven which is conducted in a more honourable and straightforward way. The business is all done by word of mouth. Very seldom is there a signed contract or any money paid in advance. I have made contracts for millions and millions of dollars' worth of cheese myself without a stroke of the pen having passed or a dollar of money having been paid, and I never had any trouble. But although our farmers all over have continually been strongly advised not to give improper food to their cows, they did last year feed them very largely with turnips, apples, rape and rye. In the sec-

Mr. MACLAREN.

tion north of Stratford, there must have been \$25,000 less taken for cheese last fall than would have been had some of the farmers not given these improper foods to their cows, and that is where the whole mischief originated. In the town of Harriston, which has a factory, the Hon. Thomas Ballantyne & Sons, bought September and October cheese at 10½ cents per pound. The September cheese, which was fine cheese, was shipped, and the contract price paid without any demur, but the October cheese, which was left in the factory to be cured, was found, when inspected, to have developed a very bad turnip flavour, and the buyer refused to take it unless at a reduction in the price. At the same time, he gave the sellers the privilege of placing the cheese on the markets and selling it to the highest bidder. Of course, the factory was bound to lose money by this transaction, but whose was the fault? Was it the fault of the people who fed their cows with improper food or of the buyers who bought first-class cheese and got instead inferior quality? These people besides had the privilege of going to the board at Listowel and having an arbitrator appointed by that board who would act with the arbitrator appointed by the buyer and a third arbitrator appointed by the other two, and in this way have the dispute settled. I have often arbitrated and never had any trouble whatever in settling disputes. As a matter of fact, disputes seldom do arise, and in this case none would have arisen had it not been for the improper feeding of the cows. I can therefore see no necessity at all for an appointment of this kind, and that is evident by the fact alone that only four people in the whole western country have voted for it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I have taken considerable interest in this Bill, and in the facts which its mover has laid before the House. In accord with what the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren) has said, I have also received a number of representations concerning the subject matter of this Bill and a good many telegrams and resolutions similar to those which the hon. gentleman put before the House have been sent to me as Minister of Agriculture. I fully concur in the representations of the condition of affairs which has been presented by the hon. mover of the Bill, so far as the history of this trade is concerned. I am aware that in the province of Quebec and in eastern Ontario there was a good deal of this thing going on in years past. That is to say, buyers would buy cheese at a certain price, and after the cheese was shipped to them in Montreal, make cuts upon that price in consequence of the cheese not being, as they said, of the quality they had expected. These difficulties arose to such an extent in that part of Canada, whose trade centres in Montreal, the greater

number of factories now insist upon selling their cheese delivered and accepted at the factory or railway station whence it is shipped to Montreal. In my own section of the eastern townships this practice has almost entirely obtained, and the result has been that difficulties of this kind no longer exist. The cheese has to be accepted by the buyer before shipment, which prevents the buyer from making any cuts. The hon. mover of the Bill referred to the appointment of the Government inspector in Montreal as removing these difficulties. I may say that while there is a Government inspector in the city of Montreal, he has no authority either by instructions from the department or by law, to intervene as an arbitrator or exercise any such authority as this Bill proposes to give the inspector. That gentleman was engaged by the Department of Agriculture before I came into office, for the purpose of inspecting and looking after cheese which is exported in cold storage, and to see that, under the law requiring American cheese passing through Canada to be stamped, such cheese is so stamped before it is exported. He does not undertake to inspect the cheese for quality at all, and any reference of disputes between buyers and sellers which may come before him, are simply made by virtue of an understanding or agreement between the buyers and sellers to accept his judgment as a referee, and not by reason of any authority given him by the Government or by statute. Still, I do think that his position there and the acknowledged fact that he is a good judge of cheese has lent a certain authority to his decisions, which has prevented further litigation in many instances, the parties concerned having preferred to leave their disputes with him to going before the court and incurring expenses and delay.

The condition of affairs in western Ontario is somewhat different. As a general rule, the cheese is sold there on cheese boards, often without the buyer seeing it at all, though in the majority of instances, I believe the buyers see it before it is put up. Where the latter practice obtains, there can be no dispute, because the buyer knows just what he is bidding on, and he bids according to his judgment of the cheese which he or his agent has actually seen or tested. I consider that that is a real safeguard in the business, and that anything which would tend to the buyer seeing and judging his cheese before he buys it would largely remove all difficulties. If that were the regular practice, there would be no necessity for further interference.

To come to the matter of this Bill itself, I can quite understand that, under the practice in western Ontario, where the buyer does not inspect the cheese some differences of opinion and difficulties may arise. These cheese boards recognize that there is opportunity for differences of opinion and have

made arrangements for boards of arbitration, and I understand that these boards of arbitration are in existence in connection with every cheese board in the province of Ontario. The board of arbitration is a perfect tribunal. But there may be difficulty, in consequence of some little clumsiness or delay in the operation, and that would naturally be considered as a reason for the appointment of an inspector as proposed. But there are difficulties in connection with the carrying out of this Bill, which, for myself, I cannot quite see the way to overcome. It seems to me that if this Bill were to pass at once the Government would be obliged to appoint an inspector for practically every cheese board in the province of Ontario, and I must tell this House and the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill that I do not know where the Department of Agriculture could, at the present moment lay their hands upon competent officials to carry out the idea of this Bill. Almost everybody who is competent to take such a position as is provided for under this Bill is to-day actively engaged in the cheese trade either as a buyer or as a seller, and, therefore, would be out of the question for appointment. And we could hardly afford—and the Bill does not provide—such sufficient payment as would justify such men as would naturally be appointed to this position in leaving their present business and accept such positions. But that difficulty, might, and would no doubt, in time, be overcome. The question as between the buyers and sellers is one of considerable consequence; and I confess I feel a great deal of sympathy with the patrons of the cheese factories generally in the difficulty they have in getting a fair price for their cheese. I do not wish to accuse the buyers of cheese in the country of taking advantage of their position in this matter. I think they conduct their business in a reasonable way as the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) has said. Where they make these cuts in the price of cheese, there is no doubt that, in most instances, there is something wrong in the cheese itself, and they are justified in the cut. At the time there is no doubt the patrons would be benefited, and it would be a better thing for the trade at large if there were some prompt and easily reached referee to whom such disputes could be quickly and efficaciously referred. I can see, therefore, that if some arrangements such as this Bill intimates could be carried out satisfactorily, it might help the cheese trade rather than hinder it. This is a matter that requires to be discussed. I would suggest that the Bill be read a second time, on the understanding that we do not commit ourselves or the House to it, for I think it is important that this question should be brought up at the great dairy conventions of the country where all branches of the dairy business are represented, and thoroughly threshed out. This would be the means of bringing before

hon. members information with regard to this subject that could hardly be gained otherwise. I would suggest that the Bill be read the second time on the understanding I speak of, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce or the Committee on Agriculture for consideration and report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It seems to me that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if carried out would commit us to the principle of the Bill, while his speech has been directly opposed to the principle. I understand the hon. Minister to be perfectly satisfied with the mode in which the trade has been carried on, and, unless we are able to reject the mass of testimony which has been laid before us by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren), we cannot but acknowledge that the opinions of buyer, seller and manufacturer of cheese all over the country are opposed to the Bill. Under the circumstances, it appears to me, the House is hardly warranted in passing the second reading of the Bill, which pledges the House to the principle of the measure. To do so would be to put the House in an inconsistent position, particularly in the case of a Bill which comes before us practically without any support whatever.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that in our legislation we should seek to interfere as little as possible with the business of the country. Listening to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I thought he had made out a fairly good case for the Bill. But after hearing the hon. member for North Perth, who is a thoroughly practical man and has had a long experience in this business, I cannot but admit that the case for the Bill is not so strong after all. If we pass the second reading we shall commit the House to the principle of the Bill, and the effect of this will be to create uneasiness among those dealing in the article, as they would not know what their position would be. According to the evidence which has been laid before us, the business has gone along very well and no interest has especially suffered. I am opposed to adopting a principle that this House is not really prepared to carry out, more particularly as the effect would be to disturb an important trade in the country to no good purpose.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no doubt that the question which my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has raised is one of great importance and interest. At the same time he can hardly expect, under the circumstances, that this Bill can possibly pass the House in the present state of public business. It is very important, as my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) suggested, that this matter should

Mr. FISHER.

be thoroughly considered by the dairy parliaments which meet at various times throughout the year; and I think, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has had his Bill before the House and has stated his views, it would meet his wishes, and, I think, would ensure a full discussion of the question if he would allow this debate to be adjourned. Considering, also, how scanty the House is to-night, my hon. friend will hardly proceed to pledge the House to a recognition of the principle involved. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. CRAIG. I am very sorry this Bill has not been entirely defeated. I have one or two objections to it which I think should lead to its being defeated instead of being dropped. I know the Government are very anxious not to antagonize the Bill of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I do not blame them at all. I have no doubt that he has given this matter some consideration. I think this Bill is objectionable for one reason, because it is a coercive measure. On the face of it it looks as if it was optional; it says every party "may," and the word "may" would lead a person to think that it was optional. But I think it makes it coercive, and the seller has an opportunity of forcing the buyer to submit to the decision of an inspector appointed by the Government. The buyer would have no option at all, and the result would be, as I am informed, that buyers would not buy cheese at all if they were subject to a decision of this kind. A buyer would be entirely at the mercy of the seller, because on every occasion that the buyer objected to take the cheese, then the seller might ask to have the matter submitted to this cheese inspector, and the buyer would be compelled to submit to his decision, and we are told his decision would be final. But it would be merely his opinion, and buyers are not going to do business in that way. He buys cheese as first class cheese and then, if that cheese comes to him as not first class, he says, I won't take that cheese, but the seller says, you must submit the matter to this inspector, and if he says it is first class, you must take it. I consider that would have an injurious effect on the country. I object to this measure because it is not asked for except by a very few people. It has not been asked for by parties who deal in cheese, nor by cheese associations. I suppose the debate being adjourned means that the Bill is killed for this session, but I think instead of adjourning this debate, the Bill should be defeated. I think it is vicious in principle, and instead of doing good to the cheese industry, the tendency would be to deteriorate the quality of the cheese, because it would have the effect of making men more careless. They feel now that if they want the cheese to be accepted, it must be of first class quality, because it is prac-

tically subjected to the inspection of the buyer. He buys first class cheese and he is going to get it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not objecting to the adjournment of the debate, but I feel called upon to refer to the objection made by the cheese board, or that section of the Board of Trade in my county, against this Bill. They have passed a resolution unanimously against it, both in North and South Oxford, and the county of Oxford was one of the first counties that went into the manufacture of cheese on a large scale, and still continues to produce perhaps as much cheese, or as good a class of cheese, as any other county in the Dominion of Canada. The meetings of these cheese boards, composed. I may say, by a large majority of the representatives of the different factories throughout the county, have forwarded the resolutions to me asking me to oppose this Bill. I must say, also that we have had no particular complaints with regard to the way that the business is being conducted. In addition to that, it is only right for me to mention because I have been requested to do so, that cheese boards in other parts of Ontario have done the same; especially the Listowel Board of Trade forwarded me a copy of a resolution passed at the meeting stating their objections, and that they had voted almost unanimously against this legislation. These boards are composed by a majority of the representatives of the factories, representing the Patrons, the farmers and the people who sell their milk to the factories to produce cheese. Therefore, it is unfair to say that these meetings are controlled by the buyers, though they may have a certain amount of influence at these meetings as being members of the same board, but they would be in a small minority. I know in the north riding of Oxford the buyers would be in a small minority at any meetings held representative of the cheese industry. I dare say it would be the same in regard to all those cheese boards, and as they have unanimously requested that this legislation should not pass, I think the Government ought to pay some attention to their request. If there was a difference of opinion with the buyers on one hand and the sellers on the other, or those representing the production of cheese, then it might be worth the consideration of the Minister of Agriculture. However, whether this Bill is referred to a committee or not, there is no doubt that the subject, now having been brought up in the House, it will be brought to the attention of the dairymen at all their meetings throughout the Dominion, and if there is any desire for legislation, we will hear from them. But at the present time the cheese boards in the county that I have the honour to represent, are unanimously opposed to any legislation of this description. Personally, unless there was some such demand, I would be opposed to the

principle of the Bill. I think we ought to be very careful in interfering by legislation with matters of trade and commerce. These matters generally regulate themselves. Any one acquainted with the cheese industry knows that a class of cheese that would suit one buyer for the market for which he is buying would not suit another buyer at all. It must be a matter of bargain and sale, and of agreement between the producer of the cheese and the buyer, as to what price the former shall receive. I simply take this opportunity of making these remarks, and of communicating to the House the fact that the cheese industries in my county are unanimously opposed to this legislation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can assure the House that I have no desire whatever to injure the cheese industry in this country. In introducing this Bill I was prompted by a desire to encourage and foster that industry. The meeting that was held at Harriston, represented fifty-seven factories, and some of the parties present came as far as 100 miles. Circulars had been issued by the secretary, and I was invited to attend that meeting. The discussion was kept up all the afternoon, and in the evening they came to a unanimous decision that unless something of this kind was done, the cheese industry in that section of the country was going to suffer seriously. As representative of a riding that has a number of factories, I felt it my duty to say that I would press upon the Government the consideration of this question, and that if they did not take it up, I myself would introduce a Bill for the purpose of testing the sense of the House with regard to the legislation. I have carried out my promise to the constituency and to those cheese factories that were represented. Now, the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) says that a large number of cheese factories are opposed to this. I can easily understand the buyers so influencing these meetings that they might secure a resolution against it. I have a letter in my possession from a party who attended the meeting in Listowel, where it is said all but four voted against the Bill. I have statements showing that, apart from the influence exercised by the buyers, a very large number, if not all, the cheese manufacturers, were in favour of the Bill; but that they had no desire to place themselves on record in opposition to the expressed wish of the buyers, they had no serious difficulty with them. Now that may be the case in many other places. Of course, I know the buyers are very strongly opposed to this Bill. My hon. friend is opposed to it, and I am not charging him with doing anything that is wrong. I do not know any man in Western Ontario that has a better reputation as a cheese buyer. Still, after all, there are buyers I have no doubt, taking advantage of the position they hold, who reject the cheese they have purchased,

if the price in the meantime has receded, and saying, your cheese is not up to what I expected, and I decline to take it except at a reduced price. I know there are good grounds for suspecting that this has been done. My hon. friend shakes his head. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman considers that buyers are all reliable men. Permit me to state what occurred in one case. The inspector for the buyer came along; he inspected the cheese and said it was not up to the standard. The reason he gave was that the cows had been fed too much on turnips, and he said the buyer would not take the cheese. After the inspector had left the factory, he stated to a person, who is prepared to prove the accuracy of this statement, that the reason why the cheese was not up to the standard was the maker had neglected his duty; that it was not on account of excessive feeding of turnips, but because the party employed to manufacture the cheese had neglected his duty and therefore loss had occurred. The reason he put it on the patrons was because they could afford to lose their percentage rather than that the poor manufacturer should be turned out of doors disgraced and not have an opportunity of making any more cheese. The hon. gentleman says the buyers as a rule are very honest and honourable men. I can furnish another case to show that this opinion does not always apply. A buyer in my section bought a lot of cheese, and had it branded in the factory "Bluevale." It was not the cheese of Bluevale, but he placed that name on it in order, if possible, to improve his prospect of selling it.

An hon. MEMBER. Give the name of the buyer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I state on my word of honour that this has been done. All these facts prove the necessity of some legislation being adopted, and the very fact of this Bill having been introduced this session, and the discussion that has occurred in the House will in all probability secure more careful action on the part of the buyers, and avoid further ground for pressing legislation of this kind through at another session. So far as the discussion of this Bill is concerned, I quite agree with the Minister of Agriculture that it is desirable such a Bill should be fully and amply discussed by the agricultural organizations before it becomes law. I am willing that these associations should have an opportunity this summer of discussing this Bill at length, especially in view of the bitter opposition it has met with from the other side of the House. I am perfectly willing that ample time should be given to fully discuss it. The hon. gentleman who addressed the committee a few moments ago spoke of the peculiarity of this measure. He said it would injure the cheese business rather than improve it,

Mr. McMULLEN.

that the standard of cheese would be reduced rather than improved; I fail to understand how he arrived at that conclusion. He stated that an inspector would invariably be called in. He would be, in my opinion, called in only when buyers refused to take the cheese at the price at which they bought it. If he did not grade the cheese properly, the inspector would be called in. With regard to the necessity of having an inspector in every cheese district, I do not think it necessary, but I believe one inspector would be able to cover the province of Ontario, for this reason. Buyers would be very anxious to avoid the possibility of the inspector being called in. They would be very careful in regard to buying the cheese, knowing that their reputation would suffer seriously if they branded the cheese lower than should be the case and they would seek to avoid being the first parties to come under the condemnation of the Government inspector, for it would destroy their chance of subsequently selling their cheese as of the highest standard. The result would be that they would seek to avoid the necessity of calling in the Government inspector, and they would try to carry out their bargain. Whenever the inspector was called in they would seek to throw the responsibility on the manufacturer. On the other hand, I do not say that all the patrons are sufficiently careful in sending their milk to the factory. I think, perhaps, the buyers are as honest men as the sellers, or as some of the patrons who send their milk to the factory; but in order to preserve the industry which is at present suffering under this unfortunate condition of things, some legislation of this kind is necessary; otherwise there will be from time to time such disappointment among the patrons of each factory that the factories will one by one be closed, as I know to be the case in my section of country. Three have been closed there and the fourth is on the eve of closing, because the patrons do not consider they get full value for the cheese. As the leader of the House has suggested an adjournment, in order to allow a discussion of the subject during the summer by agricultural organizations, and in face of the bitter opposition shown by hon. gentlemen opposite, I am willing that the consideration of the Bill be postponed. I intend, however, next year, if the cheese manufacturers have the same complaints in respect to the manner in which they are handled by the buyers, to again bring forward this measure and press it to a further consideration of the House, until some relief is afforded to those who suffer under the unfortunate condition that has existed during the past year.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am fully in sympathy with the principle of the Bill. I do not know anything of the buyers of On-

tario, but they are generally able to take care of themselves. In my section it is perfectly useless for a factory to contract for the sale of its cheese. I do not believe in legislating to interfere with buyer and seller, but I hold this Bill does not do so. It is legislating on the line that where a buyer comes to a factory and tells the salesman that he is prepared to give him so much for his cheese and enters into a contract, that contract should be carried out. The way our buyers get out of the contract is by saying that the cheese is not up to the mark. We are satisfied that the cheese is up to the standard. They refuse to accept the cheese, however, and leave it on our hands if we do not take what they offer. I am willing that in such cases any independent man may be called in to determine whether the cheese is first, second or third class. I am perfectly in accord with the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. As I have been a salesman for cheese during many years, I wish to say a word. In western Ontario the different boards make rules and regulations for the settlement of all the differences between buyers and sellers, and this system is better adapted to the province than any Government measure by which there may be appointed an officer to travel over the whole of Ontario. I cannot believe that the appointment of an inspector would make the cheese-maker less careful. In regard to the cheese produced last season, no doubt hon. gentlemen are well aware that there were special conditions affecting it. We in Ontario were short of feed; there was, however a large quantity of turnips and abundance of apples, and these were fed to the cattle, and I have seen a statement that on account of feeding apples a certain factory lost from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound in value on its cheese. We should not interfere by this Bill with the cheese industry, but we should allow the different cheese boards to appoint their arbitrators, these boards being composed more of salesmen than of buyers; in fact, there are about ten salesmen to every purchaser who attends the board. In case of dispute arising, individuals chosen from among members of the board should be appointed, who would be skilled in regard to the quality of cheese, and such an arrangement would prove more satisfactory than the appointment of any inspector by the Government. That would certainly give more satisfaction than the appointment of any Government official.

Mr. GILMOUR. I rise, Sir, to say that after a personal experience of twenty-seven years in the selling and manufacturing of cheese, I do not like the idea of legislation of this kind being passed which interferes between the buyer and seller. There are many reasons why this proposed legislation can do no good. It is altogether out of

place, and it should not be attached to the Inspection Act, because although the Inspection Act deals with many articles, in no case does it provide for such an arbitration as this between the buyer and seller. I believe, further, Sir, that this legislation is unnecessary. It meddles with a business which is now conducted fairly satisfactory, and it is the experience of those engaged in the trade that as a rule the cheese buyers are willing to submit to the arbitration arranged by the different cheese boards throughout the country. Buyers are men of honour; indeed, they have to be men of honour, for the very good reason which makes all men of good sense in their own interests men of honour, namely, that they have to do what is right in order to trade at all. If they buy cheese and refuse to take it afterwards, just because the market price is decreased in the meantime, then the sellers would refuse to deal with these buyers again. I have been engaged in the business for many years, and I have seldom felt that the buyer was in the wrong. I hope that this legislation will not pass now, and if it should be introduced next session, it would require to be more elaborate and should be in a different form. Any Bill interfering between buyer and seller in this way should provide for indemnity, and there is no such provision in this Bill. I am, Sir, on these and other grounds, opposed to its passage.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That Bill (No. 122) relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company (from the Senate), be placed on the Order paper for its second reading this day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better alter the resolution to read second reading to-morrow, because no private Bills will be taken up to-day.

Mr. DAVIN. I accept your suggestion.  
Mr. Speaker.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

### CATARACT POWER COMPANY OF HAMILTON.

Mr. MacPHERSON moved :

That that portion of the 49th Rule which limits the time for the introduction of Private Bills, be suspended respecting the Cataract Power Company of Hamilton (Limited), in accordance with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their Fourteenth Report, presented this day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would say to my hon. friend that this practice could hardly be pursued. The practice is an objectionable one, a very objectionable one, that these measures, some of which are of very great importance, should be brought in at the extreme end of the session. While I would suppose my hon. friends have grave reasons for their action in the present instance, I hope they will not repeat this course, if this motion goes through.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This Bill was considered at the last meeting of the committee. I promise that we will not have any more such cases during the present session.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I thought my hon. friend was going to say that this was a very little baby.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, this is a very important Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacPHERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) respecting the Cataract Power Company of Hamilton (Limited).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I trust there will be no objection to give this Bill a second reading so that it can be referred to committee. If objection is made to this, it may be impossible to pass the Bill this session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House has already suspended the Orders with reference to this Bill, and I hope that no objection will be raised to the Bill being placed in a position to be referred to committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The technical difficulty has arisen, that the order has been passed for the second reading of the Bill to-morrow. I presume that the unanimous consent of the House that order could be rescinded.

Mr. MacPHERSON moved :

That the Order for the second reading on to-morrow of Bill (No. 124) respecting the Cataract

Mr. SPEAKER.

Power Company of Hamilton (Limited) be now rescinded.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is read a second time to-morrow, would it not have sufficient time to get before the committee ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. These Bills have to hang up for seven days after passing the House before they can reach committee. I believe we have shortened that time to four days, but if we put the second reading off until to-morrow it will not likely reach the committee stage this session. This Bill is imperatively asked for by a large body of the people of Hamilton, and if there is no objection to it in principle, it might be read a second time now and referred to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 123) respecting Forged or unauthorized Endorsements of Bills (from the Senate).—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

### CONTROLLERS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) to repeal 50-51 Victoria, chap. 11, Statutes of Canada, and to make new provisions in lieu thereof.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Explain.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At present there are twelve Ministers of the Crown and two Controllers. By this Bill, the office of Controller of Customs and the office of Controller of Inland Revenue will be abolished. This Bill will revive the offices of Minister of Inland Revenue and Minister of Customs, without increase of salary to these Ministers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What about the Minister of Trade and Commerce ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The office of Minister of Trade and Commerce remains as at present.

Mr. DAVIN. The House did not hear what the Solicitor General said. Do we understand that the Department of Trade and Commerce remains as at present ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will not this lead to some confusion ? I may say at once, that I am entirely in favour of the Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue occupying the position of Ministers. I do not know any persons connected with the Government, whom it is more important to have in the Cabinet than the holders of these important offices, and especially so in consideration of the resolution we have

passed under which important duties devolve upon the Controller of Customs. It is absolutely necessary that he should be in a position to explain to his colleagues personally, in the clearest possible manner—in a much more clear manner than he has been good enough to explain to the House—the reasons for his action under the resolution I have referred to. Will not anomaly exist, if the Controllers are made Ministers, and if the machinery of the measure is not altered, which placed them in a subordinate position to the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to the fact that under the existing statute the position the Controllers occupy is that of practically dealing with the members of Council through the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That anomaly will be removed by this Bill. I think I may also point out to the leader of the Opposition that the leader of the last Government had given Cabinet rank, practically, to the Controller of Inland Revenue, which was, to some extent, an anomaly. The intention is to remove these anomalies.

**Mr. DAVIN.** Is the salary to be the same?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** This Bill does not make provision as to salary.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The hon. member will remember that the Prime Minister wrote to the Minister of Customs, as I suppose I must now call him, telling him that he would get Cabinet rank and the same salary as a full Minister.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman must know that the Prime Minister at present is at sea.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### THE VOTERS' LISTS.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick)** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) respecting the Voters' Lists of 1897. He said: This Bill practically re-enacts 58 and 59 Victoria, chapter 12, and its object is to dispense with the revision of the voters' lists for this year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### FISHERIES ACT—SAW-DUST IN STREAMS.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies)** moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The purport of this Bill is to postpone for one year the operation of the law which punishes the dumping of saw-dust into streams. The Act

which was passed a year or two ago provided that on and after the 1st day of July, 1897, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not have the power to make any regulations exempting any streams from the operations of the Fisheries Act. If that law remains without amendment, on and after the 1st of July next, all the mills on the Ottawa River and the Chaudière Falls will be liable to prosecution, not having arranged their machinery to provide for the consumption of saw-dust other than by throwing it into the stream. The mill-owners have been petitioning the Government for further time. After a very great deal of consideration, and it having been brought to the attention of the Government that it was not possible for at least one of these mill-owners to get his mill in such a condition as would enable him to dispose of the saw-dust in any other way than he has been accustomed to heretofore, the Government consented to introduce a Bill enlarging the Act so as to give another year for that purpose, at the end of which time it is to be hoped that not only this mill-owner but all the others will have taken measures to consume their saw-dust in some other way than by throwing it into the stream.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Is the law enforced in other parts of Canada?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** There is no change made by the Bill, except the substitution of 1898 for 1897.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MORNING SITTINGS.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright)** moved:

That after Tuesday, the 8th June, there shall be two distinct sittings of the House on each sitting day until the end of the session, one from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m., and the other from 3 p.m. until the hour of adjournment, and Government Orders shall have precedence at each such sitting after questions put by members, an hour being reserved for Private Bills on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, from 7.30 to 8.30 p.m.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I would like to ask my hon. friend when the motion is to come into operation.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It will come into operation tomorrow.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Then I am afraid it will not have the effect which is intended. I am heartily with the object of this motion; but no person knows better than the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that a very important committee, the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, is a small parliament of itself,

and that there are a few very important Bills that require to be immediately dealt with by that committee; and, as that committee is called to meet at ten or half-past ten to-morrow, I think it would facilitate business to exempt to-morrow, in order that that committee may complete its work.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I will accept my hon. friend's suggestion, and, with the leave of the House, I will alter the motion to read "after Wednesday" instead of "after Tuesday."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### RELEASE OF D. B. SULLIVAN.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I would like to ask the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to an order of the House, passed on the 3rd of May last, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all papers relating to the release of Daniel Brien Sullivan, committed to jail in Toronto on the 18th of November, 1896, including the reports of the police magistrate of the 21st and 27th of November, 1896. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would see that this order is complied with.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I shall attend to it.

#### JUBILEE CELEBRATION MEMORIAL.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. leader of the House to the fact that a Bill which came down from the Senate and of which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue took charge stands for its second reading since the 5th of May, and is among the Public Bills and Orders. Unless it be put among Government Orders, there is no probability that this Bill, which provides for the commemoration of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by making her birthday a perpetual holiday, will be again reached.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I shall look after that and call it to the attention of Council.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets, having been in actual use; crop ends of tin-plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use, \$1 per ton.

Nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured in rolling mills.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The subject that is introduced by this resolution is one of the very greatest importance, and apparently one which has given the Government considerable trouble. The changes between the resolutions as they are now in our hands, Mr. Chairman, compared with the resolutions as first introduced, constitute perhaps the most radical of all the changes that have taken place since the Budget speech, and I regret that, from the best information I can obtain on the subject, the consideration has not been extended to this important industry, the iron and steel industry, that some others have been so fortunate to receive. A day or two ago, the representative of Lambton (Mr. Fraser) speaking on behalf of the oil interest, was able to make a statement which I would be very glad to hear from some one equally familiar with the iron and steel interests. That hon. gentleman was able to say, with regard to the oil industry, that the promises or some of the promises of the hon. leader of the Government had not altogether been lost sight of. The hon. gentleman said:

Those engaged in the oil industry were strongly of the opinion, that the tariff should be allowed to remain as it was formerly, but they felt that, in deference to the great cry which was raised against this industry, they would make as large a concession as possible to be able to exist. The present rate was, therefore, fixed by the Government, and the industry will go on and flourish, or, at all events, will develop to some extent.

All protectionists would be glad to see that expectation realized, and if the hon. gentleman spoke with knowledge, the Government have been careful to see that the policy outlined by the First Minister in 1894, when leader of the Opposition, has been carried out. Speaking of the coal oil duties, the hon. First Minister then said:

You cannot remove the protection without, to some extent, endangering a large portion of the capital of the country. Well, I admit that is always a grave issue, and a thing which has to be carefully considered. I am clear upon one thing, and that is, that such protection, such taxation as this, is unjust; but, at the same time, I am also free to say that, though the tariff in this respect has to be reformed, it has to be reformed cautiously, so as to effect the minimum of injury, and, if possible, no injury at all. I would not be the man to say, much as I deprecate the protective system, much as I believe it to be injurious to the well-being of the country—I would not be the man to say that it should be wiped out at one fell swoop.

At a very interesting time during the general election, an important correspondence took place between the First Minister and a representative of a certain industry in Canada who desired to obtain from the First Minister some assurance that the advent to power of the Reform party would not mean the ruin and wreck of Canadian industries. The leader of the Government, in this correspondence which took place between him and Mr. G. H. Bertram of the Bertram Cotton Works of Toronto, said:

I submit, also, that, apart from the community as a whole, the manufacturers have not only not to suffer, but much to gain from the substitution of a revenue tariff for the present system. A revenue tariff, being based upon the fixed charges of the country, and not, therefore, subject to fluctuations and alterations made to suit and please now one interest and now another, would establish those conditions of stability and permanency which experience has shown are essential to the security and prosperity of manufacturing interests.

And after the election was over, and when the leader of the Opposition became leader of the Government, there was considerable fear in various parts of the country concerning the first budget, and the First Minister wrote to Messrs. Dunn Bros. a letter which had wide circulation. This letter was written in July last, and in it he said :

I have your favour, for which accept my sincere thanks. I can renew you, after the fight, the assurance which I gave during the fight, that the tariff will not be inconsiderately tampered with, but that due consideration will be given to all interests. I would also like to impress upon the business community that no hasty change is to take place, and that no opportunity should be lost of developing trade in every direction during the coming season.

It is clear, therefore, that by the many promises and assurances by the Reform party, before they came into power and afterwards, those who had capital to invest were to some extent lulled into the happy certainty that this Government would deal carefully and considerately with their interests, and would not, at any rate at the start, do anything that would prejudice those interests or work their ruin. And, as I said, the oil interest seems to have been, to a large extent, cared for. And I am glad of it, though in the part of Canada from which I come a large amount of political capital was made by the Reformers from one end of the province to the other by denouncing as outrageous, by denouncing in the most extreme language, that duty, and by claiming that among the many delightful things that would happen when the Reformers came into power would be the removal of this onerous, objectionable and unpopular duty altogether. However, I never supposed that that part of the programme would be fully carried out. I was, therefore, very glad, bearing in mind the assurances to which I have referred, when, a little over a month ago, the Finance Minister, who knows the importance of the interest to which I propose to refer, having heard those who represent that interest, having heard the captains of labour, having heard the workers themselves, having brought these men face to face with his colleagues, and having given the subject a great deal of careful study, came down to the House with a resolution on the 22nd April which left the steel and iron interests in a position where they had some hope at any rate of being able to exist and make a good fight for their

existence, as those concerned in the oil interest now feel in regard to it. But I regret, I regret extremely, that in so short a time the Finance Minister has been forced to give up the fight on behalf of the iron and steel interests. I regret that he has so surrendered, and that he has not been able to secure even that measure of justice for the iron and steel interests that he has been ready to concede to the oil interests and others in the western part of Canada. The hon. gentleman himself is in no pleasant position. He said in his Budget speech that the reductions in the iron duty were heavy or extensive—I forget the exact word. Then he must be not altogether comfortable when he has to come now in so short a time with so very great reduction still further to the injury and detriment of that important interest. Some hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches said not long ago that this tariff was a tariff of compromise. So far as this feature of it is concerned, it seems to me more like a tariff of surrender, and I am sorry that in the surrender of some interests, the great interests in the part of Canada from which I come have been almost totally given up. Even the protection temporarily held out for coal is explained to be a matter of very short duration, or, at any rate, not a matter depending upon what the people of this country think, or believe, or want, but on the action of a neighbouring country. The hon. gentleman, I believe, still holds to the opinion he so often, so strongly expressed in his own province—his aim is to make the article of coal altogether free. Now, in discussing the iron and steel interests, as I propose to do shortly, I refer, and necessarily refer, to the sister interest of coal, because, in striking iron and steel, so far as they are represented in the province of Nova Scotia, the hon. gentleman is striking at the coal interest at the same time, and striking it a very heavy blow indeed. The hon. gentleman, as I say, represents a tariff that cannot be described accurately as a free trade tariff, as a revenue tariff or as a protectionist tariff. There are some free traders among hon. gentlemen opposite who are pleased that there is free trade in articles that do not immediately concern their pockets, so far as the manufacture is concerned; and there are protectionists there who are pleased because the interest in which they are directly interested has been more highly protected. For instance, an hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost), representing the agricultural implement interest finds that protection is left to his industry, and he is happy. There are behind the leader of the Government free traders, protectionists and revenue tariff men. A regular hotch-potch tariff has gained their support, and their party feeling will, no doubt, enable this tariff to be finally put into effect. But the unfairness, and the striking feature of the tariff, is that protection has been extended to some favoured interests

according, largely, to the strength in population of the country in which they are particularly concerned. This contrasts strongly with the sacrifice of interest in other parts of the country which have not been able to find in the Reform ranks, in the Cabinet or out of it, such strong friends to protect them. There are some manufacturers who are illogical enough to claim coal, iron and steel at certain stages as the raw materials of manufacture because they wish to use them in that way. I do not attempt to go so deeply into the question as to expose fully the absurdity of that argument so far as it applies to any particular article the production of which a great amount of labour and a great amount of capital are required. In connection with the mining of coal, the working of pig iron and steel in the ingot stage, hon. gentlemen are aware that the expenditure for labour, as well as the initial expenditure for plant and machinery is enormous by reason of the expensive machinery required. The production of these articles represents in labour, as compared with the whole cost, about 80 per cent. These are points particularly interesting to the labourers of the country, and they show that these articles are in every sense as much entitled to a measure of protection as any other articles to be found in the tariff list. These are articles that every country that has desired to become or has become a great manufacturing nation, has given the largest possible measure of protection. No iron interest or steel interest in any country on the face of the earth has been able to get on its feet and become one of the established industries without extraordinary protection being extended to it. These are general facts and not altogether unimportant when considering the resolutions now before us. In the incongruous arrangement before us we find the Government adopting a phase of the protectionist policy that was denounced by their friends all over the country, the bounty system. If there was anything more widely and more generally used against the Conservative party than another in the last campaign and previously, it was the argument, addressed to the agricultural portion of the community—attempting to stir up their jealousy—asking them to consider whether it was right or reasonable that bounties should be given to these iron kings and iron monopolists to assist them in making money, and no bounty given to the farmers to assist them in tilling the soil and in the development of agriculture. That argument is familiar to all of us. And the Reform press of my province teemed with these arguments to such an extent that they even denounced Sir Oliver Mowat for having adopted the most obnoxious phase of the protectionist system, when he proposed to give, and did finally by legislation give, \$1 a ton in addition to the Dominion bounty for iron made in the province of Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Yet we see to-day this Government, that pretends to look kindly upon free trade principles, this Government which, in this particular case, is absolutely wrecking interests created by a protectionist policy, coming down and, in connection with these very items, increasing the bounty. On the other hand, what do they do? They ask you to give a larger bounty than we gave, they ask you to double or treble the old bounty. On the other hand they lower, and make so low the duty on the finished article as to render very doubtful the success of the scheme. From what I have heard, many of those interested in the business are almost hopeless of being able, in connection with the manufacture of steel and iron, to do much more than earn the bounty, and there would not be much satisfaction in that. What they want to do is to sell in this country the products of their industry, and to do that, the bounty proposed is inadequate. The hon. gentleman's position was more reasonable when the resolutions were first introduced, because then the hon. gentleman was able to claim, as I think he did, at any rate his friends claimed for him, that he had taken great care of the iron and steel interests, especially of those industries concerned in the first stages of the production of iron and steel; that whereas he had largely reduced the protection in the tariff for the benefit of the trade at large, as he claimed, he had for that reduction given a corresponding amount of bounty, so that in the long run the position of the industry would be left secure. If that position is right, how does the hon. gentleman explain now, having any regard for those interests, the extraordinary cut that he has made in the protection on these items of the tariff, while leaving the amount of bounty at the old figure? To be consistent even with himself, to exhibit the fairness that he was disposed, apparently, to exhibit under the first resolution, the hon. gentleman is in every sense bound to come down to this House and ask for an increased bounty for the iron and steel interests, or he should in fairness confess that he has been beaten in his fight which I hope and believe that he endeavoured to make in Council, and beaten so hopelessly that he is utterly unable to protect these interests from his more ungenerous colleagues. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the importance of this steel industry and of the manufacture of iron, is fully appreciated. The Minister of Trade and Commerce not long ago had a most contemptible idea of this industry. I recollect him, if I may say so, sneering at those interests when I spoke in this Chamber touching their importance. Since his visit, however, to Nova Scotia, which I believe he made not long ago with the Controller of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Finance, I trust that hon. gentleman's misapprehension has been entirely removed, and that he is now aware that under the National Po-

licy, not altogether as satisfactory in regard to iron and steel as it would have been had the Conservatives been able to live a little longer, and to have applied their experience in the direction of the protection which was enjoyed since 1887, these interests have become so important as to have more than a provincial standing. Take, for instance, the steel works at New Glasgow. I find that in 1896, their last best year, they used, outside of the materials purchased, excepting coal, iron, and ore, materials the cash value of which amounted to \$345,500. They paid out in wages in that one year \$277,500; and there were paid out in that one industry no less than \$480,000 in wages to supply that one interest in 1896 with coal and ore. Then take the furnaces at New Glasgow, take the furnaces at Radnor, and the furnaces at Hamilton—the Hamilton furnaces only started recently—and I find that they produced in that year 61,839 tons of pig iron, and that represented an increasing output up to that year. Now, let me put before the Controller the language of the labouring men, the men who get the great percentage of the cash that is involved in the turning over of these articles of iron and of steel in our own country. As to the importance of one industry—and I take it because it happens to be in the county that I have the honour to represent and the one of which I am most familiar—in the petition which was brought to the notice of the tariff commission, they say, as workmen :

The steel works, with which we are connected, were started in 1882. In 1884, there were 130 hands employed; this number gradually increased, till in 1896 it reached 450 at the steel works, not counting the mines and blast furnace. There are 40 earning over \$3 per day; 80 over \$2; 110 over \$1.50; 220 over \$1. The average wage for 1896 was \$1.51 per day.

Of the 450 working in Trenton, 180 live there; on these about 90 per cent, or 700 of the people of Trenton depend, the total population being about 900. Number of houses, stores, &c., 174, valued at \$120,000; yet much of the trade of these 180 goes to New Glasgow, where 250 of the men live. The prosperity of this town, with its 5,000 population, depends largely on the steel works. Twenty-one of the men live in Stellarton. Of the 180 who live in Trenton, 70 own houses, valued at \$50,000. Of the 250 in New Glasgow, 86 own houses, valued at \$130,000. All the men, with the exception of two, are Nova Scotians, most of whom are now trained in the iron business and know no other. If deprived of work here, they would have to go to the States or some other iron-producing country.

These are the facts vouched for by the men, and familiar to all who know anything of that locality. Now take the language of another petition from the labourers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, addressed to the present Finance Minister. This appeal, I regret to believe, has been almost wholly ignored and disregarded. In their petition they say :

That the greatest portion of our labour and our interests lies in the production of these raw ma-

terials, and that any radical changes in the tariff in these, and not in other products of this country, would be a serious discrimination against our interests, very hurtful to us, and apt to deprive us of our means of earning a living, and to cause us great hardship;

That the tariff laws be so framed as to protect us, who form the commercial, labouring and agricultural interests of our various sections, by giving a uniform rate of customs duty to all products, according to the amount of labour expended upon them by us and others.

That is an important point, and one which the labour element had a right to deal with and to emphasize, and it is a point which, I am sure, was pressed home on the tariff commission, that is, that the true test in scheduling the duties in connection with iron and steel is to consider the amount of labour involved to produce the article at the different stages and to grade the protection accordingly. But, according to this tariff, as I have already hinted, and as I shall show in a moment or two by referring to the items, the Government have gone out of their way, and while professing to give the article in the first stages of both steel and iron protection in the form of a bounty, they open the door and destroy the professed benefit by reducing the protection largely on articles in a more or less finished stage, and consequently neutralizing, or almost destroying the benefit which, on the face of it, one would suppose was afforded to the articles themselves. So the labourers point that out and underline it in their petition, and they go on to say :

That the operation of the Londonderry Iron Ores plant to its full capacity,—

That is another important iron industry in the province of Nova Scotia, wholly different from the one to which I have called attention, and it is situated in the county of Colchester.

—which includes ore mines, coal mines, railroads, blast furnaces, coke ovens, puddling furnaces, bar and sheet-iron mills, cast-iron pipe shops, general foundry and machine shops, and many minor interests, means direct employment to from seven or eight hundred men, which means a population of from 3,500 to 4,000 people, and an average distribution of about \$1,000 per day; that these employees and their families support a large number of people dealing in trade, the professions, agricultural products, boarding, &c.; that, further, the Iron Company uses about 130,000 tons of coal, ore, limestone and other materials per annum, and that in the mining of this coal, ore, limestone, &c., about 350 men are employed, which means a population of about 1,800 persons at mining towns other than Londonderry, which population, in turn, supports its proportion of people engaged in trade, &c.; that the business of the Iron Company involves an annual expenditure of about \$100,000 per annum in freights, &c., on the Intercolonial Railway and other roads for such coal, ore, limestone, &c., as well as for the resultant pig iron, puddled bar, cast-iron pipe, castings and machinery, which freighting means employment for a large number of additional men, and the distribution of their proportion of money to storekeepers, &c., and also in-

creasing the earning capacity of the Government's road to this extent; in all, it is probable that not less than 5,000 persons are affected, more or less directly, by anything that will cause a total or partial stoppage of the iron plant at Londonderry; and we pray the hon. Ministers and our representatives may not lose sight of this when they are urged to reduce duties on raw material by those parties who make more finished products, but whose very same finished products are, after all, only the raw materials of others buying them from them.

For instance, no single argument is used with more force than this by those who desire protection, and it is just, and it is in dealing with this that a protectionist Government finds its greatest difficulty. It might as well be claimed that the cloth which the ready-made clothing manufacturer uses is a raw material. As regards that special manufacturer it is his raw material, but he has no more right to expect that to be considered raw material than to expect his product to be deemed raw material. So, in this connection, as I shall show later on, it is an important consideration, and it is one on which I hope hon. members from my own province, regardless of politics and party, will take a firm stand, and will make the stand which the Finance Minister was prepared to make at the outset, but from which he retreated, and that is to show opposition to selfish interests which should not be considered by a free trade Government, because those interests are demanding and securing protection, and very generous protection, on many articles and in many respects, and endeavour to protect the interests of the province of Nova Scotia particularly, which are receiving anything but the same measure of justice. With a protectionist Government, these difficulties to some extent exist. They can be fairly met. They were, on the whole, largely met, not by sacrificing one interest at the demand of another, but by increasing all the duties; and the complaint of the manufacturers of implements was that there was a reduction made on other raw materials without a corresponding reduction in the material out of which they made the finished article. I believe that contention is a sound one. The only way of treating those interests, while there is an element of protection running through these resolutions, is not to sacrifice one interest for another or one interest that is strong for one that is stronger, but to give protection in such proportion as to secure them all a certain amount of protection, according to the amount of labour required in the production of the manufactured article in each case. I have referred to the petitions, and the committee has been most patient in permitting me to read pretty fully from them, because they were the general demand and outspoken request of representatives of labour in those districts in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In order to give an idea of some of the difficulties those

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

industries have to meet—and the Finance Minister is familiar with the fact, because he has the information under his hand—I may say that the New Glasgow Steel Works had to keep on hand a stock of 630 different sizes and shapes of steel bars, ingots, plates, and other materials. These are difficulties, of course, with which similar industries have had to contend at the outset, and especially in any country not very largely settled with population as the Dominion is at present. Let me refer to these reductions in order to show how extensive they have been, and within what a short time they have occurred. I have referred to the statement of the Finance Minister made on April 22nd on the resolutions he first brought down, when he said:

It has already been stated that we are making very material reductions in the duties on iron.

His argument was: while I have made these very large reductions, I have given you an increased bounty and remodelled, practically, in regard to steel, the tariff so much more in your favour; and, as the resolution at that time stated, not much complaint was made, and, at all events, no serious complaint could have been made, except with further experience on the part of those interested. Those large reductions took place on 22nd April. On 25th May, these further reductions I observe. One dollar is proposed to be the duty under the tariff item, iron or steel scrap. On that item there was a duty of \$1.50 in the tariff as submitted on 22nd of April. In item 219, iron or steel ingots, cogged ingots, or other forms less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings, &c., are now \$2 per ton, whereas on the 22nd of April they were put down at \$4 per ton. In item 221 of the tariff, rolled iron or steel angles, &c., it was considered on the 22nd of April that in fairness to these interests the rate charged should be 15 per cent, but under this proposed resolution there is a further reduction to 10 per cent. So with other items, there is a further reduction from 15 to 10 per cent since the 22nd of April. Fifteen per cent was the duty proposed on the 22nd of April by this Government, on item 229, steel in bars, &c., after careful study, after discussing this subject pro and con, and after obtaining information upon it in open meeting, but on the 25th of May there was a further reduction to 5 per cent proposed. I regret to say there are many more items in the tariff showing this state of things. There was a large reduction on the 22nd of April in regard to the protection on iron, but there was an increased bounty to compensate for it. However, on the 25th of May, we are face to face with still further and radical reductions, and there is no suggestion from the Government that there is to be any corresponding increase in the bounties on iron and steel

to compensate both the labourer and the capitalist for this heavy raid that is to be made upon them. We must assume, of course, that there is no further proposal from the Government in connection with these resolutions as regards iron and steel. If there is to be any change, the Government should at once take the House into its confidence and state what it is to be. The Minister of Finance says that I am right in assuming that there will be no change.

Some may think that in connection with the reduction of one-eighth for the first year and one-fourth in the second year in favour of England, that even if we lose somewhat in Canada or in the provinces down by the sea, after all there would be a gain to those manufacturers in the west who get this material cheap, and who are to enjoy for some time a very fair amount of protection. It might be assumed that the reduction in favour of England in the Jubilee year, while it took the bread out of the mouth of Canadians in Nova Scotia, would give it to English labourers, and that at any rate the work would be done under the flag. It might also be assumed, that it would be a benefit to the shipping trade, and that ships would bring this pig iron and these ingots into our ports, and thus a profitable trade would be created between England and Canada. If any one labours under that idea it is an entire delusion. The labour that is wiped out in the maritime provinces will not go to England, but to the United States of America. Every man in the business knows that, and I am sure the Minister of Finance has been notified of the fact, because he has political friends who are experts in this business, and who have been able to keep him well advised in the matter. Under this tariff, it is convict labour that will largely take the place of the honest work of our own Canadian labourers. No matter whether there is a clause in the tariff dealing with that subject or not, it is impossible to keep it out, and therefore the convict labour of the south, and the labour of the United States are to be benefited by the proposed changes. I shall quote to the House an authority to prove this, because after all, on such a technical question my views can only be formed on the information furnished by those interested, and on the authorities to which they have referred me. I submit, Sir, that these reductions in the tariff, threaten our home industries and favour the industries of the United States and favour United States labour as against British labour. Those who were before the tariff commission called the attention of the commissioners to an article published by a high authority in England, and I have two or three articles of the same character in my possession which I think ought be placed before the Government, and before the House, in considering this important

proposition. "The Engineering Review and Metal Worker" under date November 20th, 1896, states as follows:—

Some of the daily newspapers have recently been congratulating British manufacturers on the evident desire of the Canadian Government to release Canada from the protectionist shackles which Sir John Macdonald imposed eighteen years ago: and speak of a complete revision of the tariff as imminent. It does not, however, follow that any amount of revision will greatly help some of our leading industries, and it is assuredly doubtful whether the iron or steel industries of this country would be greatly assisted if the tariff duties were entirely abolished. This may seem a bold statement to make, but it is a true one, all the same. Canada imports from 240,000 to 250,000 tons of iron and steel annually, and manufactures about 50,000 tons more. The time was when the mother country supplied the whole of the import, but that time has gone, and nowadays Canada takes a larger value of iron and steel imports from the United States than from Great Britain. It is to be presumed that the home supply would continue the same, and the imports from the United States would be quite as large if the tariff were cut right off, but certainly, no impending change in the tariff is likely to benefit the mother country, as against our rival on the Canadian frontier.

I have referred, Sir, to the statement of the labourers themselves, whose views on this subject are not to be lost sight of, they are men who know the ins and outs of the trade, know exactly what iron costs and what labour is paid for in the production of it, and in the petition to which I have referred they called the attention of the tariff commissioners to the fact, that it is to the United States they themselves will have to go if the protection of this industry were interfered with, and not to England, and not under our own flag could they hope to be employed. I wish to refer to a high Canadian authority on this subject. Mr. George E. Drummond, in a paper prepared by him, gives us valuable information, and I shall refer to it on this point: as to what country is to be benefited, and what labour is to be benefited by the proposed tariff changes. In a paper published on the iron question, for the purposes of this very revision, he says:

American and Canadian iron was sold at fully \$4 per ton below these figures, so that the Scotch ironmasters were quite unable to compete. The home trade was the salvation of the British iron-producers in 1896. Large ship-building orders and the prospect of large Government contracts for warships served to stimulate matters considerably during the year, but while the general tone remained favourable at the close of the year, constantly increasing shipments of American pig iron and products thereof to the English market, and the ever-decreasing export trade in iron from the British market itself, form a combination of circumstances that are not promising.

Again, in the same publication—and I only refer to the remarks pointedly bearing on this phase of the subject—he says:

History attests that Great Britain gave seventy-three years' efficient protection (from 1787 to 1860)

to her iron industry. The trade returns of to-day show that, not only has the British ironmaster been driven out of the Canadian and other foreign markets, but the protected iron-makers of the United States and Germany are successfully invading the English market itself, the facts raising a very grave question as to whether Great Britain did not make a serious error when she abandoned the principle of protection.

Again, this writer, who is an expert on the subject, says :

A reference to Canadian Government statistics, say from 1885 to 1895, or to the same figures given in the "Canadian Mining Iron and Steel Manual" for 1896, page 321, &c., will demonstrate the fact that the iron-producers of the United States are rapidly driving the ironmasters of Great Britain out of the Canadian market. As a matter of fact, British iron is now but rarely used in the iron foundries of Ontario, the largest consuming market in the Dominion. Take the figures on pig-iron :

In 1885, we imported from Great Britain 34,773 net tons, and from the United States, 7,389 net tons.

Within ten years it will be found that these figures are completely reversed.

In the fiscal year 1895-96, we imported from Great Britain 6,525 net tons, and from the United States, 32,597 net tons, and the same progress is going steadily on in almost all other manufactures of iron and steel. Where formerly we used British steel boiler plates, structural iron for steel, &c., &c., we now use American. The only possible rival now and hereafter to the American producers of iron and steel will be our own native furnaces and mills, and it is for the people of Canada to consider which is best, in the general interests of our country, to sustain and encourage.

Quotations on British pig iron for delivery in Ontario towns run fully \$2 to \$3 per ton over those of equal quality of American make.

There are, however, other authorities which no one will dispute, whatever may be thought of our own Canadian experts. The "Iron Age," published in New York, which is familiar to all in the trade and is accepted by all as a most reliable authority, has a reference in its issue of May 6th to this tariff; and as it puts the case more briefly than I can possibly put the same facts, and makes more conspicuous the contrast which I have endeavoured to bring out, I will quote it; and from the examination which I have been able to make, I think that its statement will be found to be correct. Referring to the Canadian tariff, it says :

Of all the changes made in the general tariff, the most sweeping were those made in the duties on iron and steel and manufactures thereof. Large slices were taken off most of the old duties, and some of the most important articles, of mining machinery and (next year) barbed wire, were put on the free list. What foreign country will receive most, if not all, the advantage of this? Clearly the United States. It is true, Britain gets her goods in at a rate of duty now 12½ per cent, and next year 25 per cent less than the general rate, but nobody supposes, the Government least of all, that she can ship iron and steel goods into this country against United States competition. Looking over the whole list of Canadian imports of iron and steel goods, we find in

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

nearly every article that the balance is enormously in favour of the United States. Even of bar iron, of which until recently we imported altogether from the United Kingdom to supplement our own output, a larger quantity is now supplied to us from over the line than from Great Britain, our imports of bar iron in the fiscal year ending June 30 last amounting to \$52,827 from Britain, and to \$66,587 from the United States. Of railway engines, locomotives, and parts thereof, we imported in the same year to the value of \$80,147 from the United States, and none from Great Britain. Clippings of wrought iron or steel pipe we brought from the United States to the value of \$66,916; from Great Britain to the value of \$1,758. Hardware from the United States amounted to \$261,914; from Great Britain to \$23,891. Pig iron from the United States amounted to \$332,212; from Great Britain to \$74,704. Of machines and machinery we import little from any source but the United States. Sewing machines to the value of \$108,956 came last year from the United States, while only \$4,839 worth came from Great Britain. In windmills, fanning mills, portable machines, portable steam engines, portable sawmills and planing mills, sewing machines and typewriting machines the difference is vastly in favour of the United States, while of "all other machinery composed wholly or partly of iron or steel," we imported from the United States to the value of \$929,016, as against \$154,014 from the United Kingdom. In structural iron the countries are now nearly equal, the United States having furnished us of the lighter angles and channels with \$29,028 worth, while the value of Britain's share was \$27,254; of the heavier imports from the United States amounted to \$26,545, and those from Britain to \$38,631. Of girders, joists, beams, &c., we got from the United States to the value of \$25,662, and from Britain to the value of \$36,039. Of tubes and tubing, our imports from the United States and Great Britain, respectively, were as follows:—

	U. S.	G. B.
Boiler tubes.....	\$ 74,908	\$38,291
Lap-welded tubing.....	39,560	.....
Rolled steel tubes, not over 1½ inch.....	68,099	29,186
Wrought iron or steel tubing over 2 inches.....	286,713	9,322
Other wrought iron or steel pipes.....	95,063	36,575

From the United States we got steel ingots to the value of \$9,288; from Britain, to the value of \$18,847. From the United States we got steel bars, rolled or hammered, &c., to the value of \$182,141; from Great Britain, to the value of \$128,518. This item is one in which the United States has crept up swiftly. In tools and implements this is how our imports from the two countries compare :

	U. S.	G. B.
Axes.....	\$ 31,848	\$ 59
Saws.....	79,514	3,263
Carpenters' &c., tools.....	173,882	26,803
Files and rasps.....	53,714	11,223
Picks, mattocks, &c.....	5,542	501
Tools of all descriptions.....	41,079	4,076
Track tools, crowbars, sledges	3,683	1
Unenumerated articles of iron and steel.....	562,154	104,828

Now, if any one will take the trouble to look into the authorities, whether English or American, he will not consider me rash when I say that this competition is very

marked in favour of the United States and becoming more marked as the years roll by. The iron authorities in Great Britain hold out no hope that time will bring any change in favour of the mother country on the part of the United States, which has enjoyed the benefit of a protective policy. Let me read a short statement from the president of the British Iron Trade Association, which I find in "The Iron Age" of 27th May :

Between 1880 and 1886, the United States took from Great Britain close on 8,000,000 tons of iron and steel, an average of nearly 900,000 tons per year. In the history of the iron industry, this demand is the greatest that any single country has ever made. To show its enormous relative proportions, I will only add that this demand is practically as large as that made by the whole of our colonies, including India, for the same period. It is difficult for us here to realize that the American demand was in full force less than ten years ago. Conditions have completely changed. The question now is, not what quantity will the United States take from us, but what quantity is likely to come here from the States. The pig-iron makers and the steel makers both appear to be threatened. Under present conditions, it seems probable that both pig-iron and steel blooms and bars may be brought here at a profit from the United States.

I couple with that the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance with regard to the operation of freight rates and distance—all against England and in favour of the United States; and no one knows this better than these experts in the iron and steel interests of Great Britain, who are continually complaining of it. This statement of the British Iron and Trade Association shows therefore that I am warranted in saying that the effect of all this, while injurious to Canadian labour, injurious particularly to a large part of it in the province from which I come, has added to the advantage, not of Great Britain, but of the United States.

On that same subject, I have another authority also, taken from the "Iron Age" of 3rd June, in which these figures are referred to concisely :

During the last few years, a very great increase has taken place in our exports of iron and steel, and of manufactures of iron and steel. The increase has been particularly marked in the calendar years 1895, 1896. Our exports in 1895 amounted to \$35,071,563, and in 1896 to \$48,670,218.

Now, then, I think I have fairly made that point, and it is not an unimportant point, sustained as it is by authorities of great repute.

Then the hon. Finance Minister has included in these resolutions a provision to protect us from the competition of convict labour: "Goods manufactured or produced, wholly or in part, by prison labour," are prohibited. We all agree that they should be, but I am sure that the hon. Controller of Customs will admit that it is practically impossible to tell, when southern iron comes into the ports of Canada, whether that is the result of convict labour or not. It will

be impossible, by any known means, to tell whether convicts mined the ore or were in the furnace, or assisted in making the iron or in mixing up the various products for the manufacture of iron or steel. I am sure that his experience in the department and the experience of his officers would induce him to say that he had very little hope of that provision being effective.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It is much broader than it was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is in terms, I believe, but the practical difficulties are obvious. I shall not dwell upon the difficulties, because the matter is one upon which we are all agreed, but in connection particularly with iron and steel and the manufactures of iron and steel, it is absolutely impossible for him and his army of officers, no matter how efficient they may be, to keep out those products into which convict labour has gone in some form or other.

But there is another difficulty from which our Canadian people should be protected, and there is no class more respectable and better conducted or who make better citizens than the iron and coal workers and miners of the country—and the hon. gentleman knows it as well as I do—and that is the difficulty of the degraded Negro labour of the south. We have coloured citizens in Canada whom we all respect, and between whom and the Negro labour of the south there is no more similarity than there is between the white men of Canada and that degraded condition of labour, but it is that class which submit to be held in the hollow of the ironmaster's hand and be dealt with on primeval principles, or on the old system of barter and truck, with which the labour element of this country is face to face; and it is by reason of the competition of that degraded class that the United States are with such rapidity forcing themselves to the front and forcing all others out of the race. The hon. gentleman's prohibitory clause does not pretend to touch that class of labour, and it is that competition that is being let loose upon Canadian and British labour to-day. I have spoken strongly of this southern labour, but here is what Mr. Meissner, a gentleman of great experience and manager of the Londonderry Iron Works, tell us, in an interesting paper submitted to the Canadian Mining Association :

The next point is the labour question, which is a serious matter in favour of the southern furnaces, and yet of such a nature that I am certain no Canadian would be willing to see it inaugurated in his own country. I have lived and worked five years with the southern coloured labour, and while it was a very satisfactory labour in one way, in another it holds the country down to a very much lower grade of civilization and progress, as a whole, than any similar amount of white labour. The Negro does not strike, he works hard when properly pressed, he is good-natured and willing as a rule, and can stand cli-

matic conditions; but he is naturally ignorant and lazy; he will only work when watched closely, and can seldom be relied upon to do any work without slighting it. He lacks all feeling of responsibility, of morality, means well, but, like a child, cannot see the difference between right and wrong, as we view it. He is usually shiftless, seldom saves his money, yet when closely watched and in localities where there is not much other employment to be obtained by him, he will work steadily and quite faithfully; he gets about the same wages as the white labourer in the north, and if this were all, there would not be a marked difference in his labour as a cost factor against the average white labourer, but it is through his ignorance and indifference that he becomes a cheaper labourer, because through him the company store system flourishes as it is absolutely impossible to flourish with any white labour. The Negro, in most cases, is paid through the company's store. Some few will have a large portion of their pay coming to them at the end of the month, especially in town districts, but in more remote districts there is no question but that any considerable amount of cash on pay-day is a rarity. Owing to his ignorance, the temptation arises to charge him high prices, and the result is, that while our iron costs are more than those of the southern iron, yet this is largely due to this peculiar labour condition, as you can readily see, when you consider that the mining of coal, ore and limestone is almost entirely labour, and that it is just in these processes largely carried on in more remote places, that the conditions above-mentioned of inordinate store profits cause the extreme cheapness with which those articles from which iron is made, can be produced. Canadian labour is so vastly the gainer by none of these conditions existing among it, that it cannot afford to lose sight of them for a moment in any discussion of our industrial systems.

The worst feature of the southern labour conditions, however, is the contract prison labour, which is a virtual system of legalized slavery. All state prisoners are auctioned off to the highest bidder, usually a mining company, and then penned up in a camp near the mines and made to work, the company feeding and housing them, besides paying the stipulated price to the state per man. This system naturally allows of very cheap mining, for, while the men are usually treated quite fairly, yet every effort is made to get the most work out of them for the least expenditure. Now, these are considerations which cannot be wholly ignored; these are statements, too, of very serious effect, and they go to establish the point which I endeavour to present—that this cheapness of the United States iron products which is now to come in and take the place of our own Canadian product, is due to conditions which no one can prove, and is due to a rivalry that we should endeavour to prevent, and certainly a rivalry which is not fair to Canadian labour. I have referred to the statement made by the Finance Minister, and I want to remind him, in connection with this struggle, that, no doubt, did go on in the Cabinet, that he is back to the old condition of affairs apparently, and I begin to have some sympathy for him, though I never had it before. I find that, in connection with the working of the National Policy, there was no section in the country allowed to gratify its greed through the tariff. We had to

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

fight, in various parts of the country, the Reformers who endeavoured to arouse the feelings of one section against another because some interests which were protected were not generally enjoyed, but were confined to particular districts. But those who appreciate the National Policy—and I believe that the majority of the electorate of Canada ever since 1879 and down to the present time, have been wedded to that system as a whole—were willing to make concessions for concessions between the different sections of Canada, just as, for instance, the present Government and the late Government too, were prepared to make fair concessions to foreign countries where a mutually beneficial trade arrangement could be reached. One cannot always get his own way, and, in connection with the working of the National Policy, which was for the benefit of all, it was considered that every reasonable interest in the country should have the same fair amount of protection. The great iron and coal interests, it was recognized, must be protected, for these interests must be protected if a country is to be great. The protection accorded to these interests under the National Policy was, in the end, represented by most gratifying results. But, in the old times, one of the reasons why the present Finance Minister wished to break the bonds of Canadian confederation, to take his province out of the union altogether, one of the strongest grounds, one upon which he continually dwelt, was that a tariff—and he did not signalize one party more than another—was regulated for the benefit of the western provinces. It is not so very long ago since the hon. gentleman inveighed against Canada right and left. It is not so very long since he complained that in the tariff arrangements there was discrimination against the maritime provinces. For instance, he said:

To-day, we have a high tariff, not—

And this is speaking as leader of the Nova Scotia Government in 1886—

—not for the benefit of the lower provinces, but largely for the benefit of the western provinces, with which we have little common interest.

And he has lived to see the day when he can make that statement with far greater weight and far greater authority than he could in 1886; for it was the custom of his party and himself to take, not so much the protectionist features of the old policy, so far as they related to the interests of our own provinces, but oil, flour and all the products of the west which, according to these hon. gentlemen, were unduly favoured and unduly protected at the cost of the consumer down by the sea. And, as I say, the hon. gentleman has lived to assist in, or at any rate, be responsible for, tariff propositions that are remarkable for the discrimination, and the intended and avowedly unjust discrimination, against im-

portant interests in the maritime provinces and in the province of Nova Scotia in particular. I refer especially to the coal and iron interests. And it is from him the support comes for the statement that this tariff is to be for the benefit, so far as benefit can be got out of it, of those interests that are so largely represented in the west. I am aware that the hon. gentleman, even later than 1886, had very little regard for even these interests, the coal and iron of Nova Scotia. Happily Nova Scotia does not represent alone the iron interests, though, fortunately for the province, that is the interest of commanding importance in the province. In 1887, in the legislature of that province, this is the advice of the present Finance Minister :

Let us cease our efforts to produce iron, and devote our energy to catching fish and digging potatoes.

There was a proposition before the House then in connection with some iron project and the hon. gentleman in that way, that slighting way, referred to an interest which has certainly been considered in every other country one of the proudest possessions of a country. The hon. gentleman has beside him one who holds that opinion, or held it until very recently, utterly ignorant of the importance of this industry. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce has again had his revenge in his wrestle with the Minister of Finance, if the Minister of Finance ever attempted to stand by his resolution of the 22nd of April, because those resolutions of the 22nd of April could not have obtained the sincere approval of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Only in 1896 that hon. gentleman referred to those interests, the interests for which I have endeavoured to say something, as "pampered exotics," and attacked them in language such as the following :—

There is not a man who deals in iron in any shape who is not grossly oppressed by the hon. gentleman's tariff. The agricultural implement men are grossly oppressed by it ; the stove men are greatly oppressed by it ; those who manufacture tubes and other ware of that kind, are grossly oppressed by it. The hon. gentleman and his friends inflict upon these classes of men a tax of 40, or 50, or 60, aye, in some cases, as high as 70 per cent upon certain portions of the raw material they use. What justice is there in that ; what reason is there in that ; what wisdom is there in that ?

Mark these words, and the spirit of a member of the present Administration, and we will see how it was that the Minister of Finance was forced from the position that he took on the 22nd of April :

But, for the sake of pampering one or two in establishments away down in Nova Scotia, these men, who employ ten hands for one that these Nova Scotia industries can employ in the iron industries, are put to extreme hardship and inconvenience.

There is exposed an avowed and most selfish spirit ; it is for the benefit of the manufacturers of the west that these interests "away down in Nova Scotia" must be sacrificed. The hon. gentleman gave expression to that spirit before he became a member of this Cabinet. To-day he is one of the strongest, if not the strongest man in that Cabinet, and he has the satisfaction, whatever there may be in it, of finding that he has been, to a great extent, successful in stamping out what he calls these pampered exotics, these interests "away down in Nova Scotia." To show that I am not unreasonable in interpreting this language to denote a selfish spirit and a sectional policy, and a sectional policy so avowed, not free trade, not revenue tariff, and not protection—because protection had a general regard for the interests all over Canada—I propose to ask the indulgence of the committee, which has already been very great, while I read some extracts from the Toronto "Globe," which fought a campaign against the iron and steel industry on the lines of the sneering remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that I have just quoted. Possibly Ontario, and those who are enjoying protection to-day, no matter how they voted, were cajoled and led into the belief that by supporting the Reformers, free trade principles would not reach their industries to a dangerous degree, but that at the cost of the interests in the smaller provinces, their relative protection would be all the greater. The Toronto "Globe," in an unmistakable manner, elaborated that campaign to a large extent, and in my own province I in vain called attention to the proposition that was before us, and to the position we would be in if a Reform Government came in, and if the present Minister of Trade and Commerce became a member of it, and if the "Globe" retained its influence. So unreasonable was it, so narrow was it, that I have no doubt the difficulties in my way were greater than I expected, because even until the 22nd of April it was difficult to get men, whether Conservatives or Liberals, to believe that any Government in Ottawa would tread down their interests, and remove even the vestige of protection from them while retaining it in a marked degree for interests in another part of the country. It was believed that whatever happened, the policy would be a general policy, and that it would not matter when an interest came before the Government of Canada what particular part of Canada that interest was situated in. But this was the style in which the people of Ontario were canvassed by the Liberal organ, and I wish to show how the Liberal organ now claims that all its promises have been, to a large extent, redeemed at the cost of Nova Scotia. In February, 1895, the Toronto "Globe" said :

The Government can do nothing, for the coal and iron duties are the linch-pin of the National

Policy. Abolish them, and the whole fabric, as at present constituted, collapses.

Then, on the 5th of January, 1895, the "Globe" says :

Meanwhile, Ontario, the manufacturing province and the chief consuming province, wants cheaper iron and steel.

On the 15th of August, 1895, in the meanwhile steadily writing in the same direction, the Toronto "Globe" says :

New Glasgow is about the only place that has gone ahead, and the Dominion at large is paying a terrible price for iron and steel in order to boom it. The attempt to force coal from Sydney to Toronto and Hamilton, a distance of 1,500 miles, when coal can be got at points just across Lake Ontario, 1,200 miles nearer, has come to grief ; and the New Glasgow and Londonderry furnaces find it increasingly difficult to send pig iron all the way, the freight being nearly 50 per cent of the cost price of a ton at Pittsburg, Chicago or Tonawanda.

Later, on the 23rd of November, 1895, the "Globe" said, speaking of the old Mackenzie tariff :

The free list was a generous one, including pig iron, coal, and, generally speaking, all the chief raw material of the Ontario manufacturer. Hence this tariff was in reality more protective to some industries than the National Policy, which taxes their raw material most unmercifully.

There was language to which I particularly refer, that the articles that were manufactured into which this labour went in the province of Nova Scotia, were ranked as raw material because, forsooth, the manufacturers of Ontario required them to handle and to treat as raw material for their purposes. Mark you, Mr. Chairman, I do not grudge protection to the Ontario manufacturer, I do not complain of protecting any Canadian interest. If they are satisfied with what they have got, I rejoice ; if they fairly require more, I will vote for it, I would vote for it from this side of the House as readily as I would from the other side, I would vote for it at the hands of this Government as readily as I would at the hands of a Conservative Government. What I complain of is that that class of manufacturers support a sectional and selfish policy ; they wish to support a policy of protection so far as it protects interests which immediately concern themselves, and refuse that same measure of protection to other districts, and to other people who are concerned in other interests in other parts of the country. Before the election in 1895, the "Globe" supported such a policy so far as it could, as a leading Liberal organ, and I refer now to an issue on October 31, 1895 :

The repeal or reduction of the raw material duties will, no doubt, be one of his first acts. Something, perhaps, may be said, from a Nova Scotia standpoint, for the taxes on iron and coal, though as Nova Scotia is the only coal and iron region in the civilized world where population is at a standstill, it is clear that the experiment of

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

building her up at the expense of Ontario is not very successful.

I think there are some people of Ontario who do a pretty thriving business in the province of Nova Scotia, and many of them would admit that the people of that province, with a population of 450,000 more or less, have built up and sustained in a large part many interests outside of the province, as well as being able at the present time to show a commercial front equal relatively to that of any other province of Canada. This paper, however, after claiming that the National Policy was carried out at the sacrifice of Ontario, goes on to say :

Notwithstanding the terrific tariff and the bounties.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, the peculiarity of the present situation is that the terrific tariff and the bounties are to be more than doubled under the Reform Government ; but I complain not, and I should like to see them heavier. They are so framed, however, that they will utterly fail, I fear, in their object, and that is to furnish a certain amount of protection that will allow them to make, for a time at least, some return.

Therefore, we are still an almost infinite way from the protectionist idea of making all our own iron and steel goods at home, while the tax that was to give Ontario coal from Cape Breton as cheap, or cheaper, than foreign, turns out to be a fine of \$800,000 a year on the manufacturers of this province.

I am happy to say that so far the Finance Minister retains the duty on coal. I understand, though I was not present at the time, that on an early day in the session the hon. gentleman stated that the policy of his Government looked in the direction of making it free altogether, but that much depended on the action of Congress ; and if Congress, for instance, imposed a duty of 75 per cent, the duty on bituminous of 60 cents would be retained and the Government would consider the question of the imposition of a duty on anthracite. I hope some accident will arise by which the 60 cents will be retained, and I think the country would not suffer from a duty being imposed on anthracite, for if the Finance Minister looks up the prices of anthracite paid when there was a duty imposed on Canada and since—if my information be correct—he will find that the anthracite combination in the United States, for many years since coal came into Canada free, has regulated the price in such a way that the Canadian consumer receives no benefit whatever from the removal of the duty, and the treasury loses \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year revenue. I have referred to these statements of the great Liberal organ as having been made before the elections. Here is the triumphant ring of that paper after the elections had taken place. The paper said to the Ontario people : The protection afforded has

helped to some extent the interests of the Dominion, we propose to give you relief in regard to the duties on the so-called raw material; we propose to break down the interests of the provinces by the sea, and we will take care of you, we will give you what you call raw material at lower rates. Accordingly, the Minister of Finance on 22nd of April—whether he made an earnest fight on the question or not I am unable to say—came down to the House and showed that among many promises made by Reformers this was one of the promises which was not to be kept. So the "Globe" was not very happy. But on the 25th of May these amended resolutions were presented. On 27th of May the "Globe" thus refers to the comparative position of affairs:

The best feature of the changes announced on Tuesday is the disposition to give encouragement to manufactures by lowering the taxes on raw material rather than by increasing the duties on the product. For instance, spring steel, spiral spring steel, spiral springs for railways, steel billets and steel axle bars for the manufacture of carriage springs and axles, are placed on the free list. Steel for toolmakers is reduced from 15 per cent to 5 per cent. Scrap iron under the old tariff was \$4 per ton; under the first resolution, \$1.50 per ton; it is now \$1 per ton. Steel ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, puddled bars, &c., under the old tariff were \$5 per ton; under the first resolution, \$4 per ton; now reduced to \$2 per ton. Structural iron is reduced from 15 per cent to 10 per cent. Bridge plates for steel-plate manufactures are reduced from 15 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem. Rolled iron or steel plates, used by boilermakers, are reduced from 15 to 10 per cent ad valorem. Iron and steel are the basis of so many industries, we may say virtually of all, that we regard it as of the utmost importance that progress in this respect is steadily in the direction of reduction.

I have to express to the committee my debt of obligation for the very great courtesy they have shown to me while speaking as I have done, and it was largely out of respect to the committee and to some extent due to possessing only a superficial knowledge of the intricacies of this industry, that I referred so much to authorities, and authorities of high standing all the world over, and at considerable length. But I desire to point out to the Government, although I think it will be useless so far as averting this disastrous blow is concerned, that when they found on April 22nd difficulties in touching the iron and steel duties, they should have allowed them to remain in the tariff as they were, instead of tinkering with the tariff in that respect. They had the whole recess before them in which they could consider the subject and endeavour to deal with it, instead of coming down to the House with the proposition which they said would involve large reductions. It must be remembered that all men are more or less selfish in regard to tariff changes, and hon. gentlemen opposite frankly say that they have made radical reductions based upon no other desire than that of

pleasing the largest number of people. Is it a proper principle on which legislation should be enacted that if the Government finds more people interested in industries that use certain products than are employed in the production of the raw material in its first stage, they should seek to meet their views and let the rest of the community go. I submit that there is no true principle underlying these proposed tariff changes. The Government do not profess that free trade is to be found in them; certainly no protection is found in connection with the industries involved, and my great complaint is that the changes in the tariff have been partial instead of universal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would suppose it would be deemed discourteous if I did not say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman, although I have not the slightest intention of following him through his very lengthy and elaborate speech. I listened to him with very great attention, for which I hope he will be grateful. I find that the scrap-book of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is well known in the House, and when he gets it out it becomes a terror of the majority of members. I do not think that his speech of to-day is any departure from his reputation in that respect. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) began by stating, that there was too little protection for the iron industry in this tariff, and he had not proceeded very far before he began to complain that the Government had granted a bounty, and he appealed to the country to notice that this Government was increasing the bounty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) say, that I complained of the bounty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman did, in the earlier part of his speech.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) did not do me that courtesy he said he did, of listening to my speech. I would like to see the bounty larger, and I said that once or twice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The purpose of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was evidently to excite opposition against the Government, and opposition against the tariff, on the ground that it was giving an increased bounty to the iron industry. That was his purpose, unless I mistake the purport of a portion of his speech. He also professed to quote from some Liberal speaker who described a bounty as the most vicious form of protection. I think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will have difficulty in obtaining any competent authority to endorse that statement. So far as my opinion is worth anything, I do not hesitate to say, that I do not regard a bounty as the

most vicious form of protection. On the contrary, I think it is about the most sensible and defensible form of protection, because one has the advantage of knowing exactly what he is paying, and perhaps he may be able to discover what he is getting in return for the bounty. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made a studied effort to create difficulty as between the east and the west, by representing that this tariff was made at the sacrifice of the maritime provinces. That was a proposition over which the hon. gentleman laboured. Now, if he would only induce his friends in the west to take the same view, I do not know that I would have very much to complain of, but the friends of the hon. gentleman in the west are representing that this tariff has been made in the interests of the maritime provinces, and representations are being made that the maritime members of this House have had too much influence in the moulding of the tariff. The statement is as unfair and untrue in the west as it is in the east. The tariff has been made for the purpose which the hon. gentleman himself stated at the close of his speech; a purpose which he implied was a great wrong. "Why," he said, "this Government have really prepared this tariff in the interest of pleasing the largest number of the people of Canada." These were his words. Well, Sir, I confess that that is exactly the aim of this tariff. It was our aim to please, as far as we might be able to do, the largest number of the people of this Dominion.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made various allusions to struggles in the Cabinet. Perhaps that is a subject upon which he is better qualified to speak than I am. Perhaps he has had a larger experience in the matter of struggles in the Cabinet than I have. I am bound to tell my hon. friend that, in the light of his own experience, I can forgive him for not being able to understand that it may be possible to carry on a Government without struggles in the Cabinet.

With regard to the particular duties affecting the iron industries of Pictou county, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has complained of some of the duties, which in so far as they have any relation to that particular industry, are, in my opinion, really in its favour. He complained that we made the duty lower on scrap iron. If that has any effect whatever upon the iron industry in Pictou county, it is not adverse to that industry, but on the contrary, it will be to their advantage that scrap iron should be as cheap as possible. My hon. friend went on to allude to the danger that this iron tariff would encourage American iron to come into this country. Well, Sir, we regard it as of great importance to the manufacturing industries of Canada, to the general industries of Canada, that these raw materials shall be supplied to the manufacturers as cheaply as possible. That is the

line upon which the tariff has been prepared. It may be that many of these iron goods will come in from the United States, although I think the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) magnifies that danger. He quoted at length, from what he regarded as authorities, to show that England is going to be destroyed in this competition with the iron industries of the United States. My hon. friend has a weakness for discovering that England is going to be easily ruined. The somewhat famous phrase which he once used in this House, must have come to the minds of many of us when to-day he was speaking about the destruction of England's iron industry in competition with the United States. It was but a repetition of that phrase wherein he said that England had been driven from the markets of the world under her system of free trade, and was compelled to force her wares upon the uncivilized countries of the world. That was the substance of what the hon. gentleman stated upon a previous occasion. Well, we have a better of opinion than he has of the ability of England to deal with her competitors in industrial matters, and while it is possible that the development of the iron industries in the United States may for the moment give rise to the impression that England will not be able to compete as fully as we expect, yet, when business interests come back to a more solid condition, and when the present depression of trade in the United States shall have passed away, we think it is reasonably probable that in the matter of the iron industry, England will be able to compete with the United States, and that under our preferential tariff we shall be able to bring even iron goods into Canada from England, as readily as from the United States. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has again gone over the whole question of protection, and free trade, and revenue tariff. I do not believe it would be profitable to follow the hon. gentleman in that, because it would be going to the foundation of the whole question which has been discussed in this House so often. The hon. gentlemen on that side of the House view it from one standpoint, and we on this side of the House view it from another. We view it not from the absolute standpoint of free trade, from the point of view of a revenue tariff, which involves the principles of free trade as far as we can adapt them to our present circumstances. We do not think it is of such vital importance to build up industries of a particular character in our country. We think it is more important to develop the industries which are closely connected with our natural resources; the industries we can carry on with profit. We think that this is better than to attempt to force industries on the country which do not seem to adapt themselves to our condition. My hon. friend has spoken of the interests of Nova Scotia being bound

up with this policy of protection. Sir, if there is any part of the Dominion which has the right to complain of the result of this policy of protection, it is the province of Nova Scotia from which the hon. gentleman and I come. There was a time when no man would rise in the province of Nova Scotia and question the wisdom of what was then called free trade; a revenue tariff. We understood then that the tariff meant a tax, and we all wanted the least tariff and the least tax we could possibly have. And though many who believed in that old faith had strayed away from it, yet, I am satisfied that to-day the great mass of the people down there believe that the best policy for the progress of the maritime provinces is that policy under which they enjoyed their greatest prosperity. That was a time when they had a tariff away below the figures of the present tariff. We do not deny, we do not question that you may, by a policy of high protection, as applied towards particular industries, divert men from the ordinary occupations, and you may be able to build up here and there favoured industries, but we believe that in the end, viewing the question from the standpoint of the whole country, the general good cannot be advanced by such a policy. We can take as an illustration of that, the county which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) represents. He has spoken of coal, and he has spoken of iron, and he has in that county of Pictou both of these industries. They have had coal mines in Pictou for generations. They had successfully carried on the coal-mining business long before the days of the National Policy. They have had the benefit of protection on coal, and they have had the benefit of this protected iron industry, but what do we find? Why is it that the maritime provinces have gone backward in their competition with the sister provinces, and with the world at large? Not only do the census returns show that the whole of the maritime provinces have retrograded, and that the province of Nova Scotia has virtually gone back, but the hon. gentleman's own county, after ten years of fostering by protection, had fewer people in it when the census of 1891 was taken than it had ten years before. What are the figures? Why in the census of 1891, the county of Pictou represented by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), had 35,585 people, and if his view be correct, if it is possible by this policy of fostering a few industries, if it is possible by a policy of protection to make a place prosperous, then the county of Pictou should indeed prosper. It had all the advantages of coal protection; it had the iron industry; it had whatever advantage the hon. gentleman was able to give it in the way of patronage and in the building of railways; it lived under favoured conditions, so far as protection was concerned; and yet its population fell

from 35,585 at the beginning of the ten years down to 34,541 at the close, or 1,000 less. In the face of these facts, and they are but simple facts, it is nonsense for the hon. gentleman to hold up to the people of the maritime provinces the idea that a protective policy is sound. What the people of the maritime provinces want is that we shall get back to the good old days of a low tariff, the policy which enabled us to trade with the world; and if we set our faces in the right direction, and gradually, so as not to disturb too much the established industries of the country, travel back to the principles which were recognized by the leaders of both political parties in the old days, we may hope for the maritime provinces, and particularly for Nova Scotia, a measure of prosperity which has never been enjoyed since the National Policy began.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am rather surprised to hear the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), with such warmth re-introducing into the public discussion of this country the rather hackneyed and I think the somewhat exhausted arguments drawn from the census. It does him a wonderful degree of credit as a debater that he is able to work himself into such a heat and such apparent sincerity in dealing with what may not incorrectly be called a long-exploded humbug.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am dealing with the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman was dealing with the census figures, and he must have known that in that sense he was dealing with a long-exploded humbug. If he made that speech in the county of Pictou, where the Liberals, though extremely loyal to him in the past, would know from their daily experience that there was no solid substratum of fact "in the statement he made, he would fail to arouse them to any such enthusiasm as he appears himself to possess. These census figures have always been disputed, from the fact that the people of the county of Pictou have been compelled to increase their educational expenses, to enlarge their school-houses, to employ more teachers, and to take all those steps which are called for by an increase of population. The fact is that the county of Pictou, and indeed the maritime provinces as a whole, have prospered, and the people believe that they have prospered under the system of protection. It is true, during the election that is just past, the people of Nova Scotia, or one-half of them at least, have voted for gentlemen who support the present Government and the Finance Minister; but I have had the assurance of electors of the county of Pictou within the last three days that pledges were given by the Liberal candidates there that if they were elected they would support the Na-

tional Policy, and would as far as possible prevent that system being attacked or broken down. So far from adopting such a tone as that adopted by the Finance Minister on this occasion, our principal opponent in the contest did not meet us by attacking protection or denouncing the duty on coal, but he attacked us because we had not succeeded in getting the protection on coal raised to a much higher point. It cannot have escaped the notice of the Finance Minister that Mr. Edward Macdonald, in canvassing the county—and he was the only candidate who appeared before the people in the county—claimed that we had not given to the coal industry even so much protection as the revenue tariff to which the hon. gentleman referred, and maintained that we had been derelict in our duty in not seeing that 20 per cent protection at least was given to coal, which he maintained was not done. He attacked us also because we had been supporting a party which had made anthracite coal free, thereby to a certain extent displacing from the markets of Canada the bituminous coal of the county of Pictou. During the whole of that contest, the Liberal candidates, far from adopting the same tone as the Finance Minister, went to the other extreme, and represented themselves as being thoroughly and heartily in favour of increasing the protection on coal; and I think it would have been a most amazing thing to the people of our county, if they could have been here to-day and heard the very vigorous way in which the Finance Minister attacked that position. At the close of that canvass our opponent, not satisfied with giving the electors of the county the assurance that he would support protection, produced a telegram from the Hon. Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party, and as they hoped soon to become the Premier of Canada, in which he assured the people of the county of Pictou that protection to coal would be continued, and that the interests of the coal miners of that county would be carefully guarded. In order that no evasion or mistake might exist in reference to this matter, occasion was taken by my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to ask the Premier of Canada in this House precisely what he meant by the statement that the interests of the coal miners of the county of Pictou would be carefully guarded; and the Premier in his reply did everything short of confirming by an oath his previous statement, because he repeated in the strongest possible way his previous statement, merely changing the order of the terms of it. He said that in saying that those interests would be carefully guarded, he had meant that they would be guarded carefully. He went to the extreme in saying that he was honestly in favour of thoroughly supporting those interests, and I am not sure that but for that statement the gentleman who polled a very good vote in the county of Pictou would not

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

have come within hundreds of polling the vote he got. I merely mention this to show that the Finance Minister is entirely mistaken as to the temper and opinions and hopes of the people of the county of Pictou on this question. Here is another thing to show how the friends of the hon. gentleman approached the miners when speaking in the interests of the Liberal party in that county. Here is a little circular which was issued in the county of Pictou in the local elections:

A Roorback Exploded—A Campaign Lie Nailed.

The "special despatch" issued by the Conservative party, is untrue from beginning to end. It was written by arrangement, with a view to mislead the electors. Coal is not to be free under the new tariff. But there will be a duty of 75 per cent on soft coal, and a retaliatory duty on hard coal.

Anthracite coal and coke will not be free, as it was under the late Government, but will have to pay duty under the Liberal Government.

Electors, do not be misled by false telegrams, sent out at the last moment, but stand by the men who alone to-day are able to help the coal industry.

Vote for McDonald, McGregor, and McIntosh, the true friends of the coal industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend read the other one to which reference is made?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I have not the other in my hand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought not. I see from what the hon. gentleman reads that it refers to something else. I understand that it refers to a statement which, I was informed, was circulated throughout the county of Pictou on the eve of the last election, that the Government had declared to somebody that they were going to abolish the coal duty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was said by your own leader, too.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has shown nothing of the sort.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It was said by him at Windsor Hall and at Sohmer Park.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman did not refer to something said at Windsor Hall or Sohmer Park, but to something stated at Ottawa during the present session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Which was consistent with the statement made at Sohmer Park.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). What the friends of the hon. gentleman said was that coal was not to be free under the new tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is true, but the other statement is not.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). But that there would be a duty of 75 cents on soft coal and a retaliatory duty on hard coal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That remains to be seen.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). This is what was canvassed. I do not say anything about the merits of the case, but I am merely stating, in reply to the very warm statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, the ground upon which his political associates appeal to the county of Pictou for support :

Anthracite coal will not be free, as it was under the late Government, but will have to pay a duty under the Liberal Government.

From the language the hon. gentleman has used and the warmth of his utterances, it will be very difficult for the people of Pictou to know how far in the future they may believe his political friends when they come to that county and try to make the people believe that they are in favour of protection to coal. It may be perhaps that the hon. gentleman on this occasion lost his temper and has not left this point any longer open to misunderstanding or question, because, so far as the Government of Canada is supposed to speak through his mouth, he has taken the strongest ground in favour of the policy which in the past was supposed to be the policy of the Liberal party, namely, the policy of free trade. He has advanced one or two strong arguments used by free traders, but what has the course of the Government been? Has it been consistent with the arguments used by the hon. gentleman this afternoon? He used the familiar argument of the free trader that every attempt by means of protection to develop any particular interest is a diversion in a particular direction of the general strength of the country and a dangerous and delusive system. He went on to argue that protection induced the people to bend their energies and devote their attention to work in which they cannot engage to the best advantage. But how far can we believe the hon. gentleman? If these are his sentiments, they are evidently sentiments which he can change to suit the occasion. They are certainly not the sentiments which guided the Government in the framing of the tariff, because, as has already been pointed out over and over again, no matter what may be the professions of the hon. gentleman and his friends, their tariff, taking their main schedule, is a protective tariff. It does go out of its way to protect certain industries. It is not a revenue but a protective tariff, because it provides for the strengthening and supporting of certain industries in this country, and therefore makes an exception in their favour. The most conclusive evidence of this is the fact that after the Government got through with the amended tariff, we found that that tariff was still more in the direction of protection than the tariff first brought down. The Government did not move in the direction of free trade or a revenue tariff, but they did that which I

believe the interests of the country required. Judging them by the tariff they have submitted, they do not believe one word of the principles which the hon. Minister of Finance has just enunciated, but acted in the opposite direction. They moved in the direction of assisting the industries of the country. I am sure that my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said distinctly, what I repeat, that he would support the Government in protecting our industries, and would vote as readily for protection coming from that side as coming from this, and so would I. I believe the Government would have acted wisely if they had not touched the old tariff at all, and refrained from entering upon the dangerous process of touching any single part of the intricate and highly organized system of protection which it had taken eighteen years to bring up to its late state of perfection. If the Government had desired to affirm the principle of free trade by their preferential clause, they might just as well have continued the old tariff and have tacked on to it their preferential clause 16, as to have submitted this new tariff with the addition of that clause. Their present tariff is almost identical with the one they found in existence when they took office. It differs in some respects, and in every one of these it is a poorer tariff than the one which the Government professed to improve. The proof of this lies in the fact that no sooner were the provisions of the tariff they first submitted made known, then gentlemen from all parts of Canada, delegations representing trade interests from every section, came to Ottawa and vigorously represented that the changes made were imperilling the existence of our national industries. What did the Government do in view of these representations? Did the hon. Finance Minister impress upon them his views regarding free trade? Did he address to them the argument he has just now submitted to the House? Did he say to them: Gentlemen, you are entirely mistaken, you are engaged in industries which are not native to Canada, which cannot be maintained successfully in Canada, give up the manufacture of carriages and steel springs and devote yourselves to agriculture in which the province of Ontario must always take the lead? Give up making carriages, springs and axles and devote yourselves to the raising of wheat, and the production of dairy products, and the feeding of cattle. Not at all. He extended to these men the protection they asked for. There are various ways in which protection can be given. It may be given by restoring the duties taken off or by increasing them if necessary. What we complain of is that to those industries in Ontario which were threatened, he gave protection, not by restoring the tariff to a point that would be really serviceable, but by giving them raw material free or nearly free; and in order to do that, he imperilled, and I fear

has destroyed, the greatest industry that Canada has yet developed.

. It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Mr. BELL (Picton). When the committee rose for recess, I was referring to the manner with which the present tariff deals with Nova Scotia interests, and pointing out that, in order to assist some industries which were complaining of inadequate protection, the Government, instead of increasing the protection of those industries, decreased the price to them of what they called their raw material, thereby injuring these great interests in Nova Scotia whose finished products are the raw material of the carriage-makers and other consumers of steel and iron in Ontario. It seems to me a regrettable circumstance that the Government should have decided to take this course, and that it would have been very much better if they, having set out upon what I think may be fairly described as a protectionist course—as was plainly made manifest in their main schedule—had carried that out and had not sought to benefit some industries by impairing the protection to industries in the maritime provinces. For, by so doing they have, to a certain extent, undone the work which has been going on in Canada ever since the first bounties were given to the iron industry here. It is evident that the Government does not quarrel with the bounty system, because they not only continued the bounties but increased them. It is evident they do not quarrel with the idea of protecting and extending our iron industry. But I contend that by the action they are taking they have practically nullified a great deal of the work accomplished and made it extremely improbable that the iron industry will make the progress, for some time, that all friends of development in Canada would like to see go on uninterrupted.

I shall not, at this stage of the session, detain the committee by making a long speech, but I would urge the Government to consider that by, in a sense, undoing the work of their predecessors and themselves, they are striking at what is really a basic industry, the foundation of many of the great industries that should grow up in this country, that is not only our opinion, it is substantiated by the quotation read here to-day from that great organ of public opinion, the Toronto "Globe," which speaks of these industries as the pivotal points upon which all the industrial system of the country turns. It would not require much argument to show how important it is that those industries should not only not be interfered with but should be guaranteed success. The production within ourselves and by our-

Mr. BELL (Picton).

selves of our iron which, we are told, is the foundation of so many industries, would give a stability, a permanence and security which we can never attain so long as we depend upon outside sources for our supply. Now, a point has come up in this connection which I regret to have seen raised. I am sure that my hon. colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had no idea of doing what the hon. Minister of Finance charges him with doing—setting east against west, or raising sectional feeling; nor do I believe that the Finance Minister was well advised when he raised that point. I would be one of the last men—and I am sure that in this my colleague thoroughly sympathizes with me—to suggest that the Minister or this House should regard any of these questions from a sectional standpoint. We have too much provincialism in our politics, and it should be the desire of every man who wishes to see Canada become a great nation to frown down the sectional and provincial spirit and endeavour to view everything from the Dominion standpoint. Nor would I like to attribute any sectionalism to the Minister of Finance by saying that he had any feeling against the industries of his own province. I have no doubt he is actuated by an honest desire to benefit the industries of Nova Scotia so far as is consistent, in his opinion, with the welfare of the Dominion. What we find fault with is that there is an inconsistency in the action of the Government, that while practically pledged to the hilt to a system of protection, they carry on a system of supporting some industries by striking down some even more important industries that lie much nearer the basis upon which the development of the country must be built. Therefore, while I am perfectly ready to believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, coming, as he does, from the province of Nova Scotia, is friendly to the industries of that province, while I cannot attribute to him a desire to injure the industries of Nova Scotia, I would regret to attribute to him any desire to strike down the industries of Ontario or any other province, because, upon him, as a Minister, it devolves to view all the industries of Canada so as to secure the greatest national development. I would rather do what I can safely do—attribute to him a desire to serve the interests of the province from which he comes. Therefore, I regret to hear the tone and temper of the latter part of the speech which he addressed to the committee this afternoon. A great many Nova Scotians look upon the presence of the hon. gentleman as the safeguard of their particular interests in this House. But the tone of his remarks to-day seems to indicate that he held strongly an opinion which would be inconsistent with the guarantee of support and assistance to our great iron and coal industries in Nova Scotia. I do not attribute to him any feeling of hostility.

I have already said that I think I would not be going too far if I attributed to him an honest desire, as a son of Nova Scotia, to assist his own province as far as is consistent with the interests of the Dominion, but I attribute to him the belief that he should not regard so much sectional interests as the interests of the country as a whole. Therefore, viewing the matter as I do, believing that he and those with whom he is associated are practically committed to the idea of protection, I regret that they should have ministered to the support of institutions and interests in other parts of Canada by striking a special blow at the welfare of the two great interests which are most important to the province from which I come. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman speak in support of the bounty system. He could not well have done otherwise, because, on the Order paper stand resolutions to be moved by him in which he declares himself ready to support and even to increase the bounty protection which has been given in the past. But I would like to call to your attention this view of the matter—if it be the deliberate purpose of the Government to adopt this system of protection by bounty—which the hon. Minister declared one of the most defensible forms of protection and in that showed that he had chosen one form of protection and thus committed his Government to the protection idea—I think it is to be regretted that he should have made such changes in the tariff as will imperil those industries, and will, to a great extent, undo the work which he and the Ministry are prepared to do in protecting and building up on a sure foundation the iron interests of the lower provinces. I notice that the hon. gentleman, in the closing part of his address, spoke as though in supporting these industries and giving these bounties and thus committing the Government and himself to a system of protection, he was doing something that he could not honestly defend. He spoke as though these industries, so important to us, were not capable of successful development, that the action of the Government would result in diverting the energy of the people from a line in which success could be achieved to a line in which there was no chance of success. There are no circumstances in the case to warrant such a conclusion as that. If he were as familiar as I would like to see him with the history of iron production in Nova Scotia, he would know that protection has attained a large degree of success, that the iron masters of Nova Scotia are not at this moment afraid of English competition, but are perfectly prepared to meet that competition even without protection and in the open market. What they are afraid of, and that to which the action of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have laid them open, is a competition that is absolutely unfair, and is at this moment the most

severe competition to which they can be subjected. It is not the competition of England's ironmasters that the Nova Scotian fears, it is the competition of ironmasters of the United States, a country in which at this moment, on account of the remarkable discoveries in manufacture, low-priced ore, so low that it can be delivered at the furnaces at a marvellously small cost, owing to the fact that labour is exceedingly cheap, where they use convict labour, and coloured labour, and labour paid under the truck system, in which these ironmasters not only have a profit on the manufacture of iron, but a profit actually on the wages of the employees—I say under the operation of these circumstances, and under the operation of the tremendously developed proportions in which iron is now being produced in the United States, it is almost impossible for the ironmasters in Canada, even with the bounties that are given them by the Government, to compete at all. But that is not the whole of it. The point is this, that in that competition the iron producer in the lower provinces is not having fair-play, he is not competing in an open field. The Englishman can come here and sell iron very cheap, but on the other hand the Canadian can go there if the freights suit him, he can go into the English market and sell there. But that is not the case with our great rivals to the south, that is not the case with that nation to whom our Government has thrown open the iron market of Canada to-day. The tariff on iron and all its products is so high in the United States that the Canadian producer is absolutely shut out of that market, and so he is compelled to submit to the competition of the United States producer in his own market, and he is not allowed to take advantage of favourable rates, or of the convenience of neighbourhood, to sell in any part of the United States any portion of his products. Therefore it seems to me it is a most unfortunate thing for the iron interests of our province that the Government did not consistently protect such interests as required protection, without cutting down, without reducing at all, that protection to which the iron interest of Nova Scotia were certainly entitled upon every consideration. Even if you regard this matter from any point of view which the hon. gentleman can select, I maintain their position is untenable. If you regard it from a free trade standpoint, it is absolutely untenable, it is inconsistent with their whole tariff. If you regard it from the standpoint of a revenue tariff, it is inconsistent. The protection left to the producers of iron and steel in Nova Scotia falls far below the point at which a revenue tariff would place such protection. In every shape in which it can be regarded, I maintain that, while I do not attribute any feeling of hostility to any member of the Government, and particularly to my hon.

friend, towards Nova Scotia, I still maintain that the Government have been most unfortunate in the system that they have adopted to aid the industries of Ontario. Now, the most important thing for us in Nova Scotia is our manufactures. The hon. gentleman, in speaking as I have already said, used such language as would warrant the House in believing that the iron and coal industries were not such industries as should be practically protected in Nova Scotia. I would like that hon. gentleman, from his knowledge of our province, of its resources and of the different industries in which our people can engage, to tell me to what other industries they could direct attention, if it is not towards the development of our iron and mining interests. Nova Scotia does not possess those advantages of climate and of soil which would make her a great agricultural province. We are so situated that we do not at this moment produce our own food in the lower provinces. Perhaps one of the best customers that Ontario and Manitoba have for their products, one of their best markets, is to be found in those very same lower provinces. We are so situated that we have a great diversity of interests, and among others those that have always seemed to us to afford such employment as would keep the people at home and prevent them from leaving their native country, and retain them at home to become good citizens and producing citizens for the Dominion, was a development of the manufacturing interests. Therefore, I maintain, that all that portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks which seemed to imply that industrial or manufacturing development was not native or not fitted to the lower provinces, was made in entire misapprehension of the facts, and this he will recognize himself as soon as his attention is called to it. I therefore am glad to take this opportunity as a Nova Scotian and as a representative of that country in which these interests are found, to protest as strongly as I can against the fact that the Government in this matter, while doing something for them, has not done what those interests require, and their policy on the whole has not been favourable to those industries in the lower provinces. I regret to have to say that having just returned from those provinces, I have been informed that the masters who preside over these large works have been compelled, in view of this policy adopted by the Government, to announce to all their employees that if they do not choose to submit to a reduction of 10 per cent in all wages and salaries paid, it would be necessary to close up these great works, works that pay out nearly \$300,000 yearly in wages, distributing a large amount of money which goes into circulation, and which amount of money is absolutely essential in order to keep the wheels of trade revolving in our province.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)

That large amount of money is to be diminished by 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of these men, and if they are not willing to submit to that reduction, it will be necessary to close these works because they can not be continued at a profit. For the last year they have been struggling along, and they have not been able to make a profit. Now, the hon. gentleman may say: Well, if they have not been able to make money, that is sufficient proof that they should not be there. If he were to say so, it would be an excellent exemplification of the fact that a half truth or a truth half understood, is one of the most dangerous things in the world. At this very moment, after having being in operation fourteen or fifteen years, the stress of competition has been so great in the world, the iron manufacturer having been subjected to the practical competition of the whole world, that prices have been reduced 14, 15 or 16 dollars a ton below the rate which they formerly received. They have been obliged to improve their processes, to cheapen their processes, and to economize sufficiently to do this, and on account of the cutting down of cost and by becoming masters of their own business, they are now able to live at prices nearly 40 per cent less than those they were getting when they first went into the business. Now, they have been able to do that because the system of bounties given to them by the Government, held them upon their feet long enough to enable them to meet their rivals, and while fighting the battle of competition, to make such profit as would enable them to throw out expensive machinery they had put in, and replace it with other machinery. A large part of the plant of one of these great industrial establishments, has to be renewed every few years. The world moves so fast, processes are so rapidly changing and improving, that they need to have the most modern appliances, and unless they keep up with all new improvements they are inevitably compelled to fall behind in the race. Now, at a time when, on account of the industrial condition in the United States, and on account of a certain amount of depression in various parts of that country, permitting people to sell at almost any price, at a time when, I maintain, competition in these lines is greater and more severe than ever before, this is the last time in the world for the Government of Canada, which has during the last fourteen years assisted to build up these industries, to withdraw any part of the support that they have given. That they should do so is a most unfortunate thing. I tell you that these men upon whom depends these industries, who are at the head of them, are struggling along now in the hope that better ideas will come to the Government of Canada, and that a reconsideration of the circumstances will induce them at the first opportunity, when they again

meet in Parliament, to reconsider their action and to make up their minds to give to these industries in the maritime provinces that same honest and hearty support that they give to similar industries in the upper provinces. I wish to say, with all the sincerity and earnestness that I possess, that I do not wish for one moment to be held to be drawing any distinction between industries in the upper provinces and the lower provinces. We wish to suppress any such idea, we wish to give a true interpretation to the National Policy, to make it a policy in which no interests are neglected, but under which the Government will extend to all industries a paternal and fostering care. That is all we ask for the interests of Nova Scotia, and that we hope and expect to receive. No one could regret more than I do the tone and temper of the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance. I know, from an inmate acquaintance with them that his friends in Nova Scotia look to the hon. gentleman, not for severe criticism or unfriendly thought, but for earnest assistance, and I do not think they will look to him in vain. I believe the hon. gentleman regrets what he has said to-day. No doubt he spoke with some degree of warmth which he now regrets, and I trust, and have every confidence, that he will, in dealing with these industries, especially with this great iron industry, treat them in the same spirit exactly in which he has treated other industries in the upper provinces that have appealed to him for assistance. I wish the people of Canada to understand that in so far as they may have been led by the speech of the Finance Minister to believe that the people of the county I represent are not united in their desire for protection, they are mistaken. I know, from direct personal assurance, from the nature of the political contest waged, that the people of the constituency of Pictou and of the localities lying in that neighbourhood and interested in the iron industry will not support any candidate who does not honestly avow his belief in and determination to maintain that protection under which, and under which alone, the industries of that portion of the country have become what they are to-day.

Mr. FROST. The Government certainly had a mandate from the people to lighten the burdens of taxation. They would not have been returned on 23rd June last had the people been satisfied with everything connected with the tariff policy of the late Government, and perhaps no item in the whole of the tariff is more objectionable to the people generally than the item of the duties upon iron. At the inception of the National Policy, Sir Leonard Tilley, in his speech delivered in 1873 spoke cautiously as to the duty on iron. In fact, prior to that time, no Government scarcely dare touch this question, because it was one that

was bound, to a very large extent, to dislocate a great many existing industries. However, the Government proceeded very cautiously, and by placing a small duty and a small bounty on Canadian iron, which at that time did not amount to more than 10 per cent on the value of the article, and by increasing the tariff duties on a great many articles manufactured from iron, they succeeded in enabling the ironmasters to produce the article. It was not until 1887, when the present leader of the Opposition came in as Finance Minister, that the duties were very greatly increased, to as high as \$4 per ton on iron and \$2 bounty. I have here a clipping from the hon. gentleman's speech when introducing his policy, and his remarks will give some idea of what was expected to be the result of the heavy duties which, at that time, were levied for the purpose of producing iron. The hon. gentleman said :

We have applied the National Policy to innumerable industries all over Canada with marvellous success. But, Sir, there is a field, perhaps the most important, still untrodden. There is a field still unoccupied that presents great possibilities and greater opportunities than any other for developing Canadian industry, and it lies at the very root and foundation of the National Policy in all countries where it has been adopted. I refer to the iron industry. \* \* \*

Now, Sir, if there is a country in the world to which the iron industry is important, it is Canada. And why? Because we possess the coal, and we possess the iron ore, and we possess the fluxes—having everything necessary to develop the great iron industry within our own borders—and yet, down to the present moment, we have left almost untouched this enormous, this almost illimitable field for the extension of the National Policy.

This occurred fifteen or sixteen years ago, and yet up to the present time, we have not seen blast furnaces established at any one of these points. The hon. gentleman made a calculation as to what the duty of \$4 per ton on iron would amount to. He said :

Leaving out steel rails, it is equivalent to 250,000 tons of pig iron. To make this, you will require 750,000 tons of iron ore, 120,000 tons of limestone, and 750,000 tons of coal to produce the first stage of pig iron, involving a freight of no less than 1,625,000.

Then, as to the number of men that were to be employed, he said :

Now, Sir, the result is, that by the adoption of this policy you will give permanent employment to an army of men numbering at least 20,000, increasing our population from 80,000 or 100,000 souls, and affording the means of supporting them in comfort and prosperity.

We did not hear that the population of Pictou had increased very largely, according to the Finance Minister's statement this afternoon. The present leader of the Opposition further said :

Now, this estimate of increased population of 100,000 souls does not take into account the man-

ufacture of castings, cutlery and edge tools, &c., or steel rails. Were we to manufacture these articles, now imported—and why should we not progress steadily to that point—the population I have mentioned, of 100,600 souls, would be no less than trebled.

This was the glowing picture presented in 1883 by the present leader of the Opposition as the effect which the duties on iron would have on the country. We may now look in this present year of grace at the latest statistics and ascertain what has actually been done up to the present time. I find from the returns that the Nova Scotia Steel Forge Company, during the past year produced 20,470 tons of pig iron, the Londonderry Company, 10,497 tons; the Hamilton Forge Company, which has only been in operation a year or so, 25,270; the Radnor Forge Company, Three Rivers, which makes charcoal iron, 5,602 tons; making a total, including the products of two other small concerns, of 62,000 tons. This really does not supply one-half the consumption of pig iron in the country. An immense quantity of ore and coal was to be used. Of ore there was used 125,000 tons, a large portion of which came from foreign countries; the whole quantity of coal used was 115,200 tons, with 32,000 or 35,000 tons of coke.

We were told that a great army of workmen—twenty thousand, which would be trebled in a few years—would be engaged in those industries into which iron entered, but we find that at the present time the Nova Scotia Steel Company, including the manufacture of over 13,000 tons of steel and 1,200 tons of forging, now employ 700 men; the Londonderry Works, 425; the Hamilton Works, 120, and all others in Canada about 200, making a total of workmen employed—after sixteen or seventeen years nursing by a high protective tariff—of somewhat less than 1,500 men all told. Why is it that after so many years of nursing by protection, there have been such poor results from this industry that it is not able to supply the entire consumption of iron in Canada? Why is it necessary to load down the raw material of so many manufacturers in Canada; for we know very well that iron enters into more than 200 industries of various kinds. The hon. gentlemen from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Mr. Bell) complain that the Government, in this new tariff, have done injury to Nova Scotia for the benefit of Ontario and other provinces. The Government had a perfect right, as they did, to make an investigation into the various industries of the country, and it was their duty to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number. In doing that they have made such a rearrangement of the duties on iron, as to enable scores of industries now using that article to manufacture more economically, and at the same time the Government have done precisely what they promised to do when in Opposi-

Mr. FROST.

tion, namely, to so rearrange their tariff as to give to the consuming classes of this country every article they used at the very cheapest possible figure.

It is said by my hon. friend (Mr. Bell), that it will not be possible for the steel manufacturers of Nova Scotia to go on with their business, and that the tariff has practically opened the door for United States competition. These hon. gentlemen opposite do not fear English competition, but they fear United States competition. Well, the manufacturers of Nova Scotia have had a good many years of very high protection. There is no one who sympathizes with them more than I do, but I believe that under the present tariff the manufacturers in Nova Scotia will be able to make steel, and turn out pig iron, equally as profitably as they have done up to the present time. Besides that, the tariff will enable other manufacturers to start their works, which they have not been able to do, in Montreal, and in Hamilton, and other places, for a considerable time past. We know that the bar iron men have been complaining, and to-day we are getting bar iron, since this tariff came into force, at 45 cents a hundred less than before. We are getting pig iron for \$3 a ton less, and we are getting steel at \$5 and \$6 a ton less than before the tariff. When you come to apply these prices to the manufacture of stoves, radiators, springs, bolts, carriages, and everything that iron enters into as a raw material, you can readily see the great advantage which the consumers of Canada are going to get as the result of the magnificent rearrangement of the tariff which the present Government have made. The hon. the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made the remark, that the tariff was practically a surrender. Well, if the Government have surrendered, they certainly have surrendered in a very good cause, for they have surrendered for the benefit of the classes who for a great many years have been anxiously awaiting in vain to see the fruits of what our friends opposite called the National Policy. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) has said, that the Nova Scotia people have reduced their prices. I can tell the hon. gentleman, that almost every manufacturing industry in Canada during the last ten years, have been reducing their prices, until they are in some cases 50 per cent, and in other cases 60 per cent lower than formerly; and while the manufacturers have been reducing their prices, we know that during the last few years the prices of farm products, and everything which the farmer has to sell, have also been greatly lowered. It is the usual course of manufacturing business, that from year to year there is a constant change in patterns, a constant change in business, a constant change in machinery, constantly new inventions, and these things are contributing all the time to a reduction in the price of manufactured goods. It would be a very unfortunate thing if such

were not the case, because as we progress, we certainly ought to be making improvements in our manufactures. The Nova Scotia Steel Company is therefore not alone in having had to reduce their prices. I expect that in the course of the next two years, this very Nova Scotia Steel Company will so rearrange the manufacture of their goods, that they will be able to compete, not only with England but with the United States and all other countries. They are making a good article, and as a customer of the Nova Scotia Steel Company to a very large amount, I must say that I always found them to be most honourable and straightforward men to deal with. I know very well that they will be able to meet the rearrangement of the new tariff.

The "Canadian Manufacturer," a very strong protectionist paper printed in Toronto, speaking of the new iron duties, says :

This makes a very substantial reduction in the cost of the material of many branches of the iron industry, and in the wide range of industries in which iron is a very important factor.

Take the matter of steel ingots, we know that our bar iron people were complaining that scrap iron was too high at \$4 per ton. Scrap iron in my estimation ought to have been free, but \$1 a ton will make very little difference here or there. This particular rearrangement of the tariff will enable bar iron men in Montreal to reopen their works, and proceed with their very important industry. The reduction of the duty on steel ingots from \$5 to \$2 a ton, will also enable them to commence the manufacture of steel, and we will have in Hamilton, and perhaps in Toronto, and in Montreal, factories where they can begin to manufacture steel. Only this spring, you could not buy a steel ingot in Canada for less than \$32 a ton, while steel ingots in England were \$22 a ton. It has practically prohibited the manufacture of steel anywhere else than at one place in Nova Scotia. Therefore, the Government, in making this change, are practically carrying out the promise they made to the people that under their tariff there would be no chance of monopoly; and this is very good proof of the sincerity of their professions and statements while in Opposition.

There are one or two other things that I propose to refer to while on the iron duties. I am satisfied as a manufacturer using iron very largely, that almost every article into which iron enters as a factor will be cheapened this year and in the coming years, and we shall see thousands of dollars saved to the farmers and the consuming classes throughout the country. It is quite true that sectionalism is a very bad thing. For my own part, I have been desirous of seeing all that could be manufactured in Canada made here; I have been desirous of seeing every article that could

be produced at a profit, and without laying a burden on the people of the country, made in Canada; and I am satisfied, from what little study I have already made of the present tariff, that our friends in the Government have more than fulfilled the expectations of the country. We have heard of delegations coming here. How many delegations came here three years ago when an attempt was made to alter the tariff in a few items. But we have been endeavouring on this occasion to alter the whole tariff, making it more in the interest of the consuming classes; and to-day we do not hear of any delegations coming to Ottawa; we do not hear of any complaints, comparatively speaking, throughout the country. Where are the complaints coming from? Everywhere you go you hear of reviving industries. Take up this "Manufacturer," and read how many industries are being started. Take the last issue, and you find that scores of companies are being formed all over the Dominion for the purpose of going into the manufacture of machinery, the manufacture of stoves, the manufacture of engines and boilers, tanneries, woollen and cotton mills. These are being started everywhere. Any one looking over the list in the last "Manufacturer" will be satisfied that if there are any persons afraid of the tariff of Canada, it is not the manufacturers or the people who have capital; but any fear that exists is confined practically to the House of Commons and to our friends in the Opposition. To-day there is greater hope throughout the country than ever before. The object of the Government, in reducing the duties on raw materials, was to equalize a great many industries in which there were differences between the duty on the manufactured article and the duty on the raw material. In many instances the duty on the raw materials was higher than the duty on the manufactured goods—so much so that many people found it almost impossible to manufacture. The Government have restored the equality in the duties, and this of itself will revive many industries, which in the past few years have been in a very languishing condition. Looking at the tariff as a whole, and at the general policy of the Government, it seems to me that very little exception can be taken to it. As we look at it to-day, after having gone almost through a session of Parliament, with scarcely an amendment made to the general policy of the Government, we conclude that the feeling throughout the country is favourable to all that the Government have done. The people of this country know that it would not be wise to make too drastic a change now, knowing all the industries that have grown up around the old tariff, and knowing also that many men had their all invested in the industry in which they were engaged. The Government have pursued a cautious course, and I am sure that

the manufacturers of Canada as a class thoroughly understand and appreciate what the Government have done for them. I am satisfied that the consuming classes also will fully appreciate the great reductions that have been made in the tariff all along the line. I know that the agricultural classes will be more than thankful for the interest which the Government are taking in them in very many ways; and, with a revival of prosperity among our agricultural population, without any undue extension of the protective tariff, our manufacturers may expect to make a great deal more money from year to year than they could possibly make by any addition to the protective tariff. On the whole, I am very much pleased as a manufacturer with the re-arrangement of the iron duties. I think it is a step in the right direction, and I believe it will be the means of reviving trade, not only in all the iron industries of the land, but in sister industries; and throughout the length and breadth of the country we shall soon see wheels revolving, more men employed, and more money in circulation. I believe that through the tariff action of this Government, we are on the eve of the greatest prosperity which this country will ever have seen in the course of its history.

Mr. McISAAC. I desire to make a few remarks in reply to the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). That hon. gentleman complains of the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Finance. He finds fault with the aggressive tone of that speech; he also finds fault with it because it is, as he says, a free trade speech; and he concludes by telling this House that it would be unwise for the Finance Minister to go down to the county of Pictou, after delivering that speech in this House, and deliver it to his friends in that county. I know something of the Liberal party in the county of Pictou and of the Conservative party in that county, and I know also something about the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), and I beg to assure this committee that the hon. Finance Minister might go down to that county and repeat the speech he made here this afternoon without running the slightest danger. I know of a gentleman who at one time delivered a lecture in the very town of New Glasgow, within the very shadow of the steel works and the iron works, and in that lecture he used these words:

I consider the argument of the free trader unanswerable. I believe, at this moment, that if Canada took a liberal step in the direction of free trade, it would go a long way to place her upon the road to the greatest prosperity, and the reasons why I consider she could turn about and adopt the free trade policy are:

(a.) We might free ourselves from the dominating influence of the United States;

(b.) On account of the failure of the National Policy;

Mr. FROST.

(c.) Because of the startling revelations of the census returns.

The gentleman who delivered that speech, within the shadow of the steel and iron works of the county of Pictou, was never molested at that meeting, was never driven out of the town, and never had to leave the county of Pictou. Nay, more, that very gentleman, who delivered that free trade speech after due deliberation—for it was not a speech delivered in a moment of weakness, but a written lecture—was afterwards nominated, not by the Liberal party in the county of Pictou, but by the Conservative party in that county, and elected; and I am informed that up to the very moment when he received the nomination of the Conservative party, he never made an act or utterance of reparation for the opinions he expressed on that occasion. I am not aware that he has yet recanted or repudiated one word of that lecture. Yet that is the same gentleman who this afternoon made the startling statement that it would be unwise and unsafe for the Finance Minister to go down to Pictou after the speech he made this afternoon.

I am told that there was one gentleman in the county of Pictou who did not like the nomination of my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) last June and that is his colleague, the senior member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I am told that he kicked vigorously because the Conservative party nominated my hon. friend. Personally, I know nothing of this, but if we look at the matter in the light of what has taken place, no one would wonder that the hon. member for Pictou should have viewed with some disgust the nomination of the hon. gentleman at the last election. I can prove to you, Mr. Chairman, by the records, what the position of my hon. friend was. In 1887 he was what some people call a bolter. He was not true to the old Tory faith, and it is recorded that he ran an election in 1887 in that county, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition also took a part in that campaign on behalf of the candidates of the Conservative party. My hon. friend the junior member (Mr. Bell) was rather a prominent figure in provincial politics in Nova Scotia, and was jealous because he had not a seat in the federal Parliament, and perhaps it was on that account that he was not then the admirer of the National Policy that he is to-day. At any rate, there was some little trouble in the Conservative party of the county then, and the leader of the Opposition went down, and the result of his visit was that my hon. friend the junior member abandoned the idea of running for Pictou County.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must interrupt my hon. friend and call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the rule laid down, that during this discussion we must only speak to the item. We are now at the

closing hours almost of the session, and the hon. gentleman is entering into a long discussion upon the political history of some member of this House, which has nothing whatever to do with the item under discussion.

Mr. McISAAC. If the hon. gentleman had not interrupted me, I would have been through.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am simply calling the attention of the Chair to the rule and asking that it be enforced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur). There is a difference between discussing another item and the one under discussion. I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite out of order when he answers the speech made by the hon. member for Pictou, but at the same time I would ask him to confine himself as much as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. McISAAC. I have no intention of doing otherwise, and did not suppose the hon. leader of the Opposition would try to prevent my reading what I was about to quote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must protest in the strongest manner against the rule you laid down being violated. You, Mr. Chairman, have just ruled that the hon. gentleman must keep himself to the item, and he is not answering the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), which was a clear and logical and temperate argument upon the item. He did not go into any political disquisitions or rake up past history, as the hon. gentleman is doing. If the hon. gentleman is to be permitted to go back some ten years into the political history of Nova Scotia, there will be no possible means of keeping this discussion within the proper limits.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) devoted some considerable time to the discussion of the coal duties, which was not the item under discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, I understand the hon. Minister of Finance desires that in a discussion of this nature we should be given free range over the whole range of politics. If my hon. friend this afternoon transgressed a rule of the House, attention should have been called to it, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that the question of coal and iron are so closely allied, that it would be impossible to discuss thoroughly the question of protecting the iron industry without discussing the question of the coal duties which bears upon it most vitally.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All I wished to submit was that when one hon. gentleman is allowed to depart from

the rule, I do not think that those who reply to him should be kept too closely to the item.

Mr. McISAAC. I beg to assure this committee that I shall detain them but a moment while I read the manifesto issued by the chairman of the Conservative party of East Pictou. Mr. Thos. E. Fraser, denouncing the course pursued by my hon. friend (Mr. Bell). This document is also signed by Mr. John Cameron, secretary of the Liberal Conservative party of East Pictou :

To the Liberal-Conservatives of East Pictou.

Gentlemen.—Having taken pains to ascertain the fact in reference to the action of Mr. A. C. Bell, lately one of our representatives in the local House, and the leader of our party in provincial matters, I thought it my duty to lay the same before you by circular letter, so that those residing at a distance and not having the opportunities of finding out the truth, might not be misled or seduced by the report of Mr. Bell and his present political friends, our enemies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What was the date of that letter ?

An hon. MEMBER. 1887.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise again to call attention to this matter. Here is a gentleman introducing a letter written in 1887 on a question of local politics in the county of Pictou. I have no objection whatever to the fullest discussion of the subject it refers to. So far as I am concerned, this is a mere question of time. If you wish to sit until midsummer listening to matters of this kind, let the House so decide. But it is inconsistent with your ruling. Mr. Chairman, and if the Chair permits this course to be taken there is an end to the rule you have laid down. It will be impossible to enforce it in any case, and impossible to get through with this discussion within any reasonable period. I ask the hon. gentleman who leads the House to say whether this is a reasonable objection that I raise. I have not the slightest objection to the fullest discussion of the question if we desire amusement, and wish to stay here a month doing nothing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Mr. Paterson). I am sure it would not suit any of us to remain here for a month, and I am sure also that my hon. friend (Mr. McIsaac) has no wish to detain the House. I am bound to say that he very rarely claims the attention of the House and is usually very pertinent in his remarks and sticks close to the question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How has this anything to do with the subject ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As I understand, the hon. gentleman is replying to something said by my hon. friend the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). Of course, I am bound to say that there is no denying the position taken

by the hon. leader of the Opposition that we ought to discuss the question before the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am unable to find that the hon. gentleman who has been addressing the House is absolutely out of order, because, as I understand it, he is trying to show that the hon. gentleman who preceded him has already expressed ideas different from those he has expressed on the floor of the House to-day. At the same time, I must admit that it may not have a very close bearing upon the question immediately before the House, the iron duty, and I would invite the hon. member (Mr. McIsaac) to confine himself as much as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. McISAAC. I will promise that the remarks I shall make after the reading of this document will be very brief :

Mr. Bell might well be proud of the honour done him last June by the Conservatives of this county, but, instead, he has seen fit to hurl back, with apparent contempt, the trust imposed in him last June, without notice, too, or consultation with a single Conservative, by resigning his seat in the legislature.

Messrs. MacDougald and Tupper pledged themselves to abide by the action of our convention, and support our nominees, whoever they might be. I, myself, with Mr. W. B. Moore, as a committee from the meeting of our friends in New Glasgow, waited upon Mr. Bell two nights before the meeting of the convention, and Mr. Bell pledged himself, like MacDougald and Tupper, to accept and abide by the action of the convention. The morning of the convention, within two days, Mr. Bell receded from this position and repudiated his promise.

Several good Conservatives conscientiously supported Mr. Bell until the night of the 7th instant, when Mr. Bell, with six of his Conservative supporters, met Sir C. Tupper and discussed the situation. Mr. Bell then and there, of his own motion, decided to give up his intention of contesting the county in opposition to our party nominees, pledged himself again to his supporters present and to Sir C. Tupper to give up the fight, to accept the nomination from Guysborough, and authorize the publication of this, his determination, in the Halifax "Morning Herald" and otherwise.

The next morning, within twelve hours, Mr. Bell again receded, without consulting a single Liberal-Conservative, and has since confessed that he made this last somersault at the instance of certain prominent Grits of New Glasgow.

This last act has so unmasked Mr. Bell that his Conservative sympathizers determined not to follow him into the Grit camp, and are now all, or nearly all, with us in supporting MacDougald and Tupper.

Mr. Bell's deceptions and impostures do not end here. He poses as the nominee of the labouring man, when it can be proven that such is not the fact. In that respect he is the nominee of R. Drummond, the man whom he denounced last summer, and a few Grits, and nothing more.

I call upon all to ponder these facts, to recall the speeches of Mr. Bell against Mr. Drummond seven short months ago, and not to allow themselves to be deceived. The voice may be like the voice of a Conservative, but the hands are the hands of a Grit engaged with Mr. J. D. McLeod

Mr. PATERSON.

in an endeavour to destroy our constitution and dismember our Dominion.

Do not fail to inform your friends and neighbours, and vote for MacDougald and Tupper.

Yours, &c.,

THOMAS E. FEASER.

Chairman of Lib.-Con. Party, East Pictou, N.S.  
John Cameron, Sec. Lib.-Con. Party,  
East Pictou, N.S.

New Glasgow, February 11th, 1887.

This is the document which was sent broadcast through the county by the chairman and secretary of the Liberal-Conservative party on that occasion. Only that I do not wish to detain the committee, I might also give extracts from speeches made on that occasion by both the senior and junior member for Pictou. But it is well known that for a long time, and especially from 1887 to 1891 the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) never ceased in his invective against the Liberal party and his vituperation was never so malignant as when he was pouring it forth against the hon. gentleman who is his colleague in this House. So it ill-becomes the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) to lecture hon. members on this side, and particularly the Finance Minister on the ground, forsooth, that we are not sincere or consistent in our trade policy. It does not come with such ill-grace from the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) because so far as the National Policy is concerned he has been straight upon that question; but the hon. junior member, surely, surely, he will never again engage in lecturing hon. members on this side upon the subject of consistency and steadfastness in the maintenance of a policy. The hon. member (Mr. Bell) has referred to the local election in Pictou and has spoken of a circular which was distributed in the interest of the Liberals in that county during the last provincial election. But he forgot to read the circular that was distributed in his own town, left from door to door throughout the county. It is printed in red, and here it is :

#### SPECIAL DESPATCH.

Coal and Iron to be Sacrificed by the Tariff to be brought down by the Ottawa Government on Thursday.

While this is the Case, Tea, Coffee and Sugar are to be Taxed,

And the Free Breakfast Table will Become a Thing of the Past.

Montreal, April 18.—Despite all attempts on the part of the Government to conceal their tariff policy, there does not seem to be any doubt but that their friends in Montreal know pretty accurately what is to be. The withdrawal from warehouse during the last two days by leading members of the Liberal party show that current rumours as to the new tariff are well founded.

Coal is to be made free, or, at least, to be reduced to a point that will satisfy those who have for years been clamouring for free coal.

Iron is certainly going to be hit hard. Indications are that it will be made free.

Vote for Cameron, Tanner and Fitzpatrick, and protect our coal and iron industries.

That is the document, in letters of blood, that was circulated while my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) and his colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) were down in the county. And of the three candidates named here they managed to get one in by the skin of his teeth.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member—

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) is out of his seat.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not occupy my seat when I am speaking.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is out of his place.

Mr. CRAIG. I was about to say that it seems to me the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) is under a misapprehension as to the item which we are discussing. He has been discussing the item of Bells, and we have not reached that yet.

Mr. McISAAC. The hon. gentleman is too fresh altogether. I am answering the hon. member for Pictou, and referring particularly and specifically to the points that he brought out. He has endeavoured to give reasons why his party suffered defeat on that occasion in Nova Scotia. I tell him what the Conservative party in Halifax thought was the reason that brought about that disaster. In the Montreal "Gazette" of the 22nd of April, there is a telegram from Halifax which says :

Yet another theory is, that the Liberal-Conservative party in Nova Scotia needs reconstruction and the infusion of younger blood. Most of the men elected are young men, and in many cases new to political life. A majority of young voters added to the lists seem to have fallen in with the Liberal party. This would indicate that the management and methods of the Conservative party should be taken out of the hands of the old men and entrusted to younger men.

That is the explanation given in the "Gazette" by a correspondent, who was certainly voicing the sentiments of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia on the day after the local election.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I regret that I shall have to occupy the time of this committee with anything that is of a personal nature. I feel very much complimented from the fact that on the two or three occasions that I have addressed the House, the Government have thought it necessary to put up some of their back-seat supporters who, though not apt at making speeches, are able to read newspaper extracts. It is not very high evidence of originality or ability, but still it is a convenient function for some of those gentlemen. I am much gratified that the Government find it necessary, when I have made remarks in this House, to trot

out this rather antiquated and wholly unfounded legend, that I have been anything in politics but a protectionist. Since this thing has occurred for the second time, it may be as well to put the House in possession of the facts of the case. So far as protection is concerned, I went through the first fight in 1878 with the Hon. J. Jas. Macdonald on a platform of protection, and from that day to this I have been a consistent protectionist at every election in which I have taken any part, and I defy any one to produce any evidence to the contrary. I may say that I know that these gentlemen who have read these false newspaper extracts, either know nothing about the facts of the case, or if they do, they are aware that they are promulgating a falsehood. It would not be difficult at all for me to draw attention to some little idiosyncracies on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite so far as a change of opinion is concerned. I believe the gentleman who has just taken his seat rather distinguished himself upon one burning question by speaking on one side and voting on the other. I presume it was in that way that he was trying to buy the suffrages of a county, and he may have succeeded in doing so, although the fact that he is elected for any county whatever, is a matter of surprise. We have seen a notice in an organ of public opinion in Ontario, the "Canadian Freeman," which is not of very great importance, but which trotted that hon. gentleman out as one of the most brilliant representatives from Nova Scotia who ever sat in this Parliament. It is not surprising, if he believes such fulsome adulation, that he should be impatient to get on his feet occasionally. Now I have stated that so far as this question of protection is concerned, I have always been a protectionist. On one occasion I lectured on the free trade theory, pursuing the arguments in favour of that theory to a logical conclusion, and I made some statements which were reproduced by the "Eastern Chronicle," an ardent opponent of mine, and which, I presume for the sake of making political capital, misinterpreted some of my words and put others into my mouth that I did not utter. Those words are in existence in the "Eastern Chronicle," an organ which I do not recognize as a good authority, but it is competent for any person who has the necessary education to read those extracts at any time when he sees fit. I may say that this course does not at all disconcert me. In fact, I should feel flattered to think that an intellectual giant, such as that referred to by the "Canadian Freeman," should be set up to read those extracts. Now, I think there is a great lack of taste shown by those gentlemen who have chosen to attack me for inconsistency. Suppose I had been inconsistent, and that ten years ago I was a free trader and to-day I was a protectionist. Have these gentlemen no regard for the feelings of their leaders? If

I am to blush with shame as the hon. gentleman says I should, and never dare to speak in this House again because I do not hold opinions that I am misrepresented to have held ten years ago, with what burning blushes must the faces of the Government be covered when they reflect on the fact that they have swallowed all their utterances within a few months, that having gone to the country on a policy of free trade, they are now openly and avowedly protectionists? But who would deny to these gentlemen the right of changing their opinion? I am sure it ought to be a compliment, because it shows an exercise of reason that is very gratifying indeed. I am aware that a frequent course of juvenile essayists of political efforts is to charge their opponents with inconsistency, and to quote the old line "consistency thou art a jewel," and so on. That is not a difficult role, almost any one of moderate ability can carry it out. But I have been inclined to look rather with admiration upon those who have changed their opinion. I should regret very much to think that any gentleman of intelligence, thrown into such a school as that furnished by Canadian politics, has been able to pass through life without learning anything, and without having had occasion to change his opinions. The fact that a man has done so, affords reasonable assurance that he has attained further light and further knowledge. Therefore it strikes me that this charge of inconsistency is one that should not be levelled against any man as a reproach. To my mind it is much more of a compliment. Many of the greatest men that we have in politics have been guilty, if guilty it be, of this form of wrong-doing. Gladstone, the great leader of the Liberals, commenced life as a high Tory, and was one for a long time. We know that some hon. gentlemen opposite, even those whom they most delight to honour, have begun life as Conservatives. I see before me now one hon. gentleman who was a Conservative for a long time, and I am sure nothing will provoke him to laughter more readily than to accuse him of anything in the nature of wrong-doing from the fact that he saw fit to change his opinions. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the fact that he has developed, if development it be. And there are others among them. Immediately behind that hon. gentleman there is another member of the Cabinet who was at one time a prominent Conservative. In fact when I look over the ranks of the Government, I find that if I have been a sinner in the direction of changing my opinions, I have sinned in the most honourable and most respectable company that sits in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance what were the considerations that induced him to change the duty upon this from \$1.50 to \$1?

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

There must have been good reason for that, and the committee should know it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid there is no further reason to offer than the fact that we placed scrap iron at as low a rate as possible. It was formerly \$1.50, and we made the reduction because we thought the duty could be reduced a little further.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very good and lucid explanation. How long did the hon. gentleman take to understand that \$1 was lower than \$1.50?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Really I cannot answer that question any more lucidly than I did the other. This change may have been made in a moment of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid it is becoming chronic. The hon. gentleman had perhaps better leave over the item until to-morrow, when he may come to the conclusion to reduce it to 50 cents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not, however, be sure how the hon. gentleman would think of the matter to-morrow, or how his judgment might be.

Mr. FOSTER. Judgment has been passed so far as I am concerned. But does not the hon. gentleman think that allowing scrap iron to come in at so low a rate of duty, will have a prejudicial effect on the development of our iron industry, such as making puddled bar, and in fact the whole manufacture from the ore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so. In my opinion, the iron industry generally will view this item with favour, and I think there will be very little objection taken to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not generally acknowledged that iron made from scrap is inferior in grain, texture and power of endurance? Has there not been a very strong objection raised by iron manufacturers with respect to iron made from scrap? Does the hon. gentleman expect that puddled bar will be made in view of the low duty at which scrap is brought in? Or is the hon. gentleman arranging for the importation of all first-class bar iron other than that made from scrap, because I think this arrangement will have that effect?

Mr. FROST. I should like to ask the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) if he knows how many puddled bars were made when there was \$4 a ton on scrap?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman knows as much about the manufacture of iron as he knows about the manufacture of agricultural implements, he will recognize the fact that we cannot establish the manufacture of iron from the ore in a few days, a few months or a few years. The hon. gentleman knows that for a country like

Canada with its enormous resources, there is no industry which, when it becomes an established industry, can in a greater measure conduce to the prosperity of the country than the iron industry.

Mr. FROST. We might keep the duty on for eighteen years more, and make no further advance.

Mr. FOSTER. That is against the history of every iron manufacturing country, and more especially against the history of the United States. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has read history to very little purpose if he does not understand that fact.

Iron or steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, puddled bars, and loops or other forms less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings, two dollars per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. About what ad valorem duty was imposed on the best class of puddled bar?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not any calculation at hand which I can give my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he placed a duty on puddled bar and arranged duties on manufactured articles into which puddled bar enters as material, and does not know what ad valorem duty was placed on puddled bar when he placed ad valorem duties on manufactured articles?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I went into the matter very carefully with those whom I was able to consult, but I have not at hand a statement in regard to ad valorem duties. The former duty was \$5, and the old duty was an average of 28 per cent. The reduction made is very considerable.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, according to the hon. gentleman's calculation, he is giving 10 per cent protection on puddled bar.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not made to any large extent at present. It is a form of iron industry which is not being continued, the tendency of the trade is not to the manufacture of puddled bar. There is still some puddled bar made, but it is not made as largely as formerly.

Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, joists, girders, zees, stars or other rolled shapes, or trough, bridge, building or structural rolled sections or shapes, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.s.s., and flat eye-bar blanks not punched or drilled, ten per cent ad valorem.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why does the hon. gentleman propose to reduce the duty on those articles that come in for bridge building from 15 per cent to 10 per cent, as it stands at present, when after the reduction which the hon. gentleman has already made, a large contract was entered

into by parties from the United States, who had to bring in their bridge material for the construction of a large work at Montreal under the duty of 15 per cent. It appears to me that if the tariff, as the hon. gentleman had arranged it in the first instance, enabled parties from the United States to come in and compete with the bridge-builders of Canada and secure a large contract, that is evidence that there is no necessity for making a further reduction from 15 to 10 per cent.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr Paterson). We did not know anything about the contract to which reference has been made; but the hon. gentleman will see that the effect of the reduction will be the very opposite from that which he has represented. The reduction from 15 to 10 per cent is in favour of our bridge-makers. This duty will apply to materials they would have to import, and when the duty is reduced from 15 to 10 per cent, our bridge manufacturers will have received an additional advantage of 5 per cent as against foreign manufacturers. It was because we had reduced the rate of duty upon bridge material below the rate that our manufacturers of bridges had previously enjoyed, and which they thought was sufficient to protect them against foreign competition, which the hon. gentleman said has been successful in one job, that relief was given them, and 5 per cent less duty was imposed. Incidentally, I might say that this argument might apply to the statement made by the senior member for Pictou this afternoon, when he announced that this would injure the Nova Scotia steel works. The \$7 duty per ton is limited to classes of iron that can be produced by the New Glasgow Steel Company, and this reduction of from 15 to 10 per cent on bridge material is simply to enable our own manufacturers to compete. I trust I make myself plain to the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I fail to make my hon. friend understand my objection, or else I have not appreciated his statement. When these resolutions were first introduced by the Government, the duty was placed at 15 per cent. Under that duty the manufacturers in the United States were able to compete successfully with our Canadian manufacturers. That being the case it would not seem to indicate a necessity for still further reducing the protection that the manufacturers of bridges had in this country.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The bridge manufacturers to which the hon. gentleman refers would be brought in under item 235 of the tariff, at 35 per cent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are very large enterprises engaged in the manufacture of bridges in Canada, and in proportion as you lower the duty you allow outside

parties to come in and compete with them. Under the former duty foreign manufacturers obtained large contracts in this country, and the position of the Canadian manufacturers certainly will not be improved by still further reducing the duty.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. This clause is rather in favour of the Canadian builder of bridges, and the reduction is in the line of giving a benefit to our own bridge builders. Persons bringing in steel bridges would pay 35 per cent duty.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** These are the raw materials which are used in the construction of bridges, and so far as the element of protection is in this item, it will be beneficial to the Canadian bridge maker.

Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size or in whatever stage of manufacture, n.e.s.; and steel shafting, turned, compressed or polished; and hammered iron or steel bars or shapes, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** I move that the words "or steel" "or shapes" in the last line be struck out. These words make the item conflict with item 229.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend surely is not going to make a distinction between an iron shape and a steel shape. Iron and steel are practically the same in cost, and there is no conflict between this item and item 229, which deals with straight bars.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** There is not an appraiser in the service who can tell where steel ends and iron begins. You cannot tell whether a hammered bar is iron or steel.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But you can tell a hammered bar from another bar.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** It has been well considered by our hardware appraiser.

**Mr. FOSTER.** An appraiser is sometimes a good man to take an opinion from, but there are two things to be considered: one is to make an item which will be easy for the customs appraiser to understand, the other is to make an item so that proper proportion of duty will be had. If you are going to admit all hammered bars at 5 per cent, and then make a distinction between the hammered iron and the steel bar, charging hammered shapes of iron 30 per cent, and steel shapes 5 per cent, I am quite certain you will get into deep water. I should think it would be better to let this item stand.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** This was well thought out by one capable of judging. But we will let it stand, and bring it under consideration again.

Springs, axles, axle bars and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, for railway and tramway vehicles, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

Springs, axles, axle bars and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, including cart or wagon skeins or boxes, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I would suggest that these two items be made one by striking out the words, "for railway or tramway vehicles," and striking out the second altogether. I think both kinds of axles should bear the same duty. In the old tariff the duty was 1 cent a pound and 20 per cent. The smaller axle bore very much the higher duty, and I know that if the duty is left at 30 per cent, it will very seriously cripple a large industry in this country engaged in the manufacture of carriage springs and axles. The change I suggest would make all springs and axles 35 per cent, and would simplify the working of the tariff.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That might very well be done. These are very small articles, and the heightened duty does not give them very much.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** As we have let another item stand, I think we might let these stand, and we will look into the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Wire nails of all kinds, n.o.p., three-fifths of one cent per pound.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend first charged 35 per cent ad valorem, and considered the ad valorem the orthodox duty, but he has now gone back on his faith and considers a specific rate the orthodox duty. What has led to the hon. gentleman's change of faith? Did he find that his first tariff would not protect the industry?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I do not admit that the specific is the orthodox duty. In the tariff of the late Government the duty was 1 cent a pound, or a dollar a hundred. We now charge a duty of 60 cents a hundred pounds, which shows a reduction of a very substantial character.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What is the average rate of the old tariff?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** About 46 per cent.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend did not tell us how it is he came to the conclusion at one time that the orthodox duty was the ad valorem duty and then, in a little while afterwards, adopted the view that the orthodox duty was the specific duty. It is really so interesting that we would like to understand the reason of the change. Perhaps the hon. Controller of Customs can explain.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** For the purpose of valuation, in the case of under-valuation, the specific duty would tell.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It is very satisfactory to find my hon. friend admitting that we must guard against under-valuation, and to do so we must adopt the specific duty.

Mr. MONK. The importance of this item and the fact that the town of Lachine has a very large nail factory and has made heavy sacrifices for the establishment and maintenance of that industry, compel me to take up a few moments of the time of the committee while I set forth the claims of this industry to better protection. It is evident that the intention of the Government was to give some measure of protection to this article. What I submit is that the protection given is insufficient. If it were the desire of the Government to extend to that industry that amount of support which we were given to understand by the speech of the hon. Finance Minister would be given to existing industries, that object has not been attained. Nothing less than a duty of \$1 per 100 pounds could possibly enable that industry to maintain itself, and it might be just as well without protection as with the duty now imposed. The raw material from which these wire nails are made is wire and the sources of supply are in Canada and the United States. Some of the factories draw the wire themselves and supply also the non-drawing factories. In the United States some factories go through the whole five processes, from the pig iron to the finished nails, and these large factories are thus in a position to produce the nails at a very low cost.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Our people want cheap nails.

Mr. MONK. They want industries as well. The average price of nail wire in the United States is \$1.15 per 100 pounds, and in Canada \$1.42, or a difference of 27 cents in favour of the United States. Out of the 27 cents protection, about 14 cents is paid in freight on the rods from the United States, leaving 13 cents to pay duty on mill supplies, fuel and the difference between the cost of production in the Canadian and American factories. As regards the price of the nails which are made out of this wire, there is considerable difference between the prices in the United States and this country. In Ontario the price is \$2.42 per 100; in Pittsburg, U. S., it is \$1.50; in New York it is \$1.55; in St. Louis, \$1.70; in Chicago, \$1.60. But the best method of comparison is to take the price ruling in the province of Ontario, where is a larger number of nails used than in any other province, and which is also nearer the centres of American production, and compare that with the price in Pittsburg. The difference is 92 cents, but the American nails are of a heavier calibre, and consequently in a hundred pound American keg there are fewer nails than in a hundred-pound Canadian keg, so that an allowance of 15 per cent can be generally made. The actual difference, therefore, taking into consideration this percentage, would not be 92 cents, but 68 cents. When the duty was \$1 per 100

pounds, the difference in price was 92 cents, but if you allow 14 cents for the freight on the rods for the wire mills, and 13 cents protection for the wire-drawer in this country, and 15 cents for freight on the wire to the nail factory, which is a fair allowance, and 20 cents for the margin to the jobbers who handle the nails and sell the goods, you arrive at a total of 62 cents, leaving a margin of 30 cents to pay the duty on all supplies and the fuel and the difference in cost to our manufacturers, and also to give 100 nails instead of 85 corresponding nails which you find in the American keg.

If we turn to the cost of the nails in the United States, we find that in reality the Americans make their profit on the primary process, because they cannot, it is claimed, get a profit out of the cost of the nails. The American nail averages \$1.45; but the wire from which the nail is made costs \$1.15 and the keg 10 cents, making a total of \$1.25, which leaves only 20 cents as the margin for manufacture in the United States, on which, it is claimed, it is impossible to manufacture the nails. Now, our own costs of manufacture are greater than those in the United States factories. Most of the large American factories which turn out the nails have been purchased at comparatively low prices, many of them, I am informed, at auction. That is one cause of the difference. But another is the immense production of nails in the United States. They turn out over six million kegs of wire nails every year, against 200,000 kegs in Canada. Some American factories turn out as many as 3,500 kegs every day, the demand being so great that they are able to work for a long time—some factories, even, as I am informed, exclusively—on certain sizes of nails, rendering the cost of production much less. And, as I have already intimated to the committee, the Americans take their profit upon the earlier processes, of which there are five. Now, what I submit to the Government and the committee is this: If the object of this tariff is to save this industry, this does not attain it, because, with 60 per cent duty, the industry cannot possibly continue.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not 60 per cent.

Mr. MONK. Three-fifths of a cent per pound or 60 cents per 100 pounds. Nothing less than one cent per pound, I am informed, will enable this industry to go on. It would be better, if the industry is destroyed, to wipe out the duty completely. But, as I understand, that is not the intention of the Government. In regard to many industries, the Government have carried out what was foreshadowed, and the duties have been maintained at a point necessary for the carrying on of the industry. Why should there be any discrimination? Why should not this industry be saved as well as others, particularly if

they establish, as I believe they have done, with the utmost sincerity and submitting figures, that it was impossible for them to maintain the industry at any lower duty than one cent per pound? As I stated, the town of Lachine is interested in the maintenance of this as well as other industries affected by the tariff, and for this reason especially I have thought it my duty to bring this to the attention of the Government and of the committee.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) was loaded upon this question before the tariff was brought down. I know something of the wire nail trade, and I am free to say that, on the whole, the wire nail manufacturers are fairly well satisfied. They were not satisfied with the tariff as it came down in the first instance. I myself handle a very large quantity of nails the production of manufactures in the west, and I know, as a matter of fact, that the manufacturers are fairly well satisfied—not as well as if they had one cent per pound, but well enough to be willing to go on and see what they can do, and I am quite satisfied that they can hold their own and keep the American nails out. As to the speech we have just listened to, I have the material for it in my desk, made up by Mr. Whittin, of Hamilton, who got these facts together. But, they were furnished before the change was made in the tariff making it 60 cents per 100 pounds instead of one cent per pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made a mistake, I think, which will leave the impression that three-fifths of a cent per pound would be 60 per cent. The duty under this tariff is 60 cents per 100 pounds, which is not 60 per cent. I may say that in my own town of Gananoque we have a large industry engaged in wire nail manufacturing. They do not draw their wire but purchase it in the coils from the factories in Montreal. Those who control this factory tell me that it cannot possibly go on. I have a suggestion to make as between hon. gentlemen opposite and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. The difference between the duty of one cent per pound and the duty of three-fifths cents per pound is two-fifths cent. Now, I would suggest that we split the difference and make it four-fifths cent. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) thinks that the manufacturers can hardly exist under the present tariff, but may go on for a while. I do not believe that it is the intention of the Government to leave the manufacturers merely hanging in the air. I think a duty of four-fifths cent, under present prices of raw material, would probably be a fair protection. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has quoted some figures, giving prices in the United States. What he has given is what is called the based price for nails. If you ordered a

Mr. MONK.

car load at that price you would receive all large sizes, the sellers would not give small nails at that price. The factory in Gananoque is engaged wholly in the manufacture of the smaller sizes. The factory is closed, and I am satisfied that it will remain closed unless better protection is given.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Those drawing their own wire can compete with the Americans.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps, but it will be very close. They will have to reduce the wages of the men 10 or 15 per cent. But the factory that does not draw its own wire must simply close up. My friend, Mr. Parmenter, whom my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) knows, and whose word is as good as his bond, tells me that under the present duty the factory will have to remain idle.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We want to give the poor fellow who uses the nails a chance.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is something like for coal oil. The average farmer does not use 25 cents worth of nails in a year.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. I speak of the average. Of course, if a man is building a barn or something of that kind, he will use a few kegs of nails. But, under ordinary circumstances, five or ten pounds will do him for a year. The difference between three-fifths cent and four-fifths cent will not amount to half as much as the increase you make on tobacco.

Mr. PENNY. I was in conversation with one of the largest nail manufacturers in Montreal, and he did not say anything about the closing of his factory. He expressed himself as satisfied with the tariff as it is to-day.

Mr. MONK. I would not have taken up a moment of the committee's time, if my information were such as that intimated by the hon. member for Hamilton. There is a large factory in Lachine, which draws its own wire, and my information is from those in charge of that factory. I do not pretend to know the facts myself. I am a lawyer, and, though we do a great deal of nailing, we do not manufacture nails. My information is quite different from that of the hon. gentleman. The representative of the factory to which I referred assumed that they are unable to continue under this duty. The hon. gentleman may say that they are able to run, but the representations made to me are to the contrary.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The drop from \$1 to 60 cents per 100 pounds is a severe cut—no doubt about that. But, for those who do not draw their own wire the duty on the wire is reduced, while the rod from which the wire is drawn comes

in free. These wire nails are an article that go into very general use and it is desirable that they should be made as cheap as possible. Of course no one would desire to extinguish this industry. Any one can see that they will have less margin at 60 cents than at \$1. But, after all, we do not anticipate the evil results that hon. gentlemen seem to fear. But I think that we must not anticipate, or look upon the matter as gloomily from the manufacturers' standpoint as my hon. friends opposite do. I confess it is a very large cut, but it is made in the interest of the consumers.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a great pity if my hon. friend, in keeping the duty ostensibly with the view of maintaining the industry, were to miss it by a very small amount. You see in that case you would not be giving the consumer the full benefit, you would give him that if you took the duty off entirely, and you would be running the risk of shutting up the industry. Now, if you come to the difference between three fifths and four-fifths, it is so infinitesimally small as applied to the general consumer, the average consumer of nails, the farmer, the average consumption of nails by him is so small that it is a small amount at best. Suppose he paid it all, or suppose he gained it all, it would be but a very small amount. But, again, you simply reduce that by one-fifth, and I venture to say that it won't appreciably lower what the farmer, the ultimate consumer, has to pay. I venture to say that nearly the whole of that, may be the whole of it, will go into the pockets of the middlemen between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer, whilst this small amount to the ultimate consumer may be that which makes the difference between actually being able to carry on the industry, and ruin and loss. The manufacturer has to bear the whole of that. The small amount of one-fifth would be, I am satisfied, taken up by the middlemen. I do not believe that the average consumer of the article would feel the burden relaxed by a single feather's weight. My information is that it will not be possible for this industry to exist on present rates of wages, if this reduction is made. My hon. friend said: But the rod comes in free. I think my hon. friend will know, if he has inquired into this matter, that it has often occurred that they will sell you nails at Pittsburg cheaper than they will sell you the rods out of which you are to draw the wire out of which you are to make the nails. That has occurred again and again, it is one of the peculiarities of this iron business. It would be a great pity if my hon. friend strained his free trade or revenue views in the least with the idea of making the industry self-sustaining, if he failed to sustain it by omitting to put on one-fifth of a cent, which my information is would enable the industry fairly well to exist. Besides, if my hon. friend

makes a reduction in reference to imports, he is favouring entirely the United States. The whole bulk of our nails come from the United States, and not from Great Britain at all. About a quarter of a million pounds of nails come in from the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say to the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor), who appears to want to get nails cheap in this country, that the Canadian farmer to-day is buying his nails by the keg cheaper than the American farmer across the line. I made an inquiry a few weeks ago in a hardware store in Cleveland, and compared with our prices in Gananoque, I find that our prices are lower than they are in Cleveland. It may be that under the three-fifths, all these large mills that draw their own wire and make the larger sizes of nails, may go on; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is not so with the industry at Gananoque and others similarly situated throughout the country, that have to import and pay freight on their wire to their factories. They have plant there now running, they have experienced men running these machines, and it is simply a question of throwing it all into the hands of the big men and closing up these smaller establishments that are filling a gap in this country. The large ones may exist, but as my hon. friend said, you can buy large-sized nails at Pittsburg, and they will give quotations to export them cheaper than they will for the rods.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If they keep on, they will give them to us for nothing.

Mr. TAYLOR. They will do anything they can to close up Canadian industries, and if these smaller shops are closed, such as the one in Gananoque that employs ten or fifteen hands, and several others like it in the country, the bigger ones will amalgamate with the large concerns over in the United States, and they will have the same prices in Canada as in the United States. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Canadian farmer to-day is getting his nails cheaper than the American farmer.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would like it if the Government could see their way to make the duty three-quarters of a cent a pound. I think that would give general satisfaction. I do not want to urge them to do it, but in the interest of the nail factories of which we have several in the west, who are doing a very large business, I would be pleased if the Government could do so. It would enable these factories to carry on their business.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The consumer has been paying for a long time a large amount of duty on these nails, and if you are going to cut at all, I think we ought to say two-fifths instead of three-fifths and give the consumer a little chance. The manufacturers have been protected for many years.

The hon. gentleman opposite says, give the manufacturers an opportunity, let them get on their feet and they will compete against the Americans. They have been on their feet for eighteen years, and they are not prepared to compete to-day. Now, I say, give the consumer a chance, let him get on his feet and see how he will stand. If you are going to cut at all, cut it down to 50 cents. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said that nails are higher in the United States than they are in Canada. Now, surely that is not so.

Mr. TAYLOR. By retail to the farmer?

Mr. McGREGOR. There is a difference between sense and nonsense. We are supposed to talk sense when we come here, and not nonsense.

Mr. TAYLOR. I took a deputation of five farmers through the United States some three years ago to compare prices, and I think my hon. friend has seen the report that I made. If my hon. friend from Essex and my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will come home with me on Saturday, I will take them over the river and I will pay their expenses in case my statement is not true; if it is, they will pay the expenses and make a contribution for the benefit of the poor.

Mr. McMULLEN. I visited the United States last August and I found that the price of nails in Kansas City, to the consumers, is one cent a pound less than they are sold in Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. The member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has told us that finished nails are sold cheaper in Pittsburg than the plain wire is; then he tells us the next minute that finished nails are dearer in the United States than they are here; and that after the wire is brought into Canada and made into nails by Canadian labour, earning higher wages than the labour of the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be, but it does not sound all right to me.

Mr. FOSTER. One is the wholesale price and the other is the retail price.

Mr. OLIVER. As the retail price is necessarily based on the wholesale price, I may be forgiven by saying that I think the expression of the hon. member for Essex fills the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that Pittsburg quotation was for exporting. In Pittsburg they will give quotations for export to Canada at a lower rate than they will quote the rods.

Mr. CRAIG. I think the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) takes an entirely wrong view of business affairs when he is constantly talking about giving the con-

Mr. McGREGOR.

sumer a chance. Now, I say that we are all consumers, the manufacturers are consumers. I do not know who he is talking about when he talks about consumers. I suppose the hon. gentleman means the farmers. We desire to give them a chance by giving them some population to whom to sell their produce. We do not want the factories closed. Take any farmer and he will pay for a farm a larger price if it is in the vicinity of a manufacturing town than if it is in the vicinity of a town that has no manufactures. The farmers use common-sense, and the hon. member should use common-sense also. There is a false idea prevailing in regard to the farmers. I lay down the proposition that almost everything is too cheap at the present time. Take clothing, boots and shoes—they are examples. If everything was somewhat dearer it would be better for the country.

An hon. MEMBER. You think that would increase the price of farm produce?

Mr. CRAIG. I hold that the prices of farm produce would increase. I can point to one town which furnishes an example, and that is Peterborough. There is a splendid market there, and a great many of the farmers from my riding go there twice a week with their produce.

Mr. McGREGOR. The farmers of Essex cannot go there.

Mr. CRAIG. I am giving Peterborough as an illustration. If the hon. gentleman cannot understand it, other members will, no doubt. Farmers living in the neighbourhood of Peterborough fully appreciate the manufacturing industries there, because they have a first-class market for their produce. Those farmers do not require to ship their butter or eggs by cold storage because they have a market at their doors. I believe the Government would be wise if they accepted the advice of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) and imposed a duty of three-quarters of a cent instead of three-fifths of a cent, if manufacturers consider it will make all the difference in regard to the prosperity of this industry. I do not believe the farmers are so selfish as they are represented to be, and in my opinion they would not object to this slight increase of duty if thereby the factories were kept employed instead of the employees being thrown out of work and compelled to go to the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would urge the Government to put wire nails on the free list. If there was any article that was cursed as regards the duty placed on it in the North-west, it was wire nails. On every platform throughout Manitoba and the North-west this duty was denounced. I should like to see this article placed on the free list, and not only so, but that a bounty should be given to the farmers to recoup

them for the way in which they have been robbed by this duty.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot believe that the produce of the farmers is increased in price by the manufactures. Farmers believe that all our surplus produce goes to the British market and is disposed of there. While our small fruits and vegetables are more easily disposed of in the proximity of manufacturing towns, our beef, mutton and cheese go to the old country, and it cannot be pretended that the home market rules the price of the exported article. The farmers know too much to hold that opinion. There is no hon. gentleman who presses his arguments more strongly against the farmers than the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig), who at the same time pretends to be their friend; and it is high time we should let the House understand that the farmers understand their own business, and that our prices are ruled by those prevailing in the British market and not by the prices in the Canadian market.

Mr. CRAIG. Every one will agree with the hon. gentleman that the price of our exports is ruled by the price they can realize in the foreign market. I am not, however, talking about our exports, but as to what our farm produce can realize at home. It would be very interesting to obtain a correct statement as to the proportion of the farm produce that is consumed in the home market. I contend that a large part of it is so consumed—I am told seven-eighths. The hon. gentleman may talk about seven-eighths not amounting to anything; but it must be remembered that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) is engaged in the business of raising cattle for export. I have always considered that our farmers have much common-sense; I am practically elected by them, and I represent their views.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are an equal righter, not a farmer.

Mr. CRAIG. It is true I believe in equal rights to the manufacturers and the farmers, and that we are all bound together as regards our interests. One simple statement I have made proves what I have said, that you may take any farmer and he will pay more for a farm near a prosperous manufacturing town than elsewhere; and that proves the proposition, that the farmers are greatly benefited by manufactures, and I do not believe they are so selfish as to oppose the granting of moderate protection to our manufacturers.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) has talked a good deal about the home market for farmers, but he has not taken into consideration the fact that while the home market may benefit the farmers in the east, there is no home market to benefit the farmers in the west, and we have to export our whole product. The hon. gentleman said

that 10 cents would pay for all the nails a farmer used.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not say anything about nails.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Farmers use many dollar's worth of nails in a year for fencing. We had hoped that the Government would make a greater reduction than has been proposed if any change is to be made it should be to reduce the duty 10 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. In respect to this important matter as regards the farmers of the North-west, I hold that faith should be kept with them and that the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite should be carried out. I agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in regard to the desirability of reducing the duty, but I do not agree with him in the statement that the farmers of the North-west are not interested in the home market. If my hon. friend will look at the returns, he will find that both the North-west and Manitoba are interested in the home market. However, what we are interested in at this moment is nails. We all expected in the North-west Territories, that the Government would put nails on the free list, and, therefore, I move that this item be struck out of the tariff. I want to see these things placed on the free list. I want to see faith kept with the farmers. I want, in some detail of the tariff, to see hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches in the novel position of keeping a single promise they have made. Therefore, I move that this item be omitted from the tariff.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You cannot get a seconder.

Mr. ROCHE. I will second it.

Mr. HEYD. Before that motion is put, Mr. Chairman, it would be just as well for us to get back to the realm of common-sense, and leave aside these buncombe resolutions. I had the pleasure of introducing a deputation of nail men to the Government in order that they might ask that their grievances should be redressed, and which grievances they would be subject to if the duty were left at 35 per cent ad valorem. They urged that the competition from the United States was so keen that 35 per cent would not enable them to continue the manufacture of nails, and I presume it was in consequence of this competition that the Government has made the duty 3-5ths of a cent per pound. As we have a wire nail industry in the city whence I come, I am in a position to say that they are satisfied with the tariff as the Government now proposes to make it. There is one disadvantage in raising the tariff, and that is that it might stimulate the industry of making nails in this country, so that the wire nail-makers would eat one another up. That would

be the tendency if the duty was too high. I presume it is the desire of every one in this House that the nail men should live and that they should have a reasonable profit, but not too large a profit. The reduction in the price of nails of 40 cents on the hundred pounds which will be brought about by this new tariff is a considerable concession to the consuming classes of this country. I think the Government were wise in reducing the duty on nails, because the tendency undoubtedly would be to make the competition in Canada ultimately so keen that the nail-makers would not be able to make a living. As it is now, it would have this effect: That while we have in Canada I am informed fourteen nail-making concerns, seven of them buy the rod and draw the wire, while seven others buy the wire and make the nail. The concern in the city of Brantford is one of the seven which buys the wire, but owing to the reduction of duty they are compelled to put in a wire drawing machine, and the benefit accrues to the country that it has increased the demand for labour by compelling these seven wire concerns each to put in a wire-drawing plant. Brantford is being benefited by the reduction to the extent that it will double the number of employees engaged in nail making, while it will reduce the price of nails to the consumer exactly 40 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. DAVIN. I think, Sir, the hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The gentleman who contested Brant (Mr. Henry) with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd), who has just addressed this House: his voice is heard here to-night, although we have another member in his place. The speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) is the speech of a high protectionist. He says that these nail manufacturers should live, and he lays down the proposition that this Government should make a tariff to enable these people to live. I had been educated in regard to this, sitting at the feet of the Gamaliel who is now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I learned from that gentleman that these manufacturers were robbers, scoundrels great and scoundrels small.

Mr. FOSTER. Somebody has changed.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, yes; the point of view is the great difference. Sir, I am not convinced by the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd), and I must ask him to be more considerate for hon. gentlemen who are his leaders. The idea of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) coming into this House and characterizing a motion such as I make here in regard to this item as a buncombe motion: why, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) should be more considerate for his leaders. It is not respectful for a gentleman who has just come into this House to throw a slur on a man of the standing of the Min-

Mr. HEYD.

ister of Trade and Commerce, on a man of the standing of the Minister of Customs, on a man of the standing in this House of the Minister of Finance. The idea of these gentlemen, who are Nestors in politics, being flouted by one of their newest fledglings in this House, causes even me to come to their defence, when their hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) asperses them in this contemptuous manner. I agree with the sentiments of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in regard to this item. I consider that we should have nails on the free list, and in the interests of the farmers of this country, I hope that my hon. friends who are now in power and in the majority in this House, will remember their professions, remember their pledges when in opposition, and place patriotism above party, and place their duty to the farmers of this country above their duty of the moment in this committee.

Motion (Mr. Davin) negatived.

Iron or steel shoe tacks, and ordinary cut tacks, leathered or not, brads, sprigs and shoe nails, double pointed tacks, and other tacks of iron and steel, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the relative degree of protection as between the old tariff and the present one?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It is difficult to ascertain the uniform ad valorem rate. On many of these items, I dare say, the duty would run as high as 45 and 50 per cent, while in others it was not so high. We have placed these on our highest list of duties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The old duty ran from 26 to 60 per cent in some of the items.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) venture the opinion as to whether the present duty, which certainly is a great lowering on the small tacks, will be able to maintain the industry?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The representatives of these various industries who come to see us generally allege that the protection is not enough for them; but we still hope there is enough. Certainly it is a very severe reduction, and I cannot answer my hon. friend's question further than to say that our expectation is that they will still do business.

Mr. FOSTER. For the very small cost on the quantity used by the general consumer, does my hon. friend think that it would be well to endanger the industry? It is not likely that the very small reduction in the cost of shoe tacks will appreciably lower the price to the consumer. I think it is simply a squeeze that the shoe-tack maker will get, while the consumer will get no advantage at all. It may be of considerable advantage to the manufacturer who uses these tacks largely; but

he will not reduce the price of his material to the ultimate consumer on that account. I very much fear that the tack industry will be gone under this cut.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Representing as I do an agricultural constituency, a constituency of consumers, I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down and some of his friends have calculated, as various items of this tariff have come up, the very small amount in which the reduction on each article was going to benefit the consumer. But he must bear in mind that the consumer consumes all these articles, and that a very small reduction in the price of all of them mounts up to a good deal in the aggregate. Our farmers in Canada, and in the North-west, particularly, having no advantage of that home market to which our hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) alluded, have to figure on the export price for their produce; and every dollar they can save on any item in the tariff just counts so much in their annual income. We who are supporting the Government feel inclined to approve of reductions in this tariff. We do not think that in many cases the reductions are enough; but we do not wish to upset the balance of trade entirely in Canada at present. We wish to be reasonable, and, while desirous of giving the manufacturers a fair show, we must on behalf of the farmers of the North-west protest against the arguments adduced by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. It is true, a farmer may save only a few cents a year on wire nails, a few cents on coal oil, a few cents on this, that, and the other thing; but these few cents added together, and taken into consideration along with the price he gets for his products, make a considerable item in his income every year. A prosperous set of individuals makes a prosperous country, and when we consider the large number of those engaged in agricultural pursuits in proportion to those engaged in manufactures, the interests of the farmers should be considered in this House. I was rather amused at the ingenious argument of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) in regard to the home market. I would like to ask how much more the farmer in the neighbourhood of Peterborough gets per pound for his butter or per dozen for his eggs than any other farmer in Canada. The price is ruled by the export price; and when the hon. gentleman takes into account the very small export of manufactured goods compared with the export of agricultural products, I would like to know if his theory is correct where the money is to come from to provide a home market for the farmers. The condition advocated by the hon. gentleman would be like a man with his family going on a quarter section, raising produce

and cattle, and eating up everything themselves. On behalf of the farmers, I must protest against all these arguments that we are constantly hearing. As the old Scotch proverb says, many a little makes a muckle, and the farmers' interests must be looked after in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how much the farmer in the North-west consumes of 16-ounce-to-the-thousand shoe tacks in the year, and how much difference it makes in his living expenses whether these shoe tacks have a duty of 35 per cent or 1½ cents per pound. He has grown eloquent as to the immense saving this would be to the farmer. Two seats behind him there sits a gentleman who this evening declared that the makers of agricultural implements were now getting their iron \$9 a ton less than before this tariff came in. That gentleman made a very enthusiastic and rosy speech. He has saved \$9 a thousand on his raw material, and he makes the agricultural implements which the farmer of the North-west uses. They cost money—\$100, \$115, \$125. If the farmer of the North-west could only have had at the other end the advantage of the saving which my hon. friend gets on his raw materials, that would have been something; but on 16-ounce-to-the-thousand shoe tacks he does not get much.

Mr. CLANCY. It is quite evident that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) is not a farmer. If he were, I am quite sure the farmers would repudiate him as a spokesman for them. It is pretty evident that the hon. gentleman knows very little about farming when he supposes that the condition of the farmers is such that they are driven to a saving on an ounce of shoe tacks. It is paying a very poor compliment to the farmers of one country to suggest that they are to be beggared by this sort of thing. A great number of these gentlemen have a particular aptitude for talking about small things. In the elections they talked about many small things, such as wire nails and binder twine. The farmers are just as anxious to save as other people; they are obliged to save, owing to the small margin they have; and now the hon. member for Macdonald has discovered that their farms are likely to be mortgaged because they have to buy an ounce of shoe tacks in the year. These hon. gentlemen are essentially gentlemen of small grievances. I submit that the farmers of this country are quite as intelligent as these hon. gentlemen who presume to teach them. They are not looking for impossibilities. They cannot stand alone, but must look for consumers among those who are engaged in other pursuits, and it is a most unsound doctrine to say that our farmers are not interested in finding con-

sumers. If they are not, why do we spend large sums in trying to open to them outside markets where they must compete against the cheap products of other countries. When hon. gentlemen say that in every case the export price governs the price at home, they show that they have thought considerably less and know considerably less about the trade of the country than the men whom they profess to teach. Is there any hon. gentleman who does not know, does the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), who is a miller, not know that within the past two years our millers have been paying higher prices for wheat than the export market would warrant, I do not say that such is always the case, but I say that it occasionally does happen, and it is evident that hon. gentlemen opposite talk a good deal of rant about this matter.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House talk a great deal of small things. That cannot be always the case, because we talk occasionally of the great Conservative party and sometimes also of the hon. member for Bothwell himself. He alleged that I am in the habit of selling coal oil at a profit of 100 per cent. He evidently does not know much about the coal oil question in the North-west Territories, or he would not make such an absurd statement, but no doubt he felt impelled to follow the lead given him by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), the other day, when that hon. gentleman said that the freight on coal oil from the wells to Winnipeg was 3 cents a gallon. A statement of that kind does not reflect very much credit on his knowledge of the business. Had he said that the freight was more like 12½ cents per gallon, he would have been much nearer the truth. When the oil gets to our country, it costs us about 38 cents wholesale, and we have to retail it at 40 to 45 cents, which I do not think can be called an exorbitant price. These gentlemen are evidently trying to create the impression that the farmers out west are suffering at the hands of the retailers, but such is far from being the case, because the retailer out there has to pay such high freight rates, that he cannot possibly make as much profit as retailers do in the east, and could not possibly charge the exorbitant prices which the hon. member for Bothwell and the ex-Finance Minister talk so glibly about.

Screws, commonly called wood screws, of iron or steel, brass or other metal, plated or not, including lag or coach screws, and machine or other screws, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS moved that the words "plated or not" be struck out of the second line and inserted after the words "screws n.o.p.," in the third line.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. FOSTER. Why raise the duty on some screws when it is lowered on others?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think there is much of an advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it, now that you have lowered the duty on iron and steel, and taken such glory to yourselves for doing it, that you are raising the duty on screws made of iron and steel by 5 per cent?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. To what screws do you refer?

Mr. FOSTER. Iron, steel, and brass, which were formerly 30 per cent and are now 35.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The reason is because all the screws seem to go into one class, and on the whole 35 per cent was thought to be a fair rate. As respects that particular item, the hon. gentleman is right, but as respects the other items included in the number, the reduction is very substantial. If the whole item were made 30 per cent, the reduction would be very severe indeed. Of course the item could be divided as before, but there is something in favour of bringing the articles under the one item.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of the oddest reasons for an increase of duty I have ever heard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is a very good one.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to avoid the trouble of having two items, they go to work and combine in the one item two kinds of manufactures altogether different. They say to one set of manufacturers, we will reduce the duty upon your product, and they reduce that so low that the results, I think, will be rather serious to those who make wood screws. Then they went to work and reduced the duty on iron and steel, under the idea that everything made from iron and steel could be manufactured more cheaply. And just for the sake of crushing two items into one, after they have lowered the duties on iron and steel, they raise the duty 5 per cent on the manufactured article. And when asked for a reason, they say it is better to have one item rather than two.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The duty is not raised after all, because the 35 per cent is subject to the preferential reduction; and the great class of screws here enumerated is the class which, under the hon. gentleman's tariff, paid 35 and 50 and sometimes 60 per cent. The object is uniformity of tariff, and the screws to which the hon. gentleman alludes form a very small proportion of those used.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can hardly get out of the difficulty that way

because the preferential reduction applies to every item in the tariff. The hon. gentleman goes to work, in the one case, and raises the duty on the manufactured article, although he had reduced the duty on the raw material out of which it is manufactured, but in another case he reduces the duty both on the raw material and the manufactured article. In both cases, the duties are subject to the preferential reduction, so that the inconsistency still exists. I cannot see why he makes fish of one and flesh of another.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** We did that for the purpose of having uniformity of rate. Under the old tariff the duty on wood screws, reduced to ad valorem, amounted in some cases to 35 per cent, in some cases to 48 per cent and in others to 58 per cent. We put them all together. Then there was an item which at some ports might be classed in with these, and which we have included with this item. This raises it, it is true, from 30 per cent to 35 per cent, but the item is a small one, and the increase is necessary in order to secure uniformity. As a duty of 35 per cent represents such a large reduction in many lines of wood screws, we thought it would be unfair to put it at 30 per cent—that that would be too much of a drop.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But it was not necessary to do that.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** It was, in order to secure uniformity.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman might as well have put in biscuits with something else, instead of simply raising them 2½ per cent.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not, in his old tariff, have such a duty on biscuits as there was on wood screws.

**Mr. FOSTER.** There is no principle in the changes made by the hon. gentleman. In the case of the duty on steel and iron, he made a reduction, but still kept up the duties on the goods for which they were the raw material. In other cases the reduction of the duty on the raw material is an excuse for reducing the duty on the manufactured article.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The hon. gentleman knows that one of the main points was to simplify the tariff. That is a most desirable object, and we have succeeded in attaining it. In some cases, in order to secure simplicity and uniformity some articles have been slightly raised according to the general tariff, but in no case has there been an increase, I think, allowing for the reduction under the minimum tariff. As in this case those items that are increased are of small importance, and the uniformity and simplicity secured are a very desirable feature.

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).** If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had to go to the custom-house as often as merchants do, he would see the advantage of this. Under the tariff for which the hon. gentleman was responsible, the difficulty of passing entries was almost incredible. In a large house it took a man doing nothing else but writing out these various items and arranging them for the custom-house. I think the Government deserves a great deal of credit. In the consolidation of these things, the effect will be to reduce the work in a large house very greatly. To make this saving, the merchant would be willing to pay a small percentage more.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How about the poor consumer in the North-west.

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).** I cannot tell about that.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** He pays the expense, whether in duties or in clerk hire.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The consumer will get this important class of articles at 35 per cent on some of which he formerly paid 58 per cent, and if they come from England, he will, in fifteen months, get them for one-quarter less.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How much better, then, if the hon. gentleman had gone a little further, and given them the other article a little lower.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** That would have stood in the way of simplifying the tariff.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I don't think that that is simplifying the tariff; it is jumbling it up, making it more complex. In the hardware schedule in the old tariff, I think there were ninety-five items, while in the present tariff there are 104. This is making it not easier but more difficult for the importer. But what about the effect upon the industries of the country? This is all left out of account, and the only thing we are told is that this will simplify the tariff. We are told about the reduction of one-eighth now and one-eighth later on screws imported from Great Britain. But these goods are almost entirely imported from the United States. For instance, the imports from Great Britain in one clause amounted to 163 pounds, and from the United States 21,689 pounds. In another class the imports from the United States were 3,000 pounds, from Great Britain 39,000 pounds. So, this reduction of one-eighth or one-quarter amounts practically to nothing with regard to wood screws, as the imports come almost entirely from the United States. With more items in this schedule than under the old tariff, I cannot see that we are simplifying it very much.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** When the hon. gentleman again becomes Controller

of Customs and returns to the department he will be surprised to find what wonderful improvements have been made.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Barbed wire and galvanized wire for fencing, Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauge, 15 per cent ad valorem, until 1st January, 1898; thereafter, free.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was not my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) equally careful with reference to other industries, where he made a large reduction to give them a chance to get rid of their stocks.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, I think not. Surgical instruments were made free, but I think there is a provision in this to allow them a certain length of time to sell their present stock.

Mr. FOSTER. The duty on this article was not very heavy, and the hon. gentleman is going to take it off, and he leaves a certain amount so that those who have a stock on hand may get rid of it. The principle is that he does not wish to depreciate unduly the stock a man has on hand when a change is made. Why does he not apply the same principle to the heavy goods? Barbed wire and binder twine are two instances on which the hon. gentleman keeps the duty for a while. It does seem odd that you are going to introduce the principle that when you depreciate goods which are in stock by lowering the duty, you shall allow one man six months to get rid of his stock, but you shall not allow the other man the same privilege.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend can see that barbed wire is to be placed upon the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. So is binder twine.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We are treating both alike. The case he alludes to is one in which there is a reduction in duty, in some cases a larger reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman reduced any article as much as 12½ per cent?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, we have.

Mr. FOSTER. You have reduced binder twine, but nothing else. You are giving the binder twine contractor, who has a large stock on hand, a certain time to get rid of his stock off which you have taken 12½ per cent duty. You have reduced other duties on large articles by much more than 12½ per cent.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman made some reductions himself, they were not very great, but he did not follow the plan of giving them any time on which to sell the stock that they had on hand.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend know that the amount of reduction is equi-

Mr. PATERSON.

valent to the reduction in the value of the article? If you take 12½ per cent off from all cotton goods in store, or all woollen goods, you depreciate their value by that much presumably. It does not make any difference whether you make a 12½ per cent article free, or whether you make a 30 per cent article 12½ per cent, the amount of depreciation in the article is the same. You have adopted the principle of giving certain favoured ones eight or ten months in which to get rid of their stock.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The barbed wire and binder twine manufacturers are not at this time considering themselves the favoured individuals that the hon. gentleman mentions. I think he fully understands the distinction between the two cases. These are articles which go on the 1st of January, on the free list, and it was thought only right to leave them the rate of duty—the barbed wire duty is reduced to 15 per cent, which is much lower than it was—till the 1st of January, and the binder twine is left at the same rate until the 1st of January. I think the hon. gentleman will not be able to consider these as parallel cases with others in which there have been reductions made, but on which there is still as an incident of the duty that is levied, a considerable amount of protection left.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the Controller of Customs, since he has drawn a broad distinction between goods placed upon the free list and those upon which he still retains a duty, will tell us why the distinction was not made in favour of the holders of Indian corn that is placed upon the free list. There is no time given those gentlemen, the farmers. My hon. friend's logic is gone with regard to that. The farmer is sacrificed, he has been given no time. Those hon. gentlemen have been crying out for the farmers lately. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to explain why those who are dealing in the instruments of dentists and surgeons have had time to get rid of their stock, and the farmers have not had time to get rid of their corn and other articles.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Has the hon. gentleman not sold all the corn he has to sell, yet?

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman asked those engaged in selling dental instruments if they had sold them all. Has the hon. gentleman sold all his goods himself? I tell the hon. gentleman that anything that he has to sell has not been touched. I remember a speech the hon. gentleman made in the city of London not more than 12 or 15 months ago. He was answering a query put by a Conservative who declared that the hon. gentleman had been making money on the goods he had been manufacturing, and the hon. gentleman said: If I have made money, what must be the condition of the

consumer? The hon. gentleman has made money, and the consumer still languishes as he did before.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If any person has a right to complain with reference to the effect of taking off duties, it is the merchant. But so far as I know throughout the country, the merchants are not complaining, they are rather complimenting the Government upon the satisfactory tariff that they have given to the country.

Mr. FOSTER. What merchants?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I can give you a whole host of them. Some of the hon. gentleman's warmest supporters in Toronto have made a declaration almost, that they are perfectly satisfied with the tariff, and glad to see, particularly, the way in which the tariff has been simplified so that an enormous amount of work will no longer be thrown upon their clerks in making entries from time to time, as they have had to do in the past. The duty taken off iron has hit my own firm pretty severely, but I am not finding any fault, somebody has got to be hit when a tariff is reduced. But it is the merchants and not the farmers who have most reason to complain at the present time, but I am glad to say that very few of them are doing it.

Mr. MONK. I cannot allow the item to pass without making some protest. Whatever doubt may have existed in regard to wire nails, there is no doubt that this item entails the absolute destruction of a considerable amount of capital invested in this industry. We have eleven factories in all in Canada, there is a large one in the town of Lachine, in my county. There is no doubt that their output of 6,000 tons a year is going to cease now, there is no doubt that they are unable to compete with the Americans, and this for various causes. In the first place, as I said a moment ago in speaking about wire nails, the same remark applies to this. The Americans make their profits upon several processes, and, therefore, are enabled for that reason alone, if for no other, to manufacture for lower prices than our own factories. In the next place they pay much less for coal than we do, and they run winter and summer. In that respect we are less fortunately situated than they are. Now, Sir, when these industries are wiped out, a large number of skilled hands are thrown out of employment, and kindred industries are affected. The barbed wire factories spend over \$6,000 a year in wooden rollers upon which the wire is wound. They spend over \$20,000 a year for transportation. Since the first duty was put on, which I believe in its inception was \$1.50 per hundred pounds, they have been steadily reducing it until the duty got down to 75 cents. Now, that duty of 75 cents was applied by them in this way—I give the details because the impression exists that they make a

great deal of money, and get that money out of the farmers and poor men. The duty on galvanized wire was 32 cents per 100 pounds; the freight was 17 cents, disbursements to jobbers 5 per cent or 14 cents, excess of freight in Canada as compared with the United States, 4 cents; or in all 67 cents, leaving 8 cents for protection, to cover excess of cost of coal, deficit for limited output, etc. Of course under these circumstances it is easy to understand how this industry may be affected. It may not be an indifferent matter to the committee to learn that 150 workmen are employed at \$50,000 for wages annually. Then there are freights paid railways and steamers on materials, which may be placed at \$25,000; coal at \$6,000, acids \$12,500, cartage \$2,500. I have already mentioned lumber for reels, \$6,000. All these items make a total of \$102,000. The question is constantly being put, what is this going to do for the farmer? The farmer must realize, as Cobden says, that his interests is not different and distinct from the interest of the manufacturer. The manufacturers and those surrounding him contribute largely to the farmer's prosperity. But the farmer is protected very considerably by this tariff. Under the tariff there are many specific duties in favour of the farmer, and if hon. gentlemen will examine the items and compare prices with the prices of farm produce in the United States, they will find that there is a protective duty for our farmers varying from 30 to 100 per cent, very frequently 35 and 40 per cent, that is taking the prices at the present time of farm produce in the United States. I find no fault with that concession; I am aware, although I am not a farmer, that our farmers claim they are at the present time insufficiently protected. I do not claim that the farmers in my county are more intelligent than farmers elsewhere, but if a jury of farmers were in possession of all the facts connected with this particular industry, very few of them would condemn the protection given. So far as regards the North-west, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) said he was very anxious to see the duty on wire nails disappear completely. The North-west representatives must realize the fact, which they have apparently not realized, that the North-west is not the whole universe. There is the East, and it must not be forgotten what the east has done for the west, and what it is now being asked to do for the west. If a calculation were made it would be found that the west is considerably in debt to the east. Of this output of 6,000 tons of wire, statistics show that about 2,000 tons are used by railway companies for fencing purposes. This leaves 4,000 tons. According to the last census, our farming population is a little over 500,000, and the removal of the duty will give 12

cents to each one engaged in farming. The hon. member for Macdonald said that they were economical, and he stated a proverb to that effect. But there is another Scotch saying, which members from the North-west seem to have adopted very generally, and that is, "Take all, keep all, and give nothing away." I scarcely hope the Government will reconsider their decision in regard to this item, but I thought it my duty to present these views to the committee, and I trust the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) will support them.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to make a bargain in regard to items of this tariff. If it can be arranged that by an alteration in the tariff, prices will thereby be raised to the farmers, as it is claimed they will be on manufactured articles, by the advocates of the protective tariff, I will guarantee that the farmers will support any tariff on manufactured articles if we are given corresponding changes in the agricultural schedule. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told the committee that an alteration of an almost infinitesimal amount means prosperity or ruin to the manufacturing industry. If they will show that the addition of 2 cents or 10 cents or more as we may ask to the tariff on agricultural products will raise the price to that extent to the farmers, we will agree to any rate of tariff that the manufacturers may ask.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the taking off of duties on agricultural products raise the price?

Mr. OLIVER. We are not asking for duties to be taken off.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you should not ask us to take the duties off manufactured articles.

Mr. OLIVER. I am prepared to give the manufacturer any duty, provided you guarantee an increased price in farm products as a result of correspondingly increased duties on those products. Will any hon. gentleman accept the offer?

An hon. MEMBER. Put it in writing.

Mr. OLIVER. If hon. gentlemen are not willing to accept the offer, they had better stop talking on the identity of the tariff interests, of the farmer and manufacturer.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's offer was not altogether correctly presented, nor was it made in writing. The offer to be a fair one should be this: that if by leaving duty on manufactured goods, you would raise their price, then the Government should impose duties which would have a similar effect as regards agricultural products. That would be a fair proposition. If the hon. gentleman would put that in writing, we shall all be ready to sign it at once.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. CLANCY. Does this item include all kinds of wire for fencing purposes? The hon. gentleman is aware that there are other kinds of wire fencing than barb wire. There are a dozen different kinds besides the two mentioned, buckthorn and barb wire.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No; it covers exactly what it says. It covers barb wire and buckthorn and Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauge, which are the kinds of wire used almost exclusively for the purpose. There is in the next item buckthorn and strip fencing, 20 per cent, and in another item we provide for wire fencing n.e.s.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that include all other kinds of wire fence manufactured?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, that will cover all kinds not specifically mentioned elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. This item is peculiarly worded. Barbed wire and three grades of galvanized wire for fencing will come in free. How is the customs officer going to tell whether this latter kind of wire is for fencing or not? My hon. friend might just as well strike out the word "for fencing" and leave these three kinds of wire free of duty.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course it has simplified the tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) had a tariff a month ago which is quite different from this, and which provided that all the materials that entered into the construction of this wire were to be admitted duty free. They have struck out that provision in the last edition of the tariff. The first tariff submitted read as follows:—

Barbed wire and other wire for fencing, until 1st January, 1898, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Thereafter to be free; and all articles upon which duties are levied which enter into the cost of the manufacture of the said barbed or other wire shall, for this purpose then be free, the whole subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

I should think that would be delightfully definite, and would please our friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood).

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is not in this tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. But we had it in the tariff for a month, and now we have that Nos. 9, 12 and 13 are to be free if used for fencing. If you make this free for fencing it will not be possible to prevent it being free for other purposes. The merchants cannot follow the wire around to see whether it is used for fencing or other purposes.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It would work the same as free fishing twine worked in your tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. If I had the framing of that item I would not have made it.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman did make it.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no, it was the law before.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) had the privilege of altering it.

Mr. WALLACE. That item was not the same as this. It could only be imported by the twine manufacturer.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no, it could be imported by anybody.

Mr. WALLACE. It was a most unsatisfactory item and should not be perpetuated in this tariff. This twine was used for no other purpose practically, but this wire can be used for other things in addition to fencing.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That kind of wire is what is used for fencing.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The old tariff would have limited the free entry to barbed wire. This new item is a further concession to the farmers, because in addition to barbed wire they will be now able to get free galvanized wire of the numbers mentioned, and which is largely used for fencing. There is a difficulty in this as my hon. friend has pointed out, but it is a difficulty which is connected with some few items in the tariff. You had it in the old tariff. Tubing was not free, but when it was imported for oil wells it was free, and wherever you have these exceptional items you are liable to have some abuses. Our desire was to give the farmer his wire for fencing free, but we do not want it free for every other purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Tubing for oil wells was a localized industry, and it was imported practically only by the oil men.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It was imported and kept in stock by the trade.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Pater son) knows that you have hundreds of thousands of farmers extending into every corner and part of this country. You have an item here providing that wire when imported for fencing will be free. How is it possible to have anything but free wire the whole country through, so far as these three numbers are concerned? You pretend to help the wire industry, and you take on the three staple numbers, and make them free ostensibly for farmers, but really for the whole consumption of the country. Let us face the fact that it is free wire on these three numbers, and you might as well make it all free.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The twine that was brought in for the fishermen was in the

same position, and oil piping was in the same position. By this change, instead of having the cruel barbed wire for fencing, the farmers will be able to have plain wire that does not cut the cattle.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest to the Controller, if he is going to leave this item in the tariff, that he make it read, "barbed wire and galvanized wire, Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauge, when used exclusively for fencing," and strike out the words, "wire for fencing," because, as it reads, any person could import the wire for fencing and use it for anything.

Mr. FOSTER. That will help it somewhat, but my hon. friend is striking the wire industry, as he knows.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Is not the hon. gentleman's proposition striking it harder—to make wire free for all purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. I was simply pointing out to my hon. friend what his tariff did—that it was practically making all wire free.

Mr. CRAIG. I think there is a great deal in the point raised by the hon. member for York. If a merchant is importing a lot of this wire, how does he know whether it is going to be used for fencing or not? It is usually used for fencing, but he could not say that it is going to be used for that. The result, I hold, will be that the United States dealers will get the selling of this wire to parties who want to use it for fencing, while our wholesale men will be thrown out of it altogether. I would like to know what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) has to say about this.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There is a great deal of difficulty in having these three items made free, because, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has stated, these numbers can be used for many other purposes. In the case of fishermen's twine, a declaration was made at the time of the entry that it was for fishing purposes, and then it came in free, and when that declaration could not be made, the duty had to be paid. It was the same with iron pipe for oil purposes, but in some cases the pipe was sold for other purposes. In many cases the honest importer was undersold by others who do not import honestly. If the Government can see their way to make some other disposition of this item, I think it would be in the interest of the revenue as well as in the interest of the honest importer. If they insisted on a declaration being made at the time of the entry that the wire was for fencing, I suppose the balance would be left to the honesty of the importer.

Mr. MCGREGOR. To the honesty of the importer and the judgment of the collector. We have got to the stage in this country when wire has become the fencing of the country, and it is a great relief to the far-

mer to be able to buy these three numbers of wire free of duty. If you put the duty on any, I would say, put it on the barbed wire, which is very cruel to the animals.

Mr. CLANCY. Looking at the items that follow this one, I am unable to see that more than two classes of wire are free—barbed wire and the wire of these three classes used for fencing. There is another kind of wire fencing manufactured in the town to which the hon. member for North Essex belongs, which it would seem is protected. I desire to ask the Controller of Customs whether it is the intention that fencing-wire of every description, barbed, woven or otherwise should be free.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, it will not be free if the committee adopt the Government proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. The reason I ask is that the very pertinent question arises why a distinction should be made in favour of one class of manufacturers as against another. I am not advocating that the duty should be taken off in either case, but I want to know whether one industry is to be cut down and another protected. It does seem to me that my hon. friend has not a very strong case, when we find one class of wire protected and the other not. My hon. friend may say that the class admitted free is a very much more desirable kind than the other, but that does not affect the principle in the least. We should leave to the farmers to choose what kind they will use.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Numbers 9, 12 and 13 are the numbers generally used for woven fencing on this side of the water at present. It is made on the ground, and I understand that there is only one other number used by the Page Wire Company. I think they use No. 7.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We have no desire to strike down any manufacture, but to benefit the people. It is true that one manufacture may, through the operation of this clause, be in a worse position than another, but the object of the Government is to secure for the farmers their fencing free of duty, which is most in demand. The classes used more for garden lawns, and other such purposes, we thought should fairly contribute to the revenue, while giving to our farmers such wire as they generally use free. When the words "galvanized wire Nos. 9, 10, 12 and 13" were inserted in the amended resolutions, it was with the view of giving him a larger range of wire free. When we reach an item a little lower down, the hon. gentlemen will find that we will ask the committee to assent to the introduction of the words "other wire fencing, n.e.s." which will cover other kinds of fencing and make it dutiable.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. CLANCY. As a matter of fact, wire fencing that is woven and is not barbed wire at all is daily coming into use. The fact is that our farmers are almost exclusively fencing with what is called the Page wire.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. What numbers is that made out of?

Mr. CLANCY. It includes all the numbers mentioned here.

Mr. MCGREGOR. For top wire they use No. 7.

Mr. CLANCY. And a lighter wire below. I have no sympathy with barbed wire for fencing, but while the parties who make woven fences have their interests protected, we are not giving any protection to the makers of barbed wire. There is only one way of making wire cheap to the farmers and that is by allowing all kinds of wire in free. If the hon. gentleman does not do that, he will do the farmers very little good and kill an industry.

Item agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Railway Company.

EASTERN TOWNSHIP BATTALIONS.

Mr. STENSON asked :

1. Have orders been issued to have the 54th, the 58th, the 60th and the 79th Battalions of Infantry go into camp on the 22nd June instant, at Rockland, county of Richmond, province of Quebec?
2. If so, have these orders been countermanded?
3. For what reasons?
4. At whose request?
5. At what place are these battalions to go into camp this year?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). Orders had been issued in the first instance that the battalions named should go into camp on the 22nd of June. These orders were since countermanded. This was done on account of an engagement which turned out to have been entered into with the municipal council and mayor of St. Johns. These battalions are going into camp this year at St. Johns.

**LIGHT-KEEPER—GEORGE B. PICKETT.**

Mr. **FOSTER** asked :

Has George B. Pickett been dismissed from the position of light-keeper at Oak Point, King's county, New Brunswick? Were any charges preferred against him? If so, what, and was an investigation granted?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). The answer to the first two questions is "yes." He was dismissed for active political partisanship. An investigation was not deemed necessary. The statement of the representative of the county, made from his personal knowledge and on his responsibility as a member was accepted.

**GRAIN TRANSPORT FROM NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.**

Mr. **DAVIN** asked :

What number of bushels of grain of all kinds did the Canadian Pacific Railway carry east from the North-west Territories and Manitoba in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897? What number of bushels of grain did that railway carry east from the North-west Territories in each of the

above years? How many from Manitoba in each of the above years?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The information which the hon. gentleman asks is not in the possession of the department, but if the hon. gentleman desires, I have no objection to make an effort to obtain it from the proper quarters.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I should be very much obliged if the hon. Minister will do that. It is very kind of him to make the offer.

**OFFICERS OF GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.**

Mr. **CAMERON** asked :

1. What is the pay of the captains and officers of the various cruisers and survey boat or boats now and in 1896?

2. Are such officers or any of them paid in the winter months when such boats are not on duty? If so, how much are such officers paid, and what duties do they perform for the wages so paid in the winter months?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to pay when such officers are off duty?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). 1. The captains and officers receive the same pay this year as they did in 1896. 2. Payments of amounts during winter as shown in statement. It is necessary to retain these officers and engineers in the service during the winter months, and their services are available at any time when required. 3. Yes. It is not proposed to make any change in the practice of the department in regard to retaining these officers during the winter. Engineers are employed during the winter in making repairs to engines when necessary.

**FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE—WAGES OF OFFICERS, 1896 AND 1897.**

Vessel.	Officers.	Monthly wages.		Remarks.
		1896.	1897.	
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Acadia.....	Captain .....	75 00	75 00	Half pay during winter. do do do do Full pay. Work at engines during winter.
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	
	1st engineer.....	90 00	90 00	
Petrel .....	2nd do .....	60 00	60 00	Half pay during winter. do do do do Full pay.
	Captain .....	90 00	90 00	
	1st officer... ..	60 00	60 00	
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	
Dolphin .....	1st engineer... ..	65 00	65 00	Half pay during winter. do do do do Full pay. Fisheries service in summer. Ice service in winter.
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	
	Captain .....	60 00	60 00	
	do .....	90 00	90 00	
Stanley .....	1st officer. ....	60 00	60 00	Full pay. do do do do Half pay.
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	
	1st engineer.....	83 33	83 33	
	2nd do .....	68 18	68 18	
Constance .....	Captain .....	90 00	90 00	Half pay during winter. do do do do Full pay. Half pay.
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	
	1st engineer.....	65 00	65 00	
	2nd do .....	40 00	40 00	

FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE—*Concluded.*

Vessel.	Officers.	Monthly wages.		Remarks.
		1896.	1897.	
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Curlaw.....	Captain.....	75 00	75 00	Full pay. Inspector fisheries.
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	Half pay during winter.
	2nd do.....	40 00	40 00	do do
	1st engineer.....	60 00	60 00	Full pay.
	2nd do.....	40 00	40 00	do
Kingfisher.....	Captain.....	90 00	90 00	Half pay during winter.
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	do do
	2nd do.....	40 00	40 00	do do
Osprey.....	Captain.....	90 00	90 00	do do
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	do do
	2nd do.....	40 00	40 00	do do
La Canadienne.....	Captain.....	90 00	90 00	Not in commission, 1897.
	1st officer.....	60 00	60 00	
	2nd do.....	40 00	40 00	
Victoria.....	Captain.....		90 00	do do 1896.
	1st officer.....		60 00	

## LAKES SURVEY.

Bayfield.....	Captain.....	1,050 00	Per annum.
	1st engineer.....	800 00	do
	2nd do.....	40 00	Per month.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me, in that connection, to call his attention to the case of two officers, Bennett and Mackenzie, and inform me at his convenience whether it is not possible, under the exceptional circumstances to which he refers, which compelled them to be laid off during the summer as well as during the winter, owing to the ship being laid up, to allow them half-pay as well as in the case of officers laid off during the winter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will take a note of that, and submit it to Commander Spain, and see what he thinks about it.

## SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved that the House resolve itself into committee, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section 25 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for twelve days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days, but that this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section

Mr. DAVIES.

25 of the said Act, and that in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present session it shall not apply to days prior to his election.

Motion agreed to.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CRAIG. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. I do not care to obtrude myself on the House in a matter of this kind, but in this case I consider it necessary, in justice to myself. In the "Globe," of yesterday, is a report of what I said on the Alien Labour Bill. My attention was called to this by a friend of mine, who said the report would give the impression to any one reading it that I was opposed to this Bill. The report says:

Mr. Craig said he was one of those who had always been opposed to such legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

What I did say was this: I was referring to the fact that some one had said that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was not desirous that the Bill should pass, and I said that no one could say truthfully that the hon. member for South Leeds did not desire the passage of this Bill, because for years he had advocated this measure when the majority of the House, myself among the number, had been

opposed to it. But I went on to say that I was in favour of the Bill now, because I felt that there was a great necessity for it. I only wish to put myself right on this matter, and to correct this report, which represents me as being opposed to the Bill, which I am in favour of and which I supported.

#### PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the attention of the Government, and more particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to the following article in the Montreal "Witness":—

##### POOR MACKEREL CATCH.

Villagers of Nova Scotia Threatened with Want. Fish did not Strike Inshore—Destruction of Nets by Gloucester Schooners.

Halifax, N.S., June 7.—A serious degree of want is likely to be felt by the populations of the western shore villages, if fishing does not improve. Fish vendors have visited Prospect and neighbouring places in search of mackerel, and have been unable to get any. Very few have been taken. The fish passed the coast and did not strike inshore until near Canso. Numbers were taken to the eastward and shipped to Boston via Halifax. The western shore people are now depending on the second run of mackerel proving better for them. If this fails, it is a serious question what the people will do for the summer. Some of the western people complain bitterly of the destruction of their nets by the Gloucester schooners. A large number of nets have been torn when set lately, and a heavy loss caused to the owners. One man had five nets, valued at a hundred and fifty dollars, destroyed. The people say the Gloucester schooners deliberately sail through the nets, quite indifferent of the damage which must follow. The skippers of these vessels take this means of venting their ill-will upon innocent people for the enforcement of the three-mile limit and its restrictions. It was remarked this week that a large fleet of Gloucesters sailed up and down inside the three-mile limit for several days. They did not dare to take any fish, even if they had seen any, but they sailed through every net they could see, and the aggregate damage caused the shore fishermen had been very heavy. In many cases all the nets of individuals were destroyed, which would have left the unfortunate owners helpless to catch any mackerel, had the fish happened to strike in. A complaint is to be made to the Dominion Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the fishermen on the shore of Nova Scotia are not in a position to resort for a living to any fertile fields. Their little cots or homes are placed on the barren rock, and they are dependent entirely on the product of the sea, and when they are interfered with in this way, they are deprived of their means of livelihood.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** If the hon. gentleman is going to make any extended remarks on the subject, he must make a motion.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** I will conclude with a motion. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the masters

of the patrol schooners in charge of the Government have any instructions to look after foreign vessels sailing within the three-mile limit, doing injury in these waters, or whether they are merely instructed to look after them when fishing within these limits? It appears to me that orders should be given to the masters of the patrol schooners to carefully look after the interests of the fishermen, particularly in regard to the destruction of their nets. The facts are that these fishermen are frequently deprived of their nets, and are in the same position as a mechanic would be if deprived of his tools, which would mean his living. I would therefore ask the hon. Minister to see that these American schooners are watched and carefully looked after in case of infringements of rights, if he has not already given instructions to that effect. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). I heard somewhat imperfectly the remarks of the hon. gentleman and the extracts he read, but from what I did hear, his complaint was that a number of American or Gloucester fishermen, when within the three-mile limit, sailed their vessels through the nets of the local fishermen and destroyed the nets and the chances of these fishermen catching fish. I may say that it is desirable to take these newspaper reports "cum grano salis." You cannot accept them unreservedly. Commander Spain and his officers are accustomed to follow the Gloucester fleet, from the time it reaches Canadian waters until it leaves in the fall. I have reports weekly showing what the operations of the American fleet are and how they are being watched, and I can hardly imagine, judging by the vigilance which I am bound to say Commander Spain and his officers have always shown, that an outrage such as the hon. gentleman has described could have taken place without Commander Spain having had knowledge of it and taken proper action. I think the hon. gentleman knows Commander Spain well enough to feel assured that if any attempt of the kind he refers to were made by the American fishermen, he would have taken effective measures to put a stop to it. But, of course, the hon. gentleman, having deemed this matter of sufficient importance to bring it to the notice of the House, I shall have a copy of "Hansard" sent to Commander Spain and ask him to make a special report, which, as soon as received, I shall be very happy to communicate to my hon. friend.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I quite agree with the hon. Minister that the experience of the department shows that frequently these reports in the newspapers will not stand very close investigation. Nevertheless I am glad to see that he will follow the usual course and not take it for granted that those rumours are unfound-

ed. Sometimes there is foundation for them, and only too often are the nets destroyed, not only by foreign vessels but sometimes indeed by our own. I wish to suggest to the hon. gentleman that when asking Commander Spain for a report, he should see that Commander Spain causes inquiry to be made and the names of the offending vessels, if any, noted, and notice sent on to the different collectors to aid the fishery cruisers in securing any vessels against which the Government may come into possession of evidence.

Mr. KAULBACH. I may say that I have a very high opinion of Commander Spain and am convinced that at all times he will protect the interests of the fishermen when patrolling the coast and in charge of his fleet. However, I take this opportune moment now to draw attention to the fact that years ago, when the mackerel fishing was looked after by the Americans and the maritime province people, and when the deadly purse seines were used, that method was condemned by both the American Congress and the Government then in power and an arrangement was made for putting a stop to it. But after a time the Americans again engaged in the same deadly method, and our Government took no action that I am aware of to prevent it. Anyway, all the plant and implements that had been in use by the fishermen of the maritime province have remained unused and probably are still idle and unemployed. It appears to me that if the Government were to enter into correspondence with our neighbours across the border and ascertain whether some arrangement could not be made whereby this method could be prevented, it would be in the interests of all concerned, American as well as Canadian fishermen. The American fishermen at present sail within the three-mile limit, and when the flag of one of the patrol schooners or one of the cutters is not in sight, they take the opportunity of catching fish by the use of the purse seines. This fleet of American fishermen beside the injury of destroying nets tend to drive the fish from the coast. I think it would be right that every American fishing vessel found inside of the three-mile limit should be looked upon with a deal of suspicion, and be made to report itself in such a way, that the commander of the fleet would be satisfied that it was not there for any other than legitimate purposes other than the legitimate one of passing into or out of port. If this were done, I think a great deal of the loss which our poor fishermen are suffering from would be avoided in the future and a more satisfactory and reconciled feeling would exist along the shore, and our fishermen would be able to feel they could prosecute their industry in such a way that would cause them to feel they were able to support

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

their families without being subjected to those risks and losses.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

#### CLAIM OF MR. C. J. WALSH.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to invite the attention of my hon. friend leading the House to a letter which I have received from Mr. C. J. Walsh, requesting me to put on the Orders a notice of motion for papers, but as it would be too late to reach the matter in that way, I would simply state that Mr. Walsh, a civil engineer, was employed by the Government of the Leeward Islands, which had applied to the Department of Railways and Canals for an officer to carry on certain public works. Mr. Walsh was so engaged for some time, but subsequently his services were dispensed with, and he makes a claim for a considerable sum, in consequence of payment of his salary having been delayed a long time and thus prevented his return to Canada. The object of this letter is to get the Government to lay on the Table the letters and reports in the possession of the Government on this subject. I shall send this letter over to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if he finds it consistent with his duty, ask him to have these papers, without formal motion, laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is it in the nature of a claim on the Government of Canada or the Government of the Leeward Islands?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the Government of the Leeward Islands, and it is possible some of this correspondence may be with the home Government and of a confidential nature. My hon. friend will be able to ascertain if these papers can properly be laid on the Table.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall look into it.

#### POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 129) to amend the Post Office Act. He said: The first part of the Bill is to make such provision that the department may arrange for security to be given by persons connected with the post office, either in the way of taking guarantees from companies or by establishing a fund, or by both combined. I wish to avoid, if possible, the necessity of separate bonds in respect of each officer and, if possible, to arrange for insuring generally without regard to the person who, for the time being, may fill a particular office. We have a great many hun-

dreds of officers and a great deal of trouble and expense is involved in keeping track of the various bonds, seeing that they have not expired, collecting the premiums, &c. By the method proposed in the Bill, I think it is quite possible to simplify this branch of the department. Then, instead of wholly depending upon the bonds of the companies for the fidelity of officers, it is proposed to have a fund raised by contributions from the officers. This will not be an additional charge upon the officers, but will simply be a division of their contribution, part going towards the premium payable to the companies and part being turned over to this fund. The Bill also proposes to establish a branch in the Post Office Department known as the Railway Mail Service Branch and to create officers such as the controller and superintendents. These are not new officers, but will be transferees from the existing staff. The controller, it is proposed, shall be a member of the staff who has had at least fifteen years' experience, while the superintendents will be men who have had at least ten years' experience in the railway mail service. There is also a clause in the Bill providing that the mail clerks shall be liable, yearly, to what is called a "case" examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the expense of security borne by the officers entirely?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Wholly so. It does not involve any additional expense to the officers or any charge upon the country.

Mr. ELLIS. I regret that the Postmaster General did not provide in his Bill a scheme for the insurance of registered letters. I think that that is a matter that the post office ought to deal with.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: This is a Bill to give effect to the provisions of the Bill which has just been read the first time, so far as regards the controller of railway mail service and the superintendents of railway mail clerks. This Bill also creates a new class of officers, called stampers and sorters, in the city post offices. At present there are first-class clerks in city post offices engaged in the work of stamping and sorting letters, a duty that could be well discharged by this new class of clerks, as is the custom in Great Britain. There is also a clause in the Bill amending clause 60 of the Civil Service Act, and permits the Government to make certain changes in the staff where officers have been in the civil service prior to the 1st July 1882, and have not passed the necessary ex-

amination. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has a case in point which he will explain when this provision comes to be discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it to revive the old provision that officers may be appointed without an examination?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; it does not deal with new appointments. The case which has pointed out the necessity for this amendment arises out of the fact of there being in the Department of Agriculture a third-class clerk who has been there for twenty-five years, who did not pass the civil service examination, because at the time of his appointment no such examination was compulsory. He is practically unfit for the work of a third-class clerk, and it is not possible, under the present Act, even to give him an inferior position because he has not passed the examination.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to a return called for by the House at an early part of the session—the papers relating to the extension of the breakwater at Belle River. I would like to know when the return will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I will see to it to-morrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to an order of the House passed last session, calling for a statement of the expenditure by the Dominion Government on the railways of the Dominion since 1873.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The statement has been prepared and I will bring it down at once.

Mr. MARTIN. I would also ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) with regard to several returns which I have asked for once or twice before. Two of the returns I have asked for have been laid on the Table, but I wish to point out that one of these especially is very incomplete. This is that correspondence in regard to the dismissals of the postmaster at Hopefield. The correspondence refers to a petition which is not among the papers. I would like to have this return brought down in more complete form, and I would also ask that two other returns which have been moved for and of which I sent a memorandum to the Postmaster General a few days ago, should be brought down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). With regard to alleged incompleteness of the return, I will make inquiry in the department. I did not examine the return laid on the Table, but the officers were directed to comply with the order of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. I would point out that there is a letter in this Hopefield correspondence addressed to Hon. D. A. McKinnon, and dated Hopefield, December 15th, 1896, in which it is stated that "our petition contained nine names." This petition must be in the department.

### REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Justice. — (Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Buckthorn, and strip fencing, of iron or steel, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the Controller of Customs proposed to look into the matter including another kind of fencing for farmers which, it was developed in the course of conversation last night, was being made in some parts of Ontario, but it appears to have the raw material dutiable, although at what duty it is not stated here; presumably it would come under the unenumerated class at 20 per cent. But the point was, if barbed wire fencing and plain wire fencing is on the free list for farmers' use, and if, in order to make it free for farmers, the manufactories have to be closed and the industry stopped, on what principle it was that another kind of fencing made out of wire, the materials being free and used by farmers, was allowed to be protected with a duty—how much, we do not yet know. My hon. friend stated that this fencing was used for lawns and the like of that, but I am informed that it is largely used by farmers, and that it is one of the best of farmers' fences, although not the cheapest.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The matter was discussed, as the hon. gentleman states, but the Government thought that in making the concessions they have done in this matter of fencing, they had gone as far as they could at present. With reference to the other kinds the hon. gentleman alludes to, I think they are not as commonly used as the items we are making free. I suppose it would not be amiss to say that when we reach an item further down, we propose to insert the words: "Wire fencing, n.e.s." at a rate of

5 per cent. We think we have gone as far in this way as we can do at present, and I think the hon. gentleman will think that we have gone a good distance in that direction. As I said last night, we do not wish to strike at one industry or another, because it was desired to give cheap wire fencing to the farmers of the kinds that, as I understand, are most largely used by them.

Mr. CLANGY. I am sure the country will hear that statement with a great deal of disappointment. If the Government wish to show that they are serious in giving the farmers the benefit they were promised, by the pretense of making wire fencing cheap by cheapening barbed wire alone, I tell the hon. gentleman that it is not only disappointing but manifestly unfair. If the Controller of Customs has information to lead him to believe that the class of wire fencing to which I made reference last evening, I mean woven wire fencing is not generally used, he is entirely misinformed, for that class of wire fencing is one of the most useful, and is coming constantly into larger use. Barbed wire is gradually going into disuse, and the class of fencing that is being made now is that class which is not dangerous to animals in pastures, and does not maim them. I point out the unfairness of wiping out one industry and giving what is almost undue encouragement to a wire fence that is much more used for the purpose of making fences. Now, the wire is made entirely free for both barbed wire and woven wire fencing; and still there is a very high protective duty on the fence most in use—I am not complaining of the duty being retained—but there is a high protective duty maintained on that class of fencing. It would show that it is made a pet of the hon. gentleman, or of the the hon. gentleman's friends, I know not what the case may be.

Mr. TAYLOR. The factory in Windsor.

Mr. CLANGY. I would be glad to see the factory in Windsor reasonably and fairly protected as well as the manufactories of barbed wire. If the hon. gentleman makes that distinction, I do not understand it. I desire to say that it is unfair to the farmers, and that making barbed wire free is a bald sham. So far from it increasing in use, it is going out of use. If the hon. gentleman desires to give the farmers that boon that he has promised, then let him make it all free; if not, put all the manufacturers on the same ground.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that we have had a reasonable answer from my hon. friend. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the way that it appears to stand. If it does not stand in that way, then I am giving a wrong representation. It develops in the discussion of this item that the Minister has decided to make barbed wire fencing that is manufactured in this country, free. In doing that he has shut

Mr. MARTIN.

up every barbed wire factory in the whole Dominion, of which there are a large number. He is also making numbers 9, 12 and 13 wire, which is used very largely in fencing, and used in the manufacture of barbed wire, free. The whole plea of the hon. gentleman is that he is doing that because they have come to the conclusion that wire fencing must now be the farmers' fence, and that it ought to be made free. Now, it develops that there is another kind of fence made, woven wire fence, it is made out of these same numbers of wire with the exception of the top wire, and that is the wire that is free. When we ask what duty is placed upon this kind of fencing, and it is the most desirable fencing, and is coming into use amongst the farmers, we find that the Controller of Customs says he is going to ask that the committee put 25 per cent upon this in addition to free raw material. When asked why he makes the distinction between the two kinds of wire fencing, putting a protective duty on the best wire fencing for the farmer, and taking it off upon what is not the best, he says they have gone as far as they think they can go. Now, the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) last night wanted either the whole duty taken off upon wire nails, or he wanted it reduced, because they wished to help the farmers. I would like to hear that hon. gentleman rise now and ask that the duty be taken off woven wire fencing in order equally as well to help the farmer. Otherwise it would appear to the committee and to the country that the Government were making their tariff open to the charge of favouritism, of giving concessions to manufacturers for certain kinds of fencing, and that not the best kind, while on the best kinds of wire fencing they are placing a duty equivalent to 30 or 35 per cent, and that this kind to which concessions are made is specially manufactured by a factory in a county represented by one of the Government supporters.

Mr. MCGREGOR. There is in my county, at Walkerville, a factory that uses 1,000 tons of wire a year for the manufacture of plain wire fencing, and it is very good fencing. I received a telegram from the firm a short time ago, stating that they wanted Nos. 7 and 14 substituted for No. 12 wire. The hon. gentleman can scarcely blame hon. members on this side of the House for the present arrangement, for these numbers do not suit the manufacturers of my county, yet I believe they will be able to use the wire on this list. Similar factories are in operation in London, Ingersoll, Toronto and other places. A large number of the farmers, however, are now making their own wire fences, and weave their own wire, and have five or ten strands as they desire, and the machine thus used has given general satisfaction. I should like to have the numbers I have mentioned, Nos. 7 and 14, placed on this list, but the Gov-

ernment have taken a stand in regard to these three numbers covered by the tariff, and I feel that the Government have made a wonderful stride towards giving the farmers free fencing, and that it should prove satisfactory to all. It is true a very large number of our farmers do not require barbed wire fencing, but when we go to Manitoba, where, in a great many cases, fencing is composed of only three strands, barbed wire is required. In these provinces, however, we are dispensing with barbed wire, and the sooner it is dispensed with the better it will be for the country and for the animals. This proposition is one in the right direction, and we are moving in the direction of giving our farmers free wire for fencing purposes.

Mr. CLANCY. The Controller of Customs has not given an answer to the question, but he has merely stated that the Government have not yet arrived at a decision to place both classes of fencing on the same footing. The committee and the country are entitled to hear some reason why all classes of wire for fencing purposes are not included under this item. When the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has stated that a hundred thousand tons of wire are annually manufactured into this class of fencing in one factory, besides other four or five factories engaged in the same business, it is evident that if the Controller requires any proof as to the extent to which it is used, it is furnished by the statement made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. I regret the Government are not going to give the explanation asked. It has been pointed out that barbed wire is to be admitted free, and the kind of fencing which the hon. member for North Essex said was most popular among the farmers, is to receive a protection of 25 per cent on the manufactured article. In a word, these manufacturers are to have their raw material admitted free and have 25 per cent on the manufactured commodity. This proposition makes the tariff look as if it were a political tariff. Other industries of a similar kind are in existence, but they are receiving much less protection; and, moreover, this excessive duty is entirely unnecessary because duties of a protective character should be proposed in proportion to labour expended on the manufactured article. In this case the manufactured article is woven wire. Its manufacture is a simple process, and it can be done with a machine, for it is simply the gathering together of different strands and fastening them. Yet this industry obtains raw material free, and a protection of 25 per cent on the so-called manufacture, while the barbed wire industry is wiped out because it obtains no protection, and will be unable to compete with barbed wire imported from other countries. There are as many people engaged in the manufacture of barbed wire as in other wire industries. If this kind is to be made free, I

do not see why the whole remaining class should be given a protection of 25 per cent on the manufactured article, with the further concession of free raw material. I think the Government should make an explanation that should be satisfactory as to the course they are taking on this question.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I do not think any explanation need be added to that given by the Controller of Customs. It is not intended that all wire fencing should receive this exemption, but simply that most commonly used by the farmers. By admitting barbed and galvanized wire free, we are giving a concession to our farmers. If hon. gentlemen opposite mean that we might have gone further and given a larger concession, I cannot deny that, but we have thought that a reasonable reduction has been made in regard to wire fencing, and one which will be recognized by the farmers.

**Mr. SPROULE.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has given the very strongest reason in the world why he should make the other fencing free. He said that he gave a concession which he believed was the most useful, but when it was brought to his attention that he did not select the most useful article for this concession, and that the other class of wire is coming more into use with the farmers, then, if he acts on the principle he announced, he should remove the duty on that class of wire the use of which is becoming more prevalent.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** That is a point upon which opinions differ. We were advised by gentlemen, who I am sure advised us in good faith, that the wire which we have made free is that which is most commonly used, and the freeing of which from duty would be the most acceptable to the farmers. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) expresses the opinion that the woven wire fencing is the most useful, but our information was in the other direction.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) got his information from the men who manufacture that class of fencing, and not from the agricultural community.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is no doubt aware of the source from which information was obtained in the past. While we were glad to hear the manufacturers, we did not in all cases rely upon them, and our information with regard to this item did not come from the manufacturers, but it came from the practical farmers of the country.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I am glad that this discussion has arisen. The impression has gone abroad in the country that the Government has benefited the farmer by giving him his wire fencing free, but it turns out now, that this impression is wrong, and that

**Mr. WALLACE.**

only the kind of fencing which is popular with the farmers is made free, while that class of fencing which is most desirable is still placed under a high protection. I do not find fault with the Government so much for their action in this matter as for their deception. It is just as well that the farmers of Canada should understand, that they are not getting what the Government has apparently promised them they should have.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It is well that before the item passes, the remark made by my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) should be repeated, because it will bear repetition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) is very decided in his opinion, that barbed wire is a very bad fence and that it is going rapidly out of use. Being a very bad fence and going rapidly out of use, my hon. friend Mr. McGregor is very much in favour of that being made free. But, the other is an excellent fencing and is coming widely into use, and my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) who is eaten up with zeal for the farmers, is in favour of having the bad fencing which is going rapidly out of use, made free, and also in favour of putting a 25 per cent protection upon the fencing that is good and rapidly coming into use.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** It is very like the preferential trade which is nominal. This preference to the farmer is nominal also.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** If our information is correct, over 6,000 tons of barbed wire were sold in the year, and instead of it being a waning industry as some argue, it is contended on the other hand that the sales are constantly increasing. If the hon. gentlemen opposite consider, that giving 6,000 tons of wire fencing to the farmers free of duty, is of no advantage to them, well, of course we will have to leave the statement as it is made by them. In addition to that, galvanized wires of the numbers we have mentioned are also on the free list, and whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say in reference to the matter, I think our agricultural friends will believe that there has been an honest effort made, and a successful effort made, to give them relief in this item.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Now, I shall have to ask my hon. friends opposite for some information. We have been very chary in asking for information. I do not think that in the whole course of this discussion on the items, we have asked more than a very few questions seeking real information, and to nine-tenths of those we have received no answer—either the notes were not here or there was no answer to be given. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) has undertaken to do away with the protection on barbed wire, and he says his information tells him that 6,000 tons of that wire are used each

year. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) has also undertaken to put 25 per cent duty, with free raw material, upon another industry. Will he tell this committee how many factories there are, that are making this wire fencing, and about how many thousand tons of wire they are supposed to use in the year? Hon. members will see, that no well based conclusion could be come to without information covering the question I am asking. I hope the Controller of Customs will be able to give that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I certainly cannot, and I do not think the Controller of Customs can tell off-hand, the number of factories engaged in that industry. I may inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), that this item was put in the tariff, from the point of view of what would be agreeable to the farmer rather than what would be agreeable to the manufacturer.

Mr. FOSTER. I commend this answer of the Government to the House. Here is a line of conduct taken, which branches off in two directions as adverse from each other as pole is from pole. One item is free and the other has a duty of 25 per cent on it, and free raw material. The Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs have come to their decision, and neither of them is able to tell us the reasons why; neither of them is able to tell us the extent of these manufactories or any facts about them; and when we ask for facts, they say: We were completely indifferent to the facts; we just framed this item of the tariff in deference to what we think would be agreeable to the farmers. Now, does this committee approve of an answer like that? Agreeable to the farmers. Does any one mean to tell me, that farmers would not be agreeable to having this woven wire fence, which is the best kind of fence, at a reduction of 25 per cent on the duty, so that they could use it upon their farms at 25 per cent less cost, according to the contention of gentlemen opposite? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) mean to say that the farmers would throw that opportunity over their shoulders? Take the hon. gentleman's own petty reason that he gave, insufficient reason that he gave, absurd reason which he gave: That when they framed this tariff and put a big duty on one kind of fence, and took the duty off the other kind, they were not looking into the facts at all, but they were just doing what they thought would be pleasing to a class. I commend that answer to the committee and to the country. I say, that hereafter, the committee will be obliged to ask for more information before these items are passed. It should not be possible for gentlemen in the Government to pass an important question in the tariff item like this, while they had not, and have not to-day.

any information on it. My hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) told us, that one single industry used a thousand tons of wire, and he mentioned two, or three, or four others. Does my hon. friend know, whether or not the woven wire fence manufacturers will consume 6,000 tons of wire this coming year?

Mr. MCGREGOR. They do not use barbed wire at all.

Mr. FOSTER. No one said they did. No one uses barbed wire until it is made out of plain wire, with the barbs on it. My hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) in his benevolence is so glad that this is a bad fence, and that it is going out, because it adds to the monopoly they have established, with 25 per cent on it and free raw material.

Mr. TAYLOR. And a patented article as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Very likely patented. The hon. gentleman who framed this tariff ought to be able to give the committee some information. I would like to know, when they framed this tariff, about what they calculated on as the output of this wire on which they have placed a 25 per cent protection.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) forgets that a very large proportion of this wire is used by the farmers themselves on the ground when they build their fence, and it does not go into the factory at all. This wire is sold by merchants all over the country, to farmers, for that special purpose, and there is no factory at all so far as I know. I did not know about the factory that my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) refers to in Windsor. I handle a very large quantity of this wire, and I know that it is sold to the farmers, and that they themselves weave the fence on the ground as they are putting it up.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Wood) is right to some extent, but how many farmers can get the machinery which is necessary, or have the facilities necessary to do that.

Mr. TALBOT. Every one of them.

Mr. FOSTER. The very fact that one factory in Essex uses a thousand tons of wire in a single year, shows that the farmers do not, and cannot, all make their own fences.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I do not know that the fence referred to by the hon. member for North Essex is the same kind of fence that the farmers make themselves. It may be a different kind of fence altogether, and therefore I think that the bulk of this 9, 12 and 13 is wire that will be used purely and simply by the farmer in making his fences as he puts them up.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Controller if this wire fence is patented?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There is no patent on the wire which the farmer will bring in and make his fences with.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not ask that question, and the hon. gentleman knows I did not. I did not ask him whether there was a patent on wire, but whether there was a patent on that wire fence to which he is giving a protection of 25 per cent and free raw material.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman kindly name the fence he refers to?

Mr. FOSTER. I will refer my hon. friend to the hon. member for North Essex.

Mr. WALLACE. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are begging the question. When making these changes, they should not ask this side of the House what kind of fence is meant. Did not the hon. member for North Essex give them the information, and do we not know that every one of these different kinds of fences is patented? Even the straight line fence, made of a little wire with upright posts, cannot be made except with the permission of those who have the patent right for the locality. Every kind of wire fence is protected by a patent right. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) talks as if he were talking from information obtained from the farmers. He is a wholesale dealer; he does not sell a pound of wire to a farmer; he sells to the retail dealer, and he has no personal knowledge of what the retailer does with the wire. The hon. member for North Essex says that the Government have made a wonderful stride towards giving the farmers free fencing, and giving satisfaction to all. Of course, they are giving splendid satisfaction to the enterprise in which he is interested, and which he has been booming these two days in Parliament. The Controller of Customs told us that there were 6,000 tons of barbed wire used in Canada, and when the ex-Minister of Finance asked him how many tons of this fencing were used which it is now proposed to make dutiable at 25 per cent and free raw material, the Minister of Finance was compelled to say that they did not know anything about it. If they know all about one wire manufacture in this country, they should be able to give us information about the other. I would like to ask whether these three kinds of wire are the kinds used in the manufacture of barbed wire in this country to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We so understand.

Mr. WALLACE. And practically the sizes of the wire used in the manufactory at Walkerville. The hon. member for North Essex told us that instead of No. 13, they would have preferred No. 14; but if No. 14 does you will find that No. 13 does very well too. The next point is this. This

Mr. FOSTER.

industry is protected by a patent. Hon. gentlemen say that the farmers can buy a machine and make their own fences. They cannot do it.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There is a machine which has been sold throughout the country during the last four or five years, costing \$50, with which every farmer can make his own fencing.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is the same kind of fencing that is made at Walkerville.

Mr. TALBOT. No, it is not exactly the same. It is made with either five, ten or six strands, and with a diamond-shaped pattern. It is made with 9, 10 and 12 wire, the weakest being put at the bottom and the strongest at the top.

Mr. WALLACE. It is not the same as the fence made in Essex at Walkerville, because the hon. member for North Essex says they prefer 9, 12 and 13 wire. The hon. gentleman said there was a kind of fencing which was not protected by a patent, but which a farmer could make with a machine costing \$50. He has to buy the machine for \$50; but the hon. gentleman has not told us whether the farmer has to pay any royalty on the fencing afterwards.

Mr. TALBOT. None at all. He has only the machine to buy.

Mr. WALLACE. We do not know anything about that fence, but we know that it is not the kind of fencing made at Walkerville. I think the Government should give us some information about these manufactories that are going to get their raw material free and an uncalled-for protection of 25 per cent on their manufactured article—a greater protection than was given before, because they had formerly to pay a duty on their raw material.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say just a word in reply to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). In my section of the country there is a very large amount of wire used in the construction of fences, and there is no patent at all. The wire used is not barbed wire, but common galvanized wire; and each farmer, with very little instruction, and with his son or with another man, can build all the fences on his farm. It is no doubt for that purpose that are used such large quantities of wire as were referred to by the hon. Controller of Customs.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is wrong in saying that 9, 12 and 13 wire is used in the construction of rail fences lapped with wire. It is very much smaller wire—4 or 5 gauge exclusively. The hon.

member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) talks about a machine that can be purchased for \$50 to build a fence. \$50 will purchase all the wire required to fence the average farm in this country.

Mr. TALBOT. Oh, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend may laugh, but there are very few farmers who will invest \$50 in a machine to build a barbed wire fence or any other kind of fence. I want to submit this question to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who says he is a large dealer in this wire and will import it after the 1st of January for fencing purposes. If I come to him and purchase large quantities to string on telephone or telegraph poles, where will the duty come from? The same wire which I use for telephone and telegraph purposes is that which my hon. friend will have imported free for fencing purposes.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That point was discussed last night. The Controller of Customs, of course, will have to make regulations for the protection of the revenue, and I am quite satisfied he will be able to do so. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) makes a rather rash statement when he says that I do not know what use is made of the wire which is sold in my place. I know perfectly well what the farmers do with it in our section. They use a very large quantity in making their own fences, and it is for that special purpose that I sell it. The wire which comes in and which is used in the making of those fences is free, and surely hon. gentlemen cannot object to the farmers being given that advantage.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite sure the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) is rather misleading the House when he gives the impression that the farmers build those woven fences themselves. In my section I have seen a good many fences built, but know of no instances in which the farmers have built them. Men go about the country who are practical fence builders. They have the machinery for putting up the fences and they charge the farmers for their work. It is true that the farmer may furnish the wire, but still it requires a certain amount of mechanical skill to weave those fences, and they are not put up by the farmers themselves. In my opinion, the duty on this class of fence is altogether too high, when we take into consideration the promise of the Government that the farmers should have free fencing material.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I think a little confusion has arisen in the minds of hon. gentlemen who are not familiar with farm work. There is, it is true, a large number of different patent fences used in the country, but, at the same time, there are thousands of miles of fencing which are not patented in any way

whatever, but are simply wire strung upon posts and fastened by staples. Very frequently barbed wire is used, but plain wire is also frequently used, and the plain wire used for this purpose are the gauges put in here as free, and it was for the purpose of allowing the farmers to obtain these gauges at the lowest rate possible, that they were made free. A farmer can build his fence with this wire without paying any royalty or being interfered with by anybody. He simply buys rolls of plain wire and stretches the wire on posts and fastens it to these posts by staples. When we come to deal with patent fences, that is an entirely different matter. The duty on those should be as low as possible, but, at the same time, the men who make that fencing will have to be taken into account. The fence alluded to by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the Page Wire Company's fence, which is made in Walkerville, is a patent fence. It is a fence which has horizontal wires that are drawn out from a coil spring, and the gauges run all the way from as low as seven to as high as fourteen, and they have, besides, across them a thin light wire to bind them together. That kind of fence is done up in rolls and shipped all over the country and is excellent for certain purposes, but it is expensive compared with the kind that the farmer can build for himself out of the wires put in this item as free. Those who wish to put up a moderately cheap fence are not going to buy the Page Wire Company's fence, or any of these patent fences, but will buy the plain or barbed wire in rolls, and put it up themselves, without paying any royalty or being interfered with by any patent.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Agriculture is as well informed with regard to the custom of other parts of the country as his own, because I know that in my section several suits are pending at present with regard to the right of farmers to use the Page wire fence. I think he will remember that I submitted to him a question only a short time ago on that same subject on behalf of some of the farmers of my section. They complain that it was a very onerous burden imposed on them to compel them to pay a heavy rate to the patentee for using this fence. It has seemed to me very doubtful that a patent should be given for this or any other kind of wire fence. If the hon. Minister looks into the matter I think he will agree with me that the twisting of wire one way or another is not an invention that ought to be patented. All over the country actions are being instituted against the farmers for having used the Page fence, and we find that the Page Company have not only the right to claim something on account of their patent from the farmer, but are protected to a great extent over and above that. If there is any kind of fence which should be

made free, it is the Page wire fence, because it is largely in use, and our farmers have been harassed and annoyed by parties coming around to them selling the fence, and then others coming around to collect damages because the farmers have used it.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister of Agriculture is mistaken when he says that fences constructed with rails and wire are not patented. I took the trouble last autumn to inquire from the Department of Agriculture, and I found that there was a patent on record, and that it had been renewed, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that that patent is still in existence. I think the fence was called the Shad fence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. What I said was that there was nothing to hinder anybody planting posts and stretching wire from one to the other. The fence to which the hon. gentleman refers is a peculiar construction with wires woven together. I believe there was a patent issued for some such fence in years gone by, and in my section of the country considerable disputes arose out of it. Some men built that kind of fence and refused to pay the royalty and the courts were appealed to, and those who sued for the royalty were defeated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had better reserve the item. The intention of the Government, of course, was not to include woven fencing in the free list; and I do not reserve the item with any expectation that we shall be able to put it on the free list, but I think it is a fair question, in view of what we have heard, whether we should not fix a lower rate of duty than 25 per cent on woven wire fencing. We might postpone the item with a view to further discussion, and we will consider it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would submit again the suggestion I made to the hon. Minister of Finance that the Government should consider also the placing of telephone and telegraph wire on the free list. Nos. 9, 12 and 13 are generally used for this purpose. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) has stated that he has sold a great deal of galvanized wire to be used for fencing. Every person will import these numbers for fencing, and then the material will be sold for any purpose. If the item were worded "when used exclusively for fencing" that would improve it, but without some such provision these numbers of wire will be imported for all purposes, and this cannot be prevented.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad the Finance Minister has decided to reserve this and I hope the result of his reserving it will be that the wire other than the barbed wire that the farmer uses will be placed on the free list. My hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said that 6,000 tons of barbed

wire was used. That means 12,000,000 pounds. Now, suppose we take \$100 as the average amount that the farmer would spend on wire, which is lower, I believe, than would be required. Counting it at three cents per pound, which is much lower than is paid for it, this material would be used by 3,600 farmers out of 790,000 farmers in Canada. That shows that the other wire is coming into use, and the statement made by the Controller of Customs is an argument against the clause as it is; it is really an argument in doing what I hope will be done when the Minister comes to consider this matter—place all wire used by farmers for fencing on the free list.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) knows, the removal of the duty on barbed wire by the Government has met with the very hearty approval of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. The conditions of life in that country are somewhat different from the conditions of life here. The people of this part of Canada can afford to put up a more expensive fence than can the farmer of the North-west. I believe that there is not a rod of woven wire fencing in Manitoba and the North-west for every twenty miles of plain barbed wire fencing. The farmer is poor, very often; he has very long fences to put up to inclose his crop, and the only thing he can use, though dangerous and disagreeable, I admit, is barbed wire. The posts are put far apart and there are usually three strands of wire. Barbed wire is a necessity in the North-west. I think the Government deserves credit for making us this concession, and I trust they will see their way clear to reduce the duties on other wire fencing. On behalf of the farmers of the constituency of Macdonald whom I represent, I beg to thank the Government heartily for the reduction they have made.

Mr. SEMPLE. There is no doubt that the wire that has been put on the free list by the Government is the wire that has been approved by the farmers for a number of years past. The wire that hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to have reduced, is only on its trial as yet. But the farmers are making inquiry as to its merits. However, we know that the barbed wire has stood the test of time. If a farmer puts up a proper fence there is no danger of animals being hurt under ordinary conditions. As timber becomes scarce, wire will be used for fencing to a greater extent than at present. I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia on one occasion state in this House that wire was manufactured in this country for less than \$3 per 100 pounds, but the farmers of the North-west had to pay \$7 per 100 pounds. So I can readily understand that free wire for fencing will be a boon to that country, and to Ontario as well, to have it placed on the free list. If the wire

Mr. SPROULE.

fencing referred to by hon. gentlemen turns out to be what is claimed for it, I am sure my hon. friends on the Treasury benches, who have been studying the interests of the farmers and are ready to do what is possible for them, will place that fencing wire on the free list also, if it proves satisfactory for fencing purposes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Semple) refers to my previous struggles in regard to this matter. He is aware that, in consequence of my efforts in this House, the previous Government reduced barbed wire by 50 per cent. If they had remained in power they would have done what is done under this tariff as regards this item. I do not see that I suggest anything unreasonable in contending, as I contend now, that not only should barbed wire be on the free list, but, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) has suggested to his friends in the Government, we should, in the interests of the farmers everywhere place other wire on the free list. For the hon. gentleman admits that it would be a desirable thing if the farmers were to use wire not barbed in their fences.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope it will be carried. I hope that the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs, when they put their heads together, will carry out our wishes in this matter.

Item allowed to stand.

Wire, single or several, covered with cotton, linen, silk, rubber or other materials, including cable so covered, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the former duty on that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirty per cent.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The duty on this was 25 per cent in the first place and now it is made 30 per cent. I would like to know why this is done. This material is largely used by electricians, and I have received letters complaining of this change. This wire is not manufactured in the country, and I think it should be put back to 25 per cent at the most.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has been misinformed; this wire is manufactured in the country to a considerable extent. The rate at which we leave it is the rate that it bore under the old tariff.

Wire, viz. :—Brass wire, plain, ten per cent ad valorem.

Copper wire, plain, tinned or plated, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Wire cloth, or woven wire of brass or copper, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wire of all metals or kinds, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why the Government ask the House, in the first instance, to make brass wire 20 per cent and have now gone back to 10 per cent. It seems to me another case of sudden conversion, and we should be made acquainted with the basis of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the direction of cheaper raw materials for the benefit of the manufacturer, whom my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would like to help, and we are not so hard-hearted that we should not help him whenever we can.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is travelling north by south on this question. First he travelled north by doubling the duty on this material, and then he travels south and gets back to the old and reliable tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not the old, and it never was the reliable tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. This is exactly the old tariff. Brass wire was 10 per cent under our tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) proposed to make the duty 20 per cent, but now he has gone back to the rate under the old tariff.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It is 7½ per cent under this tariff, the hon. gentleman will notice.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does 25 per cent off 10 leave?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is a little ahead of time. The Government have been going forward and backward and—

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. What does 25 per cent off 10 leave?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. gentleman to answer my question, but I have put so many posers to him of late that I hardly care to press this one.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the Government whether it would not be possible to simplify that item. There is first a duty of 10 per cent, then 15, then 25, and then 20. Now, the information I have is that it is really impossible for this industry to maintain itself successfully with the duty in that position. What the manufacturer requires is a duty of 15 per cent on brass and copper wire; and the last item, wire of all metals, that is wire not provided for in item 255, should be 25 per cent. We have already had an experience of the reduction to 20 per cent. In 1894 there was a reduction from 25 to 20 on four kinds of galvanized wire. Under that reduction the industry was crippled to a considerable extent and the effects were felt in the im-

portations which took place from the United States. Thus, from March to June, 1894, 1,500 tons were imported, valued at \$57,000. During the year ended June, 1895, 2,800 tons were imported from the United States, valued at \$87,000. From June, 1895, to June, 1886, 1,400 tons were imported, valued at \$46,000. Therefore, the industry during that period of time was affected by the reduction to 20 per cent. Now, we have heard that the Government have done much for the farmers. There is no doubt that they (the farmers), may receive some benefit under the terms of item 255. They get what benefit may be derived from barb wire and certain gauges of wire being free, but the manufacturer loses his output of 6,000 tons yearly. It is further claimed, as I suggested yesterday, that with the reduction 1 to 20 per cent on the steel wire and to 10 per cent on brass and copper wire, we cannot compete on account of coal being dearer here, on account also of the increased prices of sulphuric acid, and the freight rates generally being dearer all over this country than they are in the United States. When you add to that the fact that our output is diminished by 6,000 tons a year, it is easy to see that the diminution to 20 per cent is calculated to cripple us beyond what I think is the intention of the Government. Now, in connection with this I will mention a fact which I think I am correct in stating, that of some of those woven wire fences to which allusion has been made, the best are covered by patents. Now, it is a curious thing that these patents manufactured from Nos. 10 and 12 are the gauges that are going to be admitted free under 255; the other patents manufactured from Nos. 7 and 9 are not admitted free; so there is an anomaly which I think would justify the Government in holding over this item for consideration. Now, as regards these woven wire fences which are covered by patents, the duty of 25 per cent upon wire represents a cent and one-eighth per rod, I think, or a cent and three-eighths on each rod of these patented fences. Well, these patentees have never complained of the duty and it is not probable that if there is any reduction, they on their part, will diminish the cost of these fences, of which they have a monopoly, to the consumer. I think that if the Government intend at the same time to favour the farmer and to protect this industry, they should take into consideration this representation, which I do not make in any carping spirit of criticism. The duty should be 15 per cent on brass and copper wire, and on the other gauges that are not provided for in 255 and steel wire should be maintained at 25 per cent. I must be remembered that this is a very large industry, manufacturing over a million dollars' worth of products every year, in which there is a capital of \$600,000, employing 350 workmen or more, paying wages to the extent of \$150,000 a year, paying immens

Mr. MONK.

freight rates, I think over \$160,000 a year, to the railways, consuming 12,000 tons of coal a year, most of that coal coming from Nova Scotia, and also, if I mistake not, over \$30,000 worth of acid, and \$5,000 worth of muriatic acid, employing carters to whom they pay in the aggregate over \$10,000 a year. The committee will see that this is a large and important industry, and the town of Lachine will be materially affected if these representations are not taken into consideration by the Government, as the town of Lachine is largely interested in the maintenance of that industry, and is crippled by the fact that the barbed wire industry is going to cease. It is only fair, I think, that these representations should be taken into consideration by the Government.

Iron or steel nuts, washers, rivets, and bolts with or without threads, and nut, bolt and hinge blanks, and T and strap hinges of all kinds, n.e.s., three-quarters of one cent per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DAVIN. Why has this specific duty been kept here?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest that the word "and" in front of the letter T be struck out, and after hinges put in the words "and hinges." I may inform the hon. Controller that there is a certain kind of hinge that is neither T nor strap. It is screwed into a post and afterwards fixed by bolts, and they are used for heavy doors. I understand that last year there was some difficulty in regard to them under the tariff. They are made at Gananoque and another factory in the west. No doubt the present item is intended to cover these hinges, but I suggest the amendment in order to make the wording clear.

Mr. DAVIN. Under the old tariff the duty was 1 cent and 25 per cent. It has been reduced to three-quarters of a cent and 25 per cent.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. This reduction in the duty was made because the manufacturers did not consider it sufficient. We have adopted, in this case, and in one or two other cases, specific duties and ad valorem duties combined. Under the old tariff the duty was 1 cent and 25 per cent, which we have reduced to three-quarters of a cent and 25 per cent. In regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Taylor), we have provided for different varieties of hinges, as the hon. member will see by looking at the item.

Skates of all kinds, roller or other, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the former duty?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Ten cents per pair and 25 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman considered the keen German competition in

the skate industry? If so, has the hon. gentleman come to the conclusion that 35 per cent will be sufficient to retain our skate industry as against cheap German labour? I made a reduction in the duty on skates, but I found that unless a small ad valorem duty was imposed, German skates of inferior quality but of good appearance, would certainly take this market out of our hands.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. No doubt the representations made to the Government in regard to German skates point in the same direction as the remarks made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Skates are undoubtedly a luxury in a certain sense. They are paid for by a class of people who can afford to buy them, and they are not used every day in the year. It would be only a small heroic action to place our industry in a safe position, and prevent our workmen being turned out of work on account of the goods being brought in from Germany.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The representations made by parties engaged in the manufacture of skates were in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman. However, it was pointed out, on the other side, that the duty was 35 per cent and that this was a fair protection, even if we adopt the principle of protection as being sound. In fact, most of the advocates of protection consider that a duty of 35 per cent is adequate. I am well aware that parties interested in this question are very anxious as to this competition. I hope their anxiety will prove to be without foundation.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The statement that the manufacturers will have free steel and a protection of 35 per cent may sound very well, but when you come to consider the amount of steel which enters into this manufactured article, the duty will be found to be utterly inadequate to meet the low rates secured by cheap German labour. Besides, the hon. gentleman is estopped from pleading that he cannot give more than 35 per cent, because he has already done so in several instances.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I should be very glad if the hon. Minister of Finance could see his way clear to the further revision of this item. Under normal conditions the duty proposed should certainly be considered sufficiently high, but it is very much lower than that which has heretofore existed, and I am not sure that the Government is not moving too rapidly in respect to this industry in the direction in which I am bound to support them in moving, and in which I thoroughly believe they should move. I do not propose to make any motion, for I fear that from the point of view of abstract justice the proposed duty is as high as the industry has a right to ask for, but I shall be very glad if the Government will reserve the item for further consideration.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. In view of the representations made by both sides of the House, I will let the item stand over and look further into it. With every desire to help the industry, the Government thought they were doing as much as was expected under the circumstances, but we will reserve the item and again go over the figures.

Item allowed to stand.

Files and rasps, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. **CRAIG**. I wish to say a few words on this item, and in doing so I shall not speak for politics, nor for "Hansard" but purely as a matter of business. I want to talk to the Minister of Finance and to the Controller of Customs, and I trust that they will be able to accede to the reasonable request that I shall make. We have in Port Hope a rasp and file factory which has been in business for many years, and which employs about 70 hands. Even with a duty of 35 per cent they have not been able to make a great deal of money. They pay about \$350 a week in wages which, is a very important thing for a town like Port Hope. I do not suppose that this is a convincing argument, but I may say, that nearly all the merchants of that town belong to the Liberal party, so that the money goes in the right direction.

Mr. **LANDERKIN**. The same all over the country now.

Mr. **CRAIG**. I wish to lay before the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs, the arguments which have been placed before me by the manufacturers in reference to this matter. They object to the duty being reduced from 35 to 30 per cent, because the Americans send in a low grade of files at a very low price, and a reduction of even 5 per cent in the duty makes it very difficult for them to compete with this second-rate class of American goods. When the duty was 35 per cent these manufacturers asked me several times to try and get a specific duty on this low grade of files, but I was not able to get that done. I think myself that a specific duty ought to be placed on these very inferior articles, because they ought to be kept out of the country altogether. There are enough of them made here without importing them from the States. The Americans unload these inferior files on Canada, and so keep up the prices of the first-class article in their own country. Our Canadian manufacturers believe that this reduction in the duty will encourage the importation of low grade files, and consequently will seriously cripple their business. I know that at the present time they are looking into the matter, and they are afraid they will have to reduce the wages of their working people, which are none too high at present, and to run on short time, as they have been ob-

liged to do on some occasions in the past. They tell me that they are not afraid of English competition, because the files which come from England are of a higher grade and are bought by persons who want the expensive articles. The price of the low grade of American files being very low, the ad valorem duty does not amount to very much. These manufacturers would be satisfied with a duty of 35 per cent instead of 30, and it does not seem to me that it is an unreasonable request to make. I do not believe that any one in the country would have the slightest objection to the Government restoring the old rate of duty. If hon. gentlemen opposite can show that this request of mine would increase the price—I do not believe it would—then I have nothing more to say. But, as this reduction of 5 per cent is not going to reduce the price to the consumers, and as it will have only the effect of reducing the wages of the working people and crippling the industry, I think I have made out a good case why the old duty should be continued. I ask the Government to give this matter their best consideration, and to comply with my request and the request of those interested in this industry at Port Hope, if it is possible for them to do so.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am surprised to hear the eulogy passed on these files by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig). If there is a poor class of files made in this country, it is the file made at Cobourg.

An hon. MEMBER. Port Hope.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). When he talks about a low quality of file coming in from the United States, I can tell him that there is not so low a grade made in the United States that I know of as is made in Cobourg.

An hon. MEMBER. Port Hope.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes, Port Hope. A large quantity of American files are brought into this country, but they are of a far superior grade, and are sold at prices much higher than my hon. friend's constituents can get for their files. The people who want a first-class article would never think of buying a Port Hope file. I suppose they make them as well as they can, but they do not put the material in. They get their steel free of duty, but they buy an inferior quality of steel, and employ inferior workmen, and therefore must turn out an inferior article. We would never think of importing anything so common as is made in Port Hope. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) that 30 per cent and free raw material is all that file is entitled to. If they were making a first-class file such as we import from England and the United States, I would be happy to buy large quantities of them, but you cannot expect people who are using large numbers of files in their workshops to use an inferior article,

Mr. CRAIG.

made of inferior steel, and by inferior workmen.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) is not an unprejudiced witness in this case, because he is an importer and a dealer, and that class of our business men do not want to pay any duty at all if they could help it. I do not blame them for trying to get goods in without duty, if they can. Personally I am not a judge of files, and I do not pretend to discuss the technical aspect of the question. But, I do not think the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) is justified in saying that the factory in Port Hope employs inferior workmen. How does he know that?

Mr. WALLACE. He said Cobourg.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes, he said Cobourg, but he meant Port Hope. He was trying to say Port Hope, but he did not want to talk as he has done about the place in which I live. If all the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) is as reliable as that which he has just given to the House, we need not pay much attention to him. I understand that the Port Hope people brought some of the very best workmen they could find in Montreal. They employ 70 hands and keep their factory going. They do not make very much money, because as they tell me it is hard to compete with these poor files which come from the United States. That is their statement to me, and I believe it to be correct. The additional 5 per cent duty is not too much to ask from the Government, and especially so as the reduction of 5 per cent will do nobody any good, while it will do this file factory at Port Hope a great deal of harm. I merely put it on that ground. I do not know anything about the quality of the files. I know that the importers, as a rule, would rather sell an article made in England or in the United States than a Canadian article, if one is as good as the other; and that is one reason why they do not like this factory. I want to ask the Government to reconsider this matter. If they can see their way to restore the duty to 35 per cent, it will not injure anybody. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) himself has said that these people sell their files very cheap. That is an argument in favour of what I ask the Government to do. I repeat that I am merely speaking for the working people employed in that factory, and I am sure that the merchants of the town, of whom a majority are Liberals, will endorse what I say. They do not want to see the factory closed up. The reduction in the duty will do no one any good except the importers. I have no doubt the hon. member for Hamilton will pocket that 5 per cent; but I do not think the wages of these working people should be cut down in order to give him an extra five per cent. If the Government will allow the item to

stand, and can see their way to increase the duty to 35 per cent, they will do a good thing, will not hurt anybody, and will earn the gratitude of these men.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am perfectly willing, if the Government think proper that these people should have an extra per cent. That is not the ground on which I object to the hon. gentleman's remarks. If he says that they manufacture a first class article—

Mr. CRAIG. I did not say so. I said nothing about the quality of the files.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If the Government put on the extra 5 per cent, I have not the slightest objection. From the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would suppose that it was a crime to be an importer. I do not feel that way. The interest of the workingman seems to be their present cry; but the Government, by the tariff they have brought down, are showing themselves to be the friends of the workingman. I can tell the hon. gentleman that when Canadian goods are equal in quality and price to imported goods, my firm give the home manufacture the preference. We judge workingmen by the work they turn out, and I can say that the class of good made at that factory are not up to the standard of goods which first-class merchants will sell. They may peddle a few files through the country, but the large houses do not care to buy them. I know the gentleman who manufactures them; I buy large quantities of other lines of good from him; so that I have no prejudice against the files. If they came up to the standard, we would buy as many of them as we do of others.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is very unfortunate that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) should advertise this firm as turning out inferior goods and keeping inferior workmen. I think it is gratuitous on his part and unkind to the firm. The hon. gentleman is not perhaps aware of the fact that a number of the workmen employed there were originally from Hamilton. If they were employed in Hamilton, they would be first-class workmen; but when employed elsewhere, they are of an inferior grade. If the hon. gentleman has considered the injury he might do the firm by that advertisement, I am sure he would not have done them that injustice.

Mr. CRAIG. I would like to hear what the Government have to say in regard to the request I make.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If necessary, before the tariff is concluded, we will be glad to reconsider it; but I do not think the hon. gentleman has made a sufficient case for an increase. This reduction is clearly in the interest of workingmen and mechanics, and for that reason I think th

hon. gentleman will see, on reflection, that we ought rather to be complimented upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe that 90 per cent of the manufacturers all over the country use these files. We use them in our carriage factory. The number used by carpenters does not amount to 20 per cent of the whole.

Mr. CRAIG. I hold that this reduction will not reduce the price to the workingmen at all. The price of a file is a very little thing, after all; and, as the hon. member for South Leeds says, 90 per cent of these files are used by manufacturers. These have protection on their own industry, and if the matter were put to them, I am satisfied that they would be quite willing that the duty should remain at 35 per cent. I believe that if I put the case squarely before an audience of farmers, they would be willing to have it remain at that figure. I trust the Minister of Finance will allow the item to stand. If it is once carried, I am satisfied that it will be the end of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is always room for hope.

Mr. CRAIG. I will not have so much hope if it is carried as I would have if it were allowed to stand. I am satisfied that this change is going to injure the workmen at Port Hope, who are the only men I am considering.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the Minister could fairly accede to the request of the hon. member for East Durham, because that hon. member is a protectionist and is asking for something in the line of protection. A few moments ago an hon. gentleman who represents Halifax asked to have an item stand in the interest of a manufacturer in his constituency, and I would ask him how he can justify that action, because I find that in the parliamentary herd book he is described as "a free trader in theory, believes this should be the ideal to be pursued, with due regard to condition created by the bad policy of the Liberal-Conservatives."

Mr. RUSSELL. It surely does not call for the brilliant intellect of the hon. member to perceive that what he has read is exactly in line with my present suggestion. I am asking the Government to have due regard to the "conditions created by the bad policy of the Liberal-Conservatives."

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman is only a free trader in theory, but when the question comes home to him he is a protectionist.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Government's proposal in this instance is not very far wrong. Thirty per cent protection and free raw material ought to be quite adequate for this industry.

Item agreed to.

Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.e.s.; shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for the same; and lawn-mowers, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Considering the fact that steel and iron have been reduced, this is too high a protective duty on spades and shovels. These implements are used by the labouring classes, and I think the Government should reduce the duty to at least 25 per cent. I can see no reason why spades and shovels should be charged 35 per cent when axes, scythes, reaping hooks, &c., are charged only 25 per cent. I hope the Minister will reserve this item.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a factory at Gananoque, which turns out, according to its own statement, about 9,000 dozen spades and shovels, of which the average price is \$7 per dozen; 35 per cent duty would give this institution a protection of \$22,500, which is altogether too much.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who put the price on them?

Mr. McMULLEN. I did.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give my hon. friend all the shovels and spades he requires at \$4.50 a dozen.

Mr. McMULLEN. Even that would be \$15,000 protection, which is too much to give one factory.

Mr. ROGERS. I cannot see why we should put lawn mowers in the same class of goods as spades and shovels. I think myself that 25 per cent is ample for this low class of workmen's tools. In all these matters, where there has been a reduction in the duty on the raw material, there should be a corresponding reduction in the duty on the manufactured goods.

Item agreed to.

Britannia metal, nickel silver, Nevada and German silver, manufactures of, not plated, and manufactures of aluminum, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) what he thinks of silverware being charged only 25 per cent and spades and shovels 35 per cent?

Mr. FOSTER. The workmen of this country are going to use silverware after this.

Item agreed to.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid, one-fourth of one cent per square inch.

And matrices or copper shells for the same, two cents per square inch.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the words, "one and one-half cents" be substituted for "two cents," in the second paragraph of the item.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. WALLACE.

Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like some explanation of that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that an increase or not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will reserve this item.

Item allowed to stand.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

#### PILOTS—QUEBEC AND MONTREAL.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the pilots serving between Quebec and Montreal.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HENDERSON. It is very important that we should have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) here to give an explanation of this Bill. I understand that it is of more than usual importance.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. This Bill has been discussed in the Private Bills Committee at two sittings and all interested parties have been heard at length. It is quite unusual to discuss again a Bill that has been so closely considered as this has been. I never saw a Bill more freely discussed in committee than this.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be quite true that the Bill has been discussed in the Private Bills Committee. Still, I understand, it is a Bill of very great importance, and we should certainly know from the Government what their position is in regard to the matter.

Mr. PENNY. I do not wish to raise opposition to this Bill now, but I think it should be distributed in printed form before it is passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the Bill has been distributed.

Mr. PENNY. I have not received a copy.

Mr. MAXWELL. I have not received a copy; I do not know the first thing about it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will read the clauses.

Mr. PENNY. But I think we should have copies of the Bill before us.

Mr. GUAY. The Bill has been distributed, according to the report of the clerk of the committee. He told me on Monday, when the Bill was called, that it had been distributed to all the members.

Mr. PENNY. I have not had my copy.

Mr. GUAY. It may be in the post office.

Mr. PENNY. I have had my mail every day and have received no copy. I do not wish to raise any serious opposition to the Bill, but I think we should have the re-printed Bill before us.

On section 3,

Mr. HENDERSON. As the Minister of Marine is in his place, I think we should have his opinion as to this Bill, and the statement whether the Government approves it and takes the responsibility of it. This is an important measure and it ought to be in the hands of the Government, or so drafted so as to meet their approval.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). As the Bill was introduced, the Government did not think it in proper shape, but after the discussion and hearing the commercial interests of Montreal represented in the Private Bills Committee, and also hearing pilots who are more especially concerned, the Bill was very materially altered. As it came in first, it was a compulsory Bill, but it is now a voluntary Bill. Nobody is obliged to join this trade guild unless he wishes to do so, and if he wishes to do so, he becomes amenable to the rules of the society. If he does not wish to join he can apply to the Pilot Commissioners, known as the Harbour Commissioners, who have jurisdiction over these matters, and obtain a pilot's license from them, and not come under the jurisdiction of the corporation created by this Bill at all. So there will be two distinct bodies of pilots in Montreal after this passes. It is true they may all come under this Bill, but they are not obliged to do so, and the Harbour Commissioners can license others than those who belong to this corporation to act as pilots on the St. Lawrence.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 122) to amend the Acts relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Davin.)

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We will now proceed with the items on the free list.

Mr. TAYLOR. The ex-Finance Minister expected that he would be in the House by the time that we got this amount done. I would suggest that we should take up the free list, and go through it all but reserve the item of corn, on which there will be a discussion, and let the discussion be general on the whole of the clauses.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Very good.

Travellers' baggage; and articles by mail or by express, valued at not more than fifty cents for the whole importation, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The object of exempting from duty parcels valued at not more than 50 cents, is one which, I am sure, will have the sympathy of the House. It is a great inconvenience both to the individuals importing and to the customs authorities, to have to deal with small items of that nature. The bother is greater than the money is worth. Still, on reflection, we see that it is capable of being abused, and we have concluded to drop that portion of the item.

Mr. TAYLOR. Which portion of the item?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We propose to strike out the following words in the item:—"And articles by mail or by express valued at not more than 50 cents for the whole importation."

Mr. TAYLOR. Very good.

Books, viz.: Books on the application of science to industries of all kinds, including books on agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fish and fishing, mining, metallurgy, architecture, electric and other engineering, carpentry, ship-building, mechanism, dyeing, bleaching, tanning, weaving and other mechanic arts, and similar industrial books; also books printed in any language other than the English and French languages, or in any two languages not being English and French, or in any three or more languages; and bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books and religious tracts.

Mr. ERB. I wish to ask the Minister of Finance under which of these headings Sabbath school lesson pictures would be classified? There has been considerable complaint about the duties charged on these pictures that are used for illustrating Bible history. Sometimes they were charged 25 per cent duty, sometimes 35 per cent, and sometimes they were allowed to come in free. Apparently doubts existed in the minds of the collectors as to which item of the tariff they should be classed under. It apparently is the intention of the Government that all these things used for educational purposes should be free. Under this item 445, bibles and prayer books and religious tracts are allowed in free, and it occurs to me that Sunday school lesson pictures should be included in this item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe the Controller of Customs would interpret

that clause to mean that they would come in free. Religious tracts are of the same class as those mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Erb), and I think the Customs Department would allow these pictorial lessons in free. They are not religious tracts, but they are designed for the same purpose. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Erb) would allow the item to stand for a moment, we will try to add some words which will meet his views.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Acting on the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, I propose at the end of 445 to strike out the word "and" so that it will read: "hymn books, religious tracts and Sunday school lesson charts."

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I scarcely think the word "chart" will comprehend what the hon. gentleman intends. I understand that he refers to pictures illustrative of the Sunday school lesson.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Then let it read: "Sunday school lesson pictures."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Books, not printed or reprinted in Canada, which are included and used as text books in the curriculum of any university, incorporated college or normal school in Canada; books specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, libraries of universities, colleges and schools, or for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific or art association or society, and being the property of the organized authorities of such library, and not in any case the property of individuals,—the whole under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs,—provided, that importers of books who have sold the same for the purpose mentioned in this item, shall upon proof of sale and delivery for such purpose be entitled to a refund of any duty paid thereon.

Mr. **ROSS ROBERTSON**. I wish to ask the Controller whether, if a bookseller has these books in stock and sells them to any public library or university, he will obtain a refund on the production of a proper certificate?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. Yes, I think so.

Newspapers, and quarterly, monthly and semi-monthly magazines, and weekly literary papers, unbound; and tailors', milliners and mantle-makers' fashion plates.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. How would this clause be affected by the Bill which is being passed through the Senate, prohibiting the importation of newspapers which contain accounts of a prize fight? It seems to me that there would be a conflict between the legislation of this House and the legislation of the other House if this clause were passed as it stands.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If the question were to arise, I fancy that a

Mr. **FIELDING**.

special Act passed in that relation would govern. However, that Bill has not yet become law.

Paintings, in oil or water-colours, by artists of well-known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists; and paintings in oil or water-colours, the production of Canadian artists, under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

Mr. **ERB**. On this item I wish to make a few remarks. I will not take up the time of the committee in repeating what I said the other night. I will simply add that so far as I can see, the main reason given for allowing works of this kind to come in free was their refining influence. Well, their refining influence will not be lessened by the fact that the owner of them pays duty upon them. Music to my mind exerts a greater refining influence even than paintings, and yet, musical instruments are taxed from 25 to 30 per cent; so that on the ground of consistency we should either allow musical instruments to come in free or we should tax oil paintings. Then we are told that in the United States paintings of this kind come in free. That may be quite true; but I cannot see the force of that argument. If we are to imitate the tariff of the United States, we would not have been wasting two or three days in discussing free corn. Further, the tax imposed on this class of imports would fall on shoulders that are well able to bear the burden. For these reasons, I move that this item be amended by adding thereto the words: "when imported for the use of schools of art," and that the following item be added to schedule A:—

Paintings in oil or water-colours, by artists of well-known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think my hon. friend had better confine his motion to this particular item. I do not think he can go back and make the amendment he proposes in schedule A. He proposes not only to strike paintings out of the free list, but to go back and impose a duty upon them. If he strikes them out of the free list, they become dutiable as unenumerated articles. Addressing myself to the main part of my hon. friend's motion, while it seems to be rather plausible that the wealthy classes who buy pictures shall pay duty on them, it seems to be generally conceded as sound policy to encourage the importation of good pictures. These are necessarily valuable, and a duty upon them would be large enough to prevent even a wealthy man importing them. We have not many men who can afford to bring in good pictures, and I do not think we ought to discourage their importation by imposing a greater restriction upon them than we have done in the past. I admit that there is something to be said on the other side, but I think the

balance of the argument is in favour of admitting them free, as we have done in the past. I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion, because I fear that if we adopted the policy of placing high-class paintings on the dutiable list, we would not be taking a progressive step.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I trust that this House will do nothing to discourage what I regard as of great importance to this country. The importation of articles of this kind is declared by all the authorities in art and literature to be a most effective means of inculcating in the people a love for art and cultivating their taste in what every civilized country looks upon as one of its chief sources of national pride. The result of my hon. friend's amendment would simply be to prevent the importation of valuable paintings, because people will not bring in works of merit and great value if they have to pay a duty on them. This would be a great disappointment and a great drawback to our art schools, because every work of an old master, which is brought into the country, is a source of education in itself that cannot be too highly valued. In fact it is to obtain access to such works that our artists cross the Atlantic and make great sacrifices in order to frequent the art centres of Europe, and it seems to me we would be taking a step backwards if we were to adopt this amendment.

Mr. ERB. From all that has been said, I am not yet convinced that a tariff which allows such articles to come in free and which professes, at the same time, to be a tariff in the interests of the labouring classes, is one that can be justified on the ground of either consistency, justice or common-sense. My amendment makes provision for the free admission of these things, when imported for the use of schools of art, just as we allow books to be used for educational purposes to come in free. Of course if any change be made in the free list, it would in my opinion necessitate the transfer of the item to some other part of the tariff.

Mr. ROGERS. While I should be sorry to do anything that would interfere with the progress of the people in the culture and love of art, I sympathize with the object of the mover of the resolution; and as we shall have an enormous amount of revenue to raise, we ought not to hesitate raising it on articles of this kind which are, after all, articles of luxury imported only by people who can well afford to pay the duty. I am in favour of reducing the taxation on the necessaries of life as much as possible and levying it to the fullest extent on the luxuries.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Erb) to levy a duty on certain

articles is not in order and I cannot put it to the committee.

Item agreed to.

Duck for belting and hose, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories; and canvas or fabric, frictionized for the manufacture of bicycle tires when imported by the manufacturers of bicycles for use exclusively in the manufacture of bicycle tires, in their own factories.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I may just as well now as on any other item raise the point I have raised once or twice before. I object to any manufacture having the right to import anything free that I, as a merchant, am not permitted to import free also.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a big question.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It is a big question. I do not see why there should be legislation in favour of one class alone. I as a merchant, should have the right to import articles for the use of manufacturers, who perhaps, are not able to import, at just as cheap a rate as those manufacturers who import for themselves. I do not care whether the articles are dutiable or free; I contend that I should be placed on the same footing as others in the country. There are several items of this kind, and, to my mind, they are vicious legislation. I draw the attention of the Minister of Finance and Controller of Customs to the fact that there are manufacturers who are not able to import these goods as the large manufacturers are, and they have to apply to a merchant to import these goods for them. We may be told that we can import the goods and have them delivered direct to the party who wishes to use them. But that may not always be convenient. We may not be willing to hand over to a weak man a large importation of goods that may not be used for six months; we have to hold the goods and supply him day after day out of stock. But, in such a case, the merchant has to pay a duty while the large manufacturer can import duty free.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I shall have to come to the rescue of the Government on this occasion. It seems to me that this is a principle that has been settled long ago, and, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) has accepted nearly the whole of the National Policy, he need have no hesitation in taking this part with the rest.

Dyeing or tanning articles, in a crude state, used in dyeing or tanning, n.e.s.; berries for dyeing or used for composing dyes; tumeric, nut galls and extracts thereof; lac, crude, seed, button, stick and shell; indigo, indigo paste and extract of, and indigo auxiliary or zinc dust; persis, or extract of archill and cudbear; terra japonica, gambier or cutch, extract of logwood, fustic, oak and oak bark; camwood and sumac

and extract thereof, tanner's bark, hemlock bark and oak bark; ground logwood, ground fustic, and ground oak bark; iron liquor, solutions of acetate or nitrate of iron for dyeing and calico printing; madder and munjeet, or Indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of; red liquor, a crude acetate of aluminum prepared from pyroligneous acid, for dyeing and calico printing,—free.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I will ask the Minister of Finance if he will be good enough to make a slight addition to this item, and after the word "bark" in the sixth line, add the word "quebracho" so that it will read "oak bark and quebracho." This is an extract of the bark of a tree produced in Argentina. It is only in recent years that it has come largely into use by tanners of glove leather, for tanning purposes. As nearly every other extract used by them is on the free list, you might just as well put this one on also. I would be very happy to hand the Minister any further information he might require with respect to it. It would simplify the tariff by making this addition.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** If the hon. gentleman will favour me with a memorandum, we will be glad to give it attention, and in the meantime reserve the item.

Hides and skins, raw, whether dry, salted or pickled, and raw pelts,—free.

**Mr. DOUGLAS.** I do not see why hides should be put upon the free list. If we are to carry out the avoirdupois system, we will not be able to sell our hides in the west to advantage. It is a well-known fact that at the present time they have no value. The freight rates from Australia are so low that hides from that colony can be placed in Montreal at 75 cents per 100 cwt., while the rate from Winnipeg is 73 cents. I hope the Government will take this matter into their consideration, and that some change will be made in the interest of the farmers of the west.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** The hon. gentleman stated the other day that the farmers of the Northwest did not require protection on their farm products or on anything else; yet the hon. gentleman now advocates protection on hides. I do not think there is much consistency in his attitude.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I do not think that the members on the Opposition side of the House should allow this statement to go unchallenged. In this country we require a great many more hides than we produce, and it is certainly in the interest of our industries that hides should come in free. Hides from South America do not come into competition with hides we produce in this country. If we should tax hides imported for making sole leather, we would simply be placing a tax on the finished article, because we do not produce

**Mr. HENDERSON.**

them of sufficient weight to make sole leather. This country has no difficulty in consuming all the available hides. If the farmers in the west could find means of sending hides to the eastern market, they would find no difficulty in disposing of them at fair prices. The demand here is far more than we can possibly produce.

**Mr. DOUGLAS.** We cannot get any price at all there—that is the trouble.

**Mr. RUTHERFORD.** While generally I have very much pleasure in endorsing the remarks of the hon. member for Assinibola (Mr. Douglas), I think the hon. member is not so well informed on this subject as he is generally. I may make a quotation from the report of hides market at Winnipeg on 28th May, as follows:—

Market for hides is weak and the tendency is lower. About 6 cents is the price paid for some brands, and this price, they claim in the local market, is about the Chicago basis.

I acknowledge that the hide market is a very variable one, but during last year very good prices have been paid for hides in the Manitoba market.

Oleo-stearine and degreas, when imported by manufacturers of leather and binder twine for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** I propose to amend the item by striking out all the words after "degras," so that oleo-stearine will be placed on the free list for all purposes.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** Will this oleo-stearine coming in free, interfere with the coarse grease which the farmers produce in this country?

**Mr. HENDERSON.** I think I shall have to take exception to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). I feel satisfied that the putting of oleo-stearine on the free list will in no way interfere with the sale of the farmer's tallow, nor any other grease that is produced on the farm. In 1894 I was instrumental in having this article put upon the free list, for the benefit of the harness leather tanners in this country. It was discovered that it was the best grease that could be obtained as a dressing for harness leather, and that without stearine, which is the proper name—the word "oleo" should never have been put there—Canadians were unable to compete with the harness leather makers of the United States in England. I was assured of the fact, that if oleo-stearine were admitted free into this country, in a very short time a larger market would be created for farmer's tallow to mix with this oleo-stearine, than was obtained before. I have watched the market carefully since, and I know that farmer's tallow has not decreased in price. I believe that a larger amount of farmer's tallow is used by tanners to mix with oleo-stearine than was formerly used alone, so

much has the manufacture of harness leather increased in this country. I am perfectly satisfied that the Government is right in placing this on the free list, and I am sure that it will in no way depreciate the value of the farmer's tallow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw my objection then.

Salt, imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.

Mr. McMILLAN. The salt industry is a very important industry in this country, and it has been in a very depressed condition for some time. One of the causes of this depression is the large quantity of salt that comes into this country duty free. No less than 215,000,000 pounds of salt are imported into Canada duty free, while only 84,000,000 pounds of salt are manufactured here. In the province of Ontario, we manufacture all the salt produced in the country, and the industry is in such a depressed condition that three-fourths of the wells are out of running order. There are two reasons for this. One, the large quantity of salt that comes into the country free of duty for the gulf and sea fisheries, and the other, the high railway freights charged in Canada. I am perfectly satisfied, from an examination of the amount of salt that comes in duty free, that a very large quantity is imported free of duty, which is not used for the gulf and sea fisheries, and this is a great injustice to the salt industry in the province of Ontario. Let me give an instance of the heavy rates charged by railways in Canada for carrying salt. From Syracuse to Hamilton, 215 miles, the rate is 7½ cents per one hundred pounds, or 3·48 cents per hundred pounds per hundred miles; while the rate from Seaforth to Hamilton, 84 miles, is 9 cents per one hundred pounds, or 10·71 cents per hundred pounds per hundred miles. Salt is carried in the United States for one-third the rates for which it is carried in Canada, thereby preventing our salt manufacturers from supplying the market of eastern Canada, which they would be able to do if the railway rates on salt were as low in Canada as those charged in the United States. I would also point out that 35,000,000 pounds of salt are imported, not from Britain, and not from any of her possessions, but from foreign countries, free of duty. While it may be necessary to bring in free salt from Britain and her colonies, I hold it should not come in from foreign countries, free of duty. We imported from the following foreign countries, free of duty, these quantities of salt :

	Pounds.
Dutch West Indies.....	7,707,780
French West Indies.....	2,823,430
Italy.....	13,123,800
Spain.....	6,371,800
United States.....	5,349,120

Now, I hold that that is an injustice to our salt manufacturers. They are placed at a disadvantage compared with the United States in the fuel that is used in the manufacture of salt. In the United States they have their coal dust or coal slack free of duty, whereas in Canada there is a duty on that article. I hold that the Government should impose a duty on salt coming from foreign countries, and that they should give the Canadian producers of salt, the slack free of duty. The Government should either do that or impose a duty upon what salt comes into the country, and give a rebate of that duty upon the salt that is used in the gulf and sea fisheries. By that means, all the salt that comes into the country would pay a duty except what was used for curing fish. Including the 176,000,000 pounds of salt we get from England and her colonies, about 215,000,000 pounds of salt are annually imported free of duty, and it is absurd to say that all that is for use in the gulf and sea fisheries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We can hardly adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) to remove salt from the free list, but the statement my hon. friend has made as to the quantity of salt that is brought in, outside of what was the intention of the tariff law, is well worthy of consideration, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs will investigate that, and see that if the present Act is passed we will impose upon the free importation of salt all possible restrictions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I ask the Minister: If we impose a duty upon salt will it not be injurious to the farmers of this country?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not want any further duty to be imposed upon salt. The salt manufactured in Canada is used on the farms, but the salt that is imported is not used by the farmers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to see that my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) is becoming an ardent protectionist.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not a protectionist, but I believe that as long as protection exists in this country, every industry in Canada should have its fair share of protection, and it ought not to bear unduly heavy upon any one industry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I must say with regard to the salt industry, that I endorse the sentiments of my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan). I believe that the salt industry has been overlooked, so far as western Ontario is concerned. I do not for the minute admit that in taking this position I am advocating the system of protection. I agree with my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that taxation is an injury to every one who has to bear it, and especially so to the farmers of this country. We would be all very glad if it could be

swept away. I am not advocating in any sense the system of protection, but so long as we have this system of collecting taxes, I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mc-Millan) that it should be equalized, and that every person should pay his fair share of taxation. Other industries are being protected, and the salt industry, which is a very legitimate one in this country, has not, in my opinion, had the same consideration that has been given to other industries which do not provide as much employment.

Mr. CAMERON. The time of the committee, in my judgment, is not of the slightest importance compared with the importance of this industry. Before salt was discovered in western Canada some years ago, we depended largely on English salt, which was then selling at from \$2 to \$2.50 a barrel. Salt was first discovered in Goderich, the town in which I live, and shortly afterwards the price of salt was reduced largely, and it has gone down gradually until it can be bought at the wells at about 50 cents a barrel. I say openly to the Minister of Finance that, of all the industries in Canada from first to last, there is no industry which has received such scant consideration at the hands of the late Government and at the hands of the present Government as the salt industry. Up to 1890 coarse salt from Great Britain or any British possession for the sea and gulf fisheries was admitted free. The salt manufactured in western Canada had not and have not now any objection to that provision of the law. But we in the west have to pay duty on the coal we use, not only in our houses, but in the manufacture of salt, and we protest against fine table salt being admitted free from Great Britain or elsewhere. It is well known that in Goderich, in Clinton and elsewhere, fine imported salt is sold side by side with the Canadian salt, because it comes in free, and the freights from east to west are very low, as it is carried in bulk. We cannot compete in the United States market because their duty is 12½ cents per hundred weight, while ours is only 7½ cents per hundred weight. If we could get into the American market on even terms with the Americans, we would be prepared to compete with them and beat them; but we cannot get in there. In 1894 a change was made in our tariff by the late Government, by which the duty on salt was reduced very largely, and fine salt was admitted free from Britain and the British possessions. If the hon. Minister of Finance wants to do equal justice to all the industries in Canada, he ought to take into consideration the important salt interest of the west. In the town of Goderich alone, before 1890, there were thirteen salt manufacturers. The effect of the tariff of 1890 was to cripple all these but three, and the effect of the change made in 1894 was to wipe them all out but one. In Clinton, prior to 1894, there were three,

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

and there is only one now; at Seaforth there were three, and there is only one now; at Exeter I believe there was one, and I do not think there is any now. The effect of the change in 1894 was in fact to wipe out of existence the whole salt industry of the west. Surely that is not a desirable condition of things. Suppose our salt industries were all closed up, what would be the result? We would go back to the condition that we were in when salt was first discovered in Goderich, and instead of paying 50 or 75 cents a barrel, we would be paying \$1.50 or \$2. Surely, it is time for this paternal Government, composed of the wise men from the east and from the west, to take into consideration the necessity of extending some consideration to the salt industry of Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there any combination?

Mr. CAMERON. There is no combination now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There was.

Mr. CAMERON. There was a combine, just as there was a combine of the flour men and the mill men. There is no combination, but of the three or four salt manufacturers who are now doing business it was found that each one had to employ an agent and keep up a staff of officers, and they have combined to sell all their salt through one agent. This saves a large expense, otherwise they could not live at all. All we ask is that the Finance Minister should consider the claims of the salt industry. We do not ask that salt used in the sea and gulf fisheries should be taxed, but we want some tax imposed on American salt, and salt coming from any other country which is not so used. This is not protection in the ordinary sense of the word, as hon. gentlemen opposite understand it. It is maintaining and keeping alive one of the most important industries ever established in Canada.

Mr. MCGREGOR. One of the great reasons for the closing up of some of the salt factories my hon. friend speaks of was the great find of salt in Essex, which has now the honour of being the greatest salt field in this country, producing 800 barrels a day. In 1893 we found a vein of over 200 feet in depth of solid salt; but we have more veins than that. Another advantage we have is that the salt is dried by a new process, which does the work much more cheaply than the old process, and the fuel required for the purpose is taken from the earth, in the form of natural gas. I believe it would be in the interest of all that fine salt coming from the older countries should have a small tax on it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Say protection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, Sir. I am not particular about having a heavy tax imposed.

I think we can beat the world. We have the cheapest and best quality of salt used in America. 99 per cent of it is pure salt, and we have nothing to fear except perhaps some of the very cheap salts that come to this country as ballast.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to corroborate the statement of the hon. members for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and West Huron (Mr. Cameron) with regard to the importance of the salt interests.

An hon. MEMBER. Another protectionist.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am not a protectionist, but I say that when an incidental protection is given to an industry it should be given in the fairest manner possible. As my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has said, the salt industry has never been treated in a fair and just way. It employs a very large number of men, pays out a large amount of wages every year, and is taxed for its raw material to a great extent. On the coal and iron and nails and everything else it uses it is heavily taxed, and for every one barrel it manufactures there are two imported from abroad free to compete against it in the Canadian market. All we ask is that a tax be put on the fine salt imported. We are not opposed to coarse salt coming in free for the use of the deep sea and Gulf fisheries, but are opposed to this fine salt being imported here into our markets and brought into the middle of the territory where our salt is found. In 1894, I think a clerical error took place in the wording of the item. If the hon. Minister of Finance will look at it for a moment, he will see what we want. "Salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession or imported for the use of the sea or Gulf fisheries," is the reading of the item as it stands at present. Now, if the words "or imported" after the word possession be struck out then the item will read: "Salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession for the use of the deep sea or Gulf fisheries." This change will be quite satisfactory to the salt manufacturers. I hope the hon. gentleman will let the item stand so as to give it further consideration and do justice, as far as possible, to the salt interests.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I am surprised to hear such strong free traders talk protection. If they propose to offset the duty on coal by a duty on salt, let me say that the fishermen of the maritime provinces, in whose behalf a duty is said to have been placed on coal, are heavily taxed for the clothes they wear and the beef and pork and mutton they consume, and last though not least, for the coal oil they use, and if they should happen to use any farming implements, they are heavily taxed for them also for the benefit of the western farmers and manufacturers, so that the fishermen

of the maritime provinces will certainly not be very much favoured even should the salt manufacturers of the west fail to secure protection,

Item agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are a number of items from "A" to "L" under No. 568, and I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the fact that I would like to have another item added to these, which would read as follows:—

Norway iron and steel in bars, round or flat or square, when imported by manufacturers of drop forgings, carriage hardware or threshing machines, for use in their factories and in the manufacture of these articles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will write out the item and hand it to me, we will consider it, and in the meantime pass those we have here.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall do so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What is the object.

Mr. TAYLOR. The manufacturers of carriage hardware use exclusively Norway iron not made in this country, and which is dutiable, and they are as well entitled to their raw material as the other class of manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not know that I would object on that score, but it occurs to me that charcoal iron is the same quality as Norway iron.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What is the distinction between Norway iron and charcoal iron?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know, but I know that Mr. Gillies imports Norway iron for his industry and so do other manufacturers.

Tea and green coffee imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea and coffee purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, provided there is satisfactory proof that the tea or coffee so purchased in bond is such as might be entered for home consumption in the said United Kingdom.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the desirability of having a small duty on tea. One great reason is that it is a first class revenue bearer. We do not produce anything of this kind in this country, and every pound brought in would have to pay a revenue into the treasury. Again, if you have a small specific duty on tea, it will have the effect of driving a lot of lower Congou teas out of the market. Teas are being imported at 7 cents and 8 cents per pound which are not fit for any person to use. I believe it would be in the interest of every one concerned that there should be a small specific duty on tea.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. In consideration of the extreme assiduity and attention to business manifested by the House, and the unparalleled progress which they have made with the tariff in committee, I think we are entitled to adjourn, although it is rather early in the evening. I therefore move that the House adjourn.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I would ask in the usual way what business the leader of the Government proposes to take up to-morrow.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think probably, on the occasion of the first sitting, we will take up the Fast Line Service, and thereafter, either the Estimates or the Tariff, as the case may be. Possibly some of the minor Bills later on may be taken a stage.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the judges thereof—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

**HENRY MUMA, OF DRUMBO.**

Mr. **SOMERVILLE** asked :

Is Henry Muma, of Drumbo, official referee, still in the employ of the Government? If not, has he been dismissed? Has the office been abolished? Has he been superannuated? If so, what is the amount of his superannuation allowance?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am advised that that gentleman is still in the employ of the Government. The other portion of the question is answered thereby.

### QUEBEC LANDSLIDE CLAIMS.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** asked :

1. Was a commission appointed to investigate the claims of certain citizens and inhabitants of the city of Quebec in connection with the landslide from the Citadel rock into Champlain street?

Mr. **DAVIS** (Saskatchewan).

2. When was this commission appointed?

3. Who are the members and officers of said commission?

4. Has the commission made a report, and if so, when was said report made and received by the Government?

5. What does said commission recommend?

6. Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the recommendation of said commission?

7. When does the Government intend to come to the relief of the sufferers from the said landslide?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. Yes. 2. In February or March last. 3. The members of the commission are William Cook, Q.C., Fergus Murphy and Dr. John Howe; and the secretary is T. D. Beattie. 4. The Commission has made a report, and recommended the payment of a certain amount in settlement of the claims made. I think the amount is in the vicinity of \$38,000 or \$40,000. 6. Yes, it will be dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates.

### MR. CARSTENS, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, WINNIPEG.

Mr. **DAVIN** (for Mr. Roche) asked :

1. Has Mr. Carstens of the Immigration Office, Winnipeg, been dismissed? If so, why?

2. Has his place been filled by the appointment of another gentleman? If so, who received the appointment?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Carstens, of the Immigration Office, Winnipeg, has been dismissed; cause, active political partisanship. The place has not been filled.

### NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. **McINNES** asked :

1. Did the Government advertise for tenders for a semi-weekly mail service between Nanaimo, Comox and intermediate points?

2. If so, when did the advertisement first appear, and how long did it run? Up to what time were tenders receivable? Were any tenders so received, and if so, from whom and for what amount?

3. What amount is paid the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company for the present weekly mail service between the said points?

4. Were any of the said tenders accepted? If not, why not?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). The Government advertised for tenders for a semi-weekly mail service between Nanaimo, Comox and intermediate points. The notices calling for tenders were dated the 20th November, 1896, and instructions were given for publication for at least six weeks, and the department has no reason to believe that it was not fully published. The 5th February, 1897, was the last day for receiving tenders, and only one such tender was received, namely, that of the Esqui-

raalt and Nanaimo Railway Company at the tender price of \$10,400 a year for a service twice a week. The amount paid for a weekly service is \$630 and the Government regarded the tender of \$10,400 as excessive, and for this reason was unable to accept it.

#### ST. GERVAIS AND ST. CHARLES MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Have tenders been invited for the carrying of the mails between St. Gervais and St. Charles in the county of Bellechasse ?
2. If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender ?
3. To whom was the contract awarded ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. Tenders have been invited for the mail service between St. Gervais and St. Charles railway station. 3. On the expiration of the time for receiving tenders the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer and the matter placed in the hands of the inspector for completion. The department has not yet been advised as to whether the contract has been completed, but so soon as it is the other information asked for in the question, if then desired, will be furnished.

#### CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee, to-morrow, to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, in his discretion, repay to any person heretofore or hereafter dismissed from the public service the whole, or such portion as he deems advisable, of the amount contributed by such person to any civil service superannuation fund, with interest, to the date of dismissal, not exceeding...per cent per annum.

Motion agreed to.

#### STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 113) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act (Mr. Davies), was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Under the law at present, a fourth class engineer can only act as assistant to a second or third class engineer. This permits him to act as assistant to a first-class engineer.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved that the word "temporary"

be inserted before the word certificate after the word "A" in the third line.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### REGISTRATION OF CHEESE FACTORIES AND CREAMERIES.

Bill (No. 117) to provide for the registration of Cheese Factories and Creameries and for the branding of dairy products, and to prohibit misrepresentation as to the dates of manufacture of such production (Mr. Foster), was read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. CHARLTON. I have one question to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in regard to this provision. When is it intended that this Act shall be brought into force? The provisions of this section might work, at first, with undue harshness in the case of individuals innocently acting in ignorance of the provisions of the law. Time should be given to allow the public to become apprised of this law, but I do not see that any provision is made as to the time when it shall come into operation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This Bill is permissive in its character, not compulsory. The registration of factories is entirely permissive. If the factories do not wish to register, they do not need to do so. If they do register, they are protected in their rights. The only penalty imposed is where a person wilfully and with knowledge misrepresents things. I do not think it would be necessary, in that case to give any further than the ordinary notice of the coming into force of the law. But I may say that it is my intention, immediately on the passing of the Act, to notify by circular letter all the cheese factories in the country.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

#### PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 120) further to amend the Patent Act, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I am asked to explain this Bill. I may simply say that the object of the Bill is to abolish the office of Deputy Commissioner of Patents, and to restore the former arrangement under which the Deputy Minister of Agriculture acts as Deputy Commissioner of Patents. It repeals the Act

which provided for the establishment of this new office and restores the office to the old form. That does away with an expenditure of \$2,800, the salary of the Deputy Commissioner of Patents, as the Deputy Minister of Agriculture does the work without any addition to his salary.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SECOND AND THIRD READING.

Bill No. 115) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Sifton.)

#### FORGED ENDORSEMENTS OF BILLS.

Bill (No. 123) respecting forged or unauthorized endorsements of Bills, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On subsection 3 of section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to say what the similar English provision is ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This is intended to introduce into our law section 60 of the English law.

Mr. CHARLTON. I submit that the provision here "within a reasonable time" is indefinite. What is meant by within a "reasonable time." It might be half a dozen days, or as many months.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We allow it to remain indefinite so as to put the matter at the discretion of the court. At the present time, under the first section of this paragraph, the notice must be given within the year, but there are times when a year will be much too long. Therefore we leave it as it is provided for in the Bill of Exchange Act, for the court to determine what is a reasonable time.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would not that be inviting litigation in reference to this matter ? Would it not be possible to make a more definite statement ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think myself that it is better to leave it in this way. Take, for instance, subsection 3 of section 36 as to bills payable on demand, where we leave the courts to determine what is a reasonable length of time. That is the principle which is generally adopted throughout the Bills of Exchange Act. In subsection 2 of section 45, the same principle is embodied. It is better to leave it to the court to decide whether under the circumstances, the delay has been reasonable.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not an unusual way of dealing with these matters, because, if the Bill fixed the time,

Mr. FISHER.

in some cases it might be too long, and in others, too short.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THE VOTERS' LIST.

Bill (No. 126) respecting voters' lists (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was read the second time and considered in Committee.

#### THE FISHERIES ACT—SAW-DUST IN STREAMS.

Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Fisheries Act (Mr. Davies) was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). This Bill is for the purpose of extending the time during which saw-mills in operation can put saw-dust in streams, the time given being one year. Some of the mill-owners, particularly those on the Ottawa River, cannot get new machinery necessary to deal with the saw-dust other than by putting it in the river, within that time. Some of these mill-owners waited on the Government, and convinced the Government that they would suffer almost irreparable loss unless they were given an extension of time for one year. The Government resolved to come to Parliament and ask for this extension, at the same time resolving to give an intimation that Parliament would not give any more extensions, and that at whatever cost the mill-owners would have to obtain the necessary machinery next year, at which time the Fisheries Act would go into full operation. Of course, this Act will not apply to new mills, and is confined entirely to mills in operation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the policy of the hon. Minister in regard to emptying saw-dust in the streams ? Is it his intention to enforce the law rigidly, or to go easily ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is pretty hard offhand to make any statement in regard to going easily. I have endeavoured to carry out the policy of the department without change. I could not, however, resist the application of these gentlemen. One owner of a mill, which cost a very large amount, and who has every desire to conform to the law, stated that it was quite impossible to get his mill in shape to handle the saw-dust, otherwise than by putting it in the stream, for another year. I do not believe that Parliament will listen to applications for any more extensions, and it was with the greatest possible reluctance that I consented to recommend this extension. There is a very strong feel-

ing in Ottawa and outside this city that the time has come when the mill-owners must make provision to deal with the saw-dust otherwise than by throwing it into the stream. I wish to take this opportunity to emphasize this announcement, and to say distinctly that we cannot give any further extensions, and this will be the last time an extension will be given.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I feel inclined in all these matters to do what I can to support the administration of the law by the department. There is no department where the duties are so unpleasant often as the Marine and Fisheries Department. I wish to suggest for the consideration of the Minister, that the time has come for the Government to turn over very seriously a good many of these clauses of the Fisheries Act. As a matter of fact, the weakness on the part of the department for many years has been that those who are very severely punished by the law in connection with the dumping of saw-dust, are able to point to the fact that those who commit the same offence on the Ottawa River, are let go scot-free. It is often times most difficult to explain to the parties most interested, how it is, that the conditions are such in these cases, that one party is punished and the other not. In consequence of this, the department has not had that public support which is so essential for the enforcement of all these laws. If in the experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) as Minister, he finds there are some clauses in that Act which cannot be universally enforced even after the efforts that have been made during many years, then I think it would be well to wipe them off the Statute-book altogether, and to insure that only such restrictions are imposed in connection with our fisheries as the department is determined in every case to have carried out.

Mr. CHARLTON. The criticism of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) apply with peculiar force to the administration of the Fisheries Department under himself and his friends while they were in office. I do not remember them having taken any action similar to that taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) for the terminating of this, what I must call a nuisance of dumping saw-dust into the Ottawa River. That thing was permitted to go on year after year by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and his colleagues, and the first Government of Canada that has grappled with the question is the Government now in power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say so unhesitatingly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The present Minister of Marine will not corroborate you in that.

Mr. CHARLTON. No notice has ever been served on the mill-owners on the Ottawa River, as is now done, that this dumping of saw-dust must cease within a reasonable time. To-day, the first practical step is taken to abate this nuisance, and the Government in my opinion have acted judiciously in the course they have taken. The mill-owners must have time to make preparations to erect burners to consume the saw-dust and notice is given them that they must do that. The mill-owners will understand that arrangements must be made for disposing of saw-dust in some other way than at present. I believe that the mill-owners will find that this is not so difficult or expensive as they now anticipate. As a lumberman, I heartily endorse the action that the Government has taken in the premises. I think the lumbermen of the Chaudière must themselves recognize the fact that this pouring of saw-dust into the Ottawa River has gone on long enough, and that their own interests even are in peril, through causing an obstruction to navigation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has been so often at Washington when this Parliament was sitting, that the discussion on this subject must have gone on when he was absent. Session after session the House of Commons considered the action of the department in this regard when I presided over it. No one accused the department (nor were they successfully able to do so) with anything like leniency in the treatment of the different mill-owners of this country with regard to this section of the Act. The charge that I had to meet was, that of cruelty and oppression, and that the officers of my department were enforcing the law to the detriment and injury of many of the citizens of this country. A great many men on both sides of the House approached the subject, I am bound to say, without any party spirit, but there was considerable difference of opinion as to what the policy should be, and as to what extent this law should be enforced. I appeal with confidence to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to repudiate the statements which have just been made to the committee by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). He told us, that this was the first time that the Department of Marine has taken anything approaching a firm stand, and that this was the first time that notice had been given to those mill-owners that they must put themselves in a proper condition to comply with the law. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has evidently not read this very Bill itself. This very Bill shows on its face, that the very same notice was given by Parliament a year ago, that within the time limited in the Bill the law would be enforced. I am not complaining of the Minister (Mr. Davies), but I wish to point out that instead of firmness being shown by the introduction of this Bill, the Minister actually

says to the mill-owners: A distinct legislative notice was given to you that the law would be enforced at the end of a certain time, but I now propose to postpone the enforcement of the law until another day, and I introduce this Bill to enable me to do so. I made my suggestion to the Minister of Marine in good faith, because there is the danger, that because of these constant postponements the lumbermen who do not approve of this class of legislation, may come to the conclusion that it only remains for them to wait until the statutory period expires in order to get further indulgence at the hands of Parliament. I know the embarrassment and difficulty that surrounds the Minister of Marine, and it would not be frank on my part if I did not extend to him such support and sympathy as I can when he is honestly trying to grapple with these difficulties. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has not yet had sufficient time to conclude as to which policy he will uphold—the abolition of that law altogether or its strict enforcement. I believe that during the year he will be able to consider the matter, and that next session he will be able to announce to us that he has taken a stand on one ground or the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has correctly stated the position I stand in. This is a very difficult department to administer. There are so many applications made from all parts of the Dominion, to the Minister, to endeavour to get him not to enforce the law, that the department sometimes hardly knows what to do. I have not yet been able to master the details of the administration of the department as thoroughly as I would like to, but I hope that before next session I shall have thoroughly made up my mind as to what portions of the law should be enforced, and what portions should not be enforced. With respect to those provisions which ought not to be enforced, I will try to remove them from the Statute-book altogether, in order that the portions of the law that remain shall be enforced; and enforced vigorously. There are certain branches of the administration of the law with regard to which I have made up my mind, and orders have gone out—whether it be at the expense of the loss of popularity or otherwise—that they shall be strictly enforced. I may say frankly, that during the last year or two—and I make no personal reflections on anybody—there was a little laxity introduced into the administration of the department which has imposed on me untold trouble. When once laxity is introduced, and the officers think that the department does not want the law enforced, whether from political considerations arising from elections or otherwise, the administration of the law becomes loose, and it takes a long time to get the machinery again in opera-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

tion as it ought to be. There are some points where I think the law has not been enforced as it ought to have been. But in respect to the immediate matter before the House, I have already stated the view of the department, and I am glad that some little discussion has taken place, so that the mill-owners may know what the mind of Parliament is. I know as well as I am standing here that application will be made next year for further time. They will want another year, and then another year; but, so far as I am concerned, speaking my own mind, I think this will be the last time of asking.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The last time of granting.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I mean the last time of my asking Parliament.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would like to emphasize what my hon. friends on both sides have said, and there is another reason for it. It is exactly six and twenty years since I put through the first Bill making the throwing of saw-dust into rivers an offence. Six and twenty years notice has been given to our friends on the Ottawa river to set their houses in order, and I think that is time enough.

Mr. KAULBACH. I quite realize the injury which saw-dust does to rivers, especially navigable rivers. At the same time, I would particularly request the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to exempt the small mills that are all but worn out or nearly out-of-date, but which still have a certain quantity of timber to saw. I think it would be hard treatment to compel them to come under this restriction as to saw-dust.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is worse in a little river than a big one.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have had to contend very seriously with the hon. Minister's predecessor, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, in consequence of the severity with which I thought he was dealing with some of the mill-owners in my county, who have been subject to very serious loss and inconvenience in consequence; and I ask now very particularly that these small single mills, as they are called, should be exempt from the operation of the Act. At the same time, while on my feet, I would ask the hon. Minister if his ruling with regard to the suspension of the operation of this Act on the Ottawa River is universal, and extends to the other parts of the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

## IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (N. 126) respecting the Voters' List.—  
(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

## SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section 26 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for twelve days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some Committee thereof, during such number of days, but that this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the said Act, and that in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present session it shall not apply to days prior to his election.

Mr. FOSTER. Having regard to the limited time before us, I only take occasion to ask my hon. friend who is introducing this resolution if he has lately read over his own utterances when on this side of the House, on the occasion of the appearance of such a Bill as this during the last three or four years? My speech would be simply to read from "Hansard," if it did not take up too much time, the earnest protest my hon. friend made against the bringing up of this legislation year after year—it had such a deleterious effect on the independence of Parliament, it was so small a thing to be dabbling in session after session, and if you were going to do it, you should bring in an Act and make it general. My hon. friend is halting in following our good examples, but when he has a bad example to follow, he jumps right in.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no occasion for my reading my speeches, because I had them in clear recollection. I have not changed my mind, but the circumstances were too much for me. We all know that this has to be done, and the question is whether it should be done by a special Act or by a general Act. My opinion was that we should do it generally, so that members would know how many days they would have; and had it not been for the disposition shown on both sides of the House to hurry up the close of the session so as to get through if possible by Jubilee Day, I would have pressed on my colleagues the advisability of bringing in a general Act; but, under the circumstances, I thought we would do this session what had been done before, and begin with a new resolution next year.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in committee, reported, read the first and the second times, and concurred in.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 132) respecting the Senate and the House of Commons.—(Mr. Davies.)

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries, including \$1,800 to W. J. Stewart, \$1,700 to Cameron Stanton, and \$800 to E. H. Gilbert, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act. \$55,780

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to remind my hon. friend of a subject which I brought to his attention on a previous occasion, and which I do not wish the hon. gentleman to lose sight of. It is very gratifying to me to know that, as a whole, the staff of the department is most efficient, and I do not wish to make any invidious distinctions, but with regard to a certain class of technical officers who were brought into the department from Kingston Military College by me, regardless of any political or provisional or personal considerations whatever, and who were required to do certain work, such as hydrographic surveys, to do which we were accustomed to borrow officers from the Admiralty—high-class officers enjoying good salaries, to whom we paid the salaries they had in the Navy besides what is called the colonial allowance—I wish to point out in what respect they are entitled to special consideration. Mr. Stewart, a Kingston cadet, is now doing for \$1,700 a year the work which Commander Boulton, who was borrowed from the Admiralty, was doing for the sum of \$5,000 a year, and Commander Boulton is reported as having said that the work of Mr. Stewart is just as efficiently done as was his own, and it has been accepted by the Admiralty, so that a British chart is made on the work of Mr. Stewart and the officers under him, and circulated over the whole world, and is just as good authority as if it had been directly prepared under the supervision of an officer of the British Navy.

Now, I hope that when we have that class of men in Canada we will not run the risk of losing them through being in any way niggardly towards them. I am very glad, for instance, to see Mr. Stewart's name. He is getting slow promotion and steady increase. But, when I asked for these men to be sent to the assistance of Mr. Stewart in that service, while, of course, making no positive promise, I held out to them the hope, having regard to system that obtained in the Geological Survey, that, while they would not get an increase from year to year as a matter of law, or as under the civil service proper, it would be for them to expect an annual increase in their salaries in connection with the satisfactory work performed by them. We got men of a

very high class, some of whom had obtained commissions at salaries, beginning at \$600, a mere nominal amount. Take, for instance, a man whose name is not here. He happens to come from my county, it is true; but I can assure the hon. Minister that he has had no communication with me since I left the department in regard to his affairs, or interests, or the business of the department. It is quite proper in his own interests that he should not be misunderstood in this connection. He is a graduate of that college and a gold medalist. He distinguished himself as a mathematician. The chief engineer of the department, in my time, has the highest appreciation of his services. It will be found that he received a very small salary, considering his ability and what the chief engineer will say in regard to him. I mention him as the one with others who are men of ability, men whom it would be worth the Government's while to take care of and remain in the service. So, I press upon the hon. Minister the merits of these technical officers—of course I do not wish to press their claims against those of men who are not strictly called technical officers. I am most earnest in their regard in connection with the official correspondence on file in which I held on hopes and encouraged these officials to believe that if they came to the Canadian service they would be treated fairly and not in a niggardly manner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am glad to hear what my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has said with regard to these officials. His views coincide largely with those I hold myself. The matter has been talked over by members of the Government from time to time, and I think my hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) has strong views upon the desirability of offering to those passing through the Kingston College the incentive of employment in the public service in preference to those who do not pass through that college. Coming to my own department, I called attention to the fact that Mr. Stewart should have a small increase, and the House was pleased to vote the sum I asked, \$100. I shall be happy to bear in mind the gentleman to whom he has especially called my attention—I presume he refers to Mr. Fraser. His name has been mentioned to me by several people, and I find on application to the chief of his branch that he bears a most excellent character. I can only say that I will look up the files in which he (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) as head of the department, made some statements to these gentlemen which he thinks it right that I should consider, and I shall be very glad to consider them.

Travelling allowances, Court of Queen's Bench and County Judges, Manitoba.. \$2,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In connection with the addition of county court

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

judge in the province of Manitoba, is the hon. gentleman able to say whether the appointment has been made?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot answer at the present time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call your attention to the fact that in September last it was deemed so urgent that this appointment should be made at once, owing to the congested condition of business in certain districts of that province, that the Government came down and, in advance of any Order in Council, under the Manitoba Act—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I suppose my hon. friend is referring to the appointment of Mr. Prendergast, is he not?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That appointment is made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understood the Solicitor General to say that he was not certain.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I meant that I could not now officially say whether he was sworn in or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I believe the papers say he was sworn in the day before yesterday. The Solicitor General, however, is unable to state here officially whether he is sworn in or not. But my point is this: If he was sworn in, it was only a matter of a day or two ago, in this month of June, 1897. I want to call attention to the position the Government took in September last. This was said to be so urgent a matter in connection with business in Manitoba and the litigation in that country, that the Government were unable to proceed in regular form and introduce an Act here constituting that office, but they came pell mell into the Chamber and asked for a vote, even in advance of the required action of the province of Manitoba whereby the judicial districts were constituted, which of course had to be constituted before the appointment of a judge or before the commission of the judge could issue. And strange things have happened. The money was voted in September, but no appointment was made at all, possibly—the Government are not quite sure about that—until a day or two ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). He was sworn in a day or two ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government are unable to tell us when he was appointed, but certainly he is performing no judicial functions in any part of the province of Manitoba even at this time. But extraordinary things have happened. I do not

wish to say anything about Judge Prendergast, now that he is no doubt after all, either appointed, or about to take his seat on the bench. I do not believe in attacking judges in any other way than that appointed by the law, and whatever may be said in regard to Judge Prendergast or any other judge in connection with the county court, it is a matter for inquiry by commission in connection with the judges of the Superior Court, it is a matter for inquiry for impeachment in proper form. But I am referring to the position of the Government, which is a most extraordinary one, because notwithstanding that extraordinary haste very nearly a year ago, there was not only a delay in the appointment, but there were negotiations; there were negotiations, for instance, in which the gentleman who is said to be now appointed judge, was an important actor. There were negotiations in connection with which the present Minister of the Interior was an important actor. And it was not until a settlement was reached—and this is a significant fact,—between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Government of Manitoba, that the Minister of the Interior agreed to come into the Government of Canada, and that Judge Prendergast agreed to go on the bench of Manitoba. Those facts are apparent, and imply that the position the Government took last September, and the fact that now, as I understand it, the Government do not propose to ask for legislation to provide for a judge in the regular way, but leave this duty to the caprice of the executive who may not, as they may see fit, vote the salary in the Estimates, that is a matter which requires a great deal of explanation at the hands of the Administration. It is a proper time now for me to ask why was it of such importance to take that vote in September last, that has not been required and has not been expended, before there was provision under the Manitoba Act constituting the office; and why was it, if the appointment was made during the last few days, that the Government were able to wait? Had those appointments anything to do with the Manitoba school question? That is a fair question, and I hope it will be answered in a spirit of candour. The Government surely does not propose to let judgment go by default on such grave suspicions, without giving substantial reasons for their course. If so, they are guilty, and we will take their silence as an admission.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** They are purely matters of inference.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What my hon. friend behind me (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has brought out is certainly a grave matter so far as criticism is concerned, leaving aside certain developments which are said to have taken place lately in the court at Winnipeg as the result of preliminary objections which

were taken in a certain election case. Here we had the Government, as my hon. friend has said, hurrying through the House in an unusual way a vote for a judge outside of the regular authorization by law. That was done on the plea of urgency. They have not yet made it statutory. They are coming down this year and asking again for a vote. Now, everybody knows that when you put a judge on such a tenure of office, you are unfair to the judge himself, and you are certainly degrading the proper administration of justice in this country. Every time that you ask this House to vote an individual salary for a judge on this extraordinary tenure, you invite criticism of that judge, you invite criticism of the item itself in every respect, and that is not healthy as regards the administration of justice. More than that, you put that judge in the position of insecurity and uncertainty. He knows that he does not stand as other judges, he knows that he is dependent on the will of Parliament every year. Surely this is not a principle which should rule in reference to the judiciary of this country. He knows that he is dependent upon the good-will of Parliament, and that is not all the principle which holds with reference to the judiciary in this country. These are statutory offices, their salaries go as a matter of statute, they are not dependent upon the criticism and the judgment of the House each year for their salary. Now, is the Government going to allow an occasion of this kind to pass, and say nothing as to what has caused this change, and give no explanation at all? But there is another and a graver aspect to this case, taken in connection with what my hon. friend has said of the extreme haste to get a vote before they had any intention, as appears now, of making the appointment, leaving the Government open to the suspicion that the vote was asked for a purpose, and if that purpose were fully carried out, then the appointment would be made, and if it were not, that, and what was contingent upon it, might fall to the ground. You have got the vote, it is said that you have carried out the negotiations successfully, you have gained two men, and now you are just appointing the judge. Altogether this has a very bad look upon it. Then there is the important item of news which came down from Winnipeg not long ago. Mr. Lauzon was elected in St. Boniface, and was protested; preliminary objections were put in, and what came out at these preliminary objections is a matter of newspaper record. What actually took place in court, and what was proved, and what happened as the result of that proof? It was proved that a Mr. Prendergast was guilty of illegal practices at that election. Is there any doubt that he was guilty of illegal practices? The attorney who had the case in hand for the protest against Mr. Lauzon came very quickly to the scratch and

next day agreed that all these proceedings should cease. The case could not stand in a worse position. Yet here is a Government, with all these circumstances staring them in the face, and yet when explanations are asked, there is no member who will rise and give the necessary explanations. Is a judge to depend on individual votes got year by year? Is the administration of justice to depend on the successful carrying out of certain negotiations, and not to be properly carried out unless those negotiations are successful? More than that, are they going to pat on the back a man who has violated the fundamental principles of the election law, and who has written himself down as a boodler?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is any evidence that Mr. Prendergast was admitted to be a boodler or he was shown to be a boodler?

Mr. FOSTER. We recollect—and it has not been denied—a report of the proceedings before the courts, in which the evidence was that Mr. Prendergast paid for illegal services. To that extent he was a violator of the law, and if it had been pressed, he would have been a criminal under the evidence as it exists. I know that is a touchy point with the hon. gentleman opposite, and equally pressing circumstances might have brought out a very great similarity in the case as compared with the case of my hon. friend.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have often been favoured with objections which hon. members opposite, who were then sitting on this side of the House, offered when any attempt whatever was made to allude to the practices of members of the bench. This is the first time since I have been in Parliament that I have heard a member of Parliament charge a judge with being a boodler.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not a judge.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is now a judge. This is the first time in the Parliament of Canada that any member has ventured to charge an occupant of the bench with having been a boodler at any period of his life. Much less I think is it justifiable in the present instance, inasmuch as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has not proper evidence on which to make the charge. He has made the charge on some statements he read in a newspaper. If an inexperienced member of Parliament had so far forgotten himself as to make such a statement from his place, even he would be open to censure; but when an hon. member who has filled high positions as a member of the Government takes such grounds, makes such observations, he is specially censurable. In this case the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Prendergast was a bood-

Mr. FOSTER.

ler, and has been a boodler. He has not the slightest evidence in support of that statement. In such a case, the statement should not have come from his lips, and he deserves to be classed as a common slanderer on the floor of Parliament. The hon. gentleman should either produce the evidence in support of his statement, or he should withdraw the charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not use the words "common slanderer."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will qualify my expression, in deference to your opinion, Mr. Speaker. No man should use his position—and the higher his position the worse the offence—to spread broadcast a statement respecting another man unless he is able to prove it, or there is good and proper reason to believe that the public will accept his statement as being sufficient proof of such statement. I come back to my question—has the hon. gentleman any evidence in support of his statement? If not, it is due to Mr. Prendergast's position as a judge that the hon. gentleman should withdraw his statement. It is against the decencies of Parliament that a member should be allowed to place on "Hansard" and sow broadcast throughout the country any statement, unless he is prepared to make it good. We all know that in matters which are technically offences against the election law, there are degrees of moral guilt in connection with them, while the offences may be all equally against the law. I understand the only possible foundation for the statement made by the hon. gentleman that Mr. Prendergast was a boodler is found in the particulars filed in the application in question, namely, that he paid cab-hire.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was sworn to in court.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will presume that the payment was for the illegal purpose of conveying electors to the polls; but assuming as much as you can assume in regard to payment, there still remains the bald fact that the transaction was simply one of payment of cab-hire. Does that make a man a boodler? Such is not the fact, if we take the popular acceptance of the word. What is a boodler?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a representation right opposite.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is well deserving of the observation, which you, Mr. Speaker, ruled out as unparliamentary. I call on the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement he has just made.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw my index finger.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I call on the hon. gentleman to withdraw that observation he made.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend asked me what I thought was the definition of a boodler. I pointed to the hon. gentleman, and I said : "there is a representation."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say that is a most unparliamentary expression.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) will withdraw it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, if the House understood that he was a representation of a boodler, I shall have to withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Unqualifiedly.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, unqualifiedly ; and I say, in addition, that when I want an example of gentlemanly proceeding, I will take the Postmaster General, who takes private correspondence and reads it in public.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to the point raised by the Postmaster General as to the use of the word "boodler" with respect to a judge on the bench—

Mr. TAYLOR. He has not got there yet.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand Mr. Prendergast is on the bench. Hon. gentlemen are proceeding to a certain extent on newspaper reports, and are making charges simply on newspaper reports. The Government say this gentleman has been appointed and sworn in as a judge. It is scarcely proper for any member of the House to use language such as a "boodler" to a gentleman who is now on the bench—assuming he is on the bench—members of the Government say he is—

Some hon. MEMBERS. He has been sworn in.

Mr. SPEAKER. Our rules do not protect outsiders from language of that kind ; but we find in "Bourinot," it stated :

But the Speakers of the English Commons now always interfere to prevent as far as they can all personal attacks on the judges and courts of justice. They have always felt themselves compelled to say that "such expressions should be withdrawn," and that "when it is proposed to call in question the conduct of a judge, the member desiring to do so should pursue the constitutional course of moving an address to the Crown."

I therefore think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you consider that ruling covers a statement characterizing the conduct of a gentleman who may be at the present time a judge, but which refers to his conduct anterior to his appointment as a judge ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am assuming that Mr. Prendergast is now a judge.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, you have not caught my idea.

Mr. SPEAKER. Allow me to go on. I am assuming, in the first place, that Mr. Prendergast is a judge. I think also that if that gentleman is on the bench now, it is derogatory to the dignity of the bench that one of its occupants should be characterized as a "boodler" even for past acts.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is the ruling of the Speaker, and it covers the entire of the conduct, of course it opens up an old vista as to possibilities. If that be so, certainly I do not wish to be in the position of saying anything that would detract from the dignity of the bench. But, Sir, the detraction from the dignity of the bench has been in the appointment that has been made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That does not quite cover the point. I submit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is obliged to withdraw the statement.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was understood that we should adjourn at 1 o'clock. With respect to this matter which has been represented by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), namely, the desirability of every judge being paid under statute, I think there is no difference of opinion between us, and with all reasonable speed that should be done. I now move :

That the further consideration of these resolutions be deferred to the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.05 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

### KINGSTON POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. McMULLEN asked :

1. When was James Shannon appointed postmaster at Kingston?
2. When was he superannuated?
3. What was his age when superannuated?
4. Was he an efficient postmaster?
5. Had the late Government instituted any inquiry as to his efficiency?
6. Had they any report in regard to such efficiency?
7. Had he been recommended to the late Government to be retired? If so, on what ground?
8. Had the said James Shannon an opportunity of improving himself as to the duties of his office?
9. If so, had he improved his opportunity and become a capable officer?
10. Was he a man in reasonable vigorous health?
11. Who is Mr. Shannon's successor?
12. What are such successor's qualifications for the office?
13. Is he now in charge of the office and discharging the duties of the office?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Mr. James Shannon was appointed postmaster at Kingston on the 6th of January, 1880, and was superannuated in the year 1897. He was born on the 2nd of June, 1829, and was just completing his 68th year when superannuated. In the opinion of the chief post office inspector he was not an efficient postmaster. The administration of the Kingston post office under his management had been unsatisfactory and the late Government had instituted an inquiry in regard to the management and on the 25th of June, 1895, the chief inspector reported to the Government that Mr. Shannon knew little whatever of post office duties or of the management of men; that he had been in feeble health for some years—was affected with epilepsy, and reported that it would be in the interest of the service if Mr. Shannon were placed on the retired list and a stronger and more capable man was appointed to the postmastership.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That is what we did. We appointed a man of more experience. The attention of the present Government having been called to this report, the chief inspector was consulted as to whether he still adhered to his view as therein expressed, and that officer merely gave it as his opinion that the management of the Kingston post office was unsatisfactory and had been so for many years and was in a more or less demoralized condition, amongst other reasons, owing to the inefficiency of the postmaster, including his inability to manage the staff, and that the Kingston post office was not rendering such service as the public had a right to expect, that the expense thereof was greater than it should be and that a reform in the management should begin in a change of postmaster. As a circumstance showing the inefficiency of the management of the post office, and the need for a reform, it may be stated that under the late postmaster's administration two succeeding assistant postmasters were guilty of embezzlement of the post office funds, one of whom fled the country and the other was convicted and sentenced to a term of years in the penitentiary.

As to whether the postmaster had had a reasonable opportunity of improving himself in the discharge of his duties, it may be stated that he has had seventeen years opportunity and that there was no reason to believe at the time of his superannuation that the management of the office under his administration would improve.

In reply to the 11th, 12th and 13th questions the answer is, that Mr. Shannon was succeeded in the office by Mr. Alexander Gunn. That gentleman is now in charge of the office personally discharging the duties and taking an active interest in its manage-

Mr. McMULLEN.

ment. He has had a large and extensive business experience and is reported as an excellent business man, and it is reasonably expected that under his supervision there will be a marked improvement in the management of the office.

#### NINGA, MAN., POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has W. McKnight, postmaster at Ninga, Man., been dismissed?
2. If so, what charges were preferred against him?
3. Has any investigation been held?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. Mr. W. McKnight postmaster of Ninga, has been dismissed. 2. An investigation by the post office inspector showed that Mr. McKnight had violated certain regulations of the department in delivering a registered letter from his office to a person other than the addressee, and in having divulged information obtained in his capacity as postmaster. 3. See answer to No. 2.

#### KINGSTON POSTMASTERSHIP.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. In connection with the change of postmaster in the Kingston post office, did the hon. Postmaster General obtain any report showing that the late postmaster was unfit for his work, and if so, in what respect was he considered unfit?
2. Before appointing Mr. Gunn, did the Postmaster General ascertain his age?
3. In what particular, if any, was it considered by the Postmaster General that the retirement of Mr. Shannon and the appointment of Mr. Gunn would improve the office?
4. Is the Postmaster General able to say whether Mr. Gunn is superior to Mr. Shannon in mental or physical strength, or vigour, or better qualified to perform the duties of the office?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The whole of this question has been answered by the answer given to the preceding question, with the exception of question No. 2, the answer to which is, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to questions 3 and 4, which have not been answered specially, and I think not in effect.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. If the hon. gentleman will read the answer carefully, I think he will see that I have dealt with them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not with the comparative statement with regard to Mr. Shannon and Mr. Gunn, involved in the third and fourth parts of my question. I hope the question will be again allowed to stand, and I think the hon. gentleman will see that he has not answered it.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I do not wish to avoid answering the hon. gentleman's question in the slightest degree; but, having given my answer with regard to the shortage of qualification in Mr. Shannon, and having stated that Mr. Gunn is a man of great business experience, I think I answered the two questions.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I ask for a comparative statement about mental and physical strength, for instance. That is not answered.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman may allow the question to stand till to-morrow.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That is what I wish. The hon. gentleman may persist in his view, but I think he will see, on reflection, that he has not answered these two questions.

Question allowed to stand.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTION LITERATURE.

Mr. **TAYLOR** asked :

1. Have speeches that have been delivered by Hon. A. S. Hardy, Premier of Ontario, and Hon. R. Harcourt, Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, been printed in pamphlet form?

2. Are said speeches being sent here from the office of publication in Toronto in mail bags free of postage?

3. Are said speeches being folded by the employees of this House?

4. Are Government paper and envelopes being used for this purpose?

5. Are the employees of the Government engaged addressing said speeches to the electors of Ontario?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The Government is not aware whether speeches delivered by Hon. A. S. Hardy, premier of Ontario, and Hon. R. Harcourt, provincial treasurer, have been printed in pamphlet form or in any other form; nor is the Government aware of such speeches being transmitted through the mails in any form, free or otherwise.

#### McINTYRE'S LAKE AND SYDNEY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. **HALEY** asked :

What was the contract price payable to Mr. Morrison for carrying the mail between McIntyre's Lake and Sydney, and was the contract let by tender? If not, have the Government taken any, and if so, what steps to terminate the contract and secure the performance of the service at a fair price?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). When the present Government assumed office, it found that \$8,505 per annum was paid for this service, the amount being fixed at the time the mail service between Port Hawkesbury and Sydney was cut off

at McIntyre's Lake; the rate of the latter service, \$9,000, being reduced to \$8,505 to correspond with the decrease in the length of the route. As this rate of \$9,000 was made after a tendering in 1894, which afforded little opportunity to those desiring to offer in that only five days was allowed between the opening of the tenders and the commencement of the contract, the present Government cancelled the contract at \$8,505 per annum, and proposed to put the service up to tender, but as it was represented that to put the service up on the approach of winter would fail of securing the best results from tendering, and as the contractor, Mr. Morrison, asked to be allowed a greater length of time than three months to arrange for withdrawing from the contract, the service was offered to Mr. Morrison at the rate of \$6,586.65 per annum, until the 30th June inst. This is the rate of a tender received at the time of tendering in 1894, but which was withdrawn on account of the difficulty and expense of equipping in midwinter. By this arrangement a reduction was secured of \$1,918.35 per annum until the 30th June, and tenders were invited for the service divided into two parts which connect at St. Peters. The tenders have been opened and the contracts awarded to the lowest tenderers, and the matters placed in the hands of the inspector for the completion of the contracts. At this point it would be premature to say more than that a saving will be effected which, as compared with the price paid when the Government took office, will not be less than \$18,000 for the contract term.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. **SPEAKER** read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, June 10th, 1897.

#### ATLANTIC FAST STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am afraid we shall not be able to proceed with the resolution regarding the fast steam service as there are some clerical errors in it

on the Order paper. We shall go on with it to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend be good enough to take it up to-morrow afternoon, as the Railway Committee sits in the morning?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Very well.

#### DISMISSALS OF BRIDGE TENDERS IN PICTOU.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Railways is not in his place as I wish to refer to a certain return ordered, but the fact can be brought to his notice. In our last session an order was passed for a return of the correspondence in connection with the dismissals of two bridge tenders on the railway bridge over Pictou harbour. The papers brought down refer to other letters not brought down, written by Mr. McDonald, one of the candidates at the last election, and are rather an important part of the correspondence as they doubtless contain charges against these men. This session the House, on my motion, ordered these other letters to be brought down, and I should like to have the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways called to the fact that they have not yet been laid on the Table, and I should like to have them when the Estimates of his department are under consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That is the supplemental order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What I desire to have is the correspondence referred to in the papers brought down and which are covered by the supplemental order.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada..... \$35,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. gentleman to give the names of the agents, their salaries and where they are working.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that the following is the information he desires:—

John A. Kirk, Halifax .....	\$1,200 00
T. E. Clay, Halifax .....	720 00
M. Kennedy, Halifax .....	410 62

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman also state in what cases these

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

parties appointed have taken the places of others dismissed, and the names of those who were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not absolutely sure that I could do that accurately now. I could give a statement later on of the changes, but from the statement I have in my hand I could not give the information the hon. gentleman asks for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to give us the names of those dismissed and of those who are filling their positions, we shall have to defer consideration of this item.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the names of the officers who are there now and their salaries, but I am not absolutely sure that I could say accurately in every case whether there was a change made or not. I can, however, furnish that information later.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would save time to let the item stand until the hon. gentleman has the information. It is absolutely necessary that the information should be given before this item is passed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A return was sent over from my department some days ago and laid on the Table, showing the changes that have taken place, and the hon. gentleman has access to that.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend has that return, it is a very easy matter for him to give the information.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the paper I have is not noted. Possibly, speaking from recollection, I might give some information, but could not be absolutely sure that it would be always accurate. The hon. gentleman, however, can take the returns and see what the changes are which were made.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like my hon. friend to understand that when a Minister is explaining his Estimates, he has to give the information then and there, and he might as well bow to the rule and give it, for I can assure him, as far as I am concerned, this item will not pass.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman assumes that I am not desirous of giving the information, which is not the case. What I said was that the hon. gentleman could better get the information from the return before him than from a verbal statement of mine, which possibly might not be in every case absolutely accurate. I have not the slightest desire to conceal any changes made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend has laid a return on the Table giving the information required, he ought to be able, with that return in his hand, to repeat it to us when considering the item.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman would also be capable, with the return before him, of seeing the changes.

Mr. **WALLACE**. There are 213 members of this House and only one copy of the return. How then are the members of this House to get the information? I never heard of it until within the last five minutes. The Minister has the information; let him bring it before the House.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There is no use wasting time. If the hon. gentleman objects, I will have the abstract made, and I will read it. But the hon. gentleman will not have any more information, nor will he have it in any better form.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I would suggest that we could reserve one item upon which all these questions could be taken up.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I am afraid not, and I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) why. Now is the time to take this matter up when the item is being passed for salaries of officers in this country, just as appropriate information is required when you are passing items in reference to officials in Great Britain or foreign countries. We want the information which has never been refused to the House by any Minister of the Interior or under any circumstances before.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I wish to repudiate entirely the idea that there is any intention to refuse information. I stated distinctly that I would give the information. I suggested to the hon. gentlemen that they could get the information more satisfactorily in the manner I proposed. But if they do not accept my suggestion, I am perfectly willing that the item shall stand over.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I would suggest that this whole item had better stand, because at the end of the list we find an appropriation for contingencies for all these offices. So they are all bound up together. It is all one subject, and I think the whole matter had better stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Railways and Canals--Chargeable to Capital--Intercolonial Railway..... \$348,000

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I presume that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) will take this opportunity to state to the House the policy of the Government with reference to these railway questions that are of so much importance. In the hon. Minister's absence a few days ago, I drew the attention of the hon. leader of the House to the fact, that down to the present moment, we have never had that information

that the House was entitled to on the day it met as to the arrangements made for bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. We are now in the last days of the session, and from one cause or another, even as to what was declared by the Governor General in the Speech from the Throne to be an arrangement absolutely concluded, this House has been placed in the position of not knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite have done, or what policy they had adopted. This is a most important measure entailing a very heavy expenditure upon the country. I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will now be in a position to, at least, give to the House that information which we have been entitled to for a long time, if the Speech of the Governor General at the opening of the House was a correct one.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). It was my purpose to have asked the permission of the committee, when the Estimates for Railways and Canals were entered upon to make a statement with respect to the arrangements that have been entered into or proposed to be entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Drummond County Railway Company and the Government, touching the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. In doing that I would be redeeming the promise I gave the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) the other day, when I said I would take the opportunity to furnish the House with a brief statement upon the subject in advance of tabling the resolutions. This I thought would be convenient, because hon. members would desire, before the resolutions were adopted, to have the fullest opportunity of considering the details of the proposed arrangement, and I was very desirous that they should have that opportunity. In furtherance of that pledge, I may begin by stating that the arrangements have been entirely concluded, so far as they can be concluded without the sanction of Parliament. Terms have been agreed upon between the Grand Trunk Railway Company on its part, the Drummond County Railway Company on its part and the Government, whereby it is proposed, if the arrangements are approved by Parliament, to secure an extension of the Intercolonial Railway system into Montreal by not later than the 1st of November next. I do not propose to invite, at this juncture, a debate upon the proposal, because, I suppose, it would be inconvenient all around. But I will state briefly the terms of the arrangement and will furnish the committee with a portion of the reasons, at least, which induced the Government to make the arrangements which have been made. I assume that there will scarcely be any difference of opinion whatever as to the advisability of our extending the Government system of railways into the city of Montreal. As the terminus of the road

has been situated for many years past it has been most inconvenient not only for the people who have done business with the railway, but in the interest of the road itself. I am not assuming at all that in entering upon these arrangements and adopting this policy we have taken a course that has not suggested itself or has not been desired, perhaps, by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in control of the Government of the country. But it has so happened, probably, that circumstances have been more favourable to our completing the arrangements; and I think that when I have stated those arrangements in detail they will be regarded as very favourable and will meet the approval of the House. Shortly after the conclusion of the last session of Parliament I took occasion to ascertain from the leading officials of the Grand Trunk Railway Company whether they would be open to discuss the question of the Government acquiring running rights over the bridge, the use of their terminals and such portion of the railway south of the St. Lawrence and in the direction of Lévis, as we might conclude that it would be desirable to acquire. I found a very ready disposition on their part to enter into a discussion of the question, and we had many interviews upon the subject, with the result that finally they proposed terms to us for the use of their terminal in Montreal, not only the station, but all their terminal facilities, extending as far as Point St. Charles, and all the intermediate points, and the lines and branches in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I say, they made a proposition to us including the use of all those facilities in Montreal, with the Bonaventure station, and named a figure which ultimately was reduced somewhat, and which we finally agreed upon. I will tell what that figure is later. Then as to the bridge, we found that it was in contemplation by the Grand Trunk Railway Company very much to enlarge their bridge. They felt the need of a double track being laid down for the purposes of their business; the single track has been very much congested at certain seasons of the year, and they had in contemplation at the same time, while laying down a double track for railway purposes, to afford some facilities for tramways and highways, and a foot bridge across that river. Altogether they contemplated an outlay of something in the neighbourhood of two million dollars in extending the bridge facilities. Our negotiations with them, however, only had reference to the use of the railway tracks, and we agreed ultimately upon a sum of money which we would be willing, Parliament approving, to pay them for the use of those facilities. Having found that we could come to an understanding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in respect to the terminals at Bonaventure, and in respect to the use of their bridge, we then had to consider the question how we would

Mr. BLAIR.

bridge the hiatus between our present terminus at or near the Chaudière Junction and the bridge. No doubt, a majority of the members of the committee who are aware of the local situation in that neighbourhood, know very well the various lines of railway that are now running between those points and those which have been projected. If they do, they will be aware that the Grand Trunk Railway now has a line via Richmond between Chaudière and the bridge, and it was important for us to consider whether we should seek to make arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to acquire rights over that line; and upon a consultation with the officers of my department, and upon general consideration of the question, I concluded that there were objections to our adopting that line as a connection between the present terminus of the Intercolonial Railway and the bridge, and these objections seemed to be of such a character as to be fatal to that plan. In the first place, the length of the line is greater than we could secure by other routes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By how much?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About twenty miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole length?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The distance from the Victoria Bridge to the Chaudière, I think, is about 160 miles. As I said, there was the objection of distance. There was another objection, that of grades. There are one or two very severe grades on that line, and we felt that it would be very undesirable to take that section of railway over unless we failed to secure another route at a price which we would feel justified in paying. Having, then, discarded the idea of seeking to arrange with the Grand Trunk Railway over their line via Richmond, then it became a question whether we would negotiate with the people who have partly built, and who are thinking of completing, a line running along the south shore of the St. Lawrence—I do not know by what name you would call it; some call it the South Shore. I believe it is now called the Great Eastern. At all events, the line to which I have reference runs from St. Lambert along the south shore of the St. Lawrence to connect with the Chaudière.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is familiarly known as the Drummond Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the Drummond Railway is another line; this is on the south shore. The Drummond line runs between the south Shore line and the Grand Trunk Railway via Richmond.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the South Shore come into Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. At St. Lambert, I think. I think it connects with the Grand Trunk Railway at Sorel; at all events, it connects with the Grand Trunk Railway on the south side of the St. Lawrence, because they must cross the Victoria Bridge at Montreal. Now, there was the objection of distance as respects that route; there was the further fact that but a small portion of that line had been constructed, and to complete its construction there would need to be several very costly bridges built, and there would be no comparison between the objection arising from the additional distance and the cost of the road intermediate between that line and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does the hon. gentleman know about what length that is on the south shore?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think it is some ten miles longer than that which was ultimately chosen. There then remained the Drummond Railway Company to consider. That road was projected from St. Rosalie, a point about thirty-five miles from the south end of the Victoria Bridge. It has been built and is in running operation to a point about thirty-two or thirty-three miles from the Chaudière. Then the hiatus between these two points would need to be filled up. The Drummond County Railway is in actual operation so far as it is constructed, and a branch has been built from about the present terminus to the shore at a place called Nicolet, sixteen or seventeen miles in length. In negotiating with the Drummond County Railway I may say at once that we had a decided preference to purchasing their road and completing it ourselves, if they had been willing to sell it upon reasonable terms, but they did not appear to be willing to do so.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. How near does it come to Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Thirty-five miles, as I mentioned.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. It is thirty-three miles from the eastern terminus to the Chaudière, and thirty-five miles from its western terminus to Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Perhaps I have not made myself clear. The Drummond County Railway connects with the Grand Trunk Railway system at St. Rosalie, a point thirty-five miles from the bridge; and it runs then in an easterly direction towards the Chaudière, stopping thirty-three or thirty-four miles short of reaching that point.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. That is precisely what I said. Can the hon. gentleman name the place where the Drummond County

Railway terminates, which is about thirty-three miles from Chaudière?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think the name is Forrest Vale.

Mr. **LAVERGNE**. Moose Park.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. That is the point where the Drummond Counties Railway terminates, going towards Chaudière.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There are two or three places named Forrest Vale and Moose Park. In determining whether or not it would be in the interest of the Government to arrange the taking over the Drummond County road, we, of course, had to ascertain as best we could what it would cost to build the shortest line between those two points, and how that estimate of the cost would compare with the figures which were being debated between the railway company and the Government. We ultimately came to the conclusion that it would be better to close a contract with the railway company, by which the company would complete the road from the point at which it now connects with the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière, and under which the Government would lease the whole road when completed. That is the nature of the arrangement we have made.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. That is, for the company to build the thirty-three miles from Moose Park to the Chaudière?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, and the road is to be according to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. We require the company to put down rails of not less than seventy pounds to the yard, and in other respects to make the road of the standard of the Intercolonial. The company have undertaken to do so, and the Government are to go into possession of the whole road not later than 1st November next.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Has the hon. gentleman ascertained what is the heaviest grade from Chaudière to St. Hyacinthe?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes; it will not exceed fifty-three feet to the mile. We ascertained there were two spots upon the completed portion of the road which somewhat exceed that figure, and we made a stipulation in the contract that the grade should be reduced so as to comply with the uniform standard, and that the portion of the road from Ste. Rosalie would not exceed that grade.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. What is the grade on the Grand Trunk?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I could not say.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I thought the hon. gentleman took the grade as one of the

objections to acquiring that portion of the Grand Trunk from the Chaudière to Montreal, and held they were excessive grades. In this view, it is important to know what the grades on this projected line will be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated that that was the objection offered. I have always understood that the grades were very high, and my engineers have so reported; and while I cannot state exactly what are the grades between those two points on the Grand Trunk, I am satisfied they are very heavy, I think considerably over 1 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will be able, no doubt, to furnish that information to the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, before the discussion is over. The estimate as to the probable cost of the road between these two points, as made by our engineers, is \$1,600,000. That did not, and could not, include the land damages, because we were not in a position to form anything like a correct judgment as to what the land damages would be. In the event of our deciding upon laying down a new line ourselves, and not making any arrangement with the Drummond County Railway Company, we would necessarily have to make a considerable allowance for the probable amount of land damages.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are the land damages included in the arrangement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The arrangement with the Drummond County Railway Company includes the delivery to us of the completed road, according to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway as to that portion of it which they are now completing, with a rail laid down on that portion of 70 pounds to the yard, and generally up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway; and absolutely and wholly unencumbered. As I shall explain later, it is practically unencumbered. It was considered by us as to whether or not it would be preferable, instead of making an arrangement which was the best we could make with the Drummond County, to lay down a new line ourselves, and we came to the conclusion that we could not construct such a road, under the most favourable circumstances, for less than \$1,600,000; and then we would be left uncertain as to the probable amount of land damages we would be obliged to pay. The Government have some little experience in times past with regard to this question of land damages, particularly in that section of the country, and it presented a formidable consideration for us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the condition of the country between Moose Park and Chaudière?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never been over it, but I am informed that it is farming, and probably lumber.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Most of it is in forest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I assume, that the land damages would be very little; that in fact the value of the country opened up would be more than the land damages would amount to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That remark would probably be correct if we were only considering the cost of land damages as between the point where the railway is now completed, and the Chaudière. But, if we were going to entirely decline the propositions which were made by the Drummond County Railway Company, and to build a new line ourselves, we would have to deal with the question of land damages for the entire length of the road we were building. That, I say, seemed to us to be a very formidable consideration. We concluded, for the reasons which I stated to the committee, that it would not be advisable for us to build a new road, and also for the further reason, that in building a new road we would be planting it alongside a line already constructed, and have this line as a competitor for business, and we would be practically destroying that amount of invested capital. We concluded then, that it would be better to accede to the propositions which were made, which were very fair I am bound to say, and which I think the committee will consider fair, and to—perhaps with the hope of effecting a possible saving of \$100,000 or \$200,000 in the total cost—to close with the Drummond County Company. They offered to us finally to give us a perpetual lease for \$64,000 a year, of the line from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière. That would be the interest at 4 per cent on \$1,600,000, and they transferred to us their rights and interests in the balance of the line, from the end of the Chaudière junction across the bridge and to the Intercolonial Railway connection, which was arranged between themselves and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They had made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under which the Grand Trunk Railway Company for \$6,000 a year, agreed to give them the use of the bridge and the tracks on either side of the bridge on the balance of the road, towards, and connecting with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, connecting at Ste. Rosalie.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, at the Chaudière. We took over as it were, the arrangement that the Drummond County Company had made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At Chaudière.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Instead of building a new bridge, and laying down a new track, for the purpose of making the connection ourselves, we simply took over the arrangement which was made by the Drummond Company with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under which we acquired, for \$6,000 a year, a lease of these privileges.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is in addition to the \$64,000 a year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is for the terminal facilities at the Chaudière ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Our arrangement with the Drummond County Company is in terms, a lease in perpetuity. We have it for 99 years for an annual rental of \$70,000 ; taking in the line which I have described, and the terminal facilities, and bridge at the Chaudière end of the line. It is one of the conditions of this agreement, that at the expiration of the 99 years the railway becomes the property of the Crown, entirely free of all encumbrances. We take it in fee, unencumbered, as our own property, at the expiration of that period, so that we are practically paying, as the purchase price, \$64,000 a year for the term of 99 years. In other words, we are paying 4 per cent upon \$1,600,000 for that term, and at the expiration of it the property is ours. That is the nature of the arrangement which we have entered into with the Drummond County Company.

Mr. TISDALE. May I ask the Minister, whether the terminal facilities he speaks of were included in the \$1,600,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. They were not. The estimate of the engineers did not touch this at all. I will now state to the committee the nature of the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you come to that ; at the termination of 99 years does the Crown get the possession of the portion for which you are paying the \$6,000 a year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. We are only taking over the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement, and paying what the Drummond County Company stipulated they would pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company. As respects that end of the undertaking, we acquire the ownership—we acquire a half undivided interest as it were in that end of the line. We have the same rights and the same property in it as the Grand Trunk

Railway Company have ; no more and no less.

Now, as to the other end, the arrangement you will see which we have made with the Drummond County Company, gives a connection at Ste. Rosalie, and therefore, we would need to agree with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for rights over their line, from Ste. Rosalie to the bridge. The arrangement we have concluded with the Grand Trunk Company is to pay them \$37,500 per year rental.

Mr. FOSTER. That brings you to the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That brings us to the bridge. In the leasing arrangement with the company, we acquire, not only the customary right to run our trains over their track, reaching the Grand Trunk Railway via Ste. Rosalie, but exactly the same property rights in the track and the same right to do business, to pick up traffic and carry passengers, that the Grand Trunk Company have. A similar arrangement has been made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Hamilton ; but under that arrangement the only right acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway is the right to run their trains over the line. If they do any business, they have to pay the Grand Trunk Company 85 per cent out of every 100 per cent of their receipts. They are not allowed to use the road as if they were the owners. Under this arrangement we have secured the right to use this railway as fully and completely as if we owned it—as fully and completely as the Grand Trunk Company itself.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the term of that agreement ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for ninety-nine years, renewable. It will be observed, also, upon a comparison of our arrangement with that entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Hamilton, that the mileage in that case is thirty-eight or forty miles, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I am credibly informed, pay \$40,000 a year to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for such use as they get of that track ; whereas, we pay \$37,500 a year for the ownership of one undivided half of this road. For the bridge we pay \$40,000 per year, and for the terminals in Montreal \$62,500 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These arrangements are all included in the one leasing contract, and are for the one period, and for the total rental of \$140,000. That is the arrangement we have entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I may add that the

contract has been executed, and I am now in a position at once to lay the contract on the Table, in connection with the notice of motion which I will give for the purpose of ratifying these contracts—both that with the Drummond County Railway Company and that with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is my hon. friend in a position to state how much this shortens the distance? From Chaudière to Montreal, I think, he estimated that it shortened the distance twenty-four miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask what the comparative distance will be over the Intercolonial Railway by this route, and over the short line of the Canadian Pacific through St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could run that up with the hon. gentleman, but I have not the exact mileage in my mind. It would scarcely be a fair comparison, because St. John would have a line in a directly opposite course from the direct line of the Intercolonial Railway. After you got to Moncton, you would have to run over much the same ground.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend, I think, misapprehends me. The object of this measure, I assume, is largely to shorten the distance between Halifax and Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway. When this expenditure has been made and this shortening attained, I want to know how the distance between Montreal and Halifax, via St. John, over the Canadian Pacific Railway, will compare with the distance over the Intercolonial Railway via Chaudière. These are objective points, and I assume that my hon. friend has carefully made the comparison before incurring this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend quite misunderstood me if he understood me to rest the justification of this policy upon the ground that the distance between Halifax and Montreal was being materially shortened. I have not mentioned that as yet, and I am free to confess that I did not have that consideration very much in mind. I had a different idea altogether in my mind, as others have who have regarded the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal as important. I regarded it as of the first consequence to the Intercolonial system that it should reach a commercial terminus, a large city, where it could drop down and take up business; and it is so regarded by every railway owner or operator—that he should get into a place where business originates, where population is, where he can be in a position to make his connections, and make

Mr. BLAIR.

traffic arrangements with advantage with other lines of railway. The ample justification for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal appears to me to rest in these considerations, and does not at all depend on the question of distance. The only way in which the question of distance suggested itself to my mind as an important consideration was in determining whether we should acquire from the Grand Trunk Company their present line. We chose the more direct route, on the ground of distance as one consideration.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Will the passenger trains, after leaving St. Charles, pass St. Henri and Chaudière, or by the St. Charles Branch and the Grand Trunk, as at present?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a matter that will, of course, have to be considered. I would not like to make any announcement at the present moment what the course will be. That, I presume, will be a matter which the general manager will look into and advise upon.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. If the trains leaving St. Charles are to pass nine miles from Quebec, it will make a great difference. That is a most important consideration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to give the hon. gentleman any positive assurance as to how the trains will run after the connections are made. That has not yet been considered, and until the whole arrangement is concluded, the time has scarcely arrived for determining that question. I think it extremely unlikely, however, that the trains would take a route which would leave out an important and populous centre. I should think Lévis would not be overlooked; but I am not in a position to make a positive statement about the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that the expenditure to be incurred in connection with this matter will be \$210,000 per year. I ask my hon. friend if he really undertook to enter upon an arrangement of this kind without considering the competition that he will have to meet? The hon. gentleman says that he has made a calculation of the distance between Halifax, which is the objective point, and Montreal, by the route he now proposes, but he has not entered into a calculation as to how that distance will compare with the existing line of the Canadian Pacific Railway running to St. John and thence by the Intercolonial to Halifax. It appears to me that this is the cardinal point to consider. He certainly should have taken that competition into account, and if so, I should suppose he would be able to state the relative distances. Surely the hon. gentleman, before incurring this enormous expense must have made the calculation to ascertain whether there was

already a line between these two points a great deal shorter than the new line he has arranged for.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I confess that I cannot see the direct object of the hon. gentleman's criticism. If he means to say that the Intercolonial ought not to seek to do its own trade between Lévis and Montreal and to increase that trade, if possible, because, forsooth, it would thereby be competing perhaps successfully with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is an argument which does not commend itself to my mind at all. I think it is the duty of the Government to look after the interests of its own railway, no matter what other lines of railway it may enter into competition with. We know very well that people do now travel by the Intercolonial to Lévis and take the Grand Trunk Railway from Lévis to Montreal, and we do know that a great deal of traffic is carried over the Intercolonial and transferred to the Grand Trunk Railway at Chaudière. Is it to be said that we ought not to take means to increase that business and augment the revenue of the Intercolonial and put it on a more prosperous basis, because the Canadian Pacific Railway is a rival and competitive road? I cannot see the force of that argument. I think it is our duty, no matter what other railway may enter into competition with our own, to do all the business we can. There could be no other object in operating the Intercolonial. I did not ask myself whether or not the actual mileage between Halifax via St. John, over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal, would be greater or less than the mileage by this railway when it is completed. I knew, I suppose, what the exact mileage is, and I daresay I made a comparison, but I do not carry it in my mind and I have not got it with me to state to the committee at this moment, but I will have it shortly. But whether the mileage be greater or less, everybody who looks into the question knows that the Intercolonial cannot do business upon business principles the way it has been located, and it is the duty of the Government to take such course as will make the road more successful and prosperous. If the result shall be that we will be able to command more of the business of the maritime provinces going west and also of the business from the west to the east than we have heretofore been able to obtain, and if we be able to enter into more successful competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway than we have hitherto succeeded in doing, so much the worse for the Canadian Pacific Railway and so much the better for us. We are not going to regulate our affairs by the consideration whether we shall prejudicially affect any other railway or not. There will be, after the new line is completed, something like 75 or 76 miles difference between the two roads, in favour of

the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Montreal and Halifax.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is what I wanted to get from the hon. gentleman.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have said that the contracts have been completed and are printed, and I shall be able to give a notice of motion with respect to them and put them on the Table at once, so that they may be in the possession of hon. members.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** Under this arrangement with the Drummond Railway, will the Government be prevented from giving a subsidy, as promised, to the Quebec bridge?

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) understood me to take the position he has just charged me with taking, he is the only hon. gentleman in this House on either side who has formed any such opinion. The hon. gentleman has found it convenient to put up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking it down. The point which I raised was this, and I think it will commend itself to the judgment of business men, that the Minister of Railways, before incurring an additional expenditure in connection with the Intercolonial of at least \$7,000,000, was bound to ascertain what his position would be after he had reached the city of Montreal. When the hon. gentleman undertook to say that I had questioned the right or propriety of the Government entering into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, he must have known perfectly well that he had no ground whatever for making that statement. I did not raise the question as to whether it was right and proper on the part of this Government to use the public money of the country in order to promote competition between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but what I asked the hon. gentleman was whether, before incurring this enormous expenditure, he had assured himself that he would get any commensurate advantage for the country in return. Is there a business man in this House who will not say that the first question that the hon. Minister should have put to himself was this: What will be my prospect, with this new line, of obtaining increased business? And if that does not commend itself to the hon. gentleman as a business proposition, I would like to know whether there is another member of this House who is so obtuse as not to see—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Yes—I say, whether there is a man in this House who will stand up and say he is so obtuse as not to recognize the duty of the Minister of Railways to take into his consideration as a prime question, in deciding whether this should be carried out or not, what prospect there was of obtaining business for which

he was incurring such an enormous expenditure. And yet the hon. gentleman intimated that he had not taken the trouble to ascertain whether there was another road already built and in operation that would be in a position to compete with him for business between Montreal and Halifax, seventy-six miles shorter, as he now admits it will be. Sir, there is no member of this House who would be so delighted as myself to see anything done that would facilitate business over the Intercolonial Railway between the city of Montreal and the city of Halifax. But when it becomes a question of incurring enormous expenditure by the Government of this country, I say that any person who entertains a proposition to that end is bound to ask himself whether he is going to attain the object aimed at. Does the hon. gentleman think that his ability in the management of a railway is so transcendently superior to that of Sir William VanHorne or Mr. Shaughnessey, that with a difference of seventy-six miles against him, he is going to capture the business between Halifax and Montreal? Why, Sir, the thing is so very absurd on the face of it that I can well understand the hon. gentleman attempting to withdraw from it the attention of the House by entering upon a discussion that was entirely foreign to the question, and that nothing that I had said had justified in the slightest degree. The hon. gentleman has left out of consideration another mode of obtaining access to Montreal, one which was worthy of his attention. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has asked a very pertinent question indeed; and no wonder. The fact is known to every person in this House that the late Government, like all Governments in Canada, recognized the great importance of securing the building of a bridge across the river that would bring the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Quebec. Every person knows that the late Government pledged themselves in the face of the country to assist that project. The leader of that Government, the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald authorized me to declare to the people of Quebec and in the face of the whole country, that his Government was prepared—I was not then a member of it—if the city of Quebec, the province of Quebec, and the parties interested would join in the undertaking to make a very substantial contribution for the purpose of carrying out a project of such great importance not only to the city of Quebec, but to the maritime provinces, in securing railway connection with that important city. No person can contend but that the measure which is now before the House is a death-blow to that project. Why, Sir, the only ground on which the Government of Canada could be asked to make a large contribution to the construction of a bridge to Quebec was that it would bring in the Intercolonial Railway into Quebec, instead of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

having the road reaching that city by a ferry, which was found to be a very inefficient mode of communication. With this complete communication could be had with the city of Montreal by means of a road constructed and in operation—the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec. Had the hon. gentleman forgotten that the late Government were pledged, as the present Government is pledged, to give substantial assistance to the great and important project of a bridge to connect the Intercolonial Railway with Quebec, that that pledge was on record on the part of these Governments, thus pledging the country to the proposal? That bridge would have given access to Quebec, not only by the Intercolonial, but to the Grand Trunk Railway, now running to Lévis, as well as the other railways running to the south from that point. Every person knows that the moment the project now before the House is endorsed by this House, we may at once and for ever cease to talk of any hope or chance of securing the construction of that bridge. Why? Because this project would sweep away one of the great objects to be gained by building it, for the Government will have obtained other means of access to Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway than that which would be afforded by the construction of the bridge. If the hon. gentleman was taking up that question as a matter of business, why did not he, in the first instance, knowing that the Government of which he was a member were pledged to give substantial aid to the Quebec bridge, and that the Liberal-Conservatives were likewise pledged, and were in a position, on this side, though not in power, to aid and support any Government in carrying out that pledge—why did not the hon. gentleman ascertain on what terms he could get running powers for the Intercolonial Railway over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Montreal, just as the Canadian Pacific Railway are dependent to-day on the Intercolonial for running powers from St. John to Halifax? There was every ground, every reason, every opportunity, for him to make arrangement, while, at the same time, accomplishing a great object that the people not only in the city of Quebec, but I may say to a large extent, the people of the province of Quebec are deeply interested in. The hon. gentleman has rushed into this, what for? I cannot understand for the life of me. If he had been arranging to bring the province of Nova Scotia and the province of New Brunswick nearer to Montreal than they are by existing means of communication, if he expected to accomplish any great and substantial improvement in the interest of the country, I could understand it. But, Sir, this is a project that requires to be carefully looked into. I ask the hon. gentleman—no, I need not ask him. After listening to his speech to-day, nobody can be surprised

that this House has been treated in the manner that it has in regard to this great question. On the day Parliament opened, the Governor General declared in the Speech from the Throne that these arrangements were concluded and that they would be submitted to this Parliament. Yet here we are, at this late hour of the day, begging these hon. gentlemen to carry out their pledge, to show that the words that they put in the mouth of the Governor General were true, by placing on the Table of the House the documents setting forth these arrangements that the Governor General declared not to be under consideration, but to have been absolutely concluded. Yet down to this hour it has not been laid upon the Table of this House, and the hon. gentleman waits until the dying hours of the session to stand up and make a statement to which it is impossible for any hon. gentleman in this House to give that full and complete consideration which a question of such importance demands, a project loading down this country with an additional debt of seven million dollars. Sir, I ask this House—I do not ask my hon. friends on this side of the House—but I ask every independent man on that side of the House whether he thinks that he has been treated, that this Parliament has been treated, with the respect to which it is entitled when down to this very hour those arrangements declared by the Governor General to have been concluded when this House met, are not before us, when we have only got a verbal statement, and are compelled to go into a discussion of a verbal statement of the Minister of Railways who, while detailing this matter to the House, confessed that he did not know, and had never taken the trouble to ascertain, whether Halifax would be a hundred miles nearer or a hundred miles further from Montreal by this arrangement, although this fact was one of the very first elements in a calculation as to whether this project would be beneficial to the Intercolonial Railway in view of the competition that would exist. Sir, I believe the hon. gentleman has altogether overstated the short distance of twenty miles that he intimates would be saved; I believe it will be found that he has overstated the saving of distance by at least a third, and that twelve or thirteen miles would be a much more accurate statement. But if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to look at the map, he would have found that there was already a railway projected that would be much shorter than this one. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to make arrangements with this Drummond County Railway at a great cost to the people of this country, and I have no doubt that when we get to the bottom of this transaction we will find that the hon. gentleman had good, and substantial, and sterling reasons for

making this arrangement with the Drummond County people. I say it is impossible to look at it as a business transaction, it is wanting in every single feature of a business transaction; therefore, we are compelled to look behind and beyond anything that the hon. gentleman has stated to this House, to find the reason why a citizen of Montreal should be so enormously enriched at the public expense of Canada—for that is what it comes to, and we might as well understand it at once. It appears that the proprietor of this Drummond County Railway had a white elephant on his hands, that he had a very unprofitable property, and that he was anxious to get rid of it, I can quite understand; but I cannot understand any person occupying the position of Minister of Railways and Canals of this country, entering into a transaction which, taken in the light of the information that at last we have been able to drag out of him on the floor of this House, is destitute of all those business elements that would justify such an expenditure. Sir, have we not sunk money enough already in connection with the Intercolonial Railway? Is it not a sufficient burden upon the country already, without loading it down with a capital expenditure of seven millions in addition to all that has already been expended upon it? I say that a more unwarrantable, a more unjustifiable project, it appears to me, could not well have been undertaken. And where are we? The hon. gentleman knows that while leasing this line for 99 years, he comes into competition with the Grand Trunk Railway, and as he has only running powers over the road of that company, he will be entirely at the mercy of, and dependent upon, that company. Any person who will look upon the map will see that instead of getting such a line as the Great Eastern projected railway would have given, while the present line of the Grand Trunk Railway circles away around in one direction, the line which he has undertaken and which has become a part of the Intercolonial Railway, is a circuitous route, it is a zig-zag line running in and running out through that section of country, and is anything but a direct line of railway communication. So I am afraid that we shall have to seek beyond and outside what appears in the bald details the hon. gentleman has given us, to ascertain what induced this Government to engage in an enterprise that they were so determined before they had undertaken it, to carry through, that they did not even take the trouble to ascertain whether, when they got to Montreal in this way, they would be able to compete with the existing lines of railway for the business between that and Halifax. I have no hesitation in saying that I have never listened to any statement in this House that was so utterly lacking any kind of justification, for a measure of such

magnitude. But after hearing the statement the hon. Minister has given to this House, I can quite understand why it is that at this period of the session these arrangements that were declared by the Governor General at the opening of the House, to be concluded, have been withheld from us down to the present hour. I believe the hon. gentleman felt that the only chance of getting this measure accepted by this Parliament was to hold it back, was to conceal the arrangements that had been made by the Government, was to conceal that information that the House was entitled to demand, down to the last moment of the session when there would be no opportunity of giving this question that deliberate and business-like consideration that a measure of this kind demands at our hands. I can understand now why it was impossible to induce the hon. gentleman to treat this House with that respect which was due alike to the House and to the credit of the Government themselves. Now, after listening to the hon. gentleman and finding what he had to present to the House, I do not hesitate to say that neither to the Intercolonial Railway nor to the people of any portion of this country, is this undertaking of the slightest value whatever. The hon. gentleman has made a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway to pay them \$6,000 a year for their terminal facilities at Chaudière; he has made a bargain to give them \$37,500 more for running over their line from St. Rosalie to the bridge at Montreal; he has given them \$40,000 a year more for going over the bridge; and he has given them \$62,000 per annum more for their terminal facilities, and what is all this worth to the country? Why, Sir, it is worth absolutely nothing, because the Grand Trunk Railway is a competitor from the point where the hon. gentleman leaves the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière, all the way to Montreal. The Grand Trunk Railway is a competitor along that very line to Montreal, and when he gets to Montreal, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a competitor for the trade of Montreal between that city and Halifax, with a distance of no less than 76 miles in its favour. Why, Sir, it only requires to state a proposition of this kind to the committee to show that if the hon. gentleman had dealt with this House in the manner that he was bound to deal with it in a question of this importance, if he had laid these papers upon the Table for consideration, it would have been impossible for him to hope to secure the support of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him. And how is any hon. gentleman interested in the city of Quebec to support this project? Any man with a head on his shoulders knows that this project takes away from the Government of Canada all possible excuse for contributing a single dollar for the construction of a bridge to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

take the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Quebec. Where is the hon. gentleman interested in the province of Quebec who is prepared to endorse a project that not only gives nothing to the city of Quebec, but strikes the most fatal blow at its fond hopes of securing a work of vital importance to its welfare? Where is the man, a representative in this House of the province of Quebec, who can consent to loading down the Government of Canada and the revenue of Canada with this enormous expenditure that can have no good results whatever? There is no county on the road that is not already served; there are no interests benefited, so far as I can see, except two parties. One is the Grand Trunk Railway, which has made a magnificent bargain with the Government. It is no wonder the president of that company was unable to restrain himself from telling the shareholders the glorious news of the manner in which he had been able to circumvent the Minister of Railways in Canada and secure an advantageous bargain. There is no ground for surprise at the pleasure evinced by the shareholders of the Grand Trunk at receiving \$140,000 a year out of the treasury of Canada for nothing whatever, for that which would give Canada no return, which would leave the Intercolonial at the mercy of the Grand Trunk; for, after this arrangement is completed throughout the entire line from Chaudière to Montreal, the Grand Trunk will be enabled to compete with the Intercolonial so as to render these pretended advantages entirely worthless to the Dominion. I can understand the position taken by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but I cannot understand an hon. gentleman, who is interested in protecting the revenues of the country being willing to place on the shoulders of the people additional burdens, except an hon. member who may use the same argument on this occasion that I am told was used on a recent occasion when it was desired to put a measure through—you must either support us or we will resign. After the spectacle we have had to-day on the Treasury benches, and, indeed, have had in past days, I think I could select a better Government from that side of the House, men who would be prepared to carry out the promises made from the Treasury benches. If they would not be able to make a better bargain and more fully protect the interests of Canada than they have been protected by the Minister of Railways, I would form a much lower opinion of the character, standing, and ability of hon. gentlemen opposite than I entertain at the present time. I repeat that I can find no reasons whatever except two for this action taken by the Government. The first is as regards the Grand Trunk Railway. It is a powerful corporation in Canada; it holds the fate of many constituencies in its hands, and the company may be able to return, if not anything to the

treasury, political support for this depletion of the public revenue and the additional burden placed on the shoulders of the people. It is possible that hon. gentlemen opposite in this way may be able to obtain something they consider of more value than the interests of the country. The second party benefited is the gentleman who is proprietor of the road which has been taken from his overburdened shoulders and placed on the shoulders of the people at an enormous cost, and no doubt he is gloating with delight at the fortune he has made out of this transaction with the Government and the Minister of Railways, and he will be prepared to prove his gratitude in the most substantial way whenever and wherever called upon.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am not going to discuss the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Railways. The time to do so will be when the papers relating to the contract are placed on the Table of the House. The leader of the Opposition has referred to this matter as regards Quebec. We all know that the leader of the Opposition, when he came to Quebec some years ago, made pledges respecting the proposed bridge. We all were aware at the time that these promises were made for election purposes, and we the representatives of the Quebec district and the electors there never took any stock in the hon. gentleman's pledges because we knew they were simply pledges given for election purposes and would not be fulfilled by the Tory Government. I remember that a prominent member of the party, who is now a member of this House, made the statement: No bridge, no vote; but we had no bridge, and he voted Tory all the same.

An hon. MEMBER. Who said that?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) said that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I deny that statement absolutely.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have to accept the word of my hon. friend; but I may inform him that the Quebec "Chronicle," the organ of the Tory party, of the late Government, and of the hon. gentleman, on the next day boasted that he had said: "No bridge, no vote."

Mr. CASGRAIN. I deny absolutely that the Quebec "Chronicle" ever said anything of the kind.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I saw it there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is obliged to withdraw the statement he made. He made a statement in regard to what the hon. member for Montmorency said; this the hon. member for Montmorency denied, and the hon. member for Montmagny accepted the state-

ment made. He has just said that he has seen such a statement reported in a newspaper. The hon. member for Montmorency has denied that such a statement appeared, but I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) is obliged to withdraw his statement.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I was not going to take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman has withdrawn his first statement.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Yes; I accepted the negation of my hon. friend. But I say that the Quebec "Chronicle" contained that statement, because I remember having read it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was never there.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It was in that paper. All these pledges made by the Tory party were simply election pledges, and we in Quebec never expected to have a bridge built by the Tory Government, and so Liberal candidates were elected, not only in Quebec city but in the surrounding constituencies. We have been told that this Government are willing to give a fair subsidy to any company which will be in a position to go on with that bridge. We do not expect any more than that. The Government are obliged to take care of the money of the people of this country, and when the Government see that there is a company strong enough to carry out the bridge project, I am sure they will give a subsidy, and I am sure also that this agreement to continue the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal is not a death-blow to the Quebec bridge. In my own name, and in the name of my constituents, I say, that if I were convinced that this agreement would prevent the construction of the Quebec bridge, I for one would not hesitate to vote against it. The promises that have been made by the present Government are not election promises, as were those made by the leaders of the Tory party, but they are the promises of a Government which is willing to carry out all its obligations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I challenge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) to show any pledge that I ever made, on behalf of the Government with which I was connected, or on behalf of the Government of which Sir John Macdonald was the head; I challenge him to show any pledge I ever made that has not been redeemed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Laughter will not settle a question of this kind. We are dealing with facts and not with assertions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) said, that we failed to implement our promises. I deny it. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show any pledge of mine that was not redeemed. When I went to Quebec in 1891,

I was not a member of the Government, and when the people of that city asked me, what the Government would do in regard to the bridge which they took such a deep interest in, I told them I would telegraph to Sir John Macdonald and I did so, and he sent me an answer which I read to the people. It was not my pledge, for I was not a member of the Government, but it was Sir John Macdonald's pledge and the pledge of the party. Sir, I hold to that pledge to-day. I repeated it at the last general election in the city of Quebec, and whether I am in Opposition or in the Government that pledge will be faithfully redeemed whenever and wherever an opportunity is offered, by the parties to the other side of the bargain doing that which I then stated was essential in order to obtain assistance from the Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) when he attacks a great party in this House, who have always pledged themselves to assist, and to assist to a very large extent in accomplishing that great work; may think that he is promoting the interests of the Quebec bridge, but I do not believe that either his own constituents, or the people of the city of Quebec, will agree with him.

Mr. LAVERGNE. This line runs through the county which I represent, and I wish to say a word in reference to it. I understood from the Minister of Railways that this was not the proper stage of the measure at which to debate the project. And, if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to debate this question when the resolutions are placed upon the Table, I invite their attention to the fact, that they should not trust that map which has been placed in their hands. That map has been provided by a rival company, and it does not give any exact idea of the position of the projected line. I trust that before the debate comes up again, they will secure better information than they have to-day. The leader of the Opposition says that we are going to incur an expenditure of \$8,000,000. I cannot see how he makes \$8,000,000 out of an annual expenditure of \$210,000. It is nothing like \$8,000,000. At 4 per cent it is about \$5,225,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) that this \$210,000 annually is equal to about \$7,000,000 at 3 per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He said 4 per cent.

Mr. LAVERGNE. There is \$1,000,000 difference, and that will be sufficient for the subsidy to the bridge between Lévis and Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has made certain statements which are not correct. I had the honour of presiding at the meeting at which the leader of the Opposition made,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

what the hon. member for Montmagny called a pledge. At that time everybody in Quebec was in favour of the bridge between Quebec and Lévis—when I say everybody, I mean all the Conservatives because the Liberals at that time were standing aloof. The best proof I can give of that is, that when we came to Ottawa, time and again on deputations from Quebec, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) who now leads the Government, several times refused to join us on those deputations, although he represented a very important part of the city of Quebec. The promise made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) at that time, was, that when a responsible company was formed, that when the railways which came into Lévis and to Quebec subscribed a certain amount, and that when the city of Quebec subscribed a substantial amount towards the building of the bridge, then the Government would be prepared to entertain the proposition of aiding the enterprise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is no difference between the pledge given in 1891 by Sir Charles Tupper, and the pledge given time and again by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) who leads the Government. In 1896, Sir Charles Tupper again made that pledge to a Quebec audience, and it was applauded to the echo. This Quebec bridge scheme was inaugurated by the Conservative party, and the Liberals of Quebec at that time were against us, or if they were not, they never came on our deputations, or joined the company, or invested one solitary cent of their money towards the building of the bridge. Now, when they find that the bridge project which was inaugurated in Quebec by the Conservatives, is a popular question in Quebec, they try to make political capital out of it.

I wish to say, Sir, that personally I never gave any such pledge as my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) mentioned. Never on any platform, never under any circumstances, and never on any occasion did I say: that if the Conservative Government did not give a substantial subsidy towards the Quebec bridge I would not vote for the Conservative party. I defy, and I challenge my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) before this House to produce a single newspaper, the Quebec "Chronicle" or any other, which reports me as having uttered the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) attributes to me. This speech was made on a certain day, in a certain month, in a certain year, and he can easily find it. I challenge him to bring the paper here to-day, or any other day, which will substantiate his statement. These statements made by hon. gentlemen on the other side are statements which we know are not correct. They are statements which we can challenge at any time. They are like the promises made by them in Opposition and

which got them into power, but which never were carried out. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about pledges. Sir, the pledges which were given by the Conservative party have been kept, but what has become of the pledges made by the Liberal party when they were in Opposition? They broke every pledge, they went back on every declaration and promise they had made, and the only way they could redeem themselves was by taking the pledges of the Conservative party and implementing them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman state what he said at that meeting about the bridge?

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend was a very young man at that time; he was almost a baby. He was so young that I do not think he could read the papers. At the time of that meeting there was no question about the bridge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What did you say, then?

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I repeated the speech I made, I might convert my hon. friend to this side of the House. There was no question of the bridge. It was a question of the short line between Quebec and the maritime provinces. What I said then I say now, and advocate as a reasonable policy, that when a responsible company and the railways that come to Quebec will contribute, then the Government of Canada should contribute to the building of a bridge between Quebec and Lévis. But that is not the question under discussion here. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has in a very able manner diverted the attention of this House from the question before it, and it is a most momentous question. It is momentous, not so much to the party on this side of the House or to the country, but to the party on the opposite side of the House; and it will be a much more momentous question to them before we get through with it. I see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) casting his eye this way. We will hear more of that before we get through. The question before the House is the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, or rather to St. Hyacinthe. We have always understood that the Intercolonial Railway was built to carry out a pledge made before confederation that the maritime provinces should be connected with the upper provinces by a railway to Quebec or Lévis. The Intercolonial Railway connects at Lévis with the Grand Trunk, the Quebec Central, and all the trunk lines which extend from that point on to western Canada. What is the position made by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Point Lévis to St. Hyacinthe? We shall be in the same position as we are in to-day at Lévis. We connect at Lévis with the trunk lines from east to west. What better posi-

tion shall we be in by bringing the Intercolonial Railway to St. Hyacinthe, or even to Montreal? We are not bettering the position of the maritime provinces or of the eastern part of Canada—not a bit. I say here, on my responsibility, that behind this there is a scheme not benefiting Canada, but benefiting some parties on the other side of this House. That is my statement, and I think that before we are much older that statement will be proved to this House. Let us revert for an instant to the bridge. One of the principal reasons we urged in support of building a bridge between Lévis and Quebec was that it would give uninterrupted railway connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific through Canadian territory. That was the sole argument which had any weight with the Government of Canada. From a military strategic standpoint, that was the great argument we used every time we came here in deputations from the city of Quebec. But if the Intercolonial Railway is extended from Lévis to St. Hyacinthe or to Montreal, then this enterprise, which all the people in the city of Quebec and in the surrounding counties have so much at heart, will be deprived of that argument. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Montmagny should support this measure, because I understand he has always been in favour of the bridge, and the question he put to-day to the hon. Minister of Railways proves that he is still in favour of it. How, then, is it that he consents to be deprived of this great advantage? But, Sir, we shall probably have occasion to discuss this question later on, and we shall probably be in a position to see whether or not there is any advantage to the Dominion of Canada in this extension of the Intercolonial Railway. Everybody knows that our hon. friends on the other side boast that the city of Quebec is the great Liberal citadel in the province of Quebec; but I will ask them to go around the city of Quebec, to go to the Board of Trade, to go to the great commercial corporations, and find one man outside of those who have some Government favours, who is in favour of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to St. Hyacinthe or to Montreal. It is universally condemned by all the business men in Quebec, and I ask those gentlemen who particularly represent the city of Quebec in this House how they can vote for such a project, which is going to deprive that city of the greatest and richest part of its commerce. What do the merchants and tradesmen of the city of Quebec say? They say that if this extension is carried out, they will lose the greater part of their trade with the maritime provinces and with the counties along the Intercolonial Railway, and that it will go to the city of Montreal. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman who represents Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) is not here to defend the scheme of the Government; I am not surprised that he has left the House. I say

there is not a man in this House representing the city of Quebec who dares to stand up and defend it. I see that my hon. friend the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is also absent. Is not this evidence that not one gentleman in this House who represents the city of Quebec dares to stand up and defend this extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis to Montreal? Sir, it is a question which will probably come up in the House again, and it is one which will probably have more bearing on the politics of this country, than certain gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to believe to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask one or two questions of the hon. Minister of Railways. I do not propose to discuss the merits of the case, but to get information which the committee may have as a basis for discussion afterwards. I want to ask whether in all these calculations of sums to be paid, my hon. friend has taken into account any possible sum to be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in order to assist them in double-tracking and enlarging the Victoria Bridge? Is there something outside of all this to be given?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Government have engaged to give to the Grand Trunk Railway the usual 15 per cent upon the expenditure in the reconstruction of their bridge, not exceeding \$300,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is besides the \$40,000 you pay them for going over?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask another question, and it is this, whether the hon. gentleman is able to lay before the House the terms which the Grand Trunk Railway were willing to make for running powers over their road now constructed and running between Lévis or Chaudière and Montreal? There were three routes. One was the Southern or Great Eastern, which we might have taken up and completed; then there was the middle one which my hon. friend chose; and then there was the Grand Trunk. In order that the committee may be able to decide whether a provident bargain has been made, we ought to know what we could have got running powers for over the present Grand Trunk Railway from the Chaudière to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have procured no figures from the Grand Trunk Railway at all as to the other portion of their road from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière. We concluded it would not be desirable for us to enter into any negotiations with them touching that portion of their line, as the grades and dis-

Mr. CASGRAIN.

tances were such as to make it unwise for us to have anything to do with it. I am credibly informed that you could not haul over their line more than one-half the freight train that you can over the Drummond County line. That is, you could not climb the grades with one-half the load.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not the exact grades?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but I will have them when the matter comes up.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend give the committee two other items, namely, the cost of operating this road from the Chaudière into Montreal, and the cost of maintenance after the Government undertakes to operate it? This, I suppose, according to the hon. gentleman's interpretation is a business arrangement. We are to pay out, in the first place, \$210,000 per year; then we must pay the operating expenses, and then the maintenance expenses. Against these we have to calculate what will be the acquisition of business by this arrangement, and the merits of it as a business transaction will depend upon the balance between revenue and expenditure. That will entail a very careful inquiry as to what accretion of business we may hope to get when we enter Montreal beyond what we have now. The revenue from that increase of business will be the one side and the maintenance, expenses and interest account will be the other. If my hon. friend will give us the general average of operating and maintenance and expenses and the mileage, we will be able to form an idea as to that side of the account at least. Then we shall have to exercise our best judgment as to what new business will follow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will furnish the hon. gentleman with our estimate of the receipts and income from the new road and the expenses, and the margin between the two. That information I have not here just at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. When you get over the bridge and into Montreal, is there any connection for railway traffic between the Canadian Pacific Railway system and the Grand Trunk Railway system by means of which you can take freight in car right through from the Grand Trunk Railway terminus? Or is it a fact that when you get into the city of Montreal, every ounce of freight that you may hope to transfer from the Canadian Pacific Railway western system—which, I suppose, is one of the things you are looking for—will have to be transferred from car to car? If I am rightly informed, there is no connection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is not right

when he says there is no connection. We have provided for connection.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ordinary means of connection. There are switches and tracks laid down at the Grand Trunk Railway terminus which enable cars to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and we have arranged that we are to have the full use of those lines and be able to make those connections. That is one of the things we have been very careful to arrange for.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear that, but the hon. gentleman will see to what condition he has reduced the independent members of the House of Commons. We are within nine days of the limit set for prorogation. This is one of the most important matters that could come before the House, involving an addition to the debt immediately of \$7,000,000 for this matter alone, and yet although this scheme was entirely concluded when the House met, we are kept within nine days of the term set for prorogation before we have one single document put before this committee to enable us to make up our minds. That is not treatment which any Government should give to independent supporters of its own and not the treatment which the country will consider fair when there is in question a proposed outlay of \$7,000,000 out of our capital account. That is the amount beyond doubt; no calculation can get over that. Now, I want to ask the attention of the committee, between this and the time when we shall take up the resolution, to two points. The first is what I have already made, that entering into this arrangement involves an addition to the country's debt of \$7,000,000 at the least.

Mr. CHARLTON. At what rate of interest ?

Mr. FOSTER. Three per cent, which is a fair percentage to take. Now, I ask the attention of this committee to another most important point. The only thing that we get of our own from this expenditure is a section of a road between two parts of the Grand Trunk Railway system. Then we get the use of a section of the Grand Trunk Railway on the Chaudière side, and the use of a section of the Grand Trunk Railway and its terminus on the Ste. Rosalie side. The Government have, I suppose—the hon. Minister of Railways will correct me if I am wrong—arranged that the Grand Trunk Railway will pay the whole cost of maintenance of these sections of the Grand Trunk Railway over which we get running rights.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In each of what cases ?

Mr. FOSTER. The two sections where the Government get running rights over the Grand Trunk road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all; the arrangement is the same as is usually entered into between railway companies. There is, where a right is acquired, such as we acquire, a fixed rental for that right. Then there is the division of the cost of maintenance between the two companies based on the proceeds.

Mr. FOSTER. That is most excellent. We are getting information little by little, and I have a much stronger argument than I thought. On the Ste. Rosalie side, let the committee just see what it means. The Grand Trunk Railway have to keep up their road there, they have to keep up their terminals, whether we go over it or not. They have to enlarge and double track their bridge, whether we give them anything for the cost or not. They would be put to every dollar of expense that they are put to now. They would have inevitably, as a corporation, to incur that expense. They incur it and we go in. What do we give the Grand Trunk Railway for these two terminals? We set aside out of that \$7,000,000, \$5,000,000 as a payment to the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway are not put to one single dollar extra expense on account of what they do in maintaining their road in order to give us running privileges over it. More than that. Not only do we give them \$5,000,000, but we actually, over and above that, pay our part of the cost of maintenance of that road on each of these end sections.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, why not? Now the committee has something to think over; the country has something to think over. The Grand Trunk may well have been permeated with joy from one end to the other of its great corporate system, when it received a present of \$5,000,000 and an assurance of a certain contribution in addition every year for ninety-nine years for the two end sections of the road. There is another point worth looking at. Your Intercolonial Railway, terminating at Lévis, was given the opportunity of making connection by bridge with Quebec, the construction of which would have kept faith—if you set any store by that—with the people. This connection made, you would find the Intercolonial connected side by side, a track meeting track, with the two roads that connect with the city of Montreal, the Canadian Pacific Railway on one side, and the Grand Trunk Railway on the other. In what position are you now in the city of Montreal, so far as traffic is concerned? Your position is not so good as it would be connecting with Quebec, for you have to make terms in competition with the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way which, in the traffic for Europe, is interested in taking every dollar of traffic they can over this road which is 76 miles shorter than your own. If you had made the connection with them at Quebec, you would have given them the inducement of the haulage between Montreal and Quebec over this road which they have to keep up. As the matter is before the committee now, this seems to me a most indefensible arrangement. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that if there were no coercion, no previous pledge, no hard and fast contract made that the men in Parliament know nothing about, and you were to bring this proposition before the committee purely as a business proposition, you would not find ten men in the committee who would approve it.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). It seems to me that the question before us is a very simple one. True, we have heard speeches to make it as clear as mud. But what are the facts? The Intercolonial Railway, so far, has had its terminus at Chaudière. It is a well known fact that the Intercolonial Railway has cost millions and millions to the country. At times the deficit upon its operation amounted to nearly a million a year. It is true that of late years the state of affairs has improved, all the same, the Intercolonial Railway has never paid its working expenses. Now, is there a man in this committee prepared to stand up and say that a great railway like the Intercolonial, should, for all time, be deprived of the advantage of having some great centre as its terminal point? As it is to-day it has no such terminal point. The Minister of Railways and Canals has thought fit to make an arrangement by which the Intercolonial Railway shall, in future, have its terminus in the great city of Montreal. But hon. gentlemen opposite say, amongst many other things to which I shall have occasion to allude—

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Before the hon. gentleman passes on, will he allow me to ask him a question?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. If this railway is to cost seven or eight millions of dollars to come to Montreal, why would not my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) have the terminus of the road in the city of Quebec by means of a bridge costing four millions.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. I will certainly answer the question the hon. gentleman has put to me. But I was just going to address myself to another point. Our friends from the other side say that this will involve an expenditure of seven millions of dollars. I would like to know how that can be. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) first said that it would cost seven millions—

Mr. **FOSTER**.

An hon. **MEMBER**. Eight millions.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Between seven and eight millions, I said.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. A million more or less does not make a great difference in the utterances of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper). Let us say it will cost seven millions. Let us address ourselves to facts as they are.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Give us all the facts.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Well, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows any facts that he is anxious to state to the House, let him stand up and state those facts like a man. We will, not any of us, stand any improper insinuations. If the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman on that side knows anything wrong about this matter, let him state it right now. We are ready to listen to them; we are anxious to listen to them.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Not so anxious.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain), who should not laugh about such a thing, has anything to say, let him say it now. And, on behalf of this Government, I challenge any one on the other side to say that there is anything wrong. Sir, we are here discussing a question of affairs. What are the facts? The Minister of Railways and Canals has made an arrangement by which he has agreed to pay \$210,000 a year for the use of the Grand Trunk facilities and for the use of the Drummond County Road. If we admit that the Intercolonial Railway should have its terminus in Montreal, we have to decide whether it would be better to build up a railway to Montreal, or whether it would be better to make such an arrangement as has been made. Now, I am surprised to hear a man of affairs, a man of ability, the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) speaking as he speaks to-day. He knows the city of Montreal; he knows the railways of Montreal; he is in a position to tell how much the terminal facilities of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Montreal have cost. I state here, knowing the city of Montreal as I do, that it would have been impossible to have secured terminal facilities in Montreal for a Government railway without spending between twelve and fifteen millions of dollars. No business man will deny that. The question then is whether it was better to secure terminal facilities on such terms. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are going to increase the debt of Canada by \$7,000,000. Sir, I make this prophecy—that, by the arrangement that has just been made not only shall we not have a deficit, but the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway will increase to such an extent that we shall have a large surplus. The future will decide whether I am right or wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you base that on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I base it on the simplest possible reason. The Intercolonial Railway has to-day no great centre for its terminal point. Does my hon. friend mean to say that a terminal point in the city of Montreal for a great railway will not mean anything ? Is there any man in his senses who will state such a thing ? My hon. friends say : You should not have made that arrangement, but you should have trusted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If we had adopted the plan that they propound to-day, we would simply have been at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there is no doubt about that. I am not unfriendly to the city of Quebec, very far from it. And I say that the scheme which is now before us will not at all interfere with anything which may have been promised in respect to the Quebec bridge. But coming back to the question itself, I say this : Having made up our minds that it was necessary for the Intercolonial Railway to have its terminus in the city of Montreal, we had to choose between two plans, either that of building a railway of our own, or making the arrangement that we have made. Well, how much would a bridge cost opposite Montreal ? Would it have been possible to build a bridge there without expending five or six million dollars or more, besides the cost of the road itself ? We would have been obliged to build a railway of our own, and we would have been obliged to acquire terminal facilities in Montreal where property is very high indeed. I say again, that aside from the bridge altogether, these terminal facilities would have cost ten or twelve millions. Now, how much would it have been necessary to spend to build a railway from Lévis to Montreal ? The distance, I suppose, is about 150 miles in round numbers. Has any railway been built in Canada in the past that has not cost at least \$15,000 a mile ? Let my hon. friend add all those figures together. Now, Sir, I shall have to use a strong word—is it not a preposterous proposition to come before the House and say that a railway connecting the Intercolonial Railway with Montreal will not pay a dollar. I repeat what I said a moment ago. Not only have we not increased the indebtedness of Canada, but we have taken the best possible means of making the Intercolonial Railway a paying railway. That is the policy that we have followed. I will not say much more, but I will repeat that if any hon. gentlemen opposite think that any member of this Government has acted in an improper way, let them say so and let them say so now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let them not say "hear, hear," but let

them make their charge now openly and like men.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We are not generally afraid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not generally afraid, because I have not generally done wrong. I think, Mr. Chairman, in these few words I have disposed of all the arguments which have been put forward against this scheme. In the first place, it would have cost a great deal of money to build a railway to Montreal ; in the second place, it would have been almost impossible to acquire terminal facilities in Montreal ; in the third place, the construction of a railway by this Government would have involved the necessity of building our own bridge opposite Montreal. All these schemes combined would have cost a very large amount of money, while by the arrangement that we have made, the Intercolonial Railway will become a paying concern.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Intercolonial Railway..... \$348,000

Mr. QUINN. When we rose at six o'clock, the question of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, I think, was not concluded. I do not think that the Minister of Public Works has, after all, given satisfaction generally to the House in the remarks that he thought fit to make. It seems to me that the proposition has not been taken into consideration by the Government or by the Minister of Railways in a business-like manner. There are many views to be taken of the question before adopting such an enormous expenditure as seems to be necessary for the purpose of extending the road to Montreal by the route which has been chosen by the Government. I think if we look at it in a business light to begin with, it would be well to consider whether it is at all necessary that running facilities are necessary to be obtained on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. The object, of course, is to obtain traffic for the Intercolonial Railway, and to put it in a position, I fancy, to compete with the other roads doing business with the maritime provinces. Unless this object is attained, it will be utterly useless to think of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and unless this can be obtained in a satisfactory manner, it would not be a transaction that would commend itself to the country. Now, the Minister of Public Works has asked that charges be made. I do not think that this is the time when charges should be made. Whatever our ideas may be concerning the road, or the means that have been adopted for the purpose of obtaining this road, we will

select, of course, the proper time, if any, to make any charges that may be made in this matter. But I think it would be well to consider if the object could not be attained as well by constructing a railway bridge at Quebec, for example, as by obtaining running privileges over the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway coming into Montreal. Now, one of the first things that would strike a business man in looking at this proposition, would be the advantages that may be obtained by securing these running privileges into Montreal. Will the Intercolonial road be in a different position from what it is in Quebec to-day? Will it obtain privileges that it cannot obtain by retaining its position in Point Lévis and avoiding all this extra expenditure? If it comes to Montreal does not it at once meet the competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway? Neither of these oppositions is destroyed by the fact of the road coming into Montreal. Is it worth while, then, to spend an enormous sum of money for the purpose of bringing the road into Montreal if neither opposition can be overcome by constructing the road? If the Intercolonial were left in Lévis, the terminus it has at the present moment, and a bridge were constructed from Quebec to Lévis, an expenditure of about \$4,000,000 would be involved. By carrying out this project we would have, as tributary to the Intercolonial railroad all that traffic which comes from the city of Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of the river, and that which comes by the Grand Trunk from Montreal by the south shore, as well as that of the lines which are tributaries of the Grand Trunk. There would be an expenditure of about \$3,000,000 less than is necessary to construct the road to Montreal. This would be an advantage, not only to the Intercolonial, but, I apprehend, it would be a great advantage and one that would be highly appreciated by the people of Quebec; because it would not only afford communication between the Intercolonial and the city of Quebec direct, but it would afford communication for the people of Quebec generally with the south shore of the river, a communication which they have asked for for a number of years, and which, it seems, has been promised by the different Governments. Now, if it were necessary to continue this line, it would be well to take into consideration the amount of money that must necessarily be expended for the purpose, and learn if some cheaper mode could not be devised than the one which has been adopted by the Government. It costs \$6,000 a year for the small piece of road at Chaudière; it costs \$84,000 for the road from Chaudière to Ste. Rosalie; and \$37,500 for the use of the road from Ste. Rosalie to the bridge; \$40,000 for the use of the Victoria bridge, and

Mr. QUINN.

\$62,500 for the use of terminal facilities in Montreal. The Minister spoke of arrangements for connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk at Montreal. As a matter of fact, there is no connection between the two roads in the city of Montreal. There is an interchangeable line six or seven miles west of the city of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that it is four miles. There is another connection inside the city.

Mr. QUINN. There may be an intention to make a connection of that kind, but, at present, no such connection exists. There is a line running along the wharfs in the summer time, but that is not the time when the road will be of use. The great use of this road—and I wish to speak of that point more fully in a moment—will be in winter. But, as to the connection between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the only existing connection is some distance west of the city of Montreal. Now, what is the position of the Intercolonial when it comes into the city of Montreal? It possesses the right of half of the road between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie, as I understand it, but it does not possess the ownership of that road. It does not possess the ownership of the stations or other terminal facilities, which are altogether in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Intercolonial Railway would derive the greatest benefit from this road during the winter months, and at that time of year the Grand Trunk Railway is the strongest opponent of the Intercolonial Railway for freight traffic. We therefore find, that the Intercolonial Railway is actually at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Railway Company as far as Ste. Rosalie is concerned, and as far as all its terminal facilities to the city of Montreal are concerned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. How is it at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What do you mean by saying it is at its mercy? It is no more than you would be at the mercy of the landlord, if you rented a house for a long term of years.

Mr. QUINN. I will show you how the Intercolonial Railway would be at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway owns the stations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have just as much right to them as they have.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, and no more. You have just as much right to the use of the road, but you have not the management of the road, and the precedence given to one train

over the other will be in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. QUINN. The Minister says, no, no. But, after all, you are the lessee, and your lease does not give you the right to oust the owner. Every one knows that during the winter months there is a continual block of freight on the road between Montreal and Portland, which would include the line between Montreal and Ste. Rosalie as far as Richmond. When you have the increased traffic of the Intercolonial Railway going over that road, is the Grand Trunk Railway going to allow you to block its traffic for the purpose of getting the Intercolonial Railway freight through? You will have the same rights as the owner, but you are at the mercy of the owner of the road, and it is safe to say that your freight will be blocked during the whole winter season.

Mr. PENNY. What about the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. QUINN. I do not know how that comes into the argument, but probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Penny) is thinking of what would happen if running arrangements had been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway over the North Shore road.

Mr. PENNY. I mean, would not the Canadian Pacific Railway block the traffic as well as the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. QUINN. Not on that line.

Mr. PENNY. But on the line between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. QUINN. That is not the question. I am not contending that it would be well to obtain running facilities over the North Shore line, but I am pointing out the difficulties that stand in the way of the arrangement that has been made by the Government. I maintain that the consequence of that arrangement will be, that during the winter months, between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, the Intercolonial Railway freight will be constantly blocked. Now, any one who has had experience knows, and no one knows it better than my hon. friend (Mr. Penny), that during the winter season the Canadian Pacific Railway between Montreal and Quebec is not tested to its full capacity. If a bridge had been constructed at Quebec, and running facilities obtained over the North Shore road, there would be no difficulty in the transportation of freight between Montreal and Halifax during the winter months. I do not argue that an arrangement should be made with the Canadian Pacific Railway for running facilities between Montreal and Quebec, nor do I think that that would be necessary. What I do say is, that if the Quebec bridge had been constructed, it would be much better

for the Canadian Pacific Railway to use the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway as feeders, and to exchange freight with both these lines. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke referred to the difference between seven and eight million dollars, and said that that difference of a million dollars could be contributed to the construction of a bridge. We are paying to-day seven millions for the use of this road between Montreal and Quebec, and one million more would make eight millions. The Minister of Public Works smiles at that. It is all very well for the Government to say to its followers: We have adopted this policy and as loyal supporters you must endorse it, but I warn the followers of the Government from the district of Quebec, that it is not the first time promises have been made and not carried out by Governments in this country. It is not the first time that a Government, after it had succeeded in carrying out the measure it had in view when the promise was made, turned round and said to its followers: It is impossible for us to do what you ask owing to the enormous expenditure that would be incurred. I feel satisfied that should the Government carry out this arrangement, they will say to their followers: On account of this heavy expenditure it is impossible for us to contribute the million dollars necessary for the building of the Quebec bridge. Now, Mr. Speaker, this question has been sprung upon the House at this late hour of the session, and without any papers being before us, so that it is impossible to discuss it fully on the mere verbal statement made by the Ministers. I will say, however, that at first blush, this appears to be a contract that should not be carried out. What the real meaning of it is, it is difficult to say, but I draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the reports that are in the newspapers in connection with this matter, and I have no doubt he has seen them, because they have appeared, not in one newspaper, but in many papers throughout the country. He has asked to-day for charges. Well, Sir, it is not necessary to have charges made in the House. There is a first-class opportunity given to the Minister of Public Works to indict some people for libel, as he has done before. I trust that he will indict them, and if he does so, I hope he will push the cases for trial in such a way as to vindicate himself from the charges made in the newspapers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall not detain the committee, because we will have an opportunity of discussing the question when it comes before the House by resolution. The city of Montreal is looked upon as destined to be the Liverpool of this Dominion, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) who has the distinguished honour of representing that great commercial city, has certainly

not done it any credit by the manner in which he has dealt with this question this afternoon. No one will deny that the Intercolonial Railway, from its inception to the present time has been a drain upon the resources of the people of this country. I greatly deplore that this railway, after all the public money that has been sunk in it, is not yielding a better return to the Dominion. It is disheartening to see that year after year the Intercolonial Railway is not able to pay its running expenses, and that at this present year there is a deficit of \$100,000, notwithstanding that the people of this country are paying two and a quarter million dollars in interest on the money invested in that railroad. I contend that it is a laudable act on the part of the present Government to endeavour to get the Intercolonial road into the great commercial centre of Montreal, on an independent basis. As the Minister of Railways has said, he feels satisfied, from all he has gathered, that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal will result in it paying running expenses, and if this is accomplished, I want to know if it would not be a good bargain. The hon. leader of the Opposition criticised the Minister of Railways for deciding in this abrupt way to carry the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, without first ascertaining the extent of the increased traffic the railway would get. I was rather amused at a man of his extended experience giving that as an evidence of oversight and incapacity on the part of the Minister of Railways. I would like to ask the leader of the Opposition if, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company carried their line into the Windsor station in Montreal at a cost of \$2,000,000, that company went from door to door in the city of Montreal and inquired of the merchants what possible increase of business would result from that change? I would like to ask him if, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in place of having their line run behind the city of Toronto, spent about \$1,250,000 to bring it to the Union station, they went to the business men of Toronto and inquired what increase of traffic and what increased number of passengers they might expect by making that change. I am amazed at the arguments the hon. leader of the Opposition has used. He says he questions that the road from Quebec to Montreal will be twenty miles shorter. He says he has a strong suspicion that it will be one-fourth of that. I dare say that the hon. leader of the Opposition is measuring the corn of the present Minister of Railways in his own bushel measure. We can well remember when he announced in such glowing terms, and with all the eloquence and persuasiveness he could command, the immense advantage it would be to the Intercolonial Railway, and how it would shorten the mileage, to build the Oxford and New Glasgow branch. He said that it would make

Mr. McMULLEN.

the line forty-five miles shorter, and that the grades on the Intercolonial Railway were so heavy that it was impossible to make it a financial success unless that short road were built, and the grades lowered thereby. The hon. gentleman described in glowing terms how it would vitalize the Intercolonial Railway; but what was the result? Was the line forty-five miles shorter? It was only four and a-half miles shorter. Were the grades on that road less? The grades were actually heavier than on the old line, notwithstanding that it cost this country about \$2,000,000. With regard to the bridge at Quebec, I have not a single word to say against it. I earnestly hope to live to see the day when that bridge will be built. If the predictions which the hon. leader of the Opposition made in such glowing and eloquent terms when he sat on this side of the House as to the enormous output of the North-west are fulfilled, or even 50 per cent of those predictions, it will take every line that runs out of Montreal, after we have deepened our canal system, to carry the surplus produce that will flow through that city to the sea-board. The hon. leader of the Opposition says we should have taken the Canadian Pacific Railway line on the north shore, and have come to Montreal in that way after the bridge was built. That would put the Intercolonial in a very little better position than it is now. If there is one thing which the Intercolonial Railway needs, it is to have an entrance into the city of Montreal that it will not be hampered by a competing line. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a competing line, with it to the sea board, while the Grand Trunk is not a competing line in the same sense, as it carries its freight to Portland; it does not carry it to the sea-board in the Dominion. The hon. leader of the Opposition regrets that there is going to be such an addition to the debt to bring about this extension. When the hon. gentleman undertook to build the St. Charles Branch, which has unquestionably been a political sink, in which \$1,500,000 has been sunk, he declared to this House that it would not cost over \$300,000. If at that time he had extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, he might have done something to vitalize that road; but, instead of that, he squandered that large sum of money without any advantage to this country. He says this extension is going to add \$7,000,000 to the debt on account of the Intercolonial Railway. It comes badly from him to charge the present Government with the adding largely to the debt of the Intercolonial Railway. When the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was in power, he closed the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway; it then stood at \$35,000,000. When the leader of the Opposition came into power, he reopened it, and spent money right and left, until he increased the capital account of that road from about \$35,000,000 when

he came into power to about \$55,000,000 when he went out. The hon. gentleman built roads in all directions to give accommodation to different sections of the province he represented. I do not blame him for that; but it does not look at all well for him to charge the present Government with largely increasing the construction debt of the Intercolonial Railway. If the Government carry through this measure, I hope it will be done with care and economy. I have every confidence in the Government, notwithstanding the taunts that are cast across the House about wrong-doing in connection with this transaction. The hon. gentleman says there are charges made in the public press. Why does he not get up and make charges here and now, on the floor of Parliament, which is the proper place to make charges? We are here to criticise the acts of public men and to listen to charges if the hon. gentleman has any to make. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about newspaper charges, but they dare not get up in this House and declare on their responsibility that they believe there is wrong-doing in this matter. The career of hon. gentlemen opposite in the past has not been a very clear one. It has been surrounded with a great many questionable transactions. It is very often the man who cries "thief" who is himself the thief. Hon. gentlemen opposite are beginning early to cry thief. They had better wait until this matter is got into shape, when they can better judge it; and when they examine it, I believe they will realize that a fairly good bargain has been made. If, as I believe, it will result in the Intercolonial Railway being made self-sustaining, the people of this country will be getting something for the very large amount of money they have sunk in that road. I have every confidence, from what the Minister of Railways says, that we shall attain that result, and that hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), will feel that they have made a mistake in criticising, as they have done, his action in this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—as he no doubt feels very uncomfortable in having to support the Government on this measure—should have found it necessary to wander all over Canada instead of confining himself to the question now before the House. I ask the hon. gentleman why he did not meet the question I put to the Minister of Railways why he did not look at this matter from a business standpoint—why, in adding \$7,000,000 to the debt of the country, he did not first ask himself what the advantage of extending the Intercolonial to Montreal would be. Is that business-like, or is it not? Is it business-like, if a person is undertaking an enormous expenditure to accomplish an object,

to address himself to the question as to what is to be the result of that expenditure? Does that commend itself to the hon. gentleman or not? I say that is the very first thing, and now I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to state to this committee where he expects to get the traffic for the Intercolonial by going into Montreal. Where is it to go?

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I do not propose to go into the question of the Oxford branch or any of the other questions he has referred to, because they draw attention away from the question before the House. We have a grave proposition before us. We have to decide the question put to us by the Minister of Railways and Canals: Will you saddle this country with \$7,000,000 of debt for the purpose of bringing the Intercolonial into Montreal? That is the question. If my hon. friend wants an answer in regard to the Oxford and Windsor branch, I will not waste the time of this committee in giving it to him here, but I will tell him where he will find it. He will find an elaborate answer on that subject in an address delivered by me in the town of Windsor in 1891 and reported at length. That speech has never been answered to this day, for the reason that no man in this country was ever able to answer it. If my hon. friend wants my answer to that question, he will find it there, and I am ready to meet him with regard to it; but I do not want to go away from the question now before the House. It is too solemn a question for the hon. gentleman to meet by a tu quoque argument. Suppose I made a mistake or did wrong as Minister of Railways, with the best aid I could get in the Railway Department at Ottawa, is not that a reason for care and caution and for making some investigation in this instance? The hon. gentleman misunderstood me when he said I supposed that a third of the distance would be saved. I do not believe from the best information that I can get, that twenty miles would be saved, but that twenty miles less one-third, or thirteen miles would be saved, and therefore you would have to take one-third of the saving off.

The hon. gentleman has correctly told the House of the enormous expense which the Intercolonial has been to Canada. We all admit that an enormous capital has been sunk in that undertaking on which we have to pay interest every year, and no man in this House would hail with greater pleasure than I any proposal calculated to lighten that burden, but we are not going to improve matters by increasing our capital expenditure by seven million dollars more and getting nothing in return. The hon. gentleman was bound to have laid on the Table

long ago the fullest details with reference to the whole of this transaction, so that we might be in a position to express a deliberate judgment upon it, and not be hurried into it upon a mere verbal statement made in the dying hours of the session. I have shown the hon. gentleman that he cannot get increased traffic for the Intercolonial from Montreal to Halifax. How can the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. McMullen) pretend that the Intercolonial is going to compete successfully with the Canadian Pacific Railway when, according to the statement of the Minister of Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway has a difference of seventy-six miles in its favour? Why, one of the things that struck us forcibly long ago and which led me, at any rate to the conclusion that no Government, whether Liberal-Conservative or Liberal, should undertake the construction or the operating of railways, was the impossibility for a Government to construct or to operate a railway as favourably and economically as a private company. If you want an illustration of that, contrast the Intercolonial with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Running from the city of Halifax through the city of St. John and all these towns on the North Shore, running through an open, cultivated country up to the city of Quebec, we find, nevertheless, that the Intercolonial has entailed on the country, not only an enormous expense in the building of the line itself, but a large yearly expenditure in the operating of it. Contrast that with the Canadian Pacific Railway, starting at Nipissing and running 3,000 miles across the continent and tapping only one village of some 400 or 500 inhabitants on its way, and which is yet a great commercial enterprise. The one is a sink-hole into which money is continually poured and disappears, and the other is a commercial and financial success. True, the Canadian Pacific Railway has been largely assisted by the Government, but the assistance we have had to give it is relatively nothing in comparison with what we have been obliged to pay for the Intercolonial.

To come back to the point, the hon. Minister of Railways is bound to tell us, before calling on us to add an additional \$7,000,000 to the burden of the people of Canada, on which they will have to pay interest for all time, how he expects to improve the revenue of the Intercolonial. Is that a reasonable question or is it not? Does he not owe it to the Government, the House and the country, to submit to us a careful estimate of the sources of revenue and compare that with the expenditure he is about to make. The hon. gentleman who has just expressed such unbounded confidence in this Government (Mr. McMullen), a confidence which I regret I am unable to share, ought not to allow that confidence to shut his eyes and close his ears to argument and induce him to travel all over Canada to get away

from the question. But he ought, instead of opposing me, to exercise his influence, as a leading supporter of the Government, on the Minister of Railways to induce him to explain on what ground he proposes to make this enormous expenditure, and where the money is to come from which will recoup the treasury for the interest. If it could be shown where the traffic is to come from to meet this enormous expenditure, I would join at once with my hon. friends in giving my hearty support to the Government, but I cannot see where it is to come from, and the Minister of Railways has not shown us. On the contrary, he treated the subject so cavalierly as to satisfy me that he was utterly indifferent whether this operation was to be successful or not. He had simply made up his mind to it, and do it he will. When I asked him: Supposing you save twenty miles on the present line from Montreal to Halifax, in what position will you be as regards competition at Halifax? the hon. gentleman said he did not know, he had not considered that; but, as a business man, he was bound to take that question up at the very outset. I have shown that the traffic cannot come from the business in Halifax, because the hon. gentleman will have to meet there, in competition, abler management than the Intercolonial has ever had. He will have to compete against one of the keenest and ablest railway managers to be found in America. If he cannot get his business at Halifax, where else will he get it? Where is the town? There are a number of small places between Quebec and Halifax, but he cannot expect any business from them to recoup him for this enormous expenditure. What about St. John? My hon. friend may say: Is not St. John showing that it is going to be a great winter freight port for Canada, and has it not been demonstrated that grain can be carried down to the port of St. John and shipped in competition with the town of Portland? I am glad to say that the experiment that has been made in that respect has been completely successful, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have shown that by a combination between the shippers and that company, St. John can compete with Portland as a winter freight port. Will this great expenditure enable us to increase our business with St. John? I have told the committee that they can do nothing so far as Halifax is concerned, because they have 76 miles of additional distance against them, and in favour of their competitor the Canadian Pacific Railway. How does the question stand as regards St. John, the only great port, the only important market for traffic between Montreal and Halifax. Why, my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) who has just sat down, will hardly believe me when I tell him that the distance to St. John by the proposed line is 268 miles greater than by the Canadian Pacific Railway. What does my hon. friend think of that? Is there

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

any hope of increasing business between Montreal and St. John? Is there any hope in assisting in the grain trade or anything else as regards St. John? The hon. gentleman has only to look at the timetable, and he will find that by the Intercolonial from Chaudière to St. John via Moncton is 577 miles, and from Montreal to Lévis by Grand Trunk is 172 miles, or a total from Montreal to St. John by the Grand Trunk, and the Intercolonial of 749 miles. The Minister of Railways and Canals says he is going to shorten that. I am told that thirteen miles is the utmost that he can shorten it. The hon. gentleman thinks he can shorten it by twenty miles. Suppose he does, what difference will it make? He will still have a distance of 248 miles against him. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), I ask any man in this House, I ask any candid man in this country, to tell me: Where is the traffic to come from? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) said that he anticipated tremendous results, by getting the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, getting communication with that great commercial centre. Well, it is possible to hope for that if you look at the matter generally and without examining the facts of the case. But the facts are against him. When you come to Montreal you encounter keener competition than at present. From the present terminus, Chaudière, there is no competition. But when you come to Montreal, you meet the competition of the Grand Trunk, a system paralleling your own from Montreal to Chaudière and you have the Canadian Pacific Railway which is 76 miles shorter to Halifax and 246 miles shorter to St. John than the Intercolonial. Now, is it not trifling with the intelligence of this House for any person to pretend that this enormous expenditure is going to result in securing additional traffic for the Intercolonial? In my judgment, it will enormously increase the difficulties of the operation of that road. In my judgment, you will have to pay not only the interest on \$7,000,000 added to the debt of Canada to carry out this project, but you will have to pay an additional sum for the maintenance of the road over and above all that it will give you. Why? Because from Chaudière to Montreal you have the keen competition of the Grand Trunk, running side by side with this, and enriched out of the treasury of Canada with the enormous subsidies poured into their coffers, and that without any return whatever.

There is another thing. Any person who will look at this map—and I invite my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), if he is capable of seeing or hearing anything except what will induce him to say that he has unbounded confidence in the Government and that if they declared that black is white he would corroborate their statement, to consider this matter—will find that one of the difficulties is that the Grand Trunk running between

Chaudière Junction and Montreal does not run through the open, cultivated portions of the country such as are calculated to make a line profitable. He will find, particularly with regard to the Drummond County Railway, which was constructed, I believe, piece-meal as a mere lumber road and in connection with the utilization of the forest, is of the same character. It runs through a country that offers no prospect of improved traffic. But there is a railway which has already been subsidized by the Government to the extent of \$3,200 a mile, the Great Eastern Railway, running from Chaudière, not to Ste. Rosalie, but to the bridge itself, shortening the distance by twenty-five miles and running through one of the finest portions of Canada, a country likely to yield a great deal of traffic. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) had been anxious to promote the interests of Canada and the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, I think he would have been more favourably impressed than he seems to have been with this line. But the interests of the country have been sacrificed to an alarming extent. No person is more favourable to railway extension than I am. Anything that the hon. Minister will bring forward that shows itself to be necessary for the development of the country, even if it incur heavy expense, I shall feel bound to give it support. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not believe it, but it is a fact that it would give me infinitely more pleasure to support them in this matter than to oppose them as I feel bound to do in the interests of the country.

This line, by which the hon. gentleman proposes to bring the Intercolonial into Montreal exposes him to a great difficulty which would have been avoided if he had taken the Great Eastern running through a good section of the country. A portion of the road over which he is to get running powers is the great channel for traffic between Portland and Montreal. Traffic is continually obstructed by delays on this portion of the road. I do not know whether the hon. Minister's attention has been called to that point, but I think it is a matter of some little importance.

One word more. I find that this road has already received large public subsidies. I find that according to the reports of the Department of Railways and Canals for 1896, the company had then constructed a line of seventy-three miles from St. Rosalie to Moose Park, and a branch of seventeen miles to Nicolet, in all, ninety miles; that the subsidies voted to the company by the province of Quebec, were: Drummondville to Nicolet, thirty-nine miles, at \$4,000 per mile, \$156,000; from Drummondville to St. Rosalie, 10,000 acres per mile for twenty-seven miles, and from Cunnell to Arthabaska, 10,000 acres, for twenty-three miles—in all 500,000 acres of land, which was converted into cash at 52½ cents per acre, amounting to a cash subsidy, \$262,-

500; that there was contributed towards bridges, \$50,000; that the Dominion Government has granted in addition to what the Government of Quebec granted, \$297,920; so that we are buying back, it appears, our own money. From the town of Nicolet \$10,000 were contributed and the municipality gave \$5,000. In all \$781,420 have been granted for this miserably constructed road that is quite unfit to perform the work of the Intercolonial Railway. And here I would like to ask my hon. friend the question, as I did not quite catch what he said when he was making the statement, whether it is the new portion from Chaudière to Moose Park, the thirty-three miles, that they are obliged to put 70 pound rails upon to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, or whether it is the entire line from end to end, to St. Rosalie, that they are obliged to bring up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, or is he to take the road as it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only the new portion of the road is to be laid with these heavier rails, only the new portion, as I stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the other portion remains in its present condition, and has to be put in order by the Minister of Railways at public expense.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's information is as regards its present condition, but my reports show that the road is in very good condition. When was the hon. gentleman over the road?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman information that has been placed in my hands, and I call his attention to it, because I believe that he will find it accurate and authentic:

This railway was built chiefly to transport the lumber products of the private firm which was incorporated for its construction, and is in no way fit to carry on the business of the Intercolonial Railway. (See report of engineer who examined this lately.)

I think I can furnish my hon. friend with the report of an able engineer who has made that statement:

It is well known that the line was for a long time under offer of sale—

And I call the attention of my hon. friend to this, as important:

--at \$5,000 per mile, and a cash offer would probably have secured it at a considerably lower figure.

That speaks volumes as to the condition of that road:

The line was built so as to reach various lumber tracts, and without regard to alignment. It passes through a very inferior country, unsettled, and in great part unfit for settlement, and that

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

will produce no traffic when the balance of the lumber products are removed. The population on the last 50 miles of the line does not reach 5,000.

Now, Sir, if that be true, and I have reason to believe that it is a true statement, I think the hopes that my hon. friend has founded as to the improved traffic that will be brought to the Intercolonial Railway—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who is the hon. gentleman's authority for those statements?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have given the hon. gentleman my authority.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have not named anybody at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not the engineer's report under my hand, but I will furnish him with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pardon me for one moment. He has very strongly endorsed a gentleman upon whose information he is now making these statements, and I apprehend he must know who he is, or he would not endorse his statements.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have given the hon. gentleman the facts, and there are probably gentlemen behind him, and on both sides of the House, who know this country well and who know whether these statements are well founded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman decline to give the name?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I think I will probably favour my hon. friend with it to-morrow.

A saving of distance of 13 miles is claimed between St. Rosalie and Chaudière, but unless the line is reconstructed, it will certainly be unsafe to attempt to make the same time that the Grand Trunk Railway can make on its better tracks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who says that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A gentleman who is, I suppose, as thoroughly acquainted with this road and its present condition and everything relating to it, as any person in Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me, if I guess the first letter of his name?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not hesitate to mention the gentleman's name, but having asked him for the facts in connection with it, knowing that he was in a position to understand the subject thoroughly, he placed this statement in my hands. I have not his authority to disclose the

source of my information, but I have no doubt that I can obtain it.

By continuing the aid already granted to the Great Eastern Railway Company, of \$3,200 per mile, with an additional sum in aid of the large bridges on the line, a line 25 miles shorter than the Grand Trunk Railway would have been obtained. This line possesses particularly favourable gradients, and it passes through the most fertile and thickly-settled district between Lévis and Montreal. The construction of this line would have given the Intercolonial Railway the shortest and best line to Montreal, and at very little cost to the country. This line was also approved by the Quebec Government, and the consensus of opinion throughout the country, was also in favour of it.

Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who know this locality well, will be better able to judge of the accuracy of those statements than myself.

The line could have entered Montreal by the Grand Trunk Railway bridge, or the new one proposed to be constructed, and all railways reaching Montreal could have had an independent connection with it.

Now, Sir, I think I have given the House the reasons why I felt it my duty to oppose this measure, a measure so important that this House is entitled to have all the facts and all the statements upon which the Minister of Railways has undertaken to impose this great obligation upon Canada. I have given the reasons for the conviction I have that it was absolutely a duty on the part of the Government long ago to have laid upon the Table of this House a clear and succinct statement of all the facts and reasons that led them to this conclusion. I regret that the Government should have placed my hon. friend from North Wellington in the painful position either of supporting so monstrous a proposition as this, or of voting against the Government. It is a deplorable position, I admit, but I entertain no doubt whatever that if the Government had been good enough to take this House into its confidence before this contract was signed, and had laid these statements and proposals on the Table, and invited a frank expression of the House as to whether that was a wise and judicious measure or was one fraught with great damage to the best interests of the country, I have no doubt that my hon. friend for North Wellington would have been found side by side with me, for once at all events, in condemnation of this proposal.

Mr. McMULLEN. A word in reply to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper). I challenge his statement that we are adding seven millions a year to the debt of this country. He is making a mountain out of a mole-hill, and he knows when he makes the statement that it is virtually not correct. I admit that by the proposed change the drain upon the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway will be increased to the extent of \$210,000 a year, but it is now run at a positive

loss of \$100,000 a year to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) prefers to see the Intercolonial Railway making that an annual loss rather than support an honest effort to bring the line into touch with the commercial centre of the Dominion, and to make it pay its working expenses at least. If the Intercolonial Railway, under the new arrangement, earns in addition to its present earnings, sufficient to cover the annual deficit, and to cover the \$210,000, the annual sum that it will cost to bring it to Montreal, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) if this will not be a good bargain. The hon. gentleman has asked: Where is the trade to come from? Well, the hon. gentleman knows that at one time the western terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway was Detroit, and it entered Chicago over the Michigan Central and Michigan Southern. The Grand Trunk Railway came to the conclusion that their line would never pay until it entered Chicago, and notwithstanding that there were fourteen lines centering in that city from the east at the time, they reasoned that the financial life of the Grand Trunk Railway depended upon getting into the city of Chicago, and so I say, Sir, that the financial life of the Intercolonial Railway depends upon the road getting into the Chicago of Canada, and Montreal is that city. I congratulate the Government upon their effort to try to make the Intercolonial Railway a paying concern, or at least to try and make it pay its working expenses. Where is the trade to come from, asks the hon. gentleman? Does he not know that Montreal is the head of ocean navigation, and the terminus of our great canal system which we are now deepening. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) smiles at that, but I know he hopes as I do, that Montreal is going to be an immense trade centre, and therefore it is of vital interest that the Intercolonial Railway should get connection with that city. I believe that the words of the Minister of Railways will be verified, and that when the Intercolonial Railway is running directly into the city of Montreal, its earnings will be increased, and the people of this country will no longer be called upon to pay an annual deficit of \$100,000. I have not the slightest doubt but that will be the result. The leader of the Opposition sympathizes with me, because, as he says, I am compelled to support the Government in this matter. I have been fourteen years in this House and no one more than I deplored the unfortunate financial position of the Intercolonial Railway. I believe we are now entering upon a new era in the history of that road, and I have good reason to believe, and I am prepared to test the statement of the Minister of Railways, that under this arrangement the Intercolonial Railway will pay its running expenses. I hope the leader of the Opposi-

tion will live to see the Intercolonial Railway running into Montreal, to see it earning its expenses, and to see it a very valuable addition to the carrying trade of the country. I hope the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will live to see that day, and if he does, I trust that he will blush at the imprudent attack which he has made on this scheme now before the House.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to reply briefly to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) as to the condition of this road. I am well acquainted with the Drummond County Railway, and I passed over it very recently. I am sure that the gentleman who gave the information to the leader of the Opposition perhaps never travelled over that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the first letter of his name Armstrong ?

Mr. LAVERGNE. I can say that this road is in perfect condition. I am surprised to hear it stated that it passes through a country which is not settled. This road from Ste. Rosalie passes through St. Hyacinthe, which is thickly populated, thence through Bagot County, which is also well settled, thence through Drummond County, which is also well settled, thence through Nicolet County, which is also settled, and thence through part of the county of Arthabaska, and half of that is settled.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought it was a branch to Nicolet ?

Mr. LAVERGNE. It passes through the county of Nicolet, and there is a branch running to the town of Nicolet. In Arthabaska, and in part of the county of Lotbinière, about half of the line which is not yet constructed is in the forest, but far from that being a useless country for a railway, it supplies a very large traffic. In fact, at present it is a very paying traffic. From Lotbinière this railway adjoins the county of Lévis, which is also settled. The report of the gentleman who gave the information to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is very much exaggerated. This road is in a perfect condition, and it does not pass through a desert, as the gentleman who supplied this information wants to make believe.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My authority that the last twenty-three miles went through a forest was the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. LAVERGNE. A little more than half of that part is in a forest, but there is a large lumber trade, and the line is the only means of getting out this lumber. Now, I think the hon. gentleman has magnified the competition with the Intercolonial Railway that it would meet from the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. John and Halifax.

Mr. McMULLEN.

It is well known that even if the distance is longer that competing companies will transport goods at the same rate. I admit they may not derive the same profit, but they do transport the freight at the same rates, and the Intercolonial Railway will have the same advantage of getting the business in Montreal as the Canadian Pacific Railway has.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is to say, they will bring the freight to Halifax by charging the same as the Canadian Pacific Railway does, although the latter road is 76 miles shorter ; and they will get the business of St. John by carrying it at the same rate as the Canadian Pacific Railway does, although the Canadian Pacific Railway is 240 miles shorter.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway distance is shorter, but I say that the companies will carry at the same rates ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know, but will that be profitable to the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. LAVERGNE. Certainly it will. It may not pay as well, but certainly it will be profitable if we can get the business. There is no doubt but that the report supplied to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is the report of a rival who has another scheme on hand. The map on which the hon. gentleman bases his statement that the Drummond county road is crooked, is not a correct map. Next week we will have a proper map of the road and that map will show that the line is one of the straightest in Canada.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will that map be made under the direction of the Commissioner of Public Works and Railways in the province of Quebec ?

Mr. LAVERGNE. It is an official map.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, if it is you will see the road is pretty crooked.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Yes, we will see it, and have all the correct information. I say that you cannot trust that map which you have in your hands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Look at the map that the Minister of Railways laid on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not lay any on the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, some one had a map here in addition to this one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I sent that to you.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) will look at this map he will see that this road is a very crooked one.

**Mr. LAVERGNE.** I have seen that map and that is the one I object to. It makes the Drummond County Railway very crooked, but that is not the fact. I believe that when my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has an opportunity of seeing all the information that will be laid before the House, he will perhaps alter his mind as to many details.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** This matter is so serious that after the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavergne) has made, challenging the accuracy of the views I have placed before this House, I feel bound to give him briefly the detailed statement of an engineer who has recently examined the road. I shall be happy to place this in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the information of the officers of his department. Before he proceeds with this matter, he ought to send down an engineer from his department with this statement, and have that engineer either verify it or refute it. What does it say? This is a description of the road which the hon. Minister of Railways described as being in very good condition and one which the Dominion should purchase as a connecting link with the Intercolonial Railway. This report says :

This road commences at Ste Rosalie, in the county of Bagot, a point on the Grand Trunk Railway 38 miles distant from Montreal, thence to Drummondville, a place of some importance in the county of Drummond, on the St. Francis River. From Drummondville, the line extends to Forestdale, in the county of Nicolet, through a country the most of which is uncultivated.

**Mr. LAVERGNE.** That is not correct.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER—**

From Forestdale to Moose Park, 8 miles, the line is in operation, but in an incomplete state.

**Mr. LAVERGNE.** That is not a true statement. Most of the land is settled.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I am informed by the hon. member for the county that that is not correct.

**Mr. LAVERGNE.** I say it is correct.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The report proceeds to say :

This railway has been constructed in as cheap a manner as is possible. The grade of the line to a very large extent is a surface one, consequently having bad grades that would have been avoided in a first-class line by accepting heavier work.

Grading has been done, in a great many cases, in a very injudicious manner; in most places where the banks have been made from side work, the ditches have been made too close to the bank, leaving no berm, consequently allowing the slopes of the embankments to reach into the ditches. The banks are so low that, in numerous cases, the water in the ditches is only a few inches lower than the rail, keeping the embankment in such a wet condition that it must be very diffi-

cult to keep the track up to its proper shape, and causing sags in the rail.

Another defect is, that drainage has not been properly arranged for, the water lodging in the culverts not having proper outlet by tap-drains, as are usually provided.

The track is very good in places, but there are sketches where the lining and lifting is not what it should be. The rails have not been bent on the curves, and a great number of rails are getting badly worn. There are several places on the line where the tangents have bad bents in them, notably just west of Aston Junction and close to St. Wenceslaus. The curves on the line, as a rule, are light, there not being many of a very heavy degree of curvature. Some of them, however, are badly in need of lining, one in particular, just going into Forestdale, being from six inches to a foot off centre by their track centres. The rails are the 56-pound section, joined together by common fish-plate.

The ties are chiefly hemlock, mixed with a few cedar, &c.

Between Aston Junction and Waddington Falls, the right of way has only been partially cleared up, the logs and brush being only partly burnt, and there is quite a stretch of the line not fenced.

The culverts are chiefly wooden beam, built mostly of hemlock. The workmanship on them is rough. The culverts, not having the proper deck, are without any guard-rail, as the common tie is used.

In addition to the wooden culverts, there are some masonry beam culverts in good condition, as also some masonry boxes.

The pipe culverts on the line are not protected at the ends as they should be. This is a source of danger, as the banks at outlet and inlet are sure to be damaged in high water by scouring.

The quality of the ballast on the line is, as a rule, fairly good, with the exception of some few places, but the whole line needs a good lift.

Between St. Leonard and Carmel, there is a great deal of ballast of a very sandy nature.

The track in that district is also entirely too low, needing a heavy lift of ballast to make a good track.

At Drummondville Station, the track is in bad condition, ties bedded down in the mud, badly lined, and heaved with the frost.

At Blake's Mills, between Mitchell and Carmel, there is a very heavy grade which necessitates the cutting of the trains when they consist of more than ten cars, making two trips to surmount the grade.

The hon. Minister has stated that this portion of the Grand Trunk was not purchased on account of the heavy grade; yet here is a section of this road over which only ten cars can be drawn. In my opinion it would have been better to have purchased this portion of the Grand Trunk, for thereby we would have avoided the keen competition which will for ever prevent this connection with the Intercolonial Railway being able to compete with its rival.

**An hon. MEMBER.** Where will the great competition come from?

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** It will come from the Grand Trunk, and will be strengthened by the influence possessed by the company in Montreal. The report continues :

This defect in the line can be got rid of by building to the north of the present line.

The bridging on the line is very good, the masonry, ironwork and timber superstructure being in good condition. The principal rivers crossed are :

The St. Francis, at Drummondville, four spans.

West Branch Nicolet, near Mitchell, one span.

East Branch Nicolet, near St. Leonard, steel trestle.

Becancour River, near Waddington Falls, four spans.

There are some other small bridges in good order, with the exception of one just east of Forestdale, which is a small girder, probably 30 feet, resting on timber abutments which seem to be of a weak description.

At the bridge over the East Nicolet there is a very heavy sag in the grade, which should have been avoided by keeping up the grade, especially as a trestle bridge has been used there.

The fence on the road is built of the cheapest kind ; the bulk of it is the common 4-wire fence with one board on top.

The posts are mostly split ones and spaced too far apart to make a good solid fence without an intermediate small post to brace the wire. Between Drummondville and St. Hyacinthe there is a considerable stretch of board fence, four boards high. This is in bad condition, as it is badly heaved by frost, consequent to the post being insufficiently sunk in the ground.

The station buildings on the road are mostly of a very cheap nature, small, unfinished and unpainted. This is accounted for by the bush country through which the road runs.

That my hon. friend who has just addressed the House will suppose is a very great mistake, because it appears according to him that this is not a bush country, but an open country :

Drummondville has the best station on the line and also a repair shop, which is a building 75 or 78 feet long with a single track running through it. It is a very inexpensive building.

The water supply is provided by tanks at Drummondville, St. Leonard and Forestdale.

The main defects in the line are, the narrowness of the banks, the need of another lift of ballast before any fast running can be made, and the condition of the wooden culverts and cattle-guards. Ties also need replacing, but new ties are already distributed in many places.

Now, when the House rose, one hon. gentleman said to me : "How much would it cost to put this road in good order?" I said : "There is no question about that. I did not allude to the condition of the road, because I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that it was to have a 70-pound rail throughout and be equal in every respect to the Intercolonial Railway."

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not to be ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the hon. gentleman has now admitted that my hon. friend was right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have made no different statement from the statement I made in the first instance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend misunderstands me. I did not say he did.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman says I am now admitting, implying that I stated something different before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I said that my hon. friend asked me what it would cost to put this road in running condition. I said : "That question does not arise, because, as I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals, it is already provided for in the contract, that the parties who are getting these moneys are to put the road in as good a condition as the Intercolonial Railway, and to provide 70-pound rails." When I came back I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals whether it was possible I could be mistaken on that point ; and, to my amazement, the hon. gentleman admitted that the part of the road that was to have 70-pound rails and to be put in as good condition as the Intercolonial Railway was thirty-three miles not yet built. So I have no hesitation in saying—and I speak as one of experience, having occupied the same high office as the hon. gentleman holds—that in my judgment the amount of public money that will be demanded to put that road in any kind of running condition to meet any sort of competition, with the Grand Trunk Railway running alongside of it, will be an immense sum. After what my hon. friend who has just preceded me has said, I felt obliged to give this detail, which otherwise I did not intend to go into. But I do say that in my judgment, late as it is, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, before pressing on this House the adoption of such a proposal as this, evidently involving an enormous demand on the treasury of Canada for the purpose of putting that road into a proper condition between this and next November, or whenever it is to be brought into operation, ought to be able to submit some calculation to the House. Surely my hon. friend must have sent an engineer over this road to examine and report upon it ; and if he has evidence to refute this statement, the House ought to be favoured with it, because we ought to have all the light and information on such an important question which it is possible to submit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In making the statement which I did this afternoon, I was acting on a promise which the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition had exacted from me, to present to the House, on the first occasion when we got into the Estimates for Railways and Canals, a statement of the conditions and terms upon which this arrangement had been concluded. In making that statement, I did not undertake to present to the committee all the arguments, or any of the arguments or reasons which I thought would justify the adoption of that policy by

the Government. That I thought it would be very much more convenient to enter upon when the House would be asked to take some action upon the proposals of the Government. Now, the discussion which has taken place naturally must be bootless, because we have no motion before the committee by which it can pass its judgment upon the Government's proposal. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to understand, however, and none more than the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, that this proposition is one which can be sustained in every point of view in which it may be examined. It can be sustained, Sir, above all on the ground that it is a business proposition, and will commend itself to the business judgment of the people of this country. I have listened to the hon. gentleman with unusual interest. Not that I expected to get a great deal of information from him, because I saw at once that he was in such an impetuous hurry to get a chance to denounce this proposition, that he was not willing to take the time that would elapse between now and the submission of the resolutions to the House, to study the question and to get something like an intelligent appreciation of it. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to present us with an argument; but he has presented us with a philippic from beginning to end. The first address he gave was nothing but a complete denunciation, beginning with my poor, unfortunate self. I was utterly incompetent, and we were all incompetent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I do not think I said he was incompetent. I would have been making an apology to the hon. gentleman if I had said that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman did not say it, he implied language which I think could only convey to the intelligent listener that that was the idea he intended to convey. I extremely regret that I do not stand well in the estimation of my hon. friend—that he does not place my capacity on a very high plane. But I shall have to submit and bear up under the infliction of my hon. friend's condemnation with as good grace as I possibly can; and I hope I shall be able to carry myself through the ordeal with a fair measure of comfort and success. Now, what are the reasons which were assigned by the hon. gentleman against our entertaining this proposition? One was, and the first one, that this idea is too profoundly absurd to be entertained by competent men for one instant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As stated by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the class of argument which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the intelligence of this House, as though

the very moment that he sets the seal of his condemnation upon a proposition, it cannot be adopted and no further argument need be heard. There may be a body of intelligent men, or fairly intelligent men, who have some reputation for business experience and ability, who may have carefully considered this question and come to a conclusion upon it, but when the hon. leader of the Opposition thunders out his condemnation, why, the whole thing is at an end. It is too profoundly absurd, the hon. gentleman says, for anybody to entertain the idea for one instant. Will the hon. gentleman consult the business men of Montreal? Let him go into the counting room of any man carrying on mercantile business or manufactures in Montreal, and ask him what he thinks of the idea of extending the Intercolonial to that city. He will find but one expression of opinion, and that expression in favour of the project, except perhaps on the part of some people who are so strongly opposed to the Government that they could not possibly approve of any measure which the Government might bring down or consider it at all on its merits. He will find that the business community are not only a unit in favour of this proposal but are of the opinion that it should have been carried out long ago. Let him go down to the city of Halifax, and I suppose the hon. gentleman has some little respect for the judgment of the business men in Halifax, and what will he find? He has only to refer to the newspaper reports of what transpired before this proposition was actually concluded—not before we were considering but before we had concluded and made it public—and he will find the expressions of opinion unanimous in its favour. He will find that the Board of Trade of Halifax gave the very strongest expressions of approval of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Board of Trade in Halifax had this proposition before it? If he does, then we have been treated worse than I had supposed we were.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Now, my hon. friend can take comfort out of a very trifling circumstance. This proposition, that is the proposition to extend the Intercolonial to Montreal, they had before them, and that is the suggestion which the hon. gentleman says is so profoundly absurd that no competent business man would for a moment approve of it. There are some business men in Halifax, and the hon. gentleman will find that no reasons need be urged to them to convince them that it is not only in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway as an undertaking, but in the interests of the business community, that this proposal should be carried out.

In order that the hon. gentleman may know that this is not only the idea of the

present Government, I can tell him that it has been under the consideration of the Government which preceded the present Administration. This profoundly absurd idea had found a lodgement in the brains of some of our hon. friend's opposite who were in the late Government. And there are documents in my department which show that the late Government had made progress in coming to an arrangement with respect to this question, and the judgment of the officials of the Railway Department with regard to the character of the road, with regard to its value, and with regard to the estimated cost of construction with the view of the acquiring of it by the Government, was obtained, before this Government came into power, by our predecessors in office. I do not wish to rob my hon. friend's opposite of all the credit which may attach to them of having thought favourably of the undertaking, but I think it will appear to members of this committee as being somewhat singular that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have found nothing but to condemn in this whole undertaking, when his former associates in office had been entertaining the idea of carrying out, I will not say exactly the same arrangement in all its details, but a similar arrangement. I do not suppose that the arrangement in all its details which we have agreed to is such as would meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I am justified in saying that they had their calculations made and were basing their arrangements on the same materials which were before me and which looked to the early extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal.

I could furnish the hon. gentleman with some reasons which, I think would appeal even to his judgment in favour of the completion of this work. What is the fact? It is that the Intercolonial has not been in a position to make any traffic arrangements with the merchants of Montreal for shipments to the maritime provinces. Why? Because the Grand Trunk Railway stood between them. The Grand Trunk Railway owned the line between Lévis and Montreal, and we could not arrange with any shipper to send freight to any of our merchants in the maritime provinces, unless we could succeed in inducing the Grand Trunk Railway people to make such terms as would be favourable to the completion of such arrangement. The possession by the Grand Trunk Railway of that piece of railway made it utterly impossible for the managers of the Intercolonial to do any business, or at all events to do business to the extent they had a right to expect, until we had removed this great obstacle between the business men of Montreal and the maritime provinces. The Grand Trunk Railway was ever disposed to raise objections and impose conditions, and I need only state that reason to the committee to show how powerful and convincing it is. The Grand Trunk

Mr. BLAIR.

Railway had the very strongest possible interest then, as it has still to-day, against allowing the business men of Montreal to ship their freight via Richmond to Lévis and along the Intercolonial to the ports in the maritime provinces, because they own a railway which connects with Portland and they want to force all the freight they can handle or control on to Portland, so that their line may have the benefit of the longer hauling, and then they carry it from Portland by steamer to Halifax or Yarmouth or other ports in the maritime provinces. Until, therefore, this arrangement was completed, we were practically cut out from business connection with Montreal. Let me ask the business men of this House how long would the manager or owner of a railway, 1,200 miles in extent, such as the Intercolonial, tolerate the continuance of any such position as that? There would be no effort or expenditure which they would not make in order that they might reach the great business metropolis of the city of Montreal and be in a position there to take up such reasonable portion of the traffic of that city with the maritime provinces as they might reasonably expect to obtain.

Not only that, but railway men will tell you that unless the Intercolonial comes to Montreal it does not acquire the right as a railway to be represented at the meetings of the traffic managers where rates are settled and arrangements concluded among railway companies for the trans-shipment and transport of freight. At these traffic conventions, where the schedules are made out, we were not allowed to have any representative. The Intercolonial Railway, although it cost the country \$50,000,000 and traversed 1,200 miles of Canadian territory, was excluded from the merest shadow of representation at the meetings of the railway magnates of Canada, where arrangements are concluded upon which the freight east and west and west and east is carried. Now, having completed these arrangements, as we hope we shall be able to do with the authority of Parliament, we can send our traffic manager to these conclaves and these conventions, and he will have the right to say that the Intercolonial—as any other representative would have the right to say as to his own road—must be considered in all the schemes and plans and arrangements made with reference to the shipment of freight. Our representative will have a potent voice there; he will be able to secure for us a fair show among the railways carrying freight from the west, and so we shall stand as fair chance as the Grand Trunk has done for the carrying out of Montreal of the trade coming from the west for the maritime provinces. Then, as the House will see when the papers are laid on the Table, we have made such terms that we can send our freight-men all over Canada. We can send them to any point on the

Grand Trunk and can arrange terms on which traffic will be carried to and fro, and can compel the Grand Trunk to hand the business over to us at Montreal when it comes there. I venture to say that the contract that has been entered into between this Government and the Grand Trunk and Drummond County Railway Company, if examined in the light of sound information, and not of mere political hostility, if examined in the light of judgment and business experience, will be found to be one that will commend itself to the country, and will redound to our credit as business men. It will be seen that every detail has been guarded, as far as possible. I for one, as Minister of Railways, and therefore, perhaps, more directly responsible than any other member of the Government in this matter, am willing to have the success of my administration of the affairs entrusted to me judged by the success of the arrangement which I shall propose to Parliament in relation to this matter.

Now, the hon. gentleman raised another objection. He said that no Minister would be justified in going to this enormous expense unless he had succeeded in showing that there would be a reduction of the distance between Montreal and Halifax as compared with the distance by any other route; we ought not to do these things if, when a rule is put upon the track from Montreal via St. John to Halifax, you find that the mileage is greater by this route than by another. What force is there in such a contention? How far did that argument guide the hon. gentleman when he was Minister of Railways and had proposals to make to Parliament for the extension of the Intercolonial? When he conceived the idea that it would be in the interests of the country that the line from River du Loup to Lévis should be bought, did he lay a rule down to see whether any other road could be built from Montreal to Halifax shorter than the line he was proposing to purchase? Not at all; he bought 125 miles of railway and paid a million and a half for it, and he is speaking from sad experience as to the subsequent expense, for it took about another million and a half to put the road in order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman himself says "hear, hear." Unquestionably what I say is true. He made it part of the arrangement that the iron rails then on the 125 miles of road should be handed over to people from whom he was buying the road, and so, of necessity, he had to furnish new rails, which he had to purchase. Now, why did he buy the road from River du Loup to Lévis? Was it to shorten the distance, to enable one to reach Lévis more quickly than by the Grand Trunk? No; the question of distance did not enter and does not

enter into the calculations of the hon. gentleman when he is engaged in a transaction of this kind. It is only when he is searching for some ground upon which he can condemn a proposition of his opponents that he hits upon this as something that may catch somebody's ear or impress somebody's mind. It will not impress anybody in Parliament, but it may be caught up by somebody reading the newspapers who will be impressed by the argument.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) like me to tell him why I bought that 125 miles of road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the slightest objection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will soon give the hon. gentleman the reason if he wishes it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I trust the hon. gentleman will not imagine I am afraid or unwilling he should give the reason. He does not terrify me one particle by threatening that he will give the reason. I am not saying he had any improper reason; I am willing to admit that he had reasons that were quite proper. He had not the reason which the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon gave us, that there was a contract between the older provinces under which they entered into confederation to buy that portion of the Grand Trunk and make it part of the Intercolonial. If the hon. gentleman should say that, he would assign a reason having no basis whatever; there is nothing in the compact which made it the duty of the Government of Canada in carrying out the federal arrangement to buy a piece of road. They bought it, why? Because they wanted to get nearer the centre of business and population. I only wonder that they did not long ago complete and make effective the step that they took, by continuing on to Montreal. If they had done so years ago, even on less favourable terms than those the Government are proposing, it would have been an enormous advantage to the railroad system owned by the Government, a great advantage to the city of Montreal and a great advantage also to the provinces which the road traverses.

I was particularly entertained when I heard my hon. friend dwelling with such earnestness and with such apparent sympathetic feeling upon the subject of the Quebec bridge. I thought to myself that it is in vain that the sportsman spreads his net in the sight of any bird. I should have thought that my hon. friend, with all his experience, would have learned by this time that that little scheme of his was altogether too specious, too open, too apparent, to make any impression on the minds of any of the gentlemen who may be representing the province of Quebec. Does any one suppose for a moment that that hon. gentleman is

deeply enamoured of the Quebec bridge project, that his soul is bound up in seeing a bridge built over the St. Lawrence at Quebec? If any one does so, he is doing the hon. gentleman an injustice. I know enough about the hon. gentleman to feel convinced that this matter is not torturing his thoughts, that he is not losing sleep over it, that he is not losing a comfortable moment because of the non-existence of a bridge at Quebec. The hon. gentleman can stand the deprivation, I think, about as well as anybody. Now, I think the gentlemen from the province of Quebec, and I think the leader of this Government from the city of Quebec, are likely to take as much interest in what concerns the welfare of the city of Quebec as is my hon. friend, and that whenever they see any movement taking place which seems to be prejudicial to that section of the country, when they see that the interests of their section are being struck at unfairly or unfavourably, I apprehend that they will be as careful to protect those interests as well as the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) can be.

Well, now, my hon. friend to-night and this afternoon has begun to be alarmed lest there may be an increase in the public debt. My hon. friend feels that it will be a most grievous thing if, as the result of any proposal that we may make to Parliament, no matter how meritorious the proposal is, no matter how much return we are to get for the expenditure, no matter how solemn may be the reasons which justify the proposition, the thought that this proposition may increase, as he says, the public debt of this country by seven or eight millions, is a controlling thought with him. Now, how long has the hon. gentleman been afraid of increasing the public debt? How long has the hon. gentleman been so cautious against incurring any increase to the public debt? Why, Sir, if my memory serves me right, the hon. gentleman started in his flight from a remote section of Cape Breton and went clear across this continent, touching at various points as he went along, and promising his millions here, there and everywhere. I am not going to say that the hon. gentleman was making these promises to the people of Canada on the eve of the election, without any thought of fulfilling them if he should be returned to power. I am bound to assume that the hon. gentleman was dealing fairly with the people of this country, and with the various localities to which he addressed himself when he held out these hopes. When he made these pledges to the people of Canada, I am bound to believe that he was in earnest. When he went to the province of Prince Edward Island and gave the people to understand—if he was not there personally, then through his agents—that that province should have seven new railroads, the fear of debt did not alarm the hon. gentleman then. A railway to the Hudson Bay did not affect the

Mr. BLAIR.

hon. gentleman with a single tremor; a bridge across the River St. Lawrence at Quebec received his support, and all the bridges ever mentioned in Parliament or in the public press, met the heartiest approval at the hands of the hon. gentleman; he promised them all, right and left. He threw out those Bills which were going to mature, as he thought, and which he was prepared to retire when they did mature, but which he felt with all confidence, never harbouring the shadow of a doubt but that after the 23rd of June he would be able to retire at his own discretion. Now, then, who would think that the hon. gentleman would be the one who, when a business proposition is submitted to Parliament, would raise a clamour against it because it adds to the public debt? I do not think that we can, with every desire to do justice to the hon. gentleman, acquit him of treating the House unfairly, or give him credit when he takes that stand, of speaking his honest and sincere sentiments upon this question. He is not afraid of public debt. Why, a hundred millions would not startle the hon. gentleman if it were necessary to answer the purpose which he might think, I am willing to admit, would promote the public interest. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is to be condemned because he is willing to incur any reasonable burden when, as he believes, the interest of the country require that the expenditure should be made. But to answer a mere temporary purpose at the moment, in a criticism of a proposal of the Government, he is willing to cast all these convictions, all these evidences, which he has given in his entire public career, of his readiness to incur debt when the occasion arises—he is willing to cast them all aside with the view of making a mere temporary argument against his opponents upon a proposition which is submitted for his acceptance. Now, I want to state to the committee most emphatically that I think it is unfair to say that the proposal which we are about to submit to Parliament for the leasing of these two lines, means an addition to the public debt of the country. It does nothing of the kind. We engage, it is true, to pay \$210,000 rental to the several railway companies for the use of their lines. Why do we do it? Because we have the strongest possible business reasons for believing that we will not only get that \$210,000 back, but more. Is there a member of Parliament, I do not care what his political views may be, who will say sincerely that he does not believe that the transaction is a good one, that he does not believe that we will make more than the cost of the rental, and the cost of running the railway added, in revenue from the operation of that road? Therefore, I say it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to seek to create, not here but in the country, the impression that we are adding seven million dollars to the public debt. We are

doing nothing of the kind. We are engaging to pay rental for the use of a property, not an exorbitant rental, but a reasonable one, a rental which any railway man, I do not care who the hon. gentleman may appeal to, will say is a fair rental to pay for the privileges that we are getting. He says, why didn't you build the railway by the south shore? Why didn't you take the Grand Trunk system? Our judgment did not approve it, that is the reason; and, going on our best judgment we selected the other line in preference to either of the two which the hon. gentleman has proposed. He has read here from some quarter an authority which he is unwilling, I almost think he is afraid, I think I may almost venture to say that he is ashamed, to give to Parliament for the statements that he has made. He reads these statements in condemnation of this road, picturing the road as being entirely unfit for our purposes, as being inferior in many particulars, and as being in every way a property which should not be taken over by the Government under these terms. Well, if this gentleman is an independent authority, if he has no interest in any other undertaking, if he is not feeling chagrined because we did not take up his scheme in place of taking up the Drummond County Railway, if he is free from any of these suspicions, then I say it would be fair to put that gentleman's opinion beside—whose? Beside the opinion of the officials of the Department of Railways and Canals; and I would say that I am justified, at all events, in recommending my colleagues and recommending the Administration to act upon the judgment and opinions of the officials of the department rather than haphazard statements which may be made by anybody who may be picked up in the corridor, and though he may be in the act of leaving this Parliament building. Now, I am perfectly willing to submit these proposals in all their details to the examination of the committee, I am willing that every feature of them may be taken up and closely scanned, and I am convinced that they will stand the ordeal of the most careful scrutiny. They will not, perhaps, stand to the satisfaction of my hon. friend opposite. They will not stand to the satisfaction of the ex-Minister of Finance, because the ex-Minister of Finance was amazed when he heard that we had made an arrangement whereby we are to pay annually a fixed rental upon these railroads, and that we were then going to pay towards the cost of maintenance of the road on those lines; he was amazed at that. It is quite apparent to me, as I think it must be apparent to you, that neither of my hon. friends are approaching the consideration of this question with much general knowledge as to how these arrangements are made. We, of course, agree that we will bear our share of the cost of maintenance and repair of the road. We will do it, but no more

than our business requires. If we do one-half of the traffic, then we pay one-half of the cost of maintenance, but in using the road we will only pay our share with the Grand Trunk and other roads that may be using the line and our bridge and the terminus at Bonaventure. This arrangement is in accordance with the usages of railway companies, and it is one to which no company can object. I have not invited the present discussion, and I thought it would take place at a later period. But I do not wish to avoid it; I am quite prepared to submit these matters to hon. gentlemen, and at the same time I ask that they should criticise in a spirit of fairness and judgment and not indulge in general condemnation without giving the reasons why the proposals should be condemned.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite sure when a grave proposition, which will place on the country a burden for ninety-nine years of \$210,000 each year, equivalent to \$7,000,000, on which interest will have to be paid at 3 per cent, is submitted by the Minister of Railways and Canals to Parliament and he asks ten days before the closing of the session the House to adopt such a proposition as the present, and when he endeavours to substantiate his position by such arguments as he has addressed to the committee during the last three-quarters of an hour, it must be apparent to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that his position is not a tenable one or one that appeals to the good sense of the members of the House. The hon. gentleman has not commenced his career in this House as Minister of Railways and Canals in a very business-like way. The hon. gentleman had no mandate from either the Government or himself to Parliament last session or this session to make a hard and fast arrangement to increase the public debt by \$7,000,000. The hon. gentleman may say—any child may say—this proposition is now before you, and you are at liberty to accept it or reject it. But every man knows, and no man knows better than the hon. gentleman himself, that the Government having come down and the hon. gentleman having called on his supporters to see him through, if it can be done, and the Government having bound themselves to this contract, the hon. gentleman has clipped the wings of any fair discussion and open judgment with respect to this matter. My hon. friend would have done better and would have started more favourably on his career in this House, which is not a mere guessing school, as my hon. friend tried to turn it into a few minutes ago, when he was prepared to make a guess in regard to the authority of a certain letter—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The first letter.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be still more enigmatical, and exhibit the power of the

hon. gentleman to a greater degree. The hon. gentleman should have deigned before he proposed to add to the public debt the sum of \$7,000,000, to ask the advice of Parliament, especially before he bound the Government hand and foot by a contract with a most powerful corporation and its shareholders in Great Britain and elsewhere. The hon. gentleman and the Government of which he is a member have undertaken to do what they have denounced in all moods and tenses ever since they have been in politics. The party has denounced the principle that the Government should undertake without the sanction of Parliament any large disbursement. Hon. gentlemen opposite have entered into a contract for a fast line service of steamships, for which there is to be a subsidy of \$750,000 annually, of which \$500,000 is to be paid by Canada. This arrangement has been entered into because Parliament has already discussed the proposition and has, year after year, endorsed the project. In the present case Parliament has done nothing of the kind. The Minister of Railways appeals to the House now as a business man, and yet he proposes the adoption of a contract which is equal to a capital expenditure of \$7,000,000, and he says to his followers, not one of whom was consulted beforehand: We must hang together, or we must hang separately, and you must blindly assist me in pressing this arrangement through. To-night hon. gentlemen have been talking in the dark, we have spoken of this road without full information. The hon. gentleman asks: Why are you discussing this question to-night, cannot you wait till the resolutions come down? When will the resolutions come down? Within nine days of the close of the session we have not received any information—and yet the Governor General, the symbol of truth, speaking in his capacity as Governor General, declared on the opening day of this session that the arrangement was concluded. How long is the hon. gentleman going to keep these resolutions before the House? How long is he going to keep the details of the contract and the information in his department without informing this House in regard to it? Where is the information, and why has it not been brought down? What answer has the hon. gentleman made? My hon. friend is not to-day in the New Brunswick legislature. He is in a larger sphere, and he has a larger space to fill than in the other House. He has to deal with a wider public sentiment and a stronger light than prevailed in his native province; and his reputation as a business man and a Minister suffers to-day by this transaction and the fact information in regard to it has been withheld until the very last moment. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was so brave. He declared that the leader of the Opposition went from one end of this country to the other, and promised his millions, and was filled with a perfect confidence that

he would be returned to power and that his promises would be implemented and the notes would be retired. In that, there was a wonderful difference between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) who to-day figures in so brave a role, was so brave that he did not step into the arena until the 23rd of June told him that his party would be victors, and that he could be lifted into the role of a ministership at \$7,000 a year. He hung on to the Premiership of the province of New Brunswick, and when men of the Liberal party were fighting there for years and years, he enjoyed the sweets of the smaller office in his province. When men of the Liberal party never failed to present their front to the battle whenever the contest took place, and took its risks as well as prospective honours, that hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) sat quietly within the shades of his own little tent, until he found out that the victorious Liberal party was going to take office after the 23rd of June, and then he was willing to monopolize the higher sphere. That is the bravery of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair), and that is the strong contrast between him and the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper).

Now, Sir, I am not going to enter into this argument to-night. Why? Because I am not equipped for it, because the information is not before the House, but do any hon. gentlemen opposite say that this discussion has not borne its fruit. If this discussion had not taken place, this House and the country would have been kept in the dark until the last fading hours of the session, and when a very small proportion of the members were present, it would have been rushed through and nothing heard about it. This discussion has fixed the attention of this House upon the matter, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are going to think this matter out in a business fashion. Let me strip it from one specious covering which my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) strove to put upon it. He was unfair in his argument in this respect, for he combatted the leader of the Opposition on the ground that he (Sir Charles Tupper) was opposed to the expenditure of money for any public purpose. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) took the trouble to tell him—so that the Minister of Railways could not use that argument—that he (Sir Charles Tupper) was in favour of spending public money for objects of public utility. The Minister of Railways took the ground, that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) was opposed to the increase of the debt, if that was brought about by the extension of this railway to Montreal. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) told the Minister, that he did not count that the increase in the public debt ought weigh against a great work of public utility. Does not my hon.

friend (Mr. Blair) see the difference between an idea, and the way in which he may propose to carry out the idea. The Halifax Board of Trade were in favour of the idea of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, but does the Minister mean to say, that the Halifax Board of Trade has in any way given its imprimatur to this particular plan of the Minister, by which that idea is to be carried out. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was lame from top to bottom on that ground. He confounded the idea, which may be good, with the method in which he proposes to carry it out, which may be very bad. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) can now leave that branch of the argument, because I tell him as he was told before: that it is not the idea we are combatting, but it is this particular arrangement which he has made for carrying out the idea; and that arrangement we feel is not the best one. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) said that I was amazed. I was, but I suppose I should not have been amazed at anything my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) would have brought before this House. But I was amazed, to find out when I came back after dinner, that the price we pay for the Drummond County road just simply takes it as it is to-day, in its incomplete and broken down condition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why, it is nearly a new road.

Mr. FOSTER. Nearly a new road. Then I want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Blair)—for he has the seat of advantage in this respect; he sits where he may have the information as to what that road is—why is he keeping it up his sleeve; why does not he let us know? I ask him: has he reports from reliable and competent engineers as to the quality and condition of that road at the present time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Sir, I did not expect that answer from a business man. We have a conclusion to draw, and hon. gentlemen opposite must themselves draw a conclusion from that answer. The Minister of Finance told us yesterday, that there was no necessity for looking into facts about woven wire fences and barbed wire fences, when you wanted to protect one and did not want to protect the other. He told us that they did not go so far down as to look at facts, when they were looking to see what would please the farmers. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is on the same track. Facts count for nothing with him. He is doing something which is to please

somebody, but is this the business proposition of a business man, that business men will uphold, when he has actually concluded, what? A bargain to buy a road and to pay well for it, and he has not to-day the report of a reliable engineer as to the quality and condition of that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) tell us what is correct? I asked him if he had the report of a reliable engineer as to the quality and condition of that road to-day? Has he? He said he had not. He (Mr. Blair) proposes to ask this Parliament, and to ask his followers, to make a purchase and pay over the purchase money, without having the report of a reliable engineer as to the condition of that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. member (Mr. Foster) allow me to ask him to explain his question, as to whether he means to ask me, if I have to-day in my possession or in the department the report of a reliable engineer as to the condition of the road. If that is the question my answer is, that I have. If he asks me, if I have a report as to the condition of the road to-day my answer is that I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) tell us how far he hopes to quibble over that question. Has this astute business man, this great man translated into this sphere, has he then the report of a reliable engineer of yesterday? Has he? Of if not of yesterday, of the day before; or of the day before that?

Mr. McMULLEN. That would be Sunday.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I became a little confused. When one of the agents of the Government was asking Sunday cars in Toronto, I thought the Government were on the same track and might do work on Sunday. But, let the Minister of Railways treat this House as a serious body, and just tell us now, as to what he has, as a report, as to the condition and quality of that road for which he asks us to pay \$64,000 a year. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) give us that information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got the information here, but I propose to furnish the information to the committee when I am moving the resolution. I will furnish all the information I have in my possession, and at my disposal then. That I am not in a position to do to-night. I do not carry it around in my pocket, and I have not it in my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) may carry lots in his pockets, but I did not

ask him whether he had it in his pocket or not? My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has not yet given notice of his resolution.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I intend to do so immediately.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does he intend to keep all these reports and papers until he brings his resolution down and moves it? Is he determined that he shall take this House at the vantage point of complete ignorance in this matter and by surprise, and in the very last days of the session carry it through. Nine days are still left, one of them is Sunday, and he has not given notice of his resolution. He proposes some time during that nine days to give notice; he has the report but he has not it in his pocket, and when it suits him, and he brings in his resolution, he will lay his report on the Table. Will my hon. friend not treat the House as a business body and tell us that he will bring that information down to-morrow and lay it on the Table of the House, so that we may have an opportunity of looking it over before he asks us to pass his resolution? Does my hon. friend think that is too exigent a position to take?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will say this, that if the hon. gentleman had desired to have all this information laid on the Table, I am a little surprised that he had not made a motion to that effect, when it could have been brought down earlier. I stated to the hon. gentleman who is leading the Opposition that I would, when this Estimate came up, state the terms of the arrangement between the two companies and the Government, and I have done that. I shall take occasion to give notice at once of the resolution, and with that I will bring down any information I have at my disposal touching this question; or, if the hon. gentleman desires it, I will furnish that beforehand. I do not know that I could bring it down to-morrow. It might be that it would take me longer to put it in shape for that purpose.

Mr. **FOSTER**. And has my hon. friend just waked up to the fact that we have wanted that information? Should my hon. friend have waited one single hour to bring that down after having in the Queen's Speech stated that this arrangement had been concluded? At the time this House was called together the hon. gentleman had committed the Government to an expenditure of \$210,000 per year for ninety-nine years, had concluded the arrangement, had put into the mouth of the Governor General the statement that he had concluded it, and to this day he has not laid on the Table of the House the papers which were the basis of that arrangement. Is that the track my hon. friend has been running on in the local legislature? He will find that he has a different body to deal with here. The hon. gentleman should have placed those papers

Mr. **FOSTER**.

on the Table of the House at the very first opportunity after the Address was passed; he knows it, and every parliamentarian in this House knows it. He says: If you had just asked for the papers, it would have been all right. Does not the hon. gentleman know that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition has asked for those papers over and over again? Why, Sir, I have here, on the 30th of April, an insistent appeal from my hon. friend.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Will you read what the appeal was, and the reply?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I will. Before the Orders of the Day, which is the time to emphasize the importance of a matter of this kind, Sir Charles Tupper rose and said:

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the following statement contained in the Speech from the Throne:—

"I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal."

I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government, a long time having elapsed since we had this positive declaration from the Throne that these arrangements had been concluded, if he would be good enough to lay on the Table of the House the papers in relation to the matter.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Mr. Laurier). As my hon. friend is aware, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has been laid up for some time,—

Well, he has not been laid up of late.

—and is not perhaps able to give an answer now. I shall be able at the next sitting of the House to say whether or not the papers will be brought down.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Is that all?

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Minister of Railways and Canals was not laid up that day. He said:

I think I may say to the hon. gentleman that the documents, which are in course of preparation, and which will have to be submitted, as between the two contracting parties, are not yet quite completed. Some of the important details of the negotiations are not finally agreed upon. We are making all possible speed in bringing matters to a head, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there will be no unnecessary delay in presenting the whole matter to Parliament. At the earliest possible moment the papers will be laid on the Table. They have been somewhat delayed by my indisposition of the last three or four days, but I think perhaps towards the latter end of next week I may be able to furnish the House with the desired information.

And to-night the hon. gentleman tries to shield himself behind the excuse that if we had asked for the papers we might have had them.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There was never any return moved for.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend know so little about parliamentary practice as not to know that we never have to move for a return about a matter of great importance that has been concluded by the Government and mentioned in the Queen's Speech? Does he not know that the very first thing a parliamentarian should do is to lay it on the Table of the House. But my hon. friend says these arrangements were not then concluded. Why did he let the Governor General utter a falsehood in saying:

I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal.

To get into the terminals, so to speak. On the very first day of the session the arrangement was made, and the hon. gentleman told the Governor General to tell everybody that it was actually concluded; and we have not the papers yet. The hon. gentleman tries to shelter himself behind the miserable fiction that we ought to have asked for the papers; and when we show that we did ask for them, he tries to hide himself behind the smaller excuse that we had not made a motion for a return of these papers. As if we ought to be obliged to do that. Now, we have not the information. The hon. gentleman says he has it; he is going to keep it up his sleeve, until he brings down the resolution, and he will not say when it will be brought down. Well, I commend that as a business operation of a business Government. When the time comes for us to take this matter up as a business arrangement, and to try it and see whether it is worth while to make that large expenditure to get the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, there will be the business side of this arrangement to be discussed, and we will be prepared to discuss it on this side. There are parts of this country that have no railroad communication at all, and that are longing for railroad communication.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, who resides at the Junction hears the rumble of wheels every day, and he is not dying for railways. My hon. friends who come from remote portions of this country—from the North-west, from the broad lands of British Columbia, from the back portions of even the older provinces—which have no railway communication at all, may well ask themselves why \$7,000,000 should be put upon a scheme of this kind in a part of the country where there are railways in abundance; and they must ask whether or not there is to be the certain and sure return of business accretion to follow upon this arrangement, before they can feel that they are doing justice to the whole country by voting this immense sum of money for this purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee for more than a single moment, and only to refer to two rather important statements which the hon. Minister of Railways made; and the reason I do not propose to take up any further time is, because the hon. gentleman addressed the committee for a long time without venturing to grapple with the fundamental question of the basis of arriving at the conclusion that he was going to improve the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway. But the hon. gentleman drew the attention of the House to the fact that when I was Minister of Railways and Canals I purchased some 120 miles of railway from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis, and I wish to explain to the House why I made that purchase. The Grand Trunk Railway, when confederation was accomplished, had built its railway down to Rivière du Loup. The Government of Canada, under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite, had expended a great many millions of public money in building the Intercolonial up to Rivière du Loup. We then found ourselves in this position. As it did not pay the Grand Trunk Railway to run their road from Lévis to Rivière du Loup, they allowed it to fall into utter dilapidation, so that it was not safe for life or property. The Intercolonial was therefore obliged, in order to have anything like reasonable communication with Quebec, to purchase that 120 miles of road from Rivière du Loup to Lévis and put it in proper condition. The hon. gentleman made a wild statement in reference to a part of the arrangement, and that was that the Grand Trunk Railway were to have the iron rails. Well, that was part of the bargain, but it was submitted for the approval of Parliament, and it received the hearty endorsement, I think I am safe in saying, of every gentleman on both sides, as a wise and necessary arrangement.

The hon. gentleman made one other reference to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, because he turned round to his supporters and laid a great deal of emphasis on it, and that was that when I went to the country as leader of the Government, I proposed the expenditure of millions and millions from Cape Breton to British Columbia. I ask the hon. gentleman now to point to one expenditure which he will not have increased before the House rises. I did go to the country, and in a manly, straightforward fashion I put before the people the policy I proposed, and where I felt that the expenditure of large sums of public money was demanded in the public interest I did not hesitate to express the views I held. But it ill becomes the hon. gentleman, when before this House rises he will have asked this Parliament to vote more money than would cover all the expenditure I had proposed when I went to the country before the general election, to

taunt me with making extravagant pledges and promises.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the increase at Moncton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item is not only for the building of a station-house, but also the construction of a freight shed, the laying down of an additional track, and the completion of the proposed arrangements which had been made when tenders were invited. I had not proposed to go any further than the scheme which had been outlined and determined upon by the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract for the building?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Rhodes & Currie. Tenders were invited before the change of Government, and I may say to the committee that there is only one change in the contract. The whole work, including the plumbing and heating, was embraced in the specifications for this first contract. The general manager and some of the other officials were of the opinion that the specifications for the heating and plumbing were not sufficient, and we have extracted from the contract the sum it was proposed to charge for that portion of the work. We think of having an independent contract let for that portion, but the contract in all other respects remains identical with the contract which was accepted by my hon. friend's opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to say when the parties who tendered were instructed that they would receive the contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I mistake not, they had instructions before the change of Government. That is my impression, and they were notified that the matter would be held in suspense. The session was late, nothing was done last fall, and they were not instructed to proceed with their work until this spring?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will refer to the date of the Nova Scotia election, he will find that that was the time when he decided to notify these parties, the lowest tenderers, that they would be allowed to go on with the work. I believe the result was eminently beneficial from a political point of view to the hon. gentleman's friends in the county of Cumberland.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure that my hon. friend's suspicions have been unduly aroused.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know of what I am speaking, and I know the result. One of the strongest supporters of this party in the country was paralyzed by that Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope my hon. friend is not going to suggest that that respectable firm of contractors could be influenced in that way. I think these gentlemen have a reputation to defend in this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the strongest reason for stating that the hon. gentleman did exercise a powerful influence over these contractors who were in the hands of the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These contractors are very prominent and distinguished members of the Conservative party.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And I do not think they could be influenced. Trained up as they were so many years under the guidance of the hon. gentleman, their virtue should have been stronger.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is only fair to say that these gentlemen were given to understand most explicitly by myself personally that the contract would be let to them just as it was. I gave them that assurance, not so recently as the Nova Scotia election, but weeks or months before. They had no official information, I think, from the department until late this spring.

Mr. McDUGALL. With regard to the deep water terminus of North Sydney, have any steps been taken to select the place for that terminus? Has any further arrangement been carried out with the townspeople with regard to the right of way. There were two routes selected for the building of that extension of the road to deep water. What I want to know is whether a location has been selected and any arrangement carried out with the people of the town with regard to the right of way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing definite has lately been done, and no arrangement has been concluded, but the matter remains, I think, substantially as it was a year ago. The town of North Sydney made an agreement which they have not yet signified their readiness or ability to carry out; and, pending some notification of that kind from them, we are in no position to act with respect to the matter. But we thought it right, since there was arrangement of this character made with the town of Sydney that we should ask for the grant that was in the Estimates a year or two years ago, lest they should be in a position to ask us to carry out the arrangement.

Mr. McDUGALL. I think this a matter that demands a little more consideration on the part of the Government than they seem to have given it. As the House is

aware, in a very few months important communications will take place with the Intercolonial Railway through its terminal point in the Island of Cape Breton, with the Newfoundland Railway which is to be in operation and which will be connected by steamer from Port aux Basques to the port of Sydney. Perhaps it was at one time thought that the people of North Sydney only were interested in the building of this road to deep water. But now, I consider, it is a matter of the greatest interest to the Government with respect to the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway. If they want earnings, I think it is their interest regardless of any consideration of cost for right of way to extend to deep water at the earliest possible date, and take advantage of the communication with Newfoundland which must necessarily bring a great deal of traffic to the road. I understand that the Newfoundland service is to be in operation within the next month or so, at the latest, early in the autumn. It is not for me to point out the importance to the Intercolonial of the traffic that will be brought to that point. When the road was brought to the town of North Sydney, I may as well inform the Minister of Railways, as I believe he is not in possession of the facts, there was a dispute with regard to the route by which the water terminus should be reached. It was considered best that the people of North Sydney should undertake to pay the right of way five miles next to the town at the time the building of the road was taken hold of by the Government, provided they could get a suitable water terminus and other terminal facilities in that town. But without what was considered by the people of the town sufficient communication with them as to where they desired that terminus to be built, the Government engineers proceeded with the work. They built a station a considerable distance out of the town at a most inconvenient, unsuitable and improper place. Dispute arose between two sections of the town about getting to the water at that point. No doubt, advantage was taken of the dispute by the officers of the Department. My own protests written from time to time will be found on file in the department, as well as the protest of the people through resolutions of public meetings, resolutions of the town council, and otherwise. Owing to the mistake by the officers of the department in expropriating property through the town for the building of the road which property was in litigation and about which there was a great deal of dispute, which had to be settled in the courts of law, the work of constructing the water terminus was not proceeded with. In the meantime an agitation rose for the construction of the road over another route, and the people of the town undertook to ask the Government to build over the other route.

The Government refused on the advice of their officials to undertake to build by that route. The town went to the expense of making a survey and submitted plans and profiles of the route to the department. But nothing was done to bring the road to the water terminus. This is the position of this important work up to almost the day when this important communication is to be opened with the Newfoundland Railway, a communication that must affect most favourably the earnings of the Intercolonial. I make this appeal to the hon. the Minister of Railways and to the Government on behalf of the people interested in making that communication with the harbour of Sydney and furnishing the best possible facilities for this communication with Newfoundland, to leave the petty consideration of the cost of the right of way to the town of North Sydney aside altogether. The question of pressing the people of North Sydney for paying for the right of way should not be allowed to stand in the way of the work, as the benefit will be derived mainly by the railway, and longer delay, I consider, would be a great mistake for the Government. In any case, I see no reason why the Government should not proceed with the building of the terminus and then settle their right of way dispute with the town afterwards. They have expropriated, I understand, two routes at the water terminus at North Sydney. But whether they have expropriated one or two, by all means let the Government get the road to the water terminus in order to get the communication with Newfoundland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can the importance of the point that my hon. colleague (Mr. McDougall) has brought to the notice of the Minister of Railways and Canals. At great expenditure of money as the hon. gentleman knows, a railway has been constructed for hundreds of miles from the city of St. John, Newfoundland, to Port aux Basques, and the very enterprising contractor of that road, Mr. Reid, has secured the construction of a very fine steamer to be put on immediately between Port aux Basques and Sydney, as my hon. friend has said. It is of the utmost importance that not a day, not an hour, should be lost in providing the necessary accommodation at the point at which the steamer will arrive, so as to make communication with the Intercolonial Railway. I am certain that the hon. Minister will appreciate the great importance to the Intercolonial Railway of having it made the means of communication with the Island of Newfoundland by means of connection by this steamer. I am advised, and I believe there can be no doubt as to the accuracy of my information, that, by the middle of next August the road will be completed and in operation from St. John's to Port aux Bas-

ques and the steamer, if not now on her way from England will certainly be ready to begin the service by the middle of August. It is of the greatest importance that this difficulty whatever it was between the Railway Department and the town of North Sydney, should be disposed of in some way so as to secure the facilities for handling the large traffic which, I am quite satisfied, will require to be handled at that point by the Intercolonial when the steam communication is established. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in his place, but I wanted also to draw his attention to the importance of providing a subsidy for that very important steam communication between Newfoundland and North Sydney by this means, a communication that I believe will be not only very advantageous to Newfoundland, but in promoting trade between Canada and that Island.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways whether he is in a position to inform the House whether Mr. Reid, the contractor of the railway in Newfoundland, who is putting this service in operation, has had any communication with the department with a view to traffic over the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not that I am aware of. I now learn for the first time that there is a probability of this line of steamships being established between Newfoundland and Sydney at the early date the hon. gentleman mentions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no reason to doubt that it will be in operation by the middle of August.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will bring the information given me to the attention of the officers of the department and of the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, with the view of ascertaining what his views would be upon the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wanted to ask the Minister of Railways whether the Halifax extension, the Victoria Cotton factory branch, is to be made? The item seems to have been voted the last two years, and again this year, and I am not aware that anything has ever been done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not in a position to assure the hon. gentleman whether the expenditure will be immediately entered upon. I think it not unlikely that it may be done during the coming year. But that will depend upon the result of some further negotiations that are going on with the people, as explained at the last session of Parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what direction is the proposed extension? I do not think I heard the explanation last session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The extension was to pass over the high ground back to the rear of the city. It was really an extension of the present line; and the matter was and is in negotiation between the department and the street railway people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the extension to be on the North Common?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In that direction, I think.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This proposed extension will go down to the new works of the People's Light Company, down to the shore of the Arm. It was proposed that the extension should run on the high ground down to the old penitentiary ground. That was the proposition, but it has not been agreed to by the Government.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Speaking of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway down to North Sydney, I would like to ask the hon. members from the county of Cape Breton who are interested in that extension, whether it is not a fact that there was a proposition to diverge the Intercolonial Railway from a point at or near George's River along the Little Bras d'Or and the Sydney Mines, going through North Sydney, and, therefore, getting upon this proposed extension in that way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) has referred to this matter, because I intended to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that when I was in a position to be responsible to some extent for these matters, I submitted to the Railway Department the advantage that the Intercolonial Railway would derive from having an improved condition of things in that section. I dare say my hon. friend knows that at present the railway runs to North Sydney and then backs down in the direction of the Sydney Mines, a most improper proceeding, in fact attended with danger, and I am not quite certain that it is not absolutely illegal. I submitted to the Railway Department the question of making an alteration that would be attended with a small change in the line of the road in that district, so as to give communication to an important section, the Sydney Mines and to North Sydney, so as to avoid that backing down of the trains. The department referred the matter to Mr. Pottinger, who is the manager of the railways, for a report, and he reported that he believed that it would be greatly in the interest of the business of the Intercolonial Railway to make this comparatively small expenditure, and that it would give proper communication and railway facilities to a very large number of people at Sydney Mines, besides obviating the dangers that I have mentioned. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's

attention has been drawn to that, but I would like very much if he would take the views upon the subject of the officials of the department, and I hope he will arrive at the conclusion that it would be wise to carry out that proposal.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I think the Minister of Railways and Canals will have no difficulty now in getting at the difficulties that existed for years with regard to the extension at North Sydney, I think the people of North Sydney hold their representatives largely responsible for the delay in question, in view of the fact that they proposed from one election time to another to divert the Intercolonial Railway in the direction that I have indicated, and in which the hon. leader of the Opposition now agrees with me. This, I think, will explain to the Minister of Railways and Canals why it was that the people of the town of North Sydney, that important shipping port, were deprived for many years past of the proper terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. If there is not to-day a proper terminus for this new steamship line at the town of North Sydney, I think the Minister of Railways and Canals and this House will agree with me that it was owing to this proposal on the part of the hon. gentlemen who represented that county, to divert the road from its present route around to Little Bras d'Or and Sydney Mines, thus obviating the backing down of the trains to the town of North Sydney. But the great trouble for the town of North Sydney has been that these gentlemen never carried this proposition out, and hence it is to-day that if this new steamship line is established the terminus will be wanted in order to carry out the project suggested by the junior member for Cape Breton when he wanted to post the Minister of Railways and Canals with regard to this difficulty. I think the suggestion made and the point now raised will add to the information of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and that the latter will find that the proposition made by these gentlemen for several years and never carried out by them, has had considerable to do with the delay in carrying out this most important measure for the people of the town of North Sydney.

Mr. McDUGALL. The hon. member who has just spoken I think will require to get information himself, because he is entirely in the dark as to the circumstances connected with the building of the proposed terminus to deep water at North Sydney.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The leader of the Opposition sustains me.

Mr. McDUGALL. The question of diverting the road from George's River round by Little Bras d'Or and Sydney Mines to North Sydney, only came up about a year before the leader of the Opposition visited

Cape Breton in connection with his first election there.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). When he was running his election?

Mr. McDUGALL. The people there made representations to the Government only a short time before the leader of the Opposition visited that country to run his first election there. It was his duty, as a member of the Government, to listen to the representations made by the people of the district, and lay before the Department of Railways those representations, and subsequently communicate the result of the inquiry to the people of Sydney Mines and Little Bras D'Or, as was his duty, occupying the position of head of the Government. My hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) endeavoured to lead the House to believe that the terminus was not built to North Sydney because of the representations made in regard to the construction of the road to Sydney Mines and Little Bras D'Or. There was no agitation at the time of building the road for the route around Little Bras D'Or and Sydney Mines to the water front. The reason was the difficulty which arose in regard to the right of way through properties in the vicinity of North Sydney. The route adopted by the Government engineers did not seem acceptable to a majority of the people of North Sydney, as was proved by a meeting held in that town, when the people resolved to adopt another route and employ engineers to lay out a route that was, in their opinion, feasible and practicable. Another route was surveyed, and so the people of North Sydney were left without a terminus. So the statement of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan), so far as the cause of delay in the building of the road is concerned, is entirely incorrect. There was no agitation at Little Bras D'Or or Sydney Mines until about a year before the date when the leader of the Opposition ran an election there.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Was there not an agitation there before that in favour of building the road around Little Bras D'Or and Sydney Mines?

Mr. McDUGALL. Not until about a year or two before the leader of the Opposition, in 1896, visited that county to run his election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I must have misunderstood the member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan), and I am afraid he has done a great injustice if he considers the late Government failed to avail themselves of the opportunity to carry into effect this proposition. I desire to refer to the election of 1896. I then had this matter brought before me. I found a strong feeling prevailing on the part of a large body of gentlemen all over Cape Breton in favour

of this undertaking. I took the matter up; I obtained the best information I could on the spot; I referred the subject to the officers of the Railway Department, and I obtained a report and an estimate. But my hon. friend will remember that, in the session of 1896, the Government, owing to the obstruction offered by the Liberal party, were unable to obtain Estimates for any purpose, and therefore this appropriation could not be made. Having obtained for this project the approval of the department, and ascertained that it would be valuable in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, I have no hesitation in saying that, if I had not been defeated at the general election, this work would now have been carried out, in conformity with the plans of the department, and in accordance with the opinion of the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, who considered it would be a very valuable means of contributing to the receipts of the road. So it cannot be said that I lost any opportunity, or that I am chargeable in any way with neglect; and now that I have been deprived of the opportunity of carrying this work to completion, I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to it, and I express the opinion, that on investigation he will find that its completion would be of the greatest advantage to the Intercolonial, and I hope he will carry the undertaking to completion.

Mr. McDUGALL. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) would have the House understand that this question was up during several elections before the last general elections. It was not considered by the people at a general election before the last elections.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). No; I said a year ago—and I hold to that declaration.

Mr. McDUGALL. I contend that my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The elections to which I refer, were the elections of 1891, the general elections previous to the last. There was not a syllable uttered with respect to the proposed change in the road until years after the election of 1891. It was about a year or more before when the leader of the Opposition ran in Cape Breton—that was in 1896—when it was proposed to make this change in the road, to meet the wishes of the people of Little Bras D'Or and Sydney Mines. This matter was not discussed by any party at an election before the elections of 1896.

Mr. QUINN. Is an amount of \$220, due A. A. Murphy, included in the vote of \$48,500 for increased accommodation at Lévis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid not.

Mr. QUINN. I should like to draw attention to that claim. It has been before the hon. Minister already. Mr. Murphy was employed in connection with certain work,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and sent in a bill for \$370, on which he received on account something like \$120. He was engaged in obtaining bonds from different parties to be used for the extension at Lévis—this was in the spring of 1896—and promises of sale from the proprietors of lots at Lévis. He remained there for thirty-seven days, sent in his bill, and he has not been able to obtain payment since, although his bill was approved of by the then Minister of Railways. At the request of the present Minister of Railways, Mr. Murphy had the late Minister of Railways certify to the bill, and it was forwarded in connection with an affidavit, but still payment was refused. He then made request for permission to sue, but that was refused on the ground that the sum involved was too small. Although \$220 may be a small amount to a Minister of the Crown, under some circumstances it may be of great importance to another man, and the fact that it is a small amount should not prevent a suppliant getting justice about it. The Minister is, no doubt, very busy, but I wish to get from him the assurance that he will give this matter his attention. Mr. Murphy cannot afford to remain out of his money for any length of time, and I trust that the Minister will see that Mr. Murphy is paid or give him the right to take his action before the court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My attention has been called to this matter, and if my memory serves me right it arose in this way. Mr. Murphy being without employment, he was anxious to find something to do, and he prevailed upon the late Minister of Railways to give him a commission to proceed to Lévis and ascertain about what this property would probably cost. His services were not of a specially skilful character, the object being that he should inquire from the neighbours as to about the value of land in that locality. He was afforded the chance of earning a trifle in the then needy circumstances in which he was placed. That is my information upon the subject. Mr. Murphy rendered an account for \$20 a day, but the Deputy Minister thought that \$10 a day, with some little allowance for travelling expenses, was a fair and adequate remuneration. The Deputy Minister did not feel that he could certify for any larger sum than \$10 a day, and that was paid to Mr. Murphy. I do not feel that, under the circumstances which were detailed to me, I would be justified in authorizing the payment of the other \$10 a day. I do not think that a petition of right should be granted in such a case, unless in the judgment of those who are charged with the responsibility there is a fair case, and a reasonable doubt exists. The amount is trifling although perhaps not so to Mr. Murphy, but I do not think that any one who exercises a fair judgment on the question will

say that the amount awarded to Mr. Murphy was not a fair compensation for the services he rendered. I have no feeling at all in the matter.

Mr. QUINN. I am informed by the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that the practice almost uniformly has been to grant these petitions of right when asked for. I am prepared on behalf of Mr. Murphy to accept the statement of the Minister that the Government will allow him at the rate of \$10 per day, because my information is that that is all Mr. Murphy has ever asked for. I would like to have further emphatic assurance from the Minister, so that I can write to Mr. Murphy and tell him that he will be paid at the rate of \$10 per day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Murphy has already been paid at the rate of \$10 per day. Perhaps I should have said that Mr. Murphy claims he was entitled to be paid for a larger number of days, and the real dispute between the department and Mr. Murphy may rest there. The department knows that Mr. Murphy did not give more than seventeen days to this particular service, and he was allowed \$10 a day and some other expenses in addition to that.

Mr. QUINN. I am afraid there is some misunderstanding about that. If there be any difference of opinion as to the number of days spent by Mr. Murphy there, then it makes it all the more a case in which permission should be granted him to take out his action. If he should fail in proving the number of days the cost, of course, would be against him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was not doing any real service. He was sent there just to have a chance of earning a little something at that time; not that there was any work to do. He went down to Lévis and lolled around there for thirty-five days, and then came up and rendered a bill for the amount. That is what the department says.

Mr. QUINN. I am informed that he was asked to get bonds and promises of sale from the proprietors of the property at Lévis required by the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that he suggested to the department that he could find something to do if they would commission him. When they said they had nothing for him he suggested that he should go to Lévis and look the ground over and give a report. I believe the department got the report, but nobody would say he was not well paid for the services he rendered. That is my view, and I desire to be as liberal with Mr. Murphy as possible.

Mr. McDUGALL. Where is the work on which this \$2,000 is to be expended for original construction?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is not a new item. There are some small sums left over from year to year which we require to meet. Sometimes the sum we require to pay is less than this, but the usual course is to put in \$2,000 for that purpose. During the year ending the 30th June, 1896, \$1,948 was paid for that service. These claims are coming up year by year, and I do not know that we can say when they will cease to come up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend could hardly have heard the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) bring a grave charge against me of having opened the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, which he said had been closed by my predecessor (Mr. Mackenzie). I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in both particulars; but if I did wrong in opening the capital account, I would like to know how he would justify the present Minister of Railways and Canals in a charge on capital account for the coming year of \$350,000. I have no doubt he will arrive at the conclusion that it is quite right for the present Minister of Railways and Canals to do it, and it was very wrong for me to do anything of the same kind. But, I want to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he thinks he is going to improve the resources of and the returns on the Intercolonial Railway by such a course of procedure as is adopted towards one who was for a great many years the inspector of buildings on the railway. A gentleman was employed for a great many years as the inspector of buildings at a salary of \$1,300 a year, and his services were considered by the department so valuable that, without any application on the part of anybody, I believe, the officials of the department proposed to increase his salary to \$1,500. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has seen fit to dispense with the services of that official and to employ a gentleman, Mr. Killam, who I believe was one of his supporters in the legislature of New Brunswick, to discharge a portion of those duties, at a salary of \$1,800 a year; and he has employed another gentleman, Mr. McGrath, to perform the same services at \$1,200, and a third man at \$75 a month as an additional inspector for a part of the year. So that, instead of \$1,300 a year, which has been paid for many years, or \$1,500 to which it was proposed to increase the salary of a very efficient officer, we have these three persons employed to do the same work at a greatly increased cost, along with the travelling expenses of three officials instead of one. I draw my hon. friend's attention to that as not indicating a desire to economize

or to effect such reductions on the Inter-colonial Railway, as will be likely to balance the accounts.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Whatever may be the sources of information which have enabled the non-gentleman to make this statement, I can assure him that he has been misled. There has been no authorized arrangement by which the expenses connected with the inspection of buildings, the inspection of lumber and the inspection of masonry have been increased. On the contrary, my purpose and intention is to reduce the cost of these services.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. What office does Mr. Killam hold?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. He has been appointed inspector of bridges and buildings at a salary of \$1,800, which duties were being performed by two gentlemen who, if my memory serves me, were in receipt of salaries amounting to \$2,200.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. Who was the inspector of bridges before?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think a person of the name of Sifton; I am not sure, but I will ascertain. If the hon. gentleman will take occasion to refer to this matter when the Estimates are up later, I shall be very glad.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. I will do so, and I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would furnish me with information on that point. I would like also to take the opportunity of calling the attention of the hon. gentleman to a reply which he gave to a question which the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) had put on the notice paper, and which in his absence I asked, though I knew nothing of the matter. It was with reference to the cause of the dismissal of Mr. Findlay Macdonald from the position of stationmaster at Point Tupper, in the county of Richmond. The answer which the Minister of Railways and Canals gave as to the cause of his dismissal was:

Because it was not in the interest of the road to have this man studying law in Halifax while drawing a salary as agent at Point Tupper.

The attention of Mr. Macdonald had been called to that statement, and he declares that it is not true. Therefore, I feel bound, in justice to him, to give the statement he makes to me. He says:

It is not true. I did not draw one cent of salary for the time I was off duty.

**Mr. GILLIES**. While this matter is up, I would like to say one word in connection with it. I feel sure that the Minister of Railways and Canals must have been under a wrong impression when he dealt with Mr. Macdonald in the summary manner he did. I think that when I bring the facts to his

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**.

notice, the hon. Minister of Railways will do Mr. Macdonald the justice of reinstating him. What are the facts? In September, 1896, Mr. Macdonald applied to the general manager, Mr. Pottinger, at Moncton, for six months' leave of absence to go to Halifax. The general manager wrote to him that he could not give him the six months' leave of absence, but would give him three months. Mr. Macdonald availed himself of that permission and went to Halifax, and there entered upon the study of law. On the 12th of December, he received the following letter from the district superintendent, F. D. Laurie:

New Glasgow, December 12, 1896.

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly let me know what are your intentions about resuming duty? Or do you wish your leave extended? If you do, I think it might be arranged. An early reply will oblige.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) F. D. LAURIE.

To this letter Mr. Macdonald replied as follows:—

Halifax, December 13, 1896.

F. D. Laurie, Esq., New Glasgow.

Dear Sir,—Your favour received. I will go to work on the 19th (December), as I advised you. Many thanks for your kind offer to extend my leave.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) F. MACDONALD.

Then he received a reply from Mr. Laurie which read as follows:—

New Glasgow, December 14, 1896.

F. Macdonald, Halifax.

Dear Sir,—Yours received. I inclose pass to Point Tupper. It will be O.K. for you to resume duty when you say. Do you wish to get off later on? If so, when and for how long?

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) F. D. LAURIE.

Mr. Macdonald returned to Point Tupper at the time specified, and resumed his duties where he left them off to attend the law school at Halifax during the holidays. About the 1st of January, as he wanted six weeks more to complete his term at the law school, he wrote to Mr. Laurie the following letter:—

Point Tupper, January 2, 1897.

F. D. Laurie, Esq., New Glasgow.

Dear Sir,—I should like to get off on the 9th instant for six weeks, if it could be arranged.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) F. MACDONALD.

He received the following letter in reply:—

New Glasgow, January 2, 1897.

F. Macdonald, Point Tupper.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 2nd. I will arrange as you ask about getting off. This arrangement is, of course, subject to the approval of the department.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) F. D. LAURIE.

Now, these facts, I presume, were not within the cognizance of the Minister of

Railways when he had Mr. Macdonald dismissed, later on. Mr. Macdonald went to Halifax in consequence of these promises from Mr. Laurie. Of course, Mr. Macdonald had not any correspondence with the Minister; he would not have dared to enter into correspondence with him; but he had the sanction and promise of his superior officer, Mr. Laurie, who told him he could leave and that he would arrange about it. Relying upon Mr. Laurie's promise, Mr. Macdonald went to Halifax and put in the six weeks allowed him; but, to his great surprise, he received on the 19th of February, notice of dismissal. This he could not account for in any way, inasmuch as he held in his pocket the letters I have read, from his superior officer, giving him leave of absence. Inasmuch as Mr. Macdonald is a capital officer and an able man in every respect, I hope that the presentation I have made of his case will induce the hon. Minister to reconsider it and do him justice. Not a cent of salary was paid to Mr. Macdonald during his absence, and the hon. Minister was entirely under a misapprehension when he said, in reply to a question of mine that the department feel that its interests were being subserved by having Mr. Macdonald studying law in Halifax when in receipt of a salary. I presume the hon. gentleman made that statement from a misapprehension of the facts. Not a dollar was paid to Mr. Macdonald during his absence. He was absent by permission of his superior officer, he returned at his request, and was dismissed for reasons unknown to him, and I think the hon. Minister must have acted without a due appreciation of the facts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to say that the facts as they have been stated by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, were presented to me by him a few days ago. They made a very strong impression upon my mind, and I am free to confess that I feel like having the matter looked into as soon as I possibly can get time—probably very shortly after the close of the session. I did feel, when it came to my knowledge, and it was pressed upon me very strongly, that here was an official of the railway studying law in Halifax, and it seemed rather inconsistent with the idea of his retaining service in the railway it looked as if he were simply using the railway as a means of getting into the profession and leaving the service as soon as he was in a position to take up the practice of law. However, I was not aware at the time of the facts the hon. gentleman has brought out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was the hon. gentleman aware he was not getting any pay?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume that instead of receiving pay himself the pay was given to somebody whom he substituted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to hear the hon. Minister proposes to reconsider that matter. I shall have to call the attention of the Minister to the case of Mr. Arthur Mitchell, a very respectable man, formerly in the Royal Artillery, who was appointed many years ago inspector at Con's Mills in the county of Cumberland. This is a flag station which was taken care of by this man and his wife. He says:

About ten years ago, I was employed with James Dickie, chief divisional engineer at Wallace, on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia, when this short line was under construction. So, sir, you may remember me. I was in that place for three years. At the end of that time, I asked for the simple position of sectionman, and it was given me. When the section was laid off and this was a flag-station, I was given the station to live in, being a married man with a family, and employment as sectionman, our foreman living in Oxford, as I have been here now these seven years.

This poor man, who has been very faithful, I believe, in the performance of his duties, informs me that he has been superseded and thrown out of the employment that he had so long enjoyed, and he has written me to bring the matter to the notice of the Minister, which I have now done.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not see in this item any appropriation for the running of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I would ask the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to continue to run that railway. I understand that trains have been stopped for some time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The item in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs does not appear in these estimates because these are estimates for the coming year. There will be an item in the Supplementaries.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I see that there is an item in the Supplementaries for the expense of maintaining and running the road this year until the 30th instant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman desires, when we reach that item, I will be glad to give him the information he asks.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I see an item here.

To pay for land damages, Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton Divisions..... \$2,000  
I would like to know where those claims are. What county do they concern?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item, the hon. gentleman will perceive, is a re-vote. Nothing was paid out of the item last year.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I thought that this indicated that there were some other claims.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** No.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I see here a re-vote of \$48,500 for increased accommodation at Lévis. Does the hon. gentleman think that with the policy of the Government of extending the railway to Montreal, this expenditure will be necessary.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am going to make a personal examination into the very question which the hon. gentleman has asked. I think it not unlikely that we may require some increased accommodation there, not necessarily in the direction of a new building, but in the direction of more ground.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** What are the "rest-houses at 9 engine stations" for which \$4,500 is proposed?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** These are houses which it is proposed to erect for the purpose of enabling the engine men to find some sort of comfortable quarters.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is a new item.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, though it is an old item of railway charge. These rest-houses are provided by other railways, that is by the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is an item that I think, perhaps, we might, with some advantage, have provided long since.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Can the hon. Minister say whether it is the intention to increase the pay of the Intercolonial trackmen and shopmen?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I cannot say that that is my intention.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Is the hon. gentleman asking for any provision to enable him to do that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am asking no provision for that purpose.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** A very strong appeal was made to the late Government for an increase of the pay of the trackmen, and, upon investigation, I think, it was learned, in fact, I believe, they admitted that their pay was the same as that on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Grand Trunk, and under these circumstances, we did not feel able to increase it. But is the hon. Minister aware whether there has been an increase of the pay of the trackmen on the Canadian Pacific Rail-

**Mr. BLAIR.**

way and the Grand Trunk? I saw some statement to that effect some time ago, and did not know but that the claim for increased payment was strengthened by a change having occurred in these other lines.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am not aware that there has been any increase on these other lines, in fact, my impression is that there has been none. I understand that the rate of wages paid on the Intercolonial is fully up to the rate paid upon other roads.

**Mr. BELL.** Some time ago I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister, through a question on the order paper, the subject of the inspection of fuel.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is, of coal?

**Mr. BELL.** Yes. There was an officer, Mr. William Moore, who was fuel inspector, and, from the papers submitted to me, he seemed to have done good service for the road, because it would appear from the papers that many cases were referred to him for investigation where coal was said to be of inferior quality or deficient in weight. Now, in many cases, according to the correspondence I have looked into, these deficiencies both in quality and quantity were quite serious, and the railway made large reductions from the claims of the coal companies for fuel supplied. I understood the Minister to say that this officer's services were dispensed with on the ground that they were not sufficiently valuable to justify his retention. Since that time it has come to my knowledge that an officer is, or was recently discharging that duty in Montreal, and that this officer had found that the coal supply there, which I think, came from Cape Breton, was not of the kind that should be supplied—it contained too large a percentage of small coal. Apparently it would be impossible for the railway to do without the services of such an officer because, I understand, that the bill for coal is a very large one, and the salary paid the inspector would be but a small matter in comparison with the loss that would result if it became a general thing for the coal companies to supply coal of short weight or of inferior grade to that contracted for. I would like to ask if any officer has been appointed to fill this position.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** There has been no person appointed for such purpose—that is, not a permanent appointment. In consultation with the general manager he gave me to understand that there was really no permanent employment to justify our retaining an officer of that kind at the considerable salary that we were paying him. There are no doubt occasions when it becomes necessary to employ somebody to look after the shipments which we are receiving, but a very

small trifle will cover all the expense which is involved in such employment. Mr. Moore, I think, was the name of the former inspector, he was appointed five or six years ago. I think there had been no permanent inspector in the service prior to that date. It was frankly conceded to me by the general manager that the object was not so much the inspection of the coal as it was to find some place in which to put Mr. Moore, and the office of coal inspector was created for that purpose. I have no fault to find with that, because I suppose that sort of thing will occur occasionally with all Governments. But I could not justify myself in continuing Mr. Moore as inspector when I was under no special obligation to do so, and when the service did not appear to call for it. Therefore, I intimated to Mr. Moore that we would not continue him in that capacity longer. There has been no person appointed since. I have no doubt that the other day when we were receiving some coal at Halifax, we sent somebody to look the coal over as it was being received. I think the person so engaged was required a couple of days, and the amount he would get for it would not be very much.

Mr. BELL. From the correspondence of the officers of the department, I think the engineer had informed him that his services were dispensed with for some reason that I did not understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The general manager will be able to give him full information on that subject. It was entirely for the reasons stated.

Mr. BELL. The impression the correspondence gave to my mind was that there was no adequate reason to their knowledge for his dismissal. I understand that the chief engineer—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had no communication with the chief engineer on the subject; my communications would be altogether with the general manager.

Mr. BELL. Some years ago, in the course of the evidence before the Civil Service Commission, the Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways testified to the effect that it was very necessary to have this particular work discharged, and that a large saving to the department could be effected by having a competent officer to inspect the fuel. Mr. Moore submitted to me facts that seemed to indicate that sometimes these cars were deficient to a very serious extent, tons in some cases. The larger cars which would hold nineteen or twenty tons each showed sometimes a deficiency of three or four tons. In one case in which he investigated the quality of the coal from a certain colliery the department deducted 60 per cent from the bills of that company. He furthermore

maintained that through his work he has ascertained which is the better coal for the engines to use, which is the more economical coal for steaming.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that can be so, because the engine-drivers furnish a report of the amount of coal which they use, and the mileage they make, so that we have the information constantly before us.

Mr. BELL. I observed in the correspondence that there were several complaints of engine-drivers about the quality of the coal that had been passed by the inspector.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The general manager thinks that we have plenty of people in the service who are very competent, and who, if occasion arises, may give all the necessary attention to the inspection of the coal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Minister say whether he did not contemplate, not long ago, in April, for instance, the appointment of an officer in the position Mr. Moore held, a Mr. Connolly, of New Glasgow?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I contemplated no such appointment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was that not discussed with the Minister?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Many things may have been discussed, but there is a manifest distinction between things being discussed with me and my contemplating action.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister did not propose himself, I am informed, to appoint Mr. Connolly to this position from which Mr. Moore had been removed. Is that information correct?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Propose to whom? I made no suggestion of that kind, and I had no intention of doing so. I may say that when it was understood that there would be a change of that kind, I was not asked to appoint Mr. Connolly alone, but various other persons. I find that as soon as there is any likelihood of a vacancy, it is suggested to me that there are persons who are willing to take the office that becomes vacant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Every one knows that. My point, however, is answered if the hon. gentleman tells me that he did not contemplate appointing Mr. Connolly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Contemplate making a new appointment at the time that this gentleman was dismissed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Or subsequently. I do not wish to cross-examine the Minister. That information of mine, then, was erroneous, and it was not proposed to appoint Connolly?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is entirely correct.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Am I to understand the Minister to say that he acted upon the report or advice of the general manager to the effect that the office of Mr. Moore was not required?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I had a conversation with the general manager on the subject before his dismissal. I conferred with him as to the necessity of retaining the officer. He informed me of the circumstances under which the appointment was made; if my memory serves me, I think it was less than seven years ago, but I know the period seemed to be very recent within which we were having this inspector of coal as a permanent officer in the service; and I came to the conclusion, after consultation with the general manager, that we might just as well dispense with the services of the inspector.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No written report, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. I had a verbal conversation with him.

Mr. BELL. I understand there is no fuel department on the Intercolonial, but that the coal comes into the store-keeper. That being the case, it seems to me that without some special officer it would be difficult or impossible to have a regular inspection of coal or to have the coal weighed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think we must adjourn at that point.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What business will be proceeded with to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think the business of the Railway Committee will require my attention to-morrow, as nothing of general interest will come before it. We can, therefore, proceed with the Estimates to-morrow morning.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I shall have to be present at the Railway Committee, but the Estimates may be proceeded with. I should like to ask the Minister of Railways when he proposes to make a

Mr. BLAIR.

statement in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already tabled the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### GOODWIN VS. THE QUEEN.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to an article in the Toronto "Globe," of June 22nd, 1896, wherein the following statements appear:—

"Just as was anticipated, the Goodwin case has been hurried to a conclusion and judgment given against the country. \* \* \* Why this breathless haste on the part of the Government? A few days ago the "Globe" protested against the presentation to the courts of the case by this Government. Instead of their interests being identical with those of the public, it is not hard to see that they are totally opposed. A verdict against the contractor would have convicted Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Mr. Haggart of extreme carelessness, to use the mildest phrase that could be used, of the public funds. Every instinct of self-preservation, therefore, would lead them to desire that the public should lose the law-suit.

"When it was determined to push the case through post-haste, we urged that at least eminent counsel should be employed, counsel in whom the public would have confidence, who would be trusted to make the best case possible on behalf of the public. The names of Messrs. Christopher Robinson, S. H. Blake and Mr. B. B. Osler were mentioned in this connection. As a fact Mr. J. A. Macdonell, who had just assisted Sir Charles in his attempt to disavow the authorship of the famous confidence-in-the-breed letter, was employed. Mr. Goodwin appears to have had more confidence in our judgment and he secured Mr. Osler. \* \* \* We think we speak the public mind when we say that no final action should be taken in this case until Parliament meets, and that the whole subject must have thorough consideration by the representatives of the people."

2. Who was employed by the Government to protect the interests of the Crown in the Exchequer Court case of Goodwin vs. the Queen, arising out of the contract of Mr. George Goodwin for certain sections of the Soulanges Canal.

3. What counsel was retained and employed by the professional gentleman thus entrusted with the case for the Government?

4. Who is now employed as solicitor in the case by the Government ?

5. Have the present law officers of the Crown who are now seized of all the facts of the case, any reason to complain of the manner in which the case was handled by the gentlemen first appointed ? Did he in any manner omit anything which should have been done in the interests of the Crown, or was anything done of which the present law officers of the Crown or the Department of Justice disapprove ?

6. Are the present law officers of the Crown aware that it was charged in the "Globe" and other newspapers that Mr. Macdonell had been selected with a view to the interests of the Crown being sacrificed ?

7. Do they consider that there was any shadow of justification in Mr. Macdonell's management of the case for so gross an accusation against a professional man charged with the conduct of important Crown business ?

8. Has any change been made in the counsel first retained and employed by Mr. Macdonell ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In reply to the first question of my hon. friend, I beg to say, yes. In reply to the second, Mr. Macdonell. In reply to the third, Mr. Ritchie, of Toronto. In reply to the fourth, Mr. Chrysler. To the fifth, the gentleman who originally acted with Mr. Macdonell for the Crown handled the case in every respect so as to give satisfaction to the Crown. To the fifth, no. To the sixth, there was no justification for any charge that Mr. Macdonell did not act as a professional man should have acted. To the sixth, the counsel first retained by Mr. Macdonell still acts for the Crown and the success of the case in the last instance depended entirely on the manner in which it was conducted originally before the court.

#### MONTREAL "GAZETTE" AND "STAR."

Mr. DAVIS asked :

Is the Government aware that from the 14th to 30th of December, 1895, 6,386 pounds of a special edition of the Montreal "Gazette" marked copies were passed through the mails from the Montreal post office, free of charge ?

That from the 27th to the 30th of January, 1896, 770 pounds of Montreal "Gazette" Almanacs were passed through the mails from the Montreal post office, free of charge ?

That from the 21st of December, 1895, to the 8th of January, 1896, 3,230 pounds of "Star" Almanacs were passed through the mails from the Montreal post office, free of charge ?

Have complaints been made of irregularities in the post office at Montreal ? If so, do the Government intend to hold an investigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Information has been given to the department to the effect that certain newspapers were transmitted through the mail free at Montreal being, I think, those mentioned in the question. With regard to the latter part of the question, certain complaints of the nature mentioned have been made, and when the session is over they will be looked into and, if necessary, an investigation will be held.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 128) relating to the Canada Investment and Agency Company, limited (from the Senate).—(Mr. Davin.)

#### MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from the moneys invested under the provisions of subsection 3 of section twenty-five of chapter fifty-four of the Revised Statutes of Canada, forming the School Fund for the province of Manitoba, pay over from time to time to the Government of Manitoba, on the request of the said Government, such sum or sums as the said Governor in Council thinks proper, not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars in any one year, and not exceeding in the whole the sum of three hundred thousand dollars, the sum or sums so paid over to be expended by the said Government of Manitoba in the support and maintenance of public schools in that province.

Motion agreed to.

#### COLD STORAGE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

1. That it is expedient to ratify certain agreements between the Government and certain companies, entered into under the authority of an Order in Council, dated the 4th of May, 1897 (copies of which Order in Council and agreements have been laid before Parliament), for providing cold storage on steamships from Montreal to the United Kingdom during the season of 1897, 1898 and 1899, as follows:—

With Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. David Torrance & Co., for two steamships each, and a regular and if possible, weekly service to Liverpool; with Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. William Thomson & Sons, for three steamships each, and a weekly service to London; with Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. R. Reford & Co., for one steamship each, and a fortnightly service to Glasgow; with Messrs. Eider, Dempster & Co., for five steamships, and a weekly service to Avonmouth;

Each steamship to have cold storage capacity of about 10,000 cubic feet (to Avonmouth, about 20,000 cubic feet), the cost of the refrigeration plant and insulation being estimated at \$10,000 per steamship (to Avonmouth, at \$12,325), one-half of which is to be paid by the Government in three equal annual instalments.

2. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into contracts with any person or company, for providing cold storage accommodation at Toronto, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Charlottetown, the Government guaranteeing a dividend of 5 per cent annually for three years on a sum not exceeding \$40,000, on the cost of the cold storage premises and refrigerating plant, at Quebec, at Halifax, and at St. John; on a sum not exceeding \$50,000 at Toronto,

and on a sum not exceeding \$20,000 at Charlotte-town.

Motion agreed to.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Railways and Canals, chargeable to Capital—Prince Edward Island Railway:—  
Cost of survey of proposed bridge over the Hillsborough and railway route towards Murray Harbour, \$7,500; increased accommodation and switch at Mount Stewart, \$1,500; to shorten the main line by the removal of certain curves therein, \$10,000..... \$19,000

Mr. MARTIN. Before this is passed, I wish to say a few words. Though a sum is proposed for the survey of the proposed bridge over Hillsborough, and of the railway route from Belfast to Murray Harbour, it is very unsatisfactory to the province, that a longer step has not been made. We were given to understand, during the campaign of 1886, that when the Liberals came into power, long-delayed justice in this respect was to be done to Prince Edward Island. I think this is a very short step, a very feeble step in that direction, when we consider the promises that were made. It had been charged against the late Government that they went slow in this matter. I believe they did go slow in this matter. But when we consider that after what was said during the campaign by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies), I presume on behalf of the Liberal party, we had the right to expect that some active steps would be taken to carry out this project and supplement the promise made with more than we fixed in the Estimates before us. We found the Premier of the province asserting on every platform, as did the Minister of Marine also, that long-delayed justice would at last be done to Prince Edward Island. And it has come down to this—that while we are voting millions for railways throughout the Dominion, only \$7,500 is proposed for the work of extension in Prince Edward Island. Slow as the Conservative party went, still we had the late Government committed this far—that when the general question of railway extension came up, the claims of Prince Edward Island would be considered. But to-day, we are not on as good a footing as we were then. The late Government went further. They introduced a resolution providing for the construction of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Railway as well as for the construction of other branch railways in the province. That conclusion was arrived at by the late Government, after receiving petitions and memorials from the people—and a resolution passed by the legislature of

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Prince Edward Island, a legislature, a large majority of whose members were Liberals. One session of this Parliament has passed, and the second session is nearly at its close, but all that has been done is to propose a small item for a survey. I find by a return which was placed on the Table of the House yesterday, that, since the year 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered confederation, the sum of \$106,026,567.66 has been expended by the Dominion for railway construction. How much do you suppose, out of these many millions, has been given to Prince Edward Island? Only the small sum of \$635,830. And a great deal of that money, under legislation introduced in this House in 1883, was paid to relieve the local governments of the expense of building railways in their several provinces. Prince Edward Island, as a matter of fact, has not received one dollar of that expenditure, made since 1883; the expenditure in Prince Edward Island referred to having been made previous to the year 1883. Now, according to that return, showing an expenditure of \$106,026,567.66, Prince Edward Island's share would be over \$2,600,000, nearly the sum which I said some time ago was due Prince Edward Island. So this return after all bears out the statements I made to the House in regard to the claims of that province. I do not know what value is to be attached to some of these returns. This may be a very good one; but I have been looking over the returns laid upon the Table of the House in regard to this matter, and I find a great discrepancy among them indeed. I do not know how the compiler of these returns arrived at these figures of \$635,830 expended in Prince Edward Island. I hold in my hand a return brought down showing the railway expenditure in the Dominion previous to 1882, and I find therein that Prince Edward Island had only received \$247,000. But will any member of this House say that any expenditure on railways in Prince Edward Island has been made since that year? There has been none. How they jumped from \$247,000 to the sum mentioned in this return, I fail to see. I find out also in regard to this return that it is unsatisfactory in another respect. How is this amount of \$106,026,567, stated to be the Dominion railway expenditure since 1873, arrived at? We do not know, it may be guess work. We have no basis to show in this return how that item was arrived at. We have only a bald statement that this sum is expended, without giving any details whatever. I asked for a statement showing the railway expenditure; and this is only what I receive. But besides that, we find I asked for the number of acres of land, but the return I hold does not give that. While one statement puts the claims of Prince Edward Island on good footing, I do not think this statement

went far enough. But I wish to say this, and I do not care who I am going to hit in saying it. I find in a return a statement to which I wish to call the attention of the House, because I believe the returns have misled the House. In 1895 the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked for a return similar to this one, which was brought down in 1896; and we find in that return that Prince Edward Island, up to 1896, had received \$3,750,000 for railway expenditure. Now, I question the accuracy of that statement. How is it that the return of 1896 says that Prince Edward Island received \$3,750,000 and the return that is now laid before the House says Prince Edward Island only received \$637,000? The return asked for in 1891 says Prince Edward Island had only received \$247,000. I lay these facts before you, Mr. Chairman, and before this committee, to show how little reliance can be placed on these returns. Why did not the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries call attention to this mistake in April, 1896? The statement misled the House. Now, I call the attention of the committee to the course of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the representative of Queen's County (P.E.I.) When that return of 1896 was laid on the Table of this House, containing those gross mistakes and inaccuracies, that hon. gentleman, as representing a county of Prince Edward Island, should have at least called attention to these inaccuracies, in order that hon. members of this House should not be misled by such returns. Now, I see by the correspondence which has been brought down in the other Chamber, that there is a proposition on foot to submit the claims of Prince Edward Island to arbitration. Now, while I am not at all afraid of having the railway claims of Prince Edward Island submitted to arbitration, considering the stand that has been taken in Prince Edward Island by the present Minister of Marine, I think the claims of that province are beyond dispute, that there is no necessity of submitting them to arbitration, and that arbitration means delay. While we see millions of money being spent for the Intercolonial Railway, and other proposed millions for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and other schemes, Prince Edward Island has to stand aside, and we must be satisfied to submit to an arbitration. They say that seven millions are now to be expended on the Intercolonial Railway. Sir, should not the Government of this country be just before they are generous? Have the terms made with Prince Edward Island when she came into the confederation, been fulfilled? Has Prince Edward Island ever been connected with the Intercolonial Railway or with the railway system of the Dominion, as was promised when she entered confederation? Is there not a missing link between Prince Edward Island and the mainland which the Parliament of Canada has

never yet attempted to supply? The terms said there was to be continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and that the province was to be connected with the Intercolonial Railway and with the railway system of the Dominion. Before the Dominion Government spends seven millions of money to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, the first thing they should do is to attempt to carry out the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island. What is that missing link of which I speak? There are nine or ten miles of water between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. What has been done to improve that communication since Prince Edward Island came into confederation? That Island remains nearly in the same circumstances to-day as she did 25 years ago. When I came to this Parliament last March and had to cross this small gap, had to be strapped to a boat, had to carry Her Majesty's mail in a boat, and I had to put my hand in my pocket and pay my two or three dollars for the privilege. That is the state of affairs that exists in Prince Edward Island. Sir, I say that in no part of the civilized world is there such defective communication as exists between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. And here we find this Government going to establish two or three competing lines over the same section of country between Quebec and Montreal. I see no necessity for it, certainly there is no commercial necessity for it, but I believe there is a political necessity that forces the Government to go into that scheme. Now, I am going to refer to this proposal made by the Premier of Prince Edward Island, a copy of which I hold in my hand, to refer the claims of Prince Edward Island, and among them the railway claim, to arbitration. The proposal made by the Premier is to refer the question of communication with Prince Edward and the mainland, and railway, as well as other claims, to arbitration. I see no objection to this, so far as the question of damages on account of the non-fulfilment of the terms of union with Prince Edward Island with respect to continuous communication with the mainland is concerned, but I object to the claims of the island in regard to railway construction being referred to arbitration. The Conservative party has already admitted the claims of Prince Edward Island in regard to railway construction, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) has committed the Liberal Government and party to the construction of these railways. Both parties being committed, I submit that justice will not be done if these claims are referred to arbitration, as it will necessitate delay. In regard to the item of \$7,500, I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not be so weak-kneed as to allow millions of money to be expended on the extension of the

Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and more millions on the Crow's Nest Pass Road, and admit for one moment that the little province has no right to be considered. I am afraid that the members of the Cabinet are too strong for him, and that this fact explains the item of \$7,500, while millions are being voted for railway construction in different parts of the Dominion. The Minister of Trade and Commerce asked me the other day if Prince Edward Island would be willing to take back its railway. I ask the Minister, does he believe that Ontario would be willing to take back the canals? The original cost was \$66,000,000. The interest is \$2,500,000 a year. What are the total receipts from the canals? While in 1868 only \$20,000,000 had been expended, the tolls were \$400,000, and yet to-day, after an expenditure has been made of \$66,000,000, the tolls are only \$330,000 a year. While the expenditure has increased three-fold, the tolls have actually decreased. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce agree to pay that interest and accept the tolls? No less than \$55,000,000 has been expended on the Intercolonial Railway, which, at 4 per cent, means a payment of \$2,250,000 yearly for interest. This interest has to be met every year, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite are making further expenditures of millions on this road. Are they not supposed to be just before they are generous, and yet political exigencies compel them, even against their better instincts, to make these expenditures, while at the same time they make no effort whatever to carry out the compact with Prince Edward Island. I am sorry there is not a large vote in the Supplementary Estimates to carry out the promises made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1896. It was then stated that if a Liberal Government came into power justice would be done to the Island. Instead of going forward we have been going backward. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries allows the Government to make expenditures in other directions, permits himself to be pushed on one side and is granted an item of \$7,500, while millions are proposed to be expended on the Intercolonial Railway extension and the Crow's Nest Pass Road.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Until the hon. gentleman spoke, I was not aware that I had been so naughty, as the hon. gentleman suggests. There are some men in this world who have the unhappy faculty of introducing a question near and dear to them always at the wrong moment. The hon. member has a good case as regards Prince Edward Island. In my judgment there is a good case, if presented at the proper time, under suitable circumstances and with effective arguments. What, however, has been the result of the hon. gentleman's action? The members of the House have laughed.

**Mr. MARTIN.**

**Mr. MARTIN.** I only alluded to the claims of the east as against those of the west.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** When the hon. gentleman introduces a serious question in an irrelevant manner, at a time when the House is obviously not ready to consider it, he is doing a great deal to prejudice the case of the little island. I am trying to do my best in this matter. The proposal is that a sum of \$7,000 or \$8,000 be granted to the Minister of Railways for the purpose of constructing a bridge across Hillsboro' River, or rather for surveying a site for the bridge and the railway. That is a necessary initial step before entering upon the work. Does the hon. gentleman want that money not voted? Does he want to proceed with the work before a survey is made? This is the businesslike way of proceeding. I am determined that this matter shall no longer be made a political football. We will have a survey made, and it will be my duty to press on my colleagues the necessity of having the work carried out. The other vote is for the purpose of straightening the curves of the Island Railway, so that life and limb may be safer than in the past. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) knows that this road was built as a surface road in 1872 and 1873, and that the contractors were paid so much a mile, and it was their interest to lengthen the road as much as possible. They ran around every little hillock they could find in order to get more mileage. The proposal before the House is, that a certain sum of money be granted, not to straighten the road altogether, because that cannot be done, but to take out the two dangerous parts which have actually in the past frightened people to pass over them. The proposal is to survey for the bridge and a portion of the railway, and to somewhat straighten these curves out. The hon. gentleman, in connection with this vote, drags in the claims of Prince Edward Island for better terms, and seems to make it a laughing stock before the House. The question of the claims of Prince Edward Island is another matter altogether, and it will have to be considered on its merits. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has done a great deal of harm going around among hon. gentlemen in this House, and causing it to be a subject for jeering. When that question is brought up, it will be brought up before the House in a proper way, and as a matter requiring serious consideration, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has no warrant for dragging in the question here as a kind of side show, when a vote to survey for a bridge is under consideration. It has been requested by the local legislature that this matter should be submitted to arbitration, and the Premier of the province pressed that question on this Government, when he was here a short time ago. It is a question which will have proper consideration from

my colleagues when they have time to take it up, but why it should be discounted in advance, and an attempt made to turn it into ridicule by the hon. member (Mr. Martin) is certainly most extraordinary conduct on his part.

Mr. MARTIN. I know it is very hard to please my hon. friend (Mr. Davies), and I know that I have never been able to do so, nor do I think that I shall be able to please him, so long as I am a member of this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has a very high idea about the right time to bring these matters before the House, and he has also very lofty ideas about the style in which the House should be addressed. I am very sorry that I do not come up to the hon. gentleman's standard of oratory. I am a plain man, and I speak what I have to say in a plain way. I cannot use the flowery oratory which is the gift of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has said, I believe that my remarks about Prince Edward Island were perfectly pertinent on this occasion. If hon. gentlemen will look at the record, they will find that whenever a statement is made by a Prince Edward Island member in this House the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) rises immediately afterwards, and expresses his sorrow that the remarks were not in proper time, or that they were not couched in oratorical language. They were either too low or too high in tone. We allow the hon. gentleman the palm as far as the choice of words is concerned, but considering that he occupied so much of the time of the House in the last Parliament, he might not be so exacting when a member from his province speaks of the claims of Prince Edward Island in this House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself has neglected the claims of the Island. I repeat, and I state most distinctly, that he has overlooked the claims of the Island for the last two terms of Parliament. I was justified in calling the attention of the House to the fact, that when incorrect returns, unjust to the Island province were laid on the Table of the House, it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) to stand up, and point out that these reports were not correct. When these returns stated, that three millions of money were spent in Prince Edward Island, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) instead of being the political hack that he was, should have got up and resented such an incorrect statement as that. Those returns were asked for by himself in 1895, but it appears when they were brought down, full of mistakes, he had not called attention to them. When I came to this House I found that these incorrect returns had done their work, and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) himself admitted to me that even

the members of the Government were saturated with the idea that Prince Edward Island never paid for its own railway. Now, what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) say about arbitration, and how does he stand in regard to that question. He tells us, that he has \$7,500 in the Estimates for the survey of the road and a bridge, and he says that they are pressing on the attention of the Government to submit to arbitration the whole question of the claims of Prince Edward Island. The difference between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) and myself is, that he wants arbitration so far as the claim of the province in regard to railway extension is concerned, and I do not want arbitration, on our railway claims, because arbitration means delay. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has no right to charge that I made a laughing stock of this question. He may have been laughing at it, but I am not responsible for that. Nero laughed while Rome was burning, and I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) would laugh when Prince Edward Island was being dealt with unjustly. I believe he would laugh when seven million dollars were being voted away, and not a dollar for Prince Edward Island, except a small sum for a proposed survey. If this survey was bona fide it would not be so bad, but he (Mr. Davies) says that after voting this sum of \$7,500 for a survey, he is going to ask the Government to submit the question to arbitration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all, I never said that.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman say not at all? Well, I have here a letter which was addressed to the Minister (Mr. Davies) by the Premier of Prince Edward Island, and does the Minister deny that it is proposed that the claims in regard to railway extension should be submitted to arbitration. Does he not know that that language is in the letter addressed to himself, a copy of which I hold in my hand. He cannot deny it, for I have a copy of the letter right here to prove it. The hon. gentleman the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) has always some complaint to make when a member from the Island urges its claims in this House. He tells us that the remarks of one member were inopportune, that another did not use choice words, that the hon. member for King's spoke too low, and I suppose that he thinks that I speak too high, or that I do not use the rising inflection—or that my gesture is not as graceful as his own. At all events, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is always ready with some objection of that kind. Every time there is some objection raised. It is hard to please him, but I am afraid he will not please Prince Edward Island by the course he is now pursuing. Instead of coming down here with \$7,500 for a survey, he should implement the promise he made

in 1896 in Prince Edward Island, and build that railway to Belfast. Why have we not had the survey finished, and a sum in the Estimates to-day for carrying out that promise? The hon. gentleman says this is a side issue. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is trifling with this question. I can tell him that he is watched in the province from which he comes. I feel humiliated when I see the Supplementary Estimates coming down here without that sum in them which I expected would be there on this occasion. With many large sums voted for other purposes, he should have come down with the small sum which is due to the province of Prince Edward Island for carrying out the policy of the late Government, and the policy which the hon. gentleman promised that this Government would pursue when they got into power.

Mr. PERRY. I must congratulate the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) on the able way in which he has presented the rights of the people of the little province from which he and I come. I also congratulate the people who sent him here on having such an able champion of the rights of the people. The first speech he made was well enough, but he spoiled his whole case when he made the second one. He has found fault with the Estimate which the Government has brought down, because they are not going to build that branch railway on the island immediately. Why, the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) warned the present Government not to enter into a contract before having a survey made by a competent engineer, so that they would be acting intelligently. I can readily endorse the statement of the hon. member for East Queen's that Prince Edward Island has not received justice since we entered into confederation—that the contract under which we entered confederation has not been carried out. He charges the present Government with all these slips; but what charges has he made against the late Government, which had the control of all these matters for eighteen years? What steps did the late Government ever take to carry out the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island? My hon. friend was a member of the local legislature in 1885, when that celebrated Address was passed demanding that the Government of Canada pay the province of Prince Edward Island \$5,000,000 for failing to fulfil the terms of confederation. Here was a prominent supporter of the Ferguson-Sullivan Government, who passed that Address and who were in accord with the Government of Canada at that time; and what was the result of that Address? Did they ever press it any further than to send a delegation to Ottawa, and also across the Atlantic to make an appearance in England? I do not know what kind of plea they made, but they came back with nothing. The hon.

Mr. MARTIN.

gentleman says there is a missing link. We all admit that, and the present Government will not deny it; but the late Government undertook to supply that link. In 1891 they went through the province of Prince Edward Island preaching the tunnel, after the subway scheme had failed; but it was only on the eve of the elections of 1891 that they began to advocate the tunnel. They even imported the late High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, and when he got to Amherst on his way to the Island, he telegraphed to Senator Ferguson, who was at that time a candidate for Queen's County: "I dare not trust my bones to the ice-boat to cross, but I am satisfied that the tunnel can be built for \$6,000,000, and as soon as I get back to England, I will see that that great work is commenced at once." That was on the 28th of February, and the elections were to be in the 5th of March. What have they done since? They have misspent \$12,000 in making borings. They had one of the best engineers from England out here, and they fooled him, bled him, almost robbed him. In the course of a couple of months he had nine successful borings made across the Straits. How many did the late Government have? I believe two in the course of five or six years. This is the way the late Government carried out the terms of confederation. My hon. friend from East Queen's has said a great deal about how far the late Government went to build these branch railways. They tabled resolutions providing for building them, on the very eve of the general elections. They merely gave notice that on a certain day these resolutions would be taken up in the House; but that day never came. The day did come, but they were asleep; they did not want to take them up. It was done merely to catch votes. Now, I do not want to exonerate the present Government from the heavy responsibility that lies at their door, to give the island justice. It is very well known that the people of Prince Edward Island have not received justice under confederation. It is well known that we pay more money into the exchequer of Canada than we receive in return. My hon. friend from East Queen's is right when he says that we have no right to be charged with \$3,500,000 for the building of railways on the Island, because we paid for those railways with our own money. When we entered confederation we were so many millions less in debt than the confederated provinces, and the Dominion Government agreed to take the Island road and charge us with \$3,500,000, which left \$1,500,000 or thereabouts, for which we were paid interest at 5 per cent. When my hon. friend was in the local House, supporting the local government, he gave a silent vote to allow that Government to draw from Ottawa \$200,000, which reduced the annual interest due to the Island yearly by \$10,000. Is it any wonder that the Island's finances are

not in a wholesome condition to-day? He says my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, after voting \$7,500 to survey this branch railway, has given up the whole case by asking that the matter be left to arbitration. My hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has done no such thing. He is not asking a commission or arbitration to decide upon the necessity of building these branches, but merely to determine how much is due by Canada to the people of Prince Edward Island for the non-fulfilment of the terms of confederation. Let me tell my hon. friend that the present Government have done more to recognize the rights of the people of Prince Edward Island, in the short time they have been in office, than the late Government did in the last eighteen years. I hope and trust that this Government will do justice to Prince Edward Island. I hope it will build the bridge we require and also a branch railway to pass by the door of my hon. friend from East Queen's but I believe that even if it did, he is so opposed to the Government that he would not give it any credit. I hope also that the hon. Minister of Public Works will at once enter into contract to build a wharf at Westpoint. It would have come better from the hon. gentleman if he had began his remarks by a castigation of his own friends who were in power for eighteen years and in all that time did nothing to satisfy the just claims of the Island, instead of laying the whole blame on this Government, which has not been in office longer than twelve months. My hon. friend says there is no need for arbitration. Why not? There are hon. gentlemen here from the other provinces who do not believe, as the people of the Island do, that we are entitled to our share of the \$200,000,000 of public money which has been spent on public works in the rest of Canada; and where there is such difference of opinion, is it not just and reasonable that this difference, especially in a complicated case of this kind, should be left to arbitration and not to the ipse dixit of one or two men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the case of Sullivan, formerly car and oil inspector at Stellarton. A great wrong, no doubt unintentionally, was done this man. I find, after very careful inquiry, that his character in the district where he has lived is unimpeachable, and the hon. Minister himself has not, in his communications with me, imputed to him any direct wrong, but simply that he was not sufficiently active in preventing or exposing wrong-doing on the part of another employee in the service connected with him in some way. If the hon. gentleman had found Sullivan guilty of carelessness or laxity in the discharge of his duties, after anything like a fair investigation, I would not have a word to say, but what I complain of is that this man, who had hitherto borne a

first rate character and held a responsible position, should have been dismissed without any investigation in the proper sense of the word. The officer of the hon. gentleman's department who inquired into the subject, did not examine any one in this man's presence, and there was nothing approaching to an open investigation. What was charged against Sullivan was that another man, the real offender, had remarked that he intended to tap some letter which was in the custody of the Intercolonial Railway, and that Sullivan did not report that fact to the inspector or take any means to prevent it. Now, Inspector Sullivan and his friends tell me that the delinquent, the real offender, made that remark in the presence of others as well, and made it as, they supposed, a jocular manner, and Sullivan never had any reason to believe that there was the slightest possibility of his doing anything of the kind. I am not sufficiently acquainted with all the facts to be able to say how far the offender was connected with the car and oil Inspector Sullivan. I do not know how far duties were connected with those of the man who, so far as I can understand, was properly dismissed, and I am not going to take up any further time—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As the hon gentleman is about taking his seat, I may say I will gladly allow him to have access to the evidence which was gathered on the subject, and I would be willing to confer with him upon the case generally, with a view to doing anything that would be just to the person to whom he refers. I think that the matter was practically decided by the officials before I came into the department and that I had nothing to do with it except that it came before me rather as a matter of review. I felt that, under the circumstances, and with the facts as presented to me, there was no course for me to take but to approve what had been done by the officials. Notwithstanding that, I am free to say to the hon. gentleman that I am willing to show the hon. gentleman the communications which took place and the evidence brought out in the investigation, and generally, to talk the matter over with him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is, of course, satisfactory to me. I was not attempting to make a point against the Minister personally. I know nothing of these matters. But I did believe, and I believe yet, that I can make this point in connection with so respectable a man as I know Mr. Sullivan to be—to get a fair and open inquiry. Even let the hon. Minister appoint his own officers, but let the man be brought face to face with his accusers.

There is another matter to which I wish to call the hon. Minister's attention. No doubt it has escaped his attention, for otherwise he would have been guilty of a very

great and undeserved discourtesy towards myself. Last session, I brought up on several occasions the subject of the gross injustice being done through the defeated candidate in Pictou to two men in the service of the Intercolonial. The Minister of Railways acted, so far as I can ascertain—though papers are withheld that are referred to in the correspondence brought down—on the statement of Mr. E. M. McDonald, I have investigated that statement and no more ruthless or unwarranted statement was ever made than that made by Mr. McDonald, if that statement, was as intimated in the discussion last session, that either of these men was an active partisan in the late election, or had done more than poll his vote, or had neglected his duty, or had said anything that could offend my political opponents either candidates or others. Last session the Minister intimated when this subject was before the House that he would allow an investigation to be made into the facts and see whether injustice had been done to these men. I received a request from them, which I forwarded to the Minister, asking him to be good enough to say when the investigation would take place and also whether these men would be permitted to have a representative at the investigation, as I was myself desirous of attending in connection with them. Though that letter was sent in September or October last, I have never received an acknowledgment of it—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. member will allow me, I must say that I do not recall the receipt of that letter. It may be that in the mass of correspondence that reaches me his letter may have been passed over—

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I intimated in beginning, that I did not charge the hon. Minister with overlooking this matter intentionally, because that would be an act of discourtesy that I should not expect at his hands. But the letter has remained unanswered and unattended to. I rise now not only for the purpose of asking the hon. Minister's attention to the case—for it is a case in which, I think, we can expose the unfair policy that has been adopted, in accepting the statements of defeated politicians against the interests of men in the service of the Government, high or low—but also to say that an order of the House was granted for the papers in this case, and that I had a discussion both inside and outside of the House with the Minister and pointed out that letters referred to in the papers were not brought down. Nothing having been done to supplement that return, I moved again this session, though not strictly necessary, for an order of the House for such papers as had not been brought down. I call the attention of the Minister again to the fact, because, if he grants the investigation—as no doubt he will; he pro-

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**.

mised it—it is most important that we should have a complete file in regard to the transaction.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The statement that the hon. gentleman makes in regard to the additional return is entirely correct. I may say that, asking at the department, as I do nearly every day, whether papers which have been called for have been prepared, I had my attention called this very morning, to this supplementary statement, which has been practically completed. I said I would look at it at the very first leisure moment I had. I repeat that to the hon. gentleman—I will look over the statement and bring it down as soon as possible. There was no intention to delay the matter.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I accept that.

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** I see that the item under discussion is as follows:—

Railways and Canals, chargeable to Capital—Prince Edward Island Railway—	
Cost of survey of proposed bridge over the Hillsborough and railway route towards Murray Harbour.....	\$7,500
Increased accommodation and switch at Mount Stewart.....	\$1,500
To shorten the main line by the removal of certain curves therein.....	\$10,000

I think that this is the most fitting time to refer to the matter of the Prince Edward Island branch roads notwithstanding that my good friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) has criticised my hon. friend from East Queen's (Mr. Martin) for taking up this matter at an improper time.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) misunderstood me—

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** The hon. Minister of Marine said that the hon. member for East Queen's had brought the matter up at the wrong time.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No. I was speaking of the claims of Prince Edward Island which are a distinct matter and had nothing to do with this question.

Mr. **MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** That is all very well, but my contention is that there could be no more proper time this session to bring up and discuss the matter of the Prince Edward Island railroads than the present. I must say that I entirely disagree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he criticises the hon. member for East Queen's for bringing up this matter at a wrong time. He also tried to ridicule the hon. member by saying he had made this matter the laughing-stock of the House. The only gentlemen whom I saw laughing about the matter were the hon. Minister's and his own friends. I think the matter is too serious

a one to be made a laughing-stock by any party. I do not intend to make an extended speech; this matter has been before Parliament before. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has accused the Liberal-Conservative party of playing with this matter for the last twenty years. Well, they played it up to the point where they were prepared to come down to this House and place a sum of money in the Estimates for the construction of certain branch railways; and I think that was playing with it to some purpose. The Liberal-Conservative Government, when they went out of power, were fully committed to the construction of certain branch railroads in Prince Edward Island. Not only that, but the hon. gentlemen then representing the western section of Prince Edward Island, my two hon. friends from Prince (Mr. Yeo and Mr. Perry) also favoured the construction of branch railways, some of them being in favour of certain lines, and others of other lines which were then talked of and for which an estimate was made by the late Government. So that we not only find the Liberal-Conservative members of that day being in favour of the construction of the several branches in Prince Edward Island, but we find that the hon. gentlemen who were then in Opposition, we find that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries also committed himself to an expenditure on the Belfast branch. He is also committed to the construction of a bridge across the Hillsboro' River, which he contemplates will cost half a million dollars. I do not want to criticise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries improperly, or to put him in a false position, but I must say that he tried, during the election campaign, to show that we were committed to a vast expenditure of money in Prince Edward Island for six or eight branch railways, but I want to show in a few minutes that that hon. gentleman himself was committed to a larger expenditure even than we were. It would seem that the branches, the construction of which was contemplated by the late Government, according to an estimate laid before Parliament at that time, including the necessary rolling stock that would be required for these several branches, passenger cars &c., amounted in all to \$1,088,000. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was committed, according to his statements in this House on several occasions, as well as during the election campaign, to the construction of the Murray Harbour branch, which, according to the estimate laid before Parliament, would cost \$660,000. Add to that the construction of the contemplated bridge which he placed at \$500,000, and it would make in all \$1,160,000, or \$72,000 more than the construction of all the branches that were mentioned in the estimate brought down by the late Government. So we find the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is committed to a larger expenditure than that contemplated by the late

Government. It would seem at the present time that the Premier of Prince Edward Island has laid before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and before the present Government, a memorandum to leave these matters which are in dispute between Prince Edward Island and the Federal Government to arbitration. While I for my part have no objection whatever to leave any matters that are in dispute between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion Government to arbitration, on which there should be at least one Prince Edward Islander and one Canadian, and let them choose a third, which I suppose would be a fair way to go about it—I must entirely object to leaving the matter of the construction of the branch railways in Prince Edward Island to any such arbitration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that no such proposition has ever been made or thought of by myself. The whole thing is a figment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am informed that such is not the case. However, I will at the present time put myself on record as being entirely opposed to any such thing. The Conservative party are on record with respect to those branch railways. If the present Government don't think that they are proper, they can say so. If they think they don't go far enough, let them go further; if they think they go too far, let them say so and take the consequences. But so far as the Liberal-Conservative party in Prince Edward Island are concerned, they are committed to certain branches which they believe are not only in the interest of Prince Edward Island but are in the interest of the present Prince Edward Island Railway. We know at the present time that that railway is not a paying institution. There is a yearly deficit between the revenue, and the wear and tear, and everything else. But I believe that the construction of these contemplated branches would be a good paying investment, and the railway would become a good piece of property for the people of this country. Further than that, I want to corroborate the statement that was made by the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin), and to say that the people of this country are very apt to look upon Prince Edward Island Railway as something that was constructed by the people of Canada. That is not the case. To prove that, I may say that if that railway had not been constructed when we came into confederation, we would have been drawing interest on the amount of the cost of that railway from the Dominion Government. Therefore it can be said that the people of Prince Edward Island have paid for every mile of railway that was constructed when we came into confederation, and, therefore, the Dominion of Canada

cannot turn around and say that they built the road in any shape or form. The little branches that we are asking for now are a very small item in comparison with the vast expenditures that are taking place on the railways, canals, and other public works throughout the length and breadth of the country. We have to bear our share of that expenditure, and we don't object to it; but we think that in fair-play we should get an offset to such expenditures which were not at all contemplated when we came into confederation. Now, all these branch railways which we have been looking for in Prince Edward Island, amount in the aggregate to about one million dollars in round numbers, and the Prince Edward Island share of the vast expenditures that were not contemplated when we came into confederation and on which the terms of union were fixed, amounts to two and a half million dollars, so that if the construction of these railways were carried out now, we would still have a large amount of money properly due to the province of Prince Edward Island. So far as the non-fulfilment of the terms of union are concerned I would be quite prepared to support that matter being left to arbitration. I think it is one that should be so disposed of. I am sorry to have had to delay the committee on the present occasion, but I thought it was necessary to say a few words on this matter, which is to me so important.

Mr. YEO. As one of the members from Prince Edward Island I may say I am much pleased to see this sum placed in the Estimates. I was much surprised to hear the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) censure the Government for not having been a little more active in this matter. When we remember that the Conservative Government were in power for eighteen years, and remember what they did for Prince Edward Island, I think modesty ought to have kept those hon. gentlemen silent. Now, I have always been of the opinion, and I have not hesitated to say so, that the only chance Prince Edward Island ever had of obtaining anything like justice was when we had a Liberal Government in power. That has been my opinion in the past, and I am of that opinion still. As one of the representatives of Prince Edward Island, I would not presume to ask for anything that was unfair, and I feel sure that any representations we may make to this Government in a fair spirit will have due effect, and that justice will be done to the province. I think the Government have lost no time in attending to this matter. We all know that a survey must be made before anything else is done. I think my hon. friend from King's will remember that some surveys were made in his county years ago, and that no further progress was made. Now, I hope that won't be the case now; I believe and I am sure

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

that it will not, and if everything else is right, this matter will be proceeded with. I am surprised that my hon. friends have spoken in this way of the claims which the Government of Prince Edward Island have against the Dominion Government. I do not think this is the proper time to bring them up. As far as I am concerned I believe these claims are just and fair, and I for one should not be at all afraid to submit them to any fair arbitration, because I am sure that when those claims are put forward in a right way, they will be dealt with properly. As a representative of the island, I am very glad to see these amounts in the Estimates to provide for survey for a bridge over the Hillsboro' River and to make a survey and do other work in connection with straightening the curves on the railway on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I desire to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Yeo) that in a former session of Parliament he stated that he did not like these questions brought up just previous to an election.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Would not the hon. gentleman like to settle this matter between one and three o'clock?

Mr. FOSTER. Why was this suggestion not made when the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo) was at work?

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). This is a matter that I press on the attention of the Government, because they will undoubtedly seek to keep it over until the next elections and then endeavour to bewilder the people in regard to these branch lines. The hon. gentleman accused me of having had a survey made in regard to one of these branch lines. I am glad to say that a survey was made towards Elmira, as it showed that a line could be easily constructed and is one much required throughout that part of my county.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do with a vote of \$10,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The proposition is to ascertain what can be done in the way of straightening out the worst curves on the Island Railway, to obtain an engineer's report on the subject, and endeavour to have the work carried out. This can be done for the amount made.

Mr. FOSTER. That is as regards the two worse curves. Where are those curves?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between Summerside and Charlottetown.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is going to endeavour to straighten all the

curves on the railway, it will cost a very large sum of money.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). There is a very sharp curve on the branch line from Mount Stuart to Souris through my county. I trust this will be straightened.

Soulanges Canal—Construction..... \$1,250,000

Mr. FOSTER. How is this large sum to be expended in 1897-98?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that it will be spent in the same way that a smaller sum would be spent; of course, we hope that a larger amount of work will be done than if a smaller sum were expended. Our desire is to have the work prosecuted with all possible despatch. For purposes of construction it is proposed to increase the force, and to do within a short time what was intended to be carried out in a longer period.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the sum estimated for the completion of the Soulanges Canal; what proportion of the work has already been done, and what contracts are now being carried out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was originally estimated that the construction of the Soulanges Canal would cost in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000. Up to February 25th, 1897, there had been expended in round figures \$2,400,000. We estimate that \$400,000 more will be required for the work up to 30th June. This will bring the estimated expense up to that date to about \$2,800,000. There will then remain an amount of \$2,200,000 necessary to complete the work according to the estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of the canal is under contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All the sections are under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they all been let?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and the work is progressing on all the sections from 1 to 13.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I understand the whole of the work on the Soulanges Canal is let, and under contract and the work is being proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should like to qualify my statement by saying that there is some delay in regard to contracts in the hands of Mr. Stewart, but we think that an arrangement will be made so that there will be no further delay.

Cornwall—Enlargement..... \$185,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will this amount complete the enlargement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is only for one-half. It is the first expenditure on that branch of the work. The contract has been let.

Galops—Enlargement..... \$1,635,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will that complete the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We expect it will complete it.

Mr. FOSTER. This work is under contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

North Channel—Straightening and deepening..... \$375,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this for new work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion does it bear to the whole cost. Is this half the cost of the work? What is briefly the nature of the work the hon. gentleman is going to do?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deepening of the channel requires rock excavation.

Mr. FOSTER. What draft of water will you have when it is done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have fourteen feet, and perhaps fifteen. We will have navigation there fully as good as on any stretch of the canal system.

River Reaches..... \$50,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are several points between the Cardinal and Cornwall Canals where it is thought extremely likely some work will have to be done. In the north channel we have a good deal of boulder work. We propose to take some effective method of testing the uniform condition of the channel so that there may be no doubt as to our having sufficient depth of water all the way through.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the work be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume it will be done by contract, although it is a description of the work which it would be difficult to give a contract upon. We might find that there would be very little work to be done, or we might find that there would be a great deal. We might possibly agree on some scale to be paid to the contractor according to the amount of work that should be considered necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. And with reference to the north channel?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That would be done by contract because we know what we have to do.

Trent Valley Canal—Construction..... \$650,000

Mr. **ROGERS**. I understood that, for the time being, the Government intended to suspend operations upon that canal, and not to carry it through.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) that I think no declaration has been made that we intend to suspend operations upon it at present. But, we are not asking Parliament to appropriate any amount for new work. All we are asking for is sufficient to keep the contracts going which have already been let.

To meet expenses of litigated matters which may be paid for services in connection with the litigation conducted within the Department of Justice, notwithstanding anything in "The Civil Service Act"..... \$15,000

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Would the Solicitor General be good enough to state how that \$15,000 is to be expended?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This vote is in consequence of a change I have made, so as to enable the department to make payments out of this to employees. My special object is to pay the Deputy Minister of Justice some remuneration for services that he is rendering now, and that were not rendered heretofore. When I came into the department, I found that the expenditure each year for the last five years for counsel fees, had been something in the vicinity of \$35,000. That continued up to last year. Under the new system that was adopted, and which system cannot be carried out without the effective assistance of the Deputy Minister of Justice, we hope to save the greater portion of this sum of \$35,000. In fact, for the last twelve months the Deputy Minister has done all the Solicitor's work in the Department. All the work that has heretofore been done outside is now done by our own staff in our own office. Under these circumstances, we think it advisable that we should be enabled to make some terms with the Deputy Minister for the services, which are very great, which he is now rendering.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I want to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon attempting this reform. It was one which commended itself to me, and the subject was discussed when I was connected with the Department of Justice; but nothing had been done when I left the Department. These expenses of litigation are not altogether popular, and are considered a very heavy burden on the country, and I have no doubt that by centralizing a great deal of the work in the manner proposed, even

Mr. **BLAIR**.

if there is not the strength of staff necessary at the head office, not only will much of the cost be saved to the country, but the work will be kept better in hand and be more satisfactorily performed. This is similar to the system that prevails in England, where I think the Treasury or the Privy Council have to attend to work of this kind through a special class of officers who act for the Crown.

Mr. **BRITTON**. I want to say, because I may not have another opportunity of saying it, that I object now, as I have objected on other occasions, to large extra payments being made to officers of the department who are already paid large salaries for the work they do. I do not know what special payments are proposed to be made to the Deputy Minister of Justice. I have no objection to the work that gentleman does, I shall be the first in this House or anywhere else to recognize his ability, and to say that so far as I know the work he has done has been done well. But if, in addition to the large salary he gets, it is proposed to give him another large sum in bulk or in any other way. I shall object most strongly. I think the system is a bad system. It has worked badly in other departments than the Department of Justice. It is a temptation that ought not to be placed in the way either of the Deputy or any other officer in the department. It is a system that ought not to be used except in very exceptional circumstances.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say, to prevent misunderstanding, that it is not intended to pay the Deputy Minister of Justice any extra salary.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. That was not proposed. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), as a member of the profession, will, I am sure, agree with me that any man fit to fill the position of Deputy Minister of Justice, is certainly entitled to a larger remuneration than he receives, which is some \$2,000 less than is paid to similar officers in other departments. All these officers have to come to him, and do come to him continually, to be advised in the most important matters coming before them; and it has always seemed an anomaly to me that those men, who outside would not rank with him in ability or be relatively better off, are relatively better off in the service. It does not matter whether you increase the salary or allow the remuneration in another form. The main point to the country is that by putting additional work on the officers of the department, you not only save money directly, but have the work more promptly and efficiently done.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. There is no intention to add anything to the present Deputy Minister's salary; but I may say

that we have now twenty-two cases pending in the Exchequer Court and the Supreme Court managed by the Department of Justice exclusively; and that cannot be done without getting extra assistance for the Deputy Minister.

Resolutions to be reported.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.10 p.m.

### Second Sitting.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 133) to amend the law relating to aliens.—(Mr. McMullen.)

#### THE KINGSTON POSTMASTERSHIP.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked :

1. In connection with the change of postmaster in the Kingston post office, did the Honourable Postmaster General obtain any report showing that the late postmaster was unfit for his work, and if so, in what respect was he considered unfit?

2. Before appointing Mr. Gunn, did the Postmaster General ascertain his age?

3. In what particular, if any, was it considered by the Postmaster General that the retirement of Mr. Shannon and the appointment of Mr. Gunn would improve the office?

4. Is the Postmaster General able to say whether Mr. Gunn is superior to Mr. Shannon in mental or physical strength, or vigour, or better qualified to perform the duties of the office?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I thought I had fully covered this question in my reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) yesterday, and see no reason to change my opinion, but as the hon. gentleman wanted a more definite expression of opinion from myself personally, I may add, with regard to question No. 3, that two matters were involved, one the fitness of the late postmaster and the other the fitness of the present postmaster. As regards the fitness of the late postmaster, the evidence I referred to in my answer yesterday showed that the late postmaster was not an efficient officer, and, therefore, a change was necessary. The question therefore of a new appointment arose, and I am perfectly satisfied that Mr. Gunn will show the necessary ability for the proper management of the office.

#### DISMISSAL OF MRS. LeCAIN.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked :

1. Is it true that when the late Mr. LeCain, keeper of the marine hospital, Bunker Island, N.S., was appointed the buildings were out of repair, and Mr. LeCain built at his own expense a wing to the old house and a wing for hospital use, also a workshop and several outhouses; that he improved the land, clearing about ten acres thereof, and put it in first-class condition?

2. Is it true that when the late keeper went to the island about six tons of hay could be cut thereon, and that now fifty tons besides other crop and pasturage are possible?

3. Is it true that the late keeper constructed a frost-proof barn cellar?

4. When Mr. LeCain died was Mrs. LeCain appointed his successor? If not, what instructions were sent to her, if any?

5. Was the following communication from the Department of Marine and Fisheries sent to her:—

“ Marine and Fisheries, Canada,  
“ Ottawa, 2nd January, 1897.

“ Madam,—I am to inform you that your services as keeper of the marine hospital at Bunker's Island are no longer required by the department, and I have to request you to vacate the premises as soon as possible, and hand over charge of the hospital and all Government property to Mr. Edward Cosman, who has been appointed keeper in room instead.

“ I am, madam, your obedient servant,

“ F. GOURDEAU,

“ Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

“ Mrs. LeCain, Bunker Island, Yarmouth, N.S.”

6. After this notice did the member for Yarmouth direct Mrs. LeCain not to remove fencing from the island?

7. Did an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries make an official visit to the island and take an inventory of Mrs. LeCain's effects, and promise payment on the part of the Government? If such inventory was taken, what articles does it enumerate, and when was it received by the department?

8. Has any communication been sent to Mrs. LeCain since the date of the above mentioned letter, 2nd January, 1897?

9. Is the Department of Marine and Fisheries aware that Mrs. LeCain is seventy years of age, with no means of livelihood?

10. Does the Government propose to provide for a retiring or other allowance for Mrs. LeCain? If not, what is the total amount, if any, the Government propose to pay for such articles referred to in the foregoing questions?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. The department has no report as to condition of building when the late Mr. LeCain was first appointed. Mr. LeCain built at his own expense an addition to the building, and he also built a workshop and several outhouses. We have no official knowledge of his improving the land, but as he received the use of the land as compensation in part for performing the duties of keeper, it would be his interest to cultivate and improve the land. 2. The department has no knowledge of this. 3. The department has no knowledge

of this. 4. Mrs. LeCain was not appointed keeper and it was not found necessary to send any special instructions. 5. Yes. 6. The department has no knowledge of the member for Yarmouth giving such directions. 7. Yes, an inventory was taken of Mrs. LeCain's effects and their value taken, viz: \$23.55 as per following list, and it is proposed to allow this amount to Mrs. LeCain. The inventory was received on the 4th of February last.

Inventory No. 2.

4½ pairs blankets, \$2 a pair.....	\$ 9 00
4 pillows (feather), 75 cents each.....	3 00
2 mattresses, \$1 each.....	2 00
5 shirts (worn), 10 cents each.....	0 50
3 counterpanes, \$1 each.....	3 00
3 tables at 25 cents.....	0 75
2 chairs at 20 cents.....	0 40
1 close stool-chair.....	1 00
1 stove, zinc and pipe.....	3 50
8 pillow-cases at 5 cents.....	0 40
	\$23 55

8. No communication was sent Mrs. LeCain from Ottawa, but an officer of the department from Halifax had an interview with her since the date of the letter, viz: 2nd January, 1897. 9. No. 10. The Government does not propose to provide for a retiring or other allowance for Mrs. LeCain as she has no claim to such allowance. The Government proposes to allow Mrs. LeCain the sum of \$100, but Mrs. LeCain is at liberty to remove the workshop and other buildings if unable to effect an arrangement as to their purchase with the new keeper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman's attention to his answers to questions 4 and 5. I suppose that the answer to the 4th is right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; she was not appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The letter was wrong in referring to her services as keeper of the marine hospital not being required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was keeper, but not appointed. There was no formal appointment; she remained after her husband died.

**DEEPENING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.**

Mr. ELLIS asked :

How much money has been expended by the Government of Canada in deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Quebec and otherwise in facilitating and improving the navigation of the river in the interest of trade and commerce, such as the placing of buoys, construction of wharfs and erection of light-houses or in any similar way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The total amount expended in deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Quebec, and

Mr. DAVIES.

in the construction by the Department of Public Works of wharfs and other facilities for improving the navigation of the river between those two points is \$3,800,000—\$2,725,500 of that sum being the amount expended by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and assumed by the Government upon the transfer to the Government of the ship channel works between Montreal and Quebec in 1888.

**POSTMASTER AT FITCH BAY.**

Mr. MOORE asked :

Regarding the change of postmasters at Fitch Bay in the county of Stanstead:—

1. Was there any charge against John S. C. Gage, the late postmaster?

2. What was the nature of the charge, if any was made?

3. Was the said Gage informed of the cause of his dismissal?

4. Was there any investigation before dismissal?

5. Was Mr. T. B. Rider, the late defeated candidate for this House, appointed in Mr. Gage's place as postmaster at Fitch Bay?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. Yes. 2. Undue political activity. 3. He received the usual official notice some time before the transfer of the office. 4. No. 5. Yes.

**NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RAILWAY BONUS.**

Mr. MILLS asked :

Is there any balance of subsidy granted to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company still remaining unpaid? If so, what is the balance? When will it lapse? Will the decision of the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, as to the payment of this balance be adhered to? Is such decision or opinion on file in the Department of Railways and Canals?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is a balance of subsidy granted to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company still remaining unpaid, that balance being \$4,500. The railway being completed, the balance will not lapse. I cannot, without further consideration, say whether the decision of the late Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, as to the payment of this balance will be adhered to, but so far it has not been departed from. The decision is on file in the Department of Railways and Canals.

**PIER AT MARGARETVILLE, N.S.**

Mr. MILLS asked :

Who tendered for the contract to repair the pier at Margareville, Nova Scotia? What was the amount of each tender? What tender was accepted? What was the estimate of the engineer for the repair of this pier?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). The following parties tendered for the contract to repair the pier at Margaretville, N.S., at the figures placed opposite their names :

Name.	Address.	Amount.
		\$ cts.
James E. Simmons... )	Fredericton, N.B.	10,854 00
David C. Burpee... )		
Hugh McDonald... )	Sydney, N.S.	12,881 82
C. W. W. Moffatt... )		
George Monaghan... )	Metropole Buildg., Halifax, N.S.	13,250 00
Donald Sutherland... )		
Howard M. Harris... )	Margaretville, N.S.	16,940 00
James Parks... )		
John Burns... )	404 Gilmour St., Ottawa	15,770 00
Guy Campbell... )		
J. A. Balem... )	26 James St., Ot- tawa	16,330 00
Norman Ray... )		
Isaac T. Coulstan... )		
Colin C. McLean... )		
	Margaretville, N.S.	16,650 00

The lowest tender was accepted, viz. : that of Messrs. Simmons & Burpee, for \$10,854. The estimate of the engineer was \$18,000.

#### DROWNED LANDS, COUNTY OF PONTIAC.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (for Mr. Poupore) asked :

1. Is the Government aware that there are several claims for drowned lands still unsettled in connection with the construction of the Roche Fendue and Calumet dams, in the county of Pontiac ?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates for the payment of the different claims which have been adjusted by the Government appraisers in connection with those claims ?

3. Does the Government intend to send its appraisers to examine and adjust the other claims in this connection, which have not yet been dealt with ?

4. Is the Government aware that a portion of the main road on the Calumet Island, at the Calumet village, has been washed away in consequence of the construction of the dams in question, and is it the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps to repair such damage ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government is aware that there are several claims, not settled, for drowned lands alleged to have been damaged by the construction of the Roche Fendue and Calumet dams, in the county of Pontiac. 2. The Government has not determined to provide an amount in the Supplementary Estimates in connection with those claims. 3. The Government has not decided to send appraisers to look into these claims. 4. No ; the Government is not aware that a portion of the main road on the Calumet Island, at Calumet Village, has been

washed away in consequence of the construction of these lands.

#### THE LATE ERNEST GRUNDY.

Mr. **DAVIS** (Saskatchewan) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to provide for the widow and children of the late Ernest Grundy, postmaster of Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, who was killed while assisting to arrest the Indian, Almighty Voice ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). The matter which is referred to in the question is now under the consideration of the Government. No decision has been come to.

#### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair) moved that on Monday next the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to grant and appropriate for a line of railway from Lethbridge, in the Territory of Alberta, through the Crow's Nest Pass to Nelson, in the province of British Columbia, and in consideration of the concessions hereinafter set forth, a sum of eleven thousand dollars for each mile of said railway, not exceeding in the whole the sum of three million six hundred and thirty thousand dollars, payable by instalments on the completion of the several sections of the said railway of the length respectively of not less than ten miles, and the remainder on the completion of the whole, subject to the condition that a contract and agreement between Her Majesty the Queen, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada and therein represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, of the one part, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter called "the company," of the other part, shall be first entered into in such form as the Governor in Council may think fit, containing covenants inter alia on the part of the company to the following effect, that is to say :—

(a.) That the company will construct or cause to be constructed the said railway by such route and according to such descriptions and specifications and within such time or times as may be provided for in the said agreement, and, when completed, will operate the same for ever.

(b.) That the said line of railway shall be constructed through the town of Macleod, and a station shall be established therein, unless the Governor in Council is satisfied by the company that there is good cause for constructing the railway outside of the limits of the said town, in which case the said line of railway shall be located and a station established at a distance not greater than five hundred yards from said town limits.

(c.) That so soon as the said railway is opened for traffic to Kootenay Lake, the local rates and tolls on the railway and on any other railway used in connection therewith and now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company south of the company's main line in British Columbia, as well as the rates and tolls between any point on any such line or lines of railway and any point on the main line of the company throughout Canada or any other railway owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, including its lines of steamers in Bri-

tish Columbia, shall be first approved by the Governor in Council or by a railway commission, if and when such commission is established by law, and shall at all times thereafter and from time to time be subject to revision and control in the manner aforesaid.

(d.) That a reduction shall be made in the general rates and tolls of the company as now charged, or as contained in its present freight tariff, whichever rates are now the lowest, for carloads or otherwise, upon the classes of merchandise hereinafter mentioned, westbound, from and including Fort William and all points east of Fort William on the company's railway to all points west of Fort William on the company's main line, or on any line of railway throughout Canada owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, whether the shipment be by all rail line or by lake and rail, such reduction to be to the extent of the following percentages respectively, namely:—

Upon all green and fresh fruits, 23½ per cent.

Coal oil, 20 per cent.

Cordage and binder twine, 10 per cent.

Agricultural implements of all kinds, set up or in parts, 10 per cent.

Iron, including bar, band, Canada plates, galvanized, sheet, pipe, pipe-fittings, nails, spikes and horse shoes, 10 per cent.

All kinds of wire, 10 per cent.

Window glass, 10 per cent.

Paper for building and roofing purposes, 10 per cent.

Roofing felt, box and packing, 10 per cent.

Paints of all kinds and oils, 10 per cent.

Live stock, 10 per cent.

Woodenware, 10 per cent.

Household furniture, 10 per cent.

And no higher rates than such reduced rates or tolls shall be hereafter charged by the company upon any such merchandise which shall be carried by the company between the points aforesaid; such reductions to take effect on or before the first of January, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

(e.) That there shall be a reduction in the company's present rates and tolls on grain and flour from all points on its main line, branches or connections, west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur points east, of three cents per one hundred pounds, to take effect in the following manner:—One and one-half cents per one hundred pounds on or before the first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and an additional one and one-half cents per one hundred pounds on or before the first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine. And no higher rates than such reduced rates or tolls shall be charged after the dates mentioned on such merchandise from the points aforesaid.

(f.) That the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may grant running powers over the said line of railway and all its branches and connections, or any portions thereof, and all lines of railway now or hereafter owned or leased by or operated on account of the company in British Columbia south of the company's main line of railway, and the necessary use of its tracks, stations and station grounds, to any other railway company applying for such grant upon any such terms as such Committee may fix and determine, and according to the provisions of the Railway Act and of such other general Acts relating to railways as may from time to time be passed by the Parliament of Canada. Nothing herein shall be held to imply that such running powers might not be so granted without the special provision herein contained.

Mr. BLAIR.

(g.) That the said railway, when constructed, together with that portion of the company's railway from Dunmore to Lethbridge, and all lines of railway, branches, connections and extensions in British Columbia south of the main line of the company in British Columbia shall be subject to the provisions of the Railway Act, and of such other general Acts relating to railways as may from time to time be passed by the Parliament of Canada.

(h.) That if the company or any other company with whom it shall have any arrangement on the subject shall, by constructing the said railway or any part of it, as stipulated for in the said agreement, become entitled to and shall get any land as a subsidy from the Government of British Columbia, then such lands, excepting therefrom those which in the opinion of the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada (expressed in writing) are coal-bearing lands, shall be disposed of by the company or by such other company to the public according to regulations and at prices not exceeding those prescribed from time to time by the Governor in Council, having regard to the then existing provincial regulations applicable thereto; the expression "lands" including all mineral and timber thereon which shall be disposed of as aforesaid, either with or without the land, as the Governor in Council may direct.

(i.) That if the company or any other company with whom it shall have any arrangement on the subject shall, by constructing the said railway or any part of it as stipulated for in the said agreement, become entitled to and shall get any lands as a subsidy from the Government of British Columbia which in the opinion of the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada (expressed in writing) are coal-bearing lands, then the company will cause to be conveyed to the Crown, in the interests of Canada, a portion thereof to the extent of fifty thousand acres, the same to be of equal value per acre as coal lands with the residue of such lands. The said fifty thousand acres to be selected by the Government in such fair and equitable manner as may be determined by the Governor in Council, and to be thereafter held or disposed of or otherwise dealt with by the Government as it may think fit on such conditions, if any, as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council, for the purpose of securing a sufficient and suitable supply of coal to the public at reasonable prices, not exceeding two dollars per ton of two thousand pounds free on board cars at the mines.

Motion agreed to.

#### EXPORT DUTIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As it may not be convenient to proceed with the tariff resolutions to-day, I wish to make a remark on a point which, I think the House will regard as of some importance; and perhaps the statement may facilitate the business of dealing with the tariff. I wish to say that it is the intention of the Government, before the tariff resolutions are completed, to ask for the re-enactment of the resolution in the old tariff law which authorizes the Governor in Council, under certain conditions, to impose export duties by proclamation upon logs, to include in this case export duties on pulp-wood. It is also the intention to include in the authority to be so taken, power to impose export duties upon certain ores. I may explain, in

regard especially to logs and pulp-wood, that we have no intention of applying these resolutions at once. An intimation was given by the leader of the House some days ago as regards this matter that whatever action was taken it would not prejudice the business then in progress. But it may be possible that, before the next meeting of Parliament, we may have occasion to exercise this power and therefore it is our intention to ask, in the form of a resolution, that this authority be conferred upon His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure the House will hear with great pleasure the announcement made by the Minister of Finance. There is no doubt that while it is not desirable to adopt any policy that might be considered a policy of retaliation, the time has arrived when it is absolutely necessary that the Government and Parliament of Canada should look solely to Canadian interests in regard to these matters. Face to face, as we are, with the proposed legislation in the United States, which is now of a very advanced character—as I see that the Senate have agreed to the imposition of this large increase of duty on lumber—I think it is absolutely incumbent on this Government not only to take power, but to use that power, if they find that these measures, so repressive on Canadian trade, are carried into effect on the part of our great neighbours. The hon. gentleman has stated properly that in bringing into operation any act of that kind regard would have to be had to existing contracts and work that is now in progress. But, assuming that this proposed legislation in the United States is carried into effect, I believe that no movement on the part of the Government of Canada would be more advantageous to the people of this country than to carry out the policy which is indicated in the statements just made by the hon. gentleman, and that they should not only obtain that power, but carry it into effect. I have not myself looked into the question beyond that effecting logs and pulp wood; I have not heard anything about ores until the present time, because I did not know that that matter was prominently before the attention of the Government. But so far as the question of logs and pulp wood is concerned, I believe the Government would fail in its duty to Canada if they did not promptly resort to that measure in protection in the interests of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know if I understood the hon. gentleman rightly to say that he proposed to carry out the precedents established by the late Government. If so, that means that we should deliberate upon and pass an Act here, setting the maximum limit, and that power should be given to the Government by Order in Council to put that in force within those limits.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will probably re-enact the old clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to ask the Government whether it is desirable or permissible to discuss this question at all as it has been discussed by the leader of the Opposition, or whether discussion should be postponed until the resolutions come up for discussion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may say to my hon. friend that I think it would be inexpedient, and that we should wait until the resolution comes up, which must be within a very short time. He will observe, of course, that all that is being asked for is power to act. That is all we take.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, it is a very dangerous power, in my estimation, to put into the hands of the Government. I would ask the Government whether they will set a day for the consideration of this resolution, which I shall feel bound to oppose, and shall, at that time, give my reasons for opposing it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise that the hon. gentleman shall have ample notice. I cannot, at present, name a day, but I will see that a day is fixed, and that the hon. gentleman is publicly informed of it.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—Construction and equipment..... \$75,000

Mr. FOSTER. The whole construction of that canal is now finished, is it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The construction is finished, practically. Of course, there is a good deal of dressing up to be done in connection with the canal. The amount we ask for here is to cover the cost of removing that pier. We find it absolutely necessary that that pier should be removed.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the two approaches finished as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; the substantial work is all over in the canal proper. We provide for \$15,000 to clear up and level the surface. The wall work of the canal is all done.

Lachine Canal—Enlargement..... \$216,000

Mr. QUINN. I understand that one of these items is to be left over in this list. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals for a report containing the names of those who have been dismissed from the Lachine Canal; also the reasons

for which they were dismissed, the complaints that were made against them, and by whom, and the persons who were appointed to fill their positions afterwards, so that these things may be discussed when this item is to be taken up. I simply wanted to let the Minister know that I would require that information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Was there an order of the House for it?

Mr. **QUINN**. No, but I wanted to ask for that information, so that it may be ready when this item, or some item to be reserved, is discussed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I would recommend that this item stand.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Let it stand.

Grenville Canal—Enlargement..... \$90,000

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. In connection with these canal resolutions, I want to call the attention again of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the great injustice that I think he has inflicted upon a large number of honest and valuable servants of the Government employed on those canal works. I had occasion to spend a day at Cardinal a short while ago, and I learned that the engineer in charge had been instructed to inform every Conservative that his services would no longer be required in connection with the canal work. Now, the hon. gentleman has taken the ground that these persons who have been employed on the canals in Canada, as they are only employed during the summer season, are not permanent employees, and that it is open to the Government, as each season rolls round, to obtain the services of another staff and to sweep away all those that have been in the service of the Government previously. A more cruel and a more unjust policy it is impossible to contemplate. You call these parties temporary employees; I deny it. I say that where honest, industrious and good men have been brought into the service of the Government, and have been induced to spend their own earnings, as in many cases they have done, in erecting houses along the canal for the purpose of enabling them more promptly and better to discharge their duties in connection with the canal, and have been for ten, fifteen, or eighteen years thus employed, to introduce a new rule that dismisses these men after they have spent their hard-earned savings in providing a shelter for themselves and their families, is cruel in the extreme, and is repugnant to every man who loves justice and fair-play. Of course, the Government is continuous, and without bringing any charge or finding fault with employees, except that they have gone to the polls and recorded their votes, the Government have dismissed them, and in doing so they have adopted a policy that

Mr. **QUINN**.

will be repugnant to every one who has any sense of justice. I do not intend at this late period of the session to discuss this matter at length, but I may say in conclusion that I was recently informed that the last Conservative employees in connection with the canal near Cardinal have received notice that their services are dispensed with. I have felt it to be my duty to the committee and to honest and industrious employees to again call the attention of the Minister to the course taken.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is scarcely fair to assume that the statements made by the persons to whom he has referred are accurate, and to base a charge against me on those statements. Neither directly nor indirectly, neither expressly nor impliedly have I instructed any of the officers of the department to dismiss men from the Government employment simply because they were Conservatives, and the hon. gentleman in making such a statement has made a statement that is absolutely unwarranted. So far from that being the case, I directed the officers not to act on such lines. I have said that while it was impossible for me to follow all the individual cases, I did not desire them to be dealt with on political grounds, and that the officers of the department must be satisfied that these employees have made themselves obnoxious in these matters; and I have reason to believe from the number of persons who have been retained in the service on the canals, that my instructions have been carried out. The instructions I gave were in this language: that I would not countenance the removal of men from the public service simply for the purpose of placing political friends in their positions. I consider that is a pernicious system, and I agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition in that regard, I will not countenance it; and so far as I am aware, it has not been done. Possibly there may have been some individual instances in which injustice has been done in this particular. I would not be unwilling, if my attention were called to particular cases, either to give them my personal investigation, or to take steps to have the facts ascertained. There was scarcely in the service of the Government in this department one employee who was not known as an active partisan and who was not appointed because of his activity in support of his party; and those men held those positions because they were in active sympathy with the party opposite and were appointed because they were party men. In every part of Canada where the canals are located there is a deep-seated feeling that the men employed on the canals are there because they have actively participated in political contests. That has made the administration of this department more difficult to me than would otherwise have been

the case. If those men had been allowed to attend to their business, and had not actively interfered in elections, that feeling would not have grown up. I do not cast any doubt on the sincerity of the hon. gentleman in making his statement, but I say that it is entirely unfounded. Nothing I have said is capable of such a meaning, and nothing I have done can be construed as supporting any such view.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should be only too glad to accept the statement of the hon. Minister, if I had not very conclusive evidence in the other direction. The hon. gentleman must not forget that on the floor of this House he distinctly declared that it was not possible for him to go into questions relating to employees, and that such cases he would leave in the hands of the member for the constituency if he supported the Government, or the defeated candidate. This was an invitation given by the hon. gentleman in broad and general terms to all his supporters to eject employees from office, without giving their cases investigation; in fact the hon. gentleman himself declared that he could not give attention or consideration to the reasons why these men had been removed. Having given that information, the hon. gentleman must not forget that one of his supporters declared, and he took credit for the declaration, that he had been given *carte-blanc* to sweep out twenty Government employees in his neighbourhood and put his friends in their places, but he had not done so and the men retained their positions. I am very sorry that the hon. Minister took that course instead of adopting the policy he has just stated he is prepared to follow. The hon. gentleman may say that it would be better for those people to have nothing to do with politics. But my hon. friend must not forget that by law these employees have the right to exercise the franchise, and the Government employee was naturally desirous to support the candidate of the Government by which he was appointed. I do not think the fact that any Government employee goes to the polls quietly and peaceably, without doing it in an offensive way, and exercises a privilege accorded to him by law, should weigh against him. I have stated on former occasions that if any employee takes an active and offensive part in elections and makes himself grossly offensive, he cannot expect to secure immunity from being dealt with, but employees who discharge their duties faithfully and exercise their franchise in a quiet and peaceable manner and without giving offence to any one should be protected.

Mr. McCLEARY. I desire to say a word or two in regard to the question now before the committee. It has been stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals that no man so far as he knows has been dismissed

from his position on these canals because he was a Conservative. I want to refer the Minister (Mr. Blair) to an answer he gave me to a question I asked on the 12th of May, in reference to the dismissal of some forty-five men on the Welland Canal, in and about the town of Thorold, where I live, in my county. I have no hesitation in characterizing that answer as being unworthy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), and derogatory to the high position he holds as head of a very important department in this Government. He first told us that none of the persons named in the question were dismissed from employment on the canal. I presume he based that statement on the idea that because these men were not appointed by Order in Council, or were not on the superannuation list, they were therefore not permanent employees. I can inform him that these men had been on the canal for from fifteen to eighteen years, and so long as they were giving good service, they expected to remain. They were not particularly Tories, for the Conservative party while in power employed Reformers as well. I want to say, however, that the Government are so very careful in their selection of employees this year, that they kept on the Reformers on the canal and put off the Conservatives. The Minister told us that no man was dismissed because he was a Conservative, and let me refer to the answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) gave. He said:

Before selecting the staff for the current year, I gave explicit instructions to the Superintendent of the Canal, Mr. Thompson (as I did to other superintendents) that he was to take up the list of the employees of last year and give to persons on that list the preference who had given satisfaction in the past, and who had not made themselves obnoxious by active partisanship or participation in the last general elections.

It would follow, I presume, that the men who recorded their votes at the poll would be participating in the election, and if there was no other excuse, this was used as a means to deprive these men of their means of livelihood.

Now, Sir, with all due respect to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), I want to tell him that I know something of how these men were put off the canal. I have not one word to say derogatory to Mr. Thompson, the superintending engineer of the canal. I think he is a man who would do what is fair and right between man and man, but I know that he had nothing whatever to say as to the men who were put off the canal and as to the men who were to take their places. I know that he was subject to the dictation and direction of the wire-pullers of the Liberal party in the counties of Lincoln and Welland, as to what men should be put off the canal and as to what men should be employed thereon. I challenge the Minister of Railways and Canals, or the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr.

Gibson), if he were here, to deny the statement that the Liberals held caucus meetings time and again up there, and that for weeks and months they were quarrelling among themselves as to who should be put off and who should be taken on the canal. It is misleading to make the statement to the House that Mr. Thompson, the superintending engineer, was directed to keep the best men on, and to use his judgment in that regard. Not only did the Minister of Railways and Canals give the answer I have read, but he continued to say:

It may be true that on one or more of the canals a practice had grown up of buying and selling the places of lockmasters and bridge tenders, and many persons having bought these places from persons who had influence with the late Government, or with members of Parliament, might have come to consider that they had thereby acquired a permanent title to employment; but inasmuch as no portion of the purchase price passed into the Dominion treasury, such a transaction could not be regarded as conferring any such right upon the employee.

I consider that statement as entirely unworthy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair). He has not only deprived these men of their means of making a living, which they had for all these years, but he has added insult to injury by setting them down as men who paid for obtaining the paltry positions they had upon the canal. In their name, I protest against such a charge as that, and in the name of hon. gentlemen who have represented the county of Welland in this Parliament for years, I also protest. I protest against the statement in the name of the public men of the Conservative party of the county of Welland, and I throw back to the Minister of Railways and Canals the insinuation that these men would stoop so low as to accept a pecuniary consideration from the employees on the canal. It may have been that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) had in his mind the political standard that was set up in the province of New Brunswick at a certain time, when hon. gentlemen who were controlling the affairs of that province were charged on the floor of the legislature with this kind of work. Sir, I have never known—and until now I have never even heard it insinuated—that any public man connected with the county of Welland ever looked for financial aid in consequence of getting men a position in the public service. I repeat that the answer of the Minister (Mr. Blair) was uncalled for as it was unnecessary. It is beneath the dignity of the high position he holds as Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) further stated that only forty-five men out of about 170 were dismissed from employment on the canal. Let me tell him that the forty-five names of men which I put on the Order paper as being dismissed included only those in my own immediate neighbourhood, whereas, as a matter of fact, some fifty or sixty men near my home in the county of

Mr. McCLEARY.

Lincoln, and on the southern end of the canal, have been dismissed as well. I say such conduct is most uncharitable. It is unheard of in the history of politics in this country, that such a thing should take place, and I sincerely hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will put on the brakes and not allow his wire-pullers and heelers in that neighbourhood to further influence him in inflicting injustice and wrong upon the workmen up there.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister (Mr. Blair) how many of the old employees of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal were re-engaged this season?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not give the hon. gentleman the information which he asks, as I have not got it before me. I could get it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a letter from a friend of mine, dated the 29th of May, and I assume that navigation was open then and that these men would be employed there if their services were continued for the present year. My information is that they were all dismissed except the superintendent of that canal. I have had given to me a list of names, and if this be correct it seems to be altogether unreasonable that these men who were employed there with the understanding that they would be continued in the position during good behaviour should be, without any notice, thrown out of employment. The names that were given to me are as follows:—J. W. Montague, head mechanic and electrician; J. H. Johnston; two clerks, G. E. Griffin and J. W. Hughes; two foremen, A. Carney and T. A. Brown; Sidney Penhorwood, Joseph Marshall, Raymond Miron, William Knight, Walter Williamson, James Dunn, John Biggings, Peter Brown, William Ralph, Thomas Hynes, Joseph Miller, George Shields, William Bell, Herbert Hearst, and two watchmen, one of whom is a widower, who has a family to support, and who has only one leg. This man, believing that he was a permanent employee, put up a small house for himself, and was doing his best to support his family. The others were making similar preparations under the expectation that they would be permanent. I am informed that all or nearly all were men who had taken no active part in politics whatever, but were desirous of faithfully discharging the duties entrusted to them; and yet I am informed that they were all dismissed without any warning. If it is a fact that these men have not been re-employed—and I fancy they would know something about it by the 29th of May—I think it is a great hardship to them, and it is establishing a very bad principle, and one which will not tend to make public servants discharge their duties as faithfully as they otherwise would. I know many of these men personally, and I have known them to be worthy and respectable men,

British subjects and good citizens, anxious to do their duty faithfully and honourably in any position in life. If such men are to be thrown out of the employment of the country without a moment's notice, and without any charges being made or sustained against them, I think it is establishing a principle which will tend to the disadvantage of the civil service of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. As we are now dealing with the question of canals generally I think it would be well to direct the attention of the Government to various ways in which great saving could be effected. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) spoke in very pointed terms with regard to the action of the Minister. On looking over the expenditure in connection with the Welland Canal, I find that during the last eight or ten years my hon. friend from Welland has participated very largely in the advantage of furnishing lumber supplies without having put in a tender or being called on to tender, the contract being renewed from year to year. The hon. gentleman has drawn the following amounts from the treasury of Canada on this account:—

1885.....	\$ 8,652 93
1886.....	11,310 39
1887.....	8,827 03
1888.....	7,554 05
1889.....	11,034 55
1890.....	11,084 15
1891.....	13,777 48
1892.....	10,292 98
1893.....	7,428 51
1894.....	10,095 64
1895.....	4,084 00

Total..... \$104,141 71

Which the hon. gentleman and his partner have received for lumber supplied without tender for the Welland Canal. I have the Auditor General's Report, from which I can prove every item. I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to this, and I want distinctly to state that we expect that after this the men who want to furnish supplies shall be asked to tender in competition with others, and that where there is reasonable security for the fulfilment of the contract, the lowest tender shall in each case be accepted. The idea of one man with his partner, because he is a favourite of hon. gentlemen opposite when in office, having the privilege of drawing \$104,000 from the treasury of this country for supplying lumber to the Welland Canal, and that without tender, is something that I earnestly hope will not be repeated. I want the Government to understand that if they handle matters in that shape, they will have very great difficulty in keeping me in line at any rate,

Mr. McCLEARY. I shall be very brief in dealing with the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). If he states in his place in this House that the firm with which I have been connected

have received \$104,000 from the Government of Canada since the year 1885, without tender—

Mr. McMULLEN. You gave one tender, but only one.

Mr. McCLEARY. What the hon. gentleman stated was that my firm had received \$104,000 from the Government of this country for supplies to the Welland Canal without tender. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove his statement. He cannot do so, because it is utterly without foundation in fact.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not. I am prepared to prove it before a committee of this House.

Mr. McCLEARY. Let me explain: I think I am entitled to make an explanation. From the time I knew anything about canal matters—and I was born on the Welland Canal, and I know something about the way matters were managed under the regime of the Reform party—the Department of Railways and Canals called for tenders, by advertisement in all the local papers, at any rate; and from 1874 to 1879 there was one firm which alone supplied the lumber and material to the Welland Canal—the firm of N. & O. J. Phelps, of Merritton, who were Liberals.

Mr. TAYLOR. Without tender?

Mr. McCLEARY. I think it was by tender. I think the arrangement was that the Government could discontinue the contract on giving six months' notice, or if the tenderers wished to discontinue, they were to give the Government six months' notice. That firm continued during those five years to furnish the supplies without tender in the same sense as my firm or at least without giving notice, under the same tender and at exactly the same price. When the Conservative Government came into power, or in 1880, I think, they asked for tenders, the Liberal firm continuing to supply lumber up to that year. Well, Sir, we were in the business and we tendered with others. Some hon. member in this House at that time thought there might be something wrong because the firm of McCleary & McLean got the contract and called for the papers. The tenders were brought down, about a dozen or more, I think, and ours proved to be the lowest. That contract was continued. It was exactly on the same lines as the other, as far as the wording was concerned, that is we had to give six months' notice to the Government or the Government had to give us six months' notice before it could be cancelled. The Government, I think in 1885 or 1886, gave us notice of cancellation, and new tenders were invited. We again tendered and competed with every man in the business along the line of the Welland Canal, and miles and miles away from it, and we again got the

contract. We were the lowest tenderers every time, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to have the tenders laid on the Table and prove the contrary. Afterwards, we ourselves gave notice that we wanted the contract cancelled, and new tenders were invited. Again we competed with others, and again we were the lowest and got the contract. In 1891, or 1892, I think it was, the Department of Railways and Canals changed its policy of contracting for supplies on the canals and other Government works, and adopted the system of calling for tenders every year. We got notice from the superintending engineer of canals that our contract was cancelled, and we were invited with others to bid for the supplies, which we did, and got the contract. The only time that we got the contract without putting in a bid was when the acting superintending or the superintending engineer of the canals wrote us to know whether we would be willing to supply the Government at the same rates as for the previous year, and we replied that we would. That was in 1893 or 1894, I think. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given you the history of my connection, and my firm's connection, with the supplying of material for the Welland Canal. Let me say that while the supplies, in some years, have been large, in others they have been small, and we never got one dollar out of the public exchequer for which we did not give good value, and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove the contrary before any committee he may choose. I declare here that we never got the supplies of material for the Welland Canal without tender. There may have been certain items not scheduled in the contract which the Government might want, and they would ask us by letter at what rates we would supply them, and they would ask other people at the same time. Several times that was done. The superintendent of the canal would write us that there were certain items not specified in the contract, which were required, and ask us to name a price. With that exception, the statement of the hon. gentleman is utterly without foundation.

Mr. McMULLEN. All I have to say in reply to the hon. gentleman is this: The papers are before Parliament, and if we live to meet again, I want him to understand that this matter will be investigated. He has charged me with making a statement which is false. I am prepared to prove that it is true. Since 1885, not a tender was asked but one, and that was smothered up. The hon. gentleman got excessive prices, and I want him to understand that we will have an investigation.

Mr. McCLEARY. I hope the hon. gentleman will remember that he is addressing this House, and that what he says goes down in "Hansard," and I here challenge

Mr. McCLEARY.

him to ask for an investigation at our next session.

Mr. CLANCY. We have had a most extraordinary scene brought about by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). My hon. friend from Welland was properly calling attention to dismissals, and instead of the Minister of Railways and Canals defending his conduct, we had the hon. member for North Wellington, who is the standing apologist for the Government, coming to his defence. How did that hon. gentleman answer the charge of improper dismissals? He answered it by making a personal attack on my hon. friend from Welland, by sending out broadcast to the country slanders which my hon. friend challenges him to have investigated by a parliamentary committee. The hon. member for North Wellington, however, has done all that he proposed to accomplish by circulating the slander, but I do not think the House will envy the position which that hon. gentleman holds of being slanderer in general, as well as apologist in general for the Government. The hon. gentleman has declared that tenders were not asked for. Has he discovered that too much was paid or that the country has suffered any loss? Let him turn to his friends in Ontario who have laid down the doctrine that it is a great sin to invite tenders, that goods can be bought much cheaper in the open market. The hon. gentleman's conduct was worthy of him, and no one will be inclined to dispute his possession of a role which fits him so well.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we should pay a little more attention to the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington. He said to this House, without qualification, that the hon. member for Welland had furnished supplies to the Welland Canal for ten years without ever having tendered for the contract. And when he is confronted by the hon. member for Welland with the untruthfulness of that statement, he makes another statement which he says he can prove to the House. His first statement he evidently admits to be untrue by substituting, when challenged, another one for it. It is time that charges of this kind should be brought to the attention of the House and investigated. The hon. member for Welland says that he knew the facts long ago and proposes to have them investigated at some future period. But that is not satisfactory. The hon. gentleman sends forth slanders which, if not contradicted, would be very damaging to the hon. member for Welland. Every man has a character to sustain, and the House should not allow the character of hon. gentlemen to be subjected to such unwarranted attacks as the one made by the hon. member for North Wellington without taking some steps to protect itself and assert its own dignity.

With reference to another matter, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said in the strongest terms he could use that the statement that the Government had dismissed employees simply because they were Conservatives was absolutely unwarranted. He said further that he had given instructions to the engineers on the canals to ascertain if the men were good men, and that their services were required, and that they had not taken any partisan part in the election. Why, that statement was absolutely contradicted by the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), who told this House that he had carte-blanche on the section of the Rideau Canal in his own constituency, to dismiss twenty-two men. He told us that he had absolute authority from the Railways and Canals Department to do this. That was his statement to the House. He further said that he had not exercised his power to dismiss those men, because they were good men, presumably, and performed their duties faithfully. It is highly creditable for the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) that he acted fairly. But how does that affect the Minister of Railways and Canals, who has made that statement to-day as he had made it before, that he had given his engineers these impartial directions of which he speaks. I have no doubt that the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville spoke the truth when he made that statement. Then what becomes of the statement of the Minister of Railways that he had not given such authority? If that authority was given to the hon. member for North Leeds and Grenville, we know, from the results along the Welland Canal and in other places, that the same power was given to other members of Parliament or to other committees, simply at their wish to dismiss these men from the positions they had held and appoint others. If men have acted as offensive partisans in the election, there can be no objection to the Government taking the course they have taken. But, as a general rule, the men working on the canals have simply exercised their right of voting. There is no crime in that. The law confers that right upon them and calls upon them to exercise it, and to dismiss a man for recording his vote, especially where dismissal subjects him to hardship and loss of property, as in the case of men who have built houses to live in depending upon their employment, is a serious grievance. Especially is this the case when men have but small remuneration. These men on the canals do not work in the winter time, and I suppose they are not paid for the winter time. It may be said that these men were influenced by the Government to take an active part in the election. If they did so, they became active partisans and must suffer the consequence. But, in some cases at least, this was not the case. Several cases have come to my knowledge of men who simply

exercised the right to vote, indeed, I know of one case of a man who had not even done that, because there was not a candidate to his mind; and it is quite unjustifiable for the Minister to dismiss these men. But the Minister said that the instructions he gave were to the effect that men who had not taken an offensive part in the election but had simply exercised their right to vote—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; that is the effect of what he said. I took his words down, I think. He said that these men had sympathy with the Conservative party, and there was a deep feeling against them on account of their "taking part in politics or participating in the election." Well, now, recording one's vote is "participating in the election" in the most effective way. So, if a man simply records his vote he is liable to dismissal.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No, that has always been allowed.

Mr. WALLACE. But it is no longer allowed according to the statement made a few minutes ago by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). I am sure that he will find his statement recorded in "Hansard" as I have given it—that participating in the election (which may be simply recording one's vote) is regarded as a ground for dismissal. I would like to give some cases within my own knowledge. One was that of a man who said that there was no candidate who had his sympathy—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) allow me? I do not think it will be found when "Hansard" comes out, that he correctly quoted the words I used a moment ago. But if what I said is taken together, every word with its context, I think it will be seen that I have no thought of suggesting to the committee that I considered the mere fact of a person voting in an election a reason why his tenure of office should be disturbed. I think it will be found that I said "active participation" and "offensive action" in the election. I would ask the hon. gentleman to accept my statement that that is what was in my mind, even if I failed to give correct expression to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I accept what the Minister says as to his statement of this afternoon. But I have here a statement which, no doubt, he read to the House, and for which he must be held responsible. In answer to a question he said that he gave instructions to give the preference to persons who have not made themselves obnoxious "by active partisanship or participation in the last general election." So we

find the very words repeated that I attributed to him. Simple participation is a ground—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** On what page is that?

Mr. **WALLACE.** The hon. gentleman will find it at the bottom of page 2199 and the top of page 2200. Now, there is a statement which, I presume, was written by the Minister and read to the House, in which he said that participation in the last election was sufficient ground for dismissal.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) will do me the justice to read the statement as it is. It clearly refers to "active partisanship" and "active participation." If a man has made—

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** If the hon. gentleman said what he meant, I am glad to hear it, but I think the construction of the sentence would not carry the word "active" beyond the word "or."

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is what I meant; for, to imply that merely voting in an election was to be a ground for dismissal is altogether an error.

Mr. **WALLACE.** Then take the Minister on his own statement that he meant what he did not say, that he meant "active participation." Active partisanship and active participation are exactly the same thing. There is a large number of men who have not taken an active part in the election, who were not active partisans or active participants in the election, but who were dismissed. I would ask the Minister of Railways if he will restore the men who he has unjustly dismissed and who have taken no part in the election. That would be the sequence of his own statement. I think he is in duty bound if these cases are called to his attention, as they will be right away, to restore these men to the position he has taken from them, because of his having been informed that they were active participants in the election. I would ask the hon. Minister: Will he restore these men who were not active partisans or active participants in the election?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I will answer the hon. gentleman when he is through.

Mr. **WALLACE.** I would like to have an answer now.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am not prepared to say what I will do as to that. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should call my attention to any case he has in mind. I will inquire and endeavour to satisfy my mind whether the charge of active and offensive partisanship could be brought home to the party.

Mr. **WALLACE.**

Mr. **WALLACE.** The Minister said that he was going to take the word of a member of the House as relieving him from the necessity of an investigation. Now, if he is going to take the word of a Liberal member of Parliament, surely the word of a member on this side of the House is just as good as the word of a member on that side. Our word in matters whereof we have personal knowledge, should be taken in just the same way; and if the Minister is going to act on the word of a member of Parliament, he must disregard the words of the minority of members of Parliament.

Mr. **FISSET.** (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, from the very outset of this session, and almost at every sitting of the House, we have heard hon. gentlemen opposite raking up in season and out of season this question of dismissals from the public service; but I think, this afternoon, the debate has been assuming a rather alarming character. The hon. gentlemen opposite have no doubt forgotten the wholesale dismissals that occurred in 1879. Of course, the hon. gentlemen opposite, for the most part, did not sit in this House, at that time; but, as I then happened to occupy a seat in Parliament, I remember perfectly well what took place. I have not forgotten the manner in which Regis Cardinal was dismissed from employment on the Beauharnois Canal, and how it broke the poor man's heart. And yet the hon. gentlemen have been whining and complaining with respect to a few dismissals made by the Government of the day. Why, to mention only the riding of Rimouski, which I represent in this House, and the dismissals that formerly took place there, after the defeat of Sir Hector Langevin in 1878, what did we see then? Not only were the Liberal employees summarily dismissed from their positions, but even those who were suspected of having Liberal proclivities were turned out. Of course, we have no canals in the county of Rimouski, but we have the Intercolonial Railway. Let me give to the House the names of a few employees who were decapitated, as I have not a full list of the names before me. In 1879, the late Government proceeded with beheading the postmasters. And they were dismissed without any warning, without any investigation having been held. They were merely told that their services were dispensed with. But now, it is quite the reverse, and when we go to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and press for the removal of some employees who have taken an active part in politics, we have all the trouble in the world to prevail upon him doing so. And yet it would only be dealing even-handed justice to our friends who have suffered great hardships in times past, if they were restored to the positions that have been taken from them. Let me give the names of a few station agents who were dismissed from the Inter-

colonial in the county of Rimouski. D. Bouchard, station agent at St. Simon; Francis Rioux, station agent at St. Fabien; J. A. Talbot, agent at Rimouski; John Trottier, agent at St. Luce; A. Godbout, at Ste. Luc. These six employees were thrown out of their former employment without trial. And yet, since the Liberals have come into power, there has not been one station agent dismissed upon the Intercolonial, in the county of Rimouski, notwithstanding that numerous complaints have been lodged against many of them. The hon. Minister of Railways, I hope, will no longer turn a deaf ear to my prayer and will make the investigations I have been asking for. I may further mention the case of Joseph Bourdeau, superintendent of the shops at St. Flavie. That gentleman had been turned out, but I may say that he has been re-instated in his old position by the Hon. Mr. Borden, the then acting Minister of Railways. P. Comeau, roadmaster, from St. Flavie to Riviere du Loup, was formerly dismissed without cause and without trial. This gentleman has been re-instated in his old position, owing to the fact that a vacancy had occurred, through the death of the former occupant, but nobody was driven out of his position to make room for him; and I am pretty sure, if the office-holder was still living, the hon. Minister of Railways would never have consented to remove him in order to provide a place for Comeau.

Here are the names of a few employees and foremen who were also summarily dismissed, without any investigation having taken place: Mathieu Bouchard, of St. Simon; Fabien Ouellette, of St. Fabien; Cyprien Rioux, of Le Bic; Michel L'Evêque, of Rimouski; Marcellin Beauchesne, of St. Fabien; Elzear Dubé, section No. 2 of St. Fabien; Pascal Beaulieu, of St. Flavie, and many others whose names I could give. Let us now come to the dismissals that were made in the Government shops at St. Flavie, in the same county of Rimouski. These men were thrown out of employment and their positions given to new men, without any investigation, without any notice. I will give only the names of a few men who were turned out at the time: Joseph Bourdault, superintendent of the shops at St. Flavie; Alex. Madore, Jos. Trepanier, Chas. Madore, Paul Gagnon, James Pagé, Narcisse Michaud, Georges Beaulieu, senior, Georges Beaulieu, junior, Johnny Gillois, Paul Dubé, John Grant, Octave Valcourt and Ferdinand Emond. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that I do not give all the names of those who were dismissed from employment in 1878, in the county of Rimouski alone, and all of them employed in the railway shops at Ste. Flavie. I have only given the names of those men who are now re-instated in their positions, after having been turned out by the old Government. Naturally, the Government of the day have dispensed with the services of a few men

who were not required, but the number of the late dismissals sinks into insignificance when compared to the wholesale dismissals made by the Conservative administration in 1879. Those poor workingmen who were then ruthlessly driven out of their positions and deprived of their bread were as worthy of our sympathies as the men who have been dismissed on the Welland Canal, and upon whom the hon. gentlemen opposite are now lavishing their sympathies. What part had those men taken in the elections of 1878? They had hardly participated in them at all. Some of them had merely attended public meetings, and that was all. But things were quite different at the last elections. After having so long been on the winning side, and being far from presuming that the Liberals would defeat the Conservative administration, those men rushed headlong into the struggle. Not only did they all vote, to one man, at this last election, but they took a most active part in the contest. The Intercolonial Railway employees, in the counties of Rimouski and Temiscouata, represent a very large vote, three hundred, I believe. Those people gave a solid vote against us, at the elections of 1891 and 1896, hardly one of them having registered his vote in favour of the Liberal candidate. I now come to deal with the matter of the dismissal of postmasters in the county of Rimouski. When the Mackenzie Government acceded to power in 1874, they made no dismissals in the county I represent here. And yet, notwithstanding that fact, in the case of these men, when the Conservatives came into power in 1878, all those who were Liberals or supposed so, were turned out. I may say, in this connection, to the credit of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) that he has, upon my demand, made a few dismissals, but there still remains a good deal of work to be done in that line. We have an important post office at Rimouski, yielding an income of from \$800 to \$1,000 a year, the postmaster of which, Mr. Alphonse Couillard was dismissed from his position at that time. I may mention several other dismissals that then took place, and amongst others Mr. Rouleau, postmaster of Pointe-aux-Péres, Philippe Saucier, of Sandy Bay, L. N. Blais, of Matane, which comes next to Rimouski, as a revenue producing post office, Mr. Vidal Roy, of St. Fabien, Mr. Jos. Dubé, mail-carrier, who were all turned out by the Conservative Administration. I could mention many other names, but I confine myself to the most important post offices in the county of Rimouski, the occupants of which were dismissed. We have two lighthouses for the maritime service, one of them at LeBic, and the other at Matane. In 1879, the guardians of these two lighthouses, Thos. LeBel and François Dionne, were summarily dismissed without notice, without trial being severally told that their services were no longer required. Would it not be dealing

fairly by Mr. Dionne to reinstate him in the position which was taken from him? I consider it would only be fair-play, and I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) will deal out even-handed justice in this case and in many other cases which I am now pressing upon my hon. friends, in the hope that they will redress all the grievances of these poor people. We have also at Rimouski two Government steamers. In 1879, the officers on board these steamers were turned out without trial, having merely been notified that the Government no longer required their services. The officers in question were Captain Pierre Lavoie, Joseph and James Lavoie. A year after they had been dismissed, Lavoie and his sons perished at sea, as, in order to earn their living, they had been obliged to betake themselves to their former avocation on board their small schooner. All these people had taken no active part in politics and were, at any rate, guilty of less offensive partisanship than the men I am now in vain asking the Ministers to dismiss did exhibit upon several occasions. Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that I only mentioned a few of the most conspicuous names in the list of the dismissals which took place in 1879. All those dismissals were decided upon after Sir Hector Langevin had been defeated in the county of Rimouski, in the fall of 1878, and without any investigation being held, without any trial. Now, would it not be proper for the hon. gentlemen opposite instead of raking up the question of a few dismissals made by this Government, to first consider what the Conservative Administration did in the same line in 1879? The Government now in power have redressed a few cases of grievances, in reinstating in their former positions the men who had been unjustly driven out of them. That was a mere act of justice and fair-play on the part of the Government and I give the credit for it to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). The Government, I hope, will go ahead in the same direction thus meting out justice to the old Liberal employees of the county of Rimouski, who were so ruthlessly treated by the Conservative Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. Minister tell me what charges are made, if any, against those who were dismissed from the canal, and by whom they were made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the information before me. I am not aware that any changes have taken place in the personnel of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal.

Mr. SPROULE. I am instructed that at least 22 of them were dismissed, and so far as my information goes, none of them have been re-engaged. The information I have is of the 29th of May, and I presume

Mr. FISET.

they would be employed on the works by this time, if they were re-engaged.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean the charges that were made against them, and the correspondence in connection with it—would the Minister have any objections to bring that down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no information upon the subject at all in my possession; but if there is any information of the kind to procure, I shall procure it certainly. I will take means to ascertain just what the state of the list is as respects that canal.

Mr. SPROULE. And let us have it before all the canal items are passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will endeavour to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. As one item is to be kept for general discussion, I would ask the Minister if he would be kind enough to furnish the House, either at that time or before, with information as to the number of men who have been either discharged or whose employment has been allowed to lapse and their places filled by others during the present season on these different canals. Would he also give us the reason of the dismissals? I think we ought to have that information, on account of the discussion which has arisen, and it will not be a difficult statement for his officers to make up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before we pass from this discussion in which we are now engaged, I want to say that I hear now for the first time from one of the members of the House, that the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) had stated in the House that he had absolute authority from me to dismiss 18 or 20 men on the Rideau Canal. I was not present in the House when such a statement was made, but I will look into the "Hansard" and ascertain just what the statement is which has been referred to. I think it must appear that the hon. gentleman did not put it just in that form, because I do not hesitate to say that the hon. gentleman would not be justified in making so direct a statement as that on that subject. The hon. gentleman would no doubt feel that upon his being satisfied from his own knowledge that any of these persons in the canal service within his riding had come within the description of those who had forfeited their rights to remain in the service, he would probably be justified in inferring that he had such authority. It may possibly be that to the hon. gentleman personally, in conversation, I may have said something which would lead him to draw that inference. But as for giving to

any hon. gentleman in the House supporting the Government or otherwise, a carte-blanche to turn out people from the public service, either on the canals or railways, I did not do so to my own knowledge, and intending to give any such authority.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 1939 of the "Hansard," he will read there what the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) said :

In my own constituency, where there is scarcely a Liberal office-holder, not one single man has been discharged. I know that on the Rideau Canal, where there were over 22 officials suspended last fall, when the Minister himself gave me a list and I could put any official in that I liked,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. Certainly I could, I had that privilege ; but what did I do? I told the Minister to put back every man ; not one single man in the whole riding was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not been able yet to refer to the citation from "Hansard" which the hon. member has just read, but I will have an opportunity, I dare say, to do so later. Now, having reference to what was said by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) respecting the Welland Canal, entirely irrespective of what he may have heard or what he may know, I wish to reaffirm the statement I previously made that my instructions to the general superintendent, Mr. Thompson, were clearly and explicitly as I have stated. We had in the office, as he had doubtless in his office, a list of the persons who were employed on that canal during the past year, and Mr. Thompson received my instructions. I made them clear to him and to other superintendents of the canal who were in my office at the same time and they heard the direction I gave, the Deputy Minister was also present, and I think I did not fail to make myself clear on the subject. As a result of the instructions which I gave to the superintendent, he returned a list of the employees on the Welland Canal with his suggestions and recommendations as to the changes that should be made, and that list was approved and sent back to the superintendent, and accordingly the persons were employed. Now, when the hon. member for Welland says that in addition to the persons whom he named the other day, he can furnish the names of fifty or sixty others who were dismissed and who were not then named by him, I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that, though I know nothing at all with regard to the facts, I have not verified the lists since they were placed in my hands some time ago, I believe that if he names fifty or sixty persons beyond those which he has mentioned here in the notice that he gave a while ago he will name a large number of persons who are to-day in the employ of the Government upon the Welland Canal.

There were no such numbers as he has stated of 100 people removed from the service on that canal. There are, I believe, as he correctly stated, 180 or perhaps 190 persons employed on the canal, and I am satisfied that there have been no such considerable number of persons removed. If he will furnish me with the names of 50 or 60 people to whom he refers, I will furnish him with the names of persons who are now employed on the canal.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says that he gave his instructions to Mr. Thompson, the engineer of the Welland Canal, to report as to the necessary and desirable men. Did he give the same instructions to the superintendent of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The superintendent of the Sault Canal was not present with the other superintendents. He has not been here, and he did not receive any instructions from me.

Mr. McCLEARY. I have no doubt the instructions given by the hon. Minister of Railways were as he has stated ; also, that he instructed Mr. Thompson to only put off men who were active partisans.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Offensive partisans in elections.

Mr. McCLEARY. While I accept that statement made by the hon. Minister, I am bound to say this, which is absolutely true, that Mr. Thompson obtained his information and directions from outside sources. I know there were men, some of the names being those of men whose names I have already given, who asked if they were going to get back on the canal, that spring was coming and they would like to make arrangements for the summer's work ; and Mr. Thompson was unable to tell them. I believe the Minister wishes to be fair, and that he intended no man should be put off unless he had been an active partisan. Now, I will go a little further, and I will ask this : If I show that the bulk of these men, 90 per cent of the names to which I referred in regard to dismissals, only voted, and some of them did not vote, will he restore them to their positions ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It appears to me extraordinary, as no doubt it does to a majority of members of the House, that hour and hour, and day after day, if not month after month, the time is taken up, when there are very important propositions to be considered, in discussing the action of a Minister or the Government with respect to dismissals. For myself personally I stated early in the session that I would be sorry to see any member of the civil service dismissed, without good cause, even if he had exercised to some considerable extent his political privileges as a politician. I do not

wish to be understood, however, as admitting that it is desirable or in the interest of the public service that any one occupying a position in the service should be engaged in politics. I think it is against the officer's own interests, against the interests of the civil service and against the public interests. At the same time I feel that we have been kept hour after hour and day after day with miserable discussions on this subject, many of them being very ill-timed and unfortunate. As regards temporary employees, because the employees in question are nothing more or less, if the Minister and the Government take the responsibility of saying who is capable and who is not, they act on the recommendations of the officers of the departments, and this has been the answer given in almost every case by Ministers. With respect to the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) has referred, the Minister should make an inquiry into his conduct. If we are paying to this superintendent of the canal a large salary, then he should have some duties to perform other than hobnobbing with the hon. member and keeping him posted hour by hour and day by day in regard to what is being done. The hon. member seems to have more information than the Minister received from the superintendent of the canal. The hon. member has knowledge of every little detail, and it is time the conduct of the superintendent should be inquired into. I repeat that the country is paying the superintendent a large salary, and he should have something better to do than to occupy his time in posting the hon. member to come here and raise these issues in regard to temporary employees. During the many years the party opposite occupied the Treasury benches, can any member give the name of a Liberal in politics who received employment? After that party came into power, was any position ever given to such a man cut of the hundreds and thousands of positions available?

Mr. McDUGALL. I could name hundreds of strong Liberals in my county who were given Government employment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. After 1878 the Minister of Railways made dismissals by wholesale, without investigation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I state here most emphatically that that statement is not only untrue, but is the very reverse of the truth. I have stated, and I challenge the closest investigation, because the truth can be brought out by officials of the Railway Department, that when I reorganized the department, I instructed my officers in making large reductions in the staff to do so without favour or affection, and to retain the best men, whether Liberals or Conservatives, and I was attacked by my own friends for having relieved a number of

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

them from their employment, while I retained strong Liberals in the department. I can show that from the highest positions down through the department, we selected the most responsible and efficient men, and retained a great many strong Liberals who had been appointed by Mr. Mackenzie. I desire to repeat that the statement made is not only untrue, but is the very reverse of truth.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I still abide by the statement I have just made to the House about the county of Rimouski, and I accept the challenge of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). I maintain that, after the elections of 1878, when Sir Hector Langevin was defeated, all the Liberal public servants, and even those who were suspected of being so, were dismissed without any investigation, without any trial. Let me advance a still stronger evidence. The other day, as I happened to inquire from one of the most important officials in the Railway Department why they were not following now the same course they had pursued in 1878; the reason is, he said, that our instructions are quite different from what they were formerly. We must now comply with the instructions of the Minister. If any evidence were needed in support of what I say, I might call to witness Mr. Pineauit, the member for Matane, who was an ear-witness. Therefore, in 1878, they were instructed to dismiss public employees without any investigation or trial, and the hon. leader of the Opposition cannot substantiate his statement. I may say that all what is said about dismissals, with the exception of Regis Cardinal, refers only to the county of Rimousiki.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I accept the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition as to the instructions given by himself personally. But I want to submit this point, that whatever were the instructions he gave and whatever was his desire, the result was that many men were dismissed. With respect to the province of Ontario, the few Liberals appointed, were given humble positions, but permanent positions, and it cannot be denied that hon. gentlemen opposite took the earliest opportunity to dismiss them because they had been appointed by a Liberal Government. Proof of the statement I can make. I want now to come to the discussion of the more honest and manly position with respect to this whole matter. I say it is the duty of the Government so far as ordinary officers, temporary employees are concerned, to give those appointments to their friends, or on recommendations made by their friends.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The facts relating to the Weights and Measures matter, are not familiar to me, and it is a long time since it happened, but I think the circumstances of the case were as follows. A vast

number of persons were appointed, and the Weights and Measures Department was reorganized and a great reduction effected, by which it was absolutely necessary to dispense with the services of a large number of officers.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That measure, originally introduced by the hon. gentleman himself, was put in force by the Mackenzie Government. What happened was this. An Act of Parliament was passed abolishing the whole thing, and all the officers whom we appointed, with perhaps two or three exceptions out of several hundred, were dismissed. The year after, the department was reorganized and circumstances caused a totally new set of officials to be appointed.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. They could not have been dismissed if the offices were abolished by Act of Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) can have it that way if he prefers. It was something like the dodge by which gentlemen who could not take contracts in their own name while members of Parliament obtained contracts under the interposition of a limited liability company. These weights and measures officials were all disposed of, and new men were put in their places.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND**. It is very easy for hon. gentlemen to make statements pro or con with regard to these matters, but I am in the judgment of members of this House, and of the people of the country when I say, that the facts are as I have stated them. During all the long years the Conservatives were in power, no person ever heard of any Liberal receiving an appointment or a favour from them. It is small, and narrow, and childish for gentlemen on that side of the House, now that they are out of power, to grumble because their recommendations for appointments are not taken. That is what it amounts to. They want, for one reason or another, to say what men shall be appointed on the canals this summer, and they seem to forget that circumstances have changed. Personally I take issue with the action of the Government in this matter. I say that the Government are elected to administer the affairs of this country, they are responsible for their administration, and when they are dealing with a permanent official they should give him fair-play. No matter what his politics may have been, he should not be interfered with so long as he is faithfully discharging his duties, and if there is a complaint against him and he demands a hearing, he should have a fair and just opportunity to defend himself. But, Sir, if in the opinion of the Minister, an official is not capable and is not faithful in the discharge of his duties, then, to my mind, it is simply a waste of time and money for

a Minister to appoint commissioners. The Minister should at once take the responsibility of dismissing that man, and then look to the support of Parliament and the country to sustain him. I have reason to respect my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) for his political knowledge and sagacity, but if he were in charge of an important department, and if he were satisfied that an official, high or low, was not performing his duty properly, he would be the last man to be embarrassed and hampered in his department by retaining an official with whom he was not satisfied.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. That is not the point under discussion.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND**. That is the point under discussion. If a Minister is satisfied that an official in his department is not discharging his duties, it is his duty to make a change at once, and to ask Parliament and the country to sustain him. I believe, Sir, that if a Minister acts in good faith in this respect, the people of this country will sustain him. Now, with regard to these temporary positions, and these little contracts, we find the present Government from day to day and from week to week dealing in a most generous manner with their opponents. It doubtless is the best business method to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, irrespective of politics. That is the system adopted by the present Government, and it is a new system. We never heard of such a thing in the past, and I trust, Sir, it will work for the public interest. Let me ask any Conservative member of the House who was here in previous Parliaments, would he not raise a nice row if the Minister made an appointment in his constituency without consulting him, and without regard to the political persuasion of the person who got the appointment? What was done in the past was that the Government appointed the friends of their supporters. This Government has adopted an entirely different system from that heretofore in vogue in the matter of granting contracts. They let the contract to the lowest tenderer, and we know that if that system is honestly carried out it will work to the best interests of the country at large. But with regard to appointments, I say that the Ministers are responsible for their conduct and they should take the full responsibility. It is unfortunate that the time of the House should be taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite grumbling and complaining, and demanding that this Government should do what they themselves never for a moment proposed to do when in power. These hon. gentlemen opposite never appointed their political adversaries to office, and we know they would raise the biggest possible kind of row if their party were in power, and if the Government made these temporary appointments in their constitu-

cies without consulting them. The Ministers of the present Government, and the Minister of Railways especially, have been erring on the generous side, and in almost every case the officials of the late Government have been reappointed to office, unless there have been reports against them for improper conduct, for incapacity, or something of that kind. If any gentlemen in this House have reason to complain, it is the Liberal supporters of the Government whose friends are asking them for positions, while the Government are giving the positions to those who opposed these Liberal members. It is very easy for an hon. gentleman to stand up in the House and say, such and such a man did not take an active part in politics, but the people in the vicinity know whether that man was an active politician or not, and the member of this House who recommends his dismissal on that ground, is responsible to his constituents for his action. Anyhow, I do not know that these temporary employees have any particular claim. They know that they were only getting temporary employment. It is a fact that when the Conservatives were in power, they did not make the same appointments every season. We have plenty of evidence in this House, that the Conservative Government left it to the member for the county to make nominations, and we know that certain of the Conservative members not being satisfied with the men they had appointed one year, recommended that others should be appointed in their places for the ensuing year. I do say, that the Minister of Railways has dealt most generously with these dismissals in giving the instructions he has, and in carrying them out, more than to the letter, because he has reappointed to these temporary positions almost every man that served under the late Government. And still, for the few changes that have been made, the time of the House is taken up by grumbling and finding fault and making all kinds of representations which I do not think any sensible man would take any stock in. It is a misrepresentation to say that these are dismissals. These people all know that when the season comes round, whatever party is in power, it is by the favour of those who hold the patronage whether they are re-engaged or not. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be very sorry if any member of the Government did an injustice to any man in the service; but, after the generous way in which they are dealing with these matters, and after all this grumbling, I think it is time to tell these hon. gentlemen that we are responsible, and are prepared to answer to the House and the country for the way in which we deal with these matters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has adopted a very curious mode of promoting the business of the committee or of directing the attention of the com-

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

mittee to the question before it. The hon. gentleman has opened up a wide field for discussion on a very serious question. He treats with supreme contempt the idea of the time of this House being taken up with such petty matters as the dismissal of civil servants who have honestly and faithfully discharged their duties for many years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not say any such thing. The hon. gentleman contradicted me by saying that the statement I made was not true. He knows that I stated, as I did on a former occasion, that I would be no party to dismissing a permanent official who did his duty, and I think he ought to accept that statement, and say exactly what I did say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the time the hon. gentleman rose to his feet until he sat down he was occupied in ridiculing the idea of the time of this House being wasted with the petty story of the dismissal of public employees.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It was not about dismissals; it was about the re-employment of temporary employees during the season.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman say that a man who eighteen years ago was placed in the public employment on the canal system of this country, who has been steadily employed for eighteen years whenever the season came round, who was induced to invest his hard earnings to build a house to shelter himself and his family, is not entitled to be protected in the position he has occupied during all those years, because he is not in the permanent civil service of the country. I say a more frightful act of injustice it is impossible for any person to put before this House. I say more: this is one of the most important questions which this committee or this House has ever had before it. We have had, Sir, since the regime of this new Administration, the spoils system introduced for the first time—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, for the first time in the history of Canada we have had the doctrine propounded, "to the victors belong the spoils;" and it has been carried to an extent to which no party in this country ever before dreamed of carrying it. From the very highest position under the Government, that of Deputy Minister, down to the canal employees and the employees on the Intercolonial Railway, who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, from one end of this country to the other, hundreds of honest and faithful public servants have been driven out of their positions, and their positions filled by the hungry partisans and supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the Depart-

ment of Railways and Canals that system has been carried to an extent to which no gentleman who has ever filled that office before has carried it. Hundreds of persons, who for the time being are in the power of that hon. gentleman, are now driven out of the positions in which they had been honestly earning their bread, and doing faithful service to this country, for the purpose of providing for the partisans of the Government, and for no other reason. I say that under these circumstances it is time that the country understood that this is a new policy, for which no justification has existed in the past. Take any department of the public service, and what do you find? You find all over this country a policy introduced of driving out of the public service men who have faithfully discharged their duties, and against whom nothing can be alleged except that they are Conservatives and have been accustomed to record their votes in favour of their party. Now, Sir, let me as a matter of evidence read a letter from a gentleman, who, for a long time sat in this House as the representative of the county of Inverness. It is dated Mabou, Inverness, 13th May, and is signed by H. Cameron, a gentleman who is well known to the members of this House. He says:

Sir,—I notice that the dismissal of Dominion officials has been discussed in Parliament.

Walter Lawrence, postmaster, Cheticamp, vigorously opposed the late Dominion Government for eighteen years, yet he still holds his office.

For eighteen years he had fought the late Government and the gentleman who was sent here to support it; and yet he was allowed to retain his position, and holds it to-day.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). They were afraid to dismiss him, because there was nobody else to take the position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is not a man who has sat in this House with the late hon. member for the county of Inverness who will venture to question the accuracy of any statement he makes:

John P. McFarlane, postmaster, Margaree Harbour, vigorously opposed the late Government at the general elections of 1887 and 1891, while Dr. McLennan, M.P., then supported the Government.

The hon. gentleman who now sits in this House as the member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) was then a Conservative, and this gentleman opposed him when he was a Conservative.

It was said that McFarlane was favourable to John McKeen in the late Dominion election. Although the Government declined to entertain charges then made by Dr. McLennan against McFarlane before his own conversion, yet the present Government dismissed him from the position of postmaster shortly after taking the reins of government.

Dr. McLennan, as a Conservative, made charges of political partisanship against this man, and called upon the Conservative Government to dismiss him; but he was retained, in spite of the application of the Conservative candidate, and he has been dismissed by the present Government from his position.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Will the hon. gentleman allow me one moment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will allow the hon. gentleman after I finish this letter, because he will find that he has a good deal to answer besides that:

Charles McDonald, postmaster, East Lake Ainslie, vigorously opposed the late Government for eighteen years, yet he holds his office.

The sons and assistants of Mrs. McDonald, postmistress of Whycomah, vigorously opposed the late Dominion Government, yet they were not dismissed.

Donald McDonald, postmaster, Mabou Harbour, and his sons vigorously opposed the late Government, and he was not dismissed.

Alexander Thompson, late postmaster, Port Hood, opposed the late Government, and he was not disturbed, he himself having resigned on leaving the place.

Alexander McDonald, postmaster, Seaside, opposed the late Government, while holding his office, and was not disturbed.

Duncan Cameron, postmaster, Creymore, vigorously opposed the late Government, and he was not dismissed.

John McMaster, postmaster, Princeville, vigorously opposed the late Government all his lifetime, yet he acted as postmaster for a quarter of a century, and is not yet dismissed.

Peter Campbell, postmaster, Glencoe, opposed the late Government, yet he holds his office.

James McDonald, postmaster, West Bay, vigorously opposed the Conservative party for eighteen years, and is now M.P.P. for Inverness; yet he was left in his office.

There were two Conservative postmasters, Lachlan McDougall, Whycomah, and Donald Campbell, of Margaree Forks, dismissed after an investigation; also, Angus McDonald, of Port Hood, and Isaac McLeod, of Strathlorne, after investigation, without my consent, as Conservative member for Inverness, during the reign of the Conservative party, as the official papers will prove.

In a word, there was not one Dominion official in Inverness dismissed for political reasons, and only for gross neglect of duty proven before a proper tribunal, after sufficient notice had been given them for self-defence; and even in such cases Conservatives were dismissed, as well as Liberals.

The present Government dismissed John P. McFarlane, postmaster, Margaree, without trial.

Severin Aucoin, sub-collector, or preventive officer, Cheticamp, was dismissed without investigation because, it is alleged, that he seized smuggled goods and was too efficient an official in the eyes of the Grand Etang Doucettes, one of whom is now M.P.P. for Inverness. The Customs Department has the particulars of such seizures within the past three years. He was dismissed without notice.

The present Government dismissed Joseph Deveaux, fishery overseer, Cheticamp, and appointed a strong partisan Liberal in his place.

A large number of fishery guardians have been dismissed, and partisan successors have been appointed in their places by the present Dominion Government.

It is said that every Conservative official in the county will be dismissed as soon as the election petition against Dr. McLennan will be settled.

Letters have been sent by at least one Minister, warning his officials to give no employment to any opponents of the Government.

A short time will cure the evil of such contemptible treatment of the people.

Yours faithfully,

A. CAMERON.

There is a statement which shows conclusively that in the county of Inverness, during eighteen years, not one official was dismissed from his office on account of any political action on his part. More than that, it was proved that we retained in their offices many of them despite their long-continued and vigorous opposition to the Government. That was the policy we pursued. Our policy never was to dismiss employees unless for unfitness or other just cause, apart from politics, or for violent and offensive political partisanship. That, I maintain, is the true policy which ought to govern both parties, and this Government is responsible for inflicting a most serious evil upon this country in departing from that policy and adopting the one of "to the victors belong the spoils." To them belongs the odium of driving men out of their positions, from the highest down to the lowest, for no other reason than to provide places for their own supporters. No one denies the right or propriety, whenever a vacancy occurs, of the Government filling that vacancy by a man best entitled to the position out of their own ranks, but a greater injustice was never perpetrated upon the employees of the country and the people generally than this ruthless depriving men, high and low, of the positions they filled, simply because they happened to hold opinions in politics opposed to the Government and their places were wanted by hungry supporters of the Administration. I should not have felt it necessary to go into this statement, were it not for the taunt thrown down by my hon. friend who last addressed the House, and who certainly did not take the best means of expediting public business. Knowing the deep wrongs inflicted by the Minister of Railways and Canals, who holds the bread of thousands of honest and deserving poor men in his hands, it would have been an act of infidelity to the best interests of the country if these remarks had been permitted to pass unchallenged, and the opportunity not taken of exposing to the country the cruel and harsh course which the hon. Minister of Railways has seen fit to pursue.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). In reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition and the very innocent letter which he has just submitted to the House, I may say that one of the gentlemen who should be indebted to Dr.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Cameron's generosity and mentioned in his letter is Walter Lawrence, Esq. Mr. Lawrence is a business man doing a large business in a place called Cheticamp in the county of Inverness. This is an Acadian settlement, principally composed of fishermen and small farmers, who are a very industrious and respectable class of people. Mr. Lawrence has always been looked up to by them as a leading man and one from whom many of them got their fishing and other supplies for the past forty or forty-five years, and Dr. Cameron, no doubt, found it very much indeed to his interest to leave Mr. Lawrence severely alone and not crush him by depriving him of a small \$10 or \$15 per year office, forsooth. Mr. John P. Macfarlane was postmaster at Margaree, and while I agree that I helped Dr. Cameron to come here while McFarlane opposed him, it is equally true that I did not want McFarlane to abuse the position of postmaster at Margaree, and upon the occasion—one of many—of one Mr. J. B. Paton, the agent of the Manufacturers' Insurance Company in the city of Halifax, coming to Margaree, and asked to have a money order cashed, McFarlane treated him in such a manner that I was actually ashamed that an official of his stamp should be found who could act thus towards a stranger in the village where I resided. I at once gave Mr. Paton what assistance I could to have the matter brought to the attention of the Government in order to have McFarlane punished for using this gentleman in such an utterly unwarrantable manner. McFarlane is known to be a most violent political partisan, and got only his deserts when dismissed for this and other causes, by the present Government as their predecessors should have done if efficiency should count with them. McFarlane conducted a rather extensive trade in that community, and apart from being an obsequious follower of Dr. Cameron for years previously, he no doubt found it convenient to leave McFarlane alone for the reason that he left Mr. Lawrence. But I would ask whether Dr. Cameron treated Mr. Lawrence's brother, who is not so well off as regards the world's goods as his brother of Cheticamp, and who depended upon his salary for the maintenance of himself and a large and weak family. The brother in Cheticamp is well off, as I have said, and the ten dollar office sought him, not he the office. Mr. Lawrence of Port Hastings was not treated with the same consideration. The brother at Port Hastings was in receipt of a salary of \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year as railroad station agent at that place, and lived on his salary. Without even a charge or inquiry he was dismissed, and his family and himself thrown into the cold; and yet the hon. leader of the Opposition declared that it was ruthless cruelty to deprive these men who served the Government so faithfully of their positions and the means of

maintaining themselves and their families, and yet he is writing to this House—the only way he can ever be heard in it—that he—the innocent—never dismissed an official for eighteen years. The bulk of the salaries he cited as secured to the other official he so mercifully spared would not total one hundred dollars; and in every instance the office sought the man. Yes, Mr. George C. Laurence, of Port Hastings, station agent of the Intercolonial Railway, was dismissed by the same Dr. Cameron and by this same Government for which the hon. gentleman opposite claims so much virtue in this regard.

Mr. POWELL. Who appointed Mr. Laurence station master?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). If my memory serves me well, he was appointed under the Mackenzie Administration, shortly before they went out of office.

Mr. POWELL. Had they the road down there at that time?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). They had the eastern extension. Mr. Laurence was station agent at the Cape Breton terminus of the Eastern extension. Mr. James McDonald, the respected M. P. P., for Inverness held a post office in West Bay under about the same conditions as that which Mr. Walter Laurence held his in Cheticamp. The salary in the office was about \$10, the same as that of Mr. Laurence. He stood in the same relation to Dr. Hugh Cameron as Mr. Laurence did. It is well known in Inverness that, if Dr. Cameron had considered it to be to his interest or that of his party, he would have removed Mr. McDonald from office, as he did Mr. Laurence, of Hastings. But he considered it more prudent to let sleeping dogs lie in that case also. Mr. Charles McDonald is a farmer living at Lake Ainslie also holding a \$10 post office. I contested an election against Dr. Cameron on the 23rd of June last, and I feel confident that Mr. McDonald voted against me and for Dr. Cameron, as he has been in the habit of doing for several years past. What is more, no suggestion from either side of politics has been made that Mr. McDonald should be disturbed in office. To supplement the hon. gentleman's information I may observe that Mr. Joseph Deveaux, fishery overseer at Cheticamp, has been dismissed for the reason that he compounded, so to speak, a crime, that he bribed a few of his neighbours to spear salmon in the Cheticamp River, in order that he might demonstrate to the Government that he was such an efficient officer when he should seize certain fishing or spearing gear used by his associates and lodge complaints. His unsuspecting neighbours did go to spear salmon in the river, and this official speared with them. But he gave information against his neighbours to Mr. Bartram, fishery overseer for Cape Breton Island, and brought

these inoffensive people on trial, with the result that they were fined by the authorities. I reported the matter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who at once took steps to have Mr. Deveaux removed from office, not on the ground of any representations made by me as to political acts, but because of the representations that came in the sworn evidence taken before the officials in the county. These are the "victims" that Dr. Hugh Cameron sheds tears over, while his friends in this House join him. The post office at Creigmore, held by Mr. Duncan Cameron, is a wayside post office, a \$10 affair, which it was not convenient for Dr. Cameron to remove because Mr. Cameron does business in the community, and it is found more convenient to have him than any of his neighbours attend to post office matters. As I have already said, the office sought him. Mr. McDonald, of Port Hope, was dismissed for political, and no other reason, by advice of Dr. Cameron. Here is where the hon. leader of the Opposition and myself met on an interesting occasion. It is the shire town of Inverness and the post office was, therefore, of interest as to salary, and hence a dismissal. Mr. Aucoin, sub-collector of customs in Cheticamp, was dismissed, and he, I believe, is the only one of the number the hon. gentleman has cited who was dismissed on my representation, solely on the ground of being an offensive political partisan. He is the Tory municipal councillor for Cheticamp in the municipal council of Inverness, to begin with. He was my opponent's agent at Cheticamp on election day last June, and otherwise conducted himself in a most partisan manner. I have given a list of the officers whom Dr. Cameron and the party he supported were generous enough to leave in office. They were all men whom Dr. Cameron did not find it to his political interest to molest in office. Where he thought he could do so to advantage, he secured dismissal, as in the case of Mr. George C. Laurence, and others. I think I have now pretty fully disposed of this mare's nest that the hon. leader of the Opposition discovered in Inverness from perusal of his dear departed friend's melancholy letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it comes with very bad grace from the chief whip of the Government (Mr. Sutherland) to charge this side of the House with wasting time. If he had been in the House as regularly as some of the other members, he would have found that whenever a row has been raised, the starter of it has always been the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). That hon. gentleman is responsible for the time that has been wasted to-day. The chief whip of the Government knows, or ought to know, that when he and his friends occupied seats on this side of the House, whenever an attack was made upon the Opposition by a member supporting the

Government, the Opposition of that day answered three or four-fold. I think that the Government have no fault to find with the Opposition this year; I think the criticisms have been fair and that no time has been wasted. But when a member sitting behind the Government rises to defend the Government, and, failing to defend them throws mud at the Conservative party, they must expect to get a Roland for their Oliver. But the hon. gentleman made some statements that are not correct. He challenged the late Government, or any one supporting them, to cite the case of a man employed by the Conservative Government who did not agree with them in politics. I have a letter here that covers the point. I do not know whether it refers to the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals, but as both Ministers are in their places, I will take the liberty of reading the letter:

Gananoque, May 17th, 1897.

Dear Sir,—For the last seven years I have held a position under the Dominion Government in the Public Works Department, as tug wheelsman, latterly on the tug "St. Paul." During this period no charge has ever been brought against me, nor has any fault ever been found with me. Each spring, I was notified as to the time I should return to duty, and, receiving no notice this spring, I telegraphed to Mr. James Howden, the superintendent of dredges, but received no reply. I then had a prominent Liberal write to the department, and he informs me that he has received no reply. Consequently, I consider myself dismissed. I sent in my application for reappointment for this season in February. Had I then been informed that I would not be re-engaged, I might have endeavoured to secure another appointment. I was not so informed, and now I am left without a job, with a family to support. I know of no reason for my dismissal, except that I went and voted at the last general election. I had always been a Reformer, and I told no one how I voted at the last election, and, of course, took no part in the same. I consider that the Opposition in Ottawa are doing good work in bringing such cases before Parliament and the people, and I authorize you to use this letter for that purpose.

(Sgd.) DANIEL J. KENNEDY.

Now, I may say that Mr. Kenny is a Liberal living in my county. He came to me asking if I could get him a job—he was a sailor—on some Government boats. I gave him a letter of introduction to Mr. Howden, and asked him to forward it to the Department of Public Works. He got instructions from Mr. Howden to go to work, and had been at work ever since, until he got his dismissal this year. My hon. friend the Chief Whip of the Government (Mr. Sutherland) made the further statement, referring to these dismissals, that they applied only to temporary officers. I want to ask the Minister of Railways if lockmasters, these men who have been dismissed in the county of Welland, are temporary officers when their employment is the year round, and they are being paid by the year. The lock labourers, of course, are only paid by the season when

Mr. TAYLOR.

the canals are open. But lockmasters everywhere draw their pay yearly, and have been drawing it for eighteen or twenty years, yet some of them are turned off. These are permanent officials. I would not have said a word except to read this letter, had not the Chief Whip of the Government taunted the members of the Opposition with wasting the time of this House. I am satisfied that if any person will look at the "Hansard" they will find that more time has been taken up by members supporting the Government throwing mud at the late Conservative Government, than has been taken up by members of the Opposition in reply.

Mr. SNETSINGER. Many complaints have been made about dismissals from the Cornwall Canal. I can say that out of the large number who are employed on that canal there has been but one single dismissal, to my knowledge. The Government has dealt very liberally with those gentlemen. I have talked with a large number of those men since the elections were over. They went to nearly every Conservative convention in the county, and left the locks, left their employment on the canal, to attend these conventions. When spoken about it they simply told me that they were obliged to go, and that otherwise they were likely to be dismissed. I claim that only one employee on that canal has been dismissed. There was another individual who was not dismissed but who was dropped because he was not required on the canal. He always supported the Conservative Government, but he was taken back on the canal, and is there to-day. Under the late Government there were a number of dismissals, and I can prove to the House that they were dismissed simply because they voted against the late Conservative Government, and for no other reason.

Mr. McCLEARY. I want to put myself straight in connection with a reference made by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). He stated that I had been in collusion, practically, with the superintendent of the canals, and that that gentleman had nothing else to do but to give me information, and that the Government had better inquire into his conduct. I want to say that never, directly or indirectly, had I any communication with Mr. Thompson about this matter. I have not spoken to him for more than six months, I have not seen him to speak to him; and neither by letter or in any other way have I heard from him at all about this matter. These meetings are a matter of public notoriety, and to prove my statement I will read a short article which will show the source from which we get our information in this regard. I find in the St. Catharines "Journal," a Liberal paper published in that city, the following notice of their meeting:—

The meeting of Liberal workers of the counties of Lincoln and Welland, held yesterday afternoon in this city, was attended by representative members of the party from all quarters of the two ridings. The matter of the appointment of a central committee for the purpose of recommending the dismissal and appointment of civil service employees in the ridings was discussed at some length.

So the meeting together of these committees was a matter of public notoriety, as was their intimation of who was to get positions. In my own town the party is divided into three factions. After the meetings I have always known what was going on, because the men who would not get places were dissatisfied, would be kicking about it, and they would give information about these matters. So it is not fair to charge any official of the Government with giving me information in this matter. Let me give the names of some of the persons who were present at this meeting. I find that addresses were made by the chairman, and by Messrs. Captain Perritt, of Port Dalhousie, W. H. J. Evans, of Niagara, Captain Sheppard, of Queenston, and others. Captain Perritt, of Port Dalhousie, is, I believe, collector of customs and canal tolls there, so if there is to be any inquiry into the conduct of officials, you might take this gentleman into your consideration.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 28) relating to Canada Investment and Agency Company, Limited.—(Mr. Davin.)

#### RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved that the House again resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.

Mr. McALISTER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in regard to this Bill. In 1885 an Act was passed in the New Brunswick legislature incorporating a company called the Restigouche and Victoria Colonization Railway Company to build a railway from a point on the Intercolonial at or near

Campbellton to a point at or near Grand Falls on the St. John River. This railway would run through the counties of Restigouche and Victoria. In the autumn of the same year, 1885, instructions were given by the Railway Department here to have the road explored, to have an exploratory survey made, for according to the instructions sent to Mr. Duffy, the engineer in charge, we find it was merely an exploration. The instructions were sent by Mr. Schrieber, the chief engineer of Government railways, in August, 1885. The instructions were as follows :

Under instructions from the department to have an exploration made of the proposed route for this railway, I detailed Mr. Duffy for the service.

This proposed railway is to form a junction with the Intercolonial Railway about 8 miles west of Campbellton,—

I may say here that that is the point started from by the engineers. Instead of starting from Campbellton, they started from a point six or eight miles west of Campbellton.

This proposed railway is to form a junction with the Intercolonial Railway about 8 miles west of Campbellton, to cross the divide between the waters of the Restigouche and those of the St. John rivers, and form a junction with the New Brunswick Railway at Grand Falls.

I think the wording of the Act is "at or near Grand Falls." In August the engineers went down to Campbellton, and after some days spent in getting ready, they started and explored the routes, and they merely explored it from Campbellton to Grand Falls, a distance of about 108 or 110 miles. They returned to Ottawa and the engineer made up his report, and sent it in on the 29th of September. That will show the House that it would be a matter of impossibility to have anything like a survey made of the road in the short time at their disposal. There was only one party, composed of some eight or ten men, and they went over all this distance through the wilderness, the entire route there being through a wilderness. The House will see that it was merely an exploration, and that it would be impossible to make anything like a survey in that time. Further, that was all the survey or all the exploration made on that entire route, with the exception of thirty-five miles that were located in 1894 and 1896. The engineer at the time of making his report, also made a rough plan of the route, and he filed it with the Minister of Railways. Nothing further was done, and by the terms of the charter it lapsed in 1888, but the matter was allowed to stand until 1891, when an amendment to the Act was passed extending the time for a further period of three years. Again nothing was done, and the charter lapsed again by the limitation of time in 1894. At the session of the New Brunswick legislature in 1894 a further amendment was granted ex-

tending the time for a period of three years ; that is, three years from the time of the passing of the amendment to the Act, which is of date 21st of April, 1894. Therefore, the charter would lapse on the 21st of April, 1897, if nothing further was done in the way of surveying the whole of the route. Mr. Speaker, I will read the limitation of time set out in the Act of 1894, section 2 of which is merely copied from the Acts of 1888 and 1891.

Mr. BRITTON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman one question. Is his limitation of time one hour ?

Mr. McALISTER. I want to explain the circumstances of the case, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I have the right to do so. Section 2 of the Act of 1894 says :

In order to entitle the said company to the privileges of their said charter, the necessary surveys of the contemplated line from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, in the parish of Addington, at or near Campbellton, in the county of Restigouche, to a point on the Saint John River, in either of the counties of Victoria or Madawaska shall be made within three years, and the construction of the said line commenced within six years from the passing of this Act, and the construction bona fide continued from year to year, so that the whole may be completed within ten years from the passing of this Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the limitation of time clearly set out, and I contend that the charter lapsed on the 21st of April last, in consequence of the whole line not being surveyed in accordance with the provisions in the Act and amendments thereto. The charter therefore is no longer in existence. It is not at all contended on the part of the promoters of this road that anything further was done in the way of surveying on this road than I have mentioned. There is no dispute of that fact, and whatever dispute arises is merely on the construction of this section as to whether it means that the survey that was made was sufficient ; or whether it means that the necessary surveys of the whole line were to be done. I would draw attention to the fact that the wording of the section is not that the survey shall be done, but that all the necessary surveys shall be done. It would therefore seem quite clear that the necessary surveys required for the building of this road should be made within three years in order to have that charter kept alive. But no survey at all was made since the passage of the Act of 1894, with the exception of the thirty-five miles I have mentioned here, and that was from the Campbellton end of the road, nor did they survey over the same route, because this location started from a point eight miles west of Campbellton, while what was located started from the town of Campbellton, eight miles further east, and therefore this part that was surveyed did not go over the original exploration at all. Then, in

Mr. McALISTER.

the fall of 1894, in order to get this road built, the company of which I was a member at the time, undertook to survey fifteen miles which was subsidized by the Dominion and local governments, and they were taking steps to complete that part of the road. They surveyed the fifteen miles at a cost of about \$2,000. Nothing further was done until the fall of 1895, when the company agreed to take over the charter and build the road. The company passed resolutions authorizing the directors to transfer the charter to any company which would show sufficient financial ability to build the road. The company who undertook to build it entered into a contract with the railway company to take over the charter and build the road, and they paid the directors of the company \$2,000, the sum asked, to pay the expenses which the company were put to in surveying the fifteen miles. In the spring of 1896, I think in the month of March, the new company, after getting legislation passed in New Brunswick ratifying the transfer of the road, and giving further bonding powers and several other powers, started work, got a staff of engineers, and began at the town of Campbellton to survey the road. At the end of the first month, the bills amounting to \$2,300 or \$2,400 were paid, when the next month's bills became due they were not paid ; still the engineers continued their work, employing men as before, and in the month of July the accumulated bills amounted to some \$4,000 or \$5,000. The engineer in charge wanted money to pay his expenses and to pay for supplies ; but no money had been forwarded to him by the company, and he wrote and telegraphed to the president, Mr. Boselly, several times, asking for money to pay the bills. He received replies promptly for some time that money would be forthcoming, that it would be sent in a few days. The few days passed, a week passed, a month passed, and no money had come. The engineer wrote to Mr. Demets, of New York, the only man who had put money into this road, knowing that he was anxious to have the road built ; and Mr. Demet's reply was that he was surprised to find that matters were in the shape in which they were. I will read a part of his letter, which is dated 3rd September, 1896. He says :

It surprises me immeasurably to learn that only \$2,500, in round figures, have reached your hands. I agreed to advance \$5,000 to meet the expense of surveying the first section of the road, and the \$1,000 which I sent you direct on the 8th June, completed my part of the contract.

The engineer then wrote to Mr. Demets a second letter, after he had received a statement from Mr. Boselly purporting to show what moneys he had received and what moneys he had paid out in connection with the road. In reply to that Mr. O'Dwyer, the engineer in charge, received from Mr. Demets a letter, bearing date 8th September, 1896, from which I will read the following:—

New York, September 8th, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for the frank statement you make in your favour of the 5th instant, at hand this morning. I had not the slightest suspicion that anything was wrong in Toronto, until I received your telegram of the 16th July, and I regret very much that you did not communicate more fully with me after receiving the letter I addressed you the same day, acknowledging the receipt of the telegram.

The statement of accounts rendered by Mr. Secord is very much at variance with your own, but I can easily conceive of the purpose, which was to render the amount appropriated to their own use as small as possible.

Much as I would desire to get you out of the hole, the misconduct of the head of the company has placed you and your men, and all those who have trusted the company, you can understand that only a fool could be induced now to sink any more money into this sink of iniquity, for Boselly & Secord, controlling the majority of the stock, would undoubtedly continue to swallow one-half of whatever any one would entrust them with. Whether Canada has any laws against such practices, I do not know, but I have just written to Boselly, that unless he settles with you immediately, to the extent of \$5,000—for the purpose of making and paying, as I understood—I would lay the matter before the Minister of Railways at Ottawa. I will be pleased to hear from you, even by wire, that he has done so.

The whole thing was represented to me very differently, of course, Boselly having every incentive to make the scheme attractive as possible, having pocketed some \$11,000 thereby; that is, he and Secord, from what I learn now.

I may say here, that I have absolutely and unconditionally refused to advance one dollar more since I awoke to the situation, and all Boselly or Secord has either written or wired you concerning the treasurer, are monumental lies.

That is the reply of Mr. Demets, one of the directors who had the charter transferred to them, and who undertook to build that road. I may say that Mr. Demets was the only man in the company who had any money to advance towards the surveying or the building of the road. The first directors of the company were Francis R. Boselly, Edmund A. Charters, George Demets, Herbert C. Secord, and William Murray. In consequence of some dissatisfaction with Mr. Murray as one of the directors, an application was made by the local representative to have a change made. A change consequently was made, and Dr. Lunam, of Campbellton, was appointed in his place. A circular was sent out by Mr. Boselly or on his behalf. I may say that the pressure mentioned in that circular was not brought upon the directors to make the change; but the local representative knew that if Mr. Murray continued to be one of the directors, he would use his influence against them, and it came to their notice that instead of \$2,000 being paid, \$5,000 was paid. The \$2,000 went to the company. Yet but \$3,000 went into the pockets of two of the directors of the company who had taken that road over. That was therefore a very unsatisfactory state of things, and there was a desire to have a change made in the directorate. A change was made, and Dr. Lunam was ap-

pointed a director. Later on Mr. Demets wrote on the 22nd of September, 1896, to Mr. O'Dwyer as follows:—"From Mr. Boselly's ambiguous correspondence, I am led to believe that your expenses amount altogether to \$8,000. Now, Mr. O'Dwyer, the engineer, sent in an honest and straightforward statement showing exactly what was due, something between \$4,000 and \$5,000, and afterwards Mr. Demets went over the account, and the account not only varied from the statements sent in by Mr. Boselly with regard to the expenses, but showed that there was a much smaller sum due than was represented by him. Evidently the directors of that company, who now seem to be reunited and working in harmony to promote this Bill, were not altogether a happy family at that time. On the 1st of October, 1896, Mr. Charters wrote to Mr. O'Dwyer with regard to the manner in which work was going on, and with regard to the manner in which the funds supplied by Mr. Demets had been appropriated, and referring to Mr. Boselly, he said:

But if we can whip him into line, get this money and square up our bill, it will be pleasanter than a public exposition, and I am convinced the work will go ahead all O.K. in due season; but you may be sure that, under the direction and control of Mr. Boselly, who has proved himself, to my mind, wholly ignorant of the principles of business management and common courtesy and honesty. If you felt like it, I would be much pleased to have a copy of this precious accounting for this \$5,000, but perhaps you have not time.

This letter contains much more matter of a personal character not necessary to refer to here, and I merely mention the facts to show how this company was carrying on the work, how they were appropriating the money that was advanced by one of the directors to build the road, and how all of them were aware that everything was not right. I quote this to show the opinion that Mr. Charters had of Mr. Beausoleil, the president of the company, and that Mr. Charters was aware that the money which had been advanced by Mr. Demets for the purpose of surveying, was misappropriated. Matters continued so until Dr. Lunam, the local director, in the month of October, 1896, I think, requested a meeting of the directors to be called to take into consideration the advisability of doing something to pay off the liability. Consequently, a meeting was called in Toronto, at which all the directors were present, but after going over the whole matter nothing satisfactory was arrived at. Dr. Lunam suggested to the directors that each one should contribute so much towards the payment of the pressing claims.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I see that the object of the hon. gentleman is simply to talk the Bill out, and I am quite ready to admit—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is right for the hon. gentleman to impute motives

of that kind. The hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) is perfectly in order.

Mr. McALISTER. I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman that the matter I wish to go over will occupy more than two hours, and I am not addressing the House for the purpose of talking out the hour, because there is so much ground to cover that it will take me two hours at least to cover it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I quite understand your motives.

Mr. McALISTER. I was going on to say that Dr. Lunam, the only local director, and a man of honour and integrity, who is very much annoyed at the way the business of the company was being conducted, wanted to have matters straightened out and proposed that each of the directors would contribute so much towards the payment of the pressing claims. That was agreed upon, and each one agreed to put up \$100 in order to pay the men and some of the board bills. After a while, Mr. Boselly sent Dr. Lunam a cheque of \$100 for his share. Dr. Lunam knew that Mr. Boselly had sent some cheques before and they were dishonoured, and he took the precaution of sending this one through the bank for collection. When the cheque was presented at the bank in Toronto on which it was drawn, it was found that Mr. Boselly had nothing to his credit at the time he gave it or at the time it was presented, or at any time between the two dates, and it was returned dishonoured, so that nothing came of that proposition. Matters went on this way, nothing further was done, the debts were accumulating, and not one cent was forwarded to pay them. The result was that public feeling in the town of Campbellton and in the whole county of Restigouche ran very high against this company, and when the legislature of New Brunswick met in February last application was made for a new charter, the old charter having lapsed on the 21st of April in consequence of the non-fulfilment of its conditions. A meeting was called in Campbellton to consider the advisability of going on with the application for a new charter. The meeting was unanimous in its approval of the proposed legislation, and an application was made for a new charter in the month of February, notice of which was given on the 11th February, 1896. This circular says that no notice at all was given, but that is incorrect. It was given on the 11th April, and was a longer notice than that given by the promoters of the Bill I am now opposing. The first notice of this Bill appeared on the 22nd April of this year, and the petition was brought before the Standing Orders Committee on the 4th of May and reported by that committee. The president of the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, which was in existence at that time, seeing the application made for a new charter, then began to try

Mr. McALISTER.

to do something in the way of raising funds to pay off the liabilities of the company. He made several propositions, but none of them to pay down the amount due. He always wanted time. The local representatives, Messrs. Mott and Labilloy, knew very well what this promise amounted to, and they went on with the application for a new charter. Then the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company employed counsel and opposed the charter as strongly as they possibly could. Naturally, there were differences of opinion amongst the members of the Railway Committee. Some thought that as the Restigouche and Victoria charter was in existence, it was not proper to grant a new charter. But when the facts were laid before the committee and the manner in which the company had dealt with the people was exposed, the committee decided, that, under the circumstances, it was quite just to grant the new charter, and it was granted on the 6th of March last. After the charter was granted the president of the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company entered into negotiations to have the charter transferred to them. Had this been done they would have the benefit of both charters, and would be enabled to go on with the work. But the feeling in the county of Restigouche against any company with which Mr. Boselly was connected was so great that they would not approve of any negotiations with him. Consequently, nothing came of the negotiations. A short time ago Messrs. Malcolm and Ross, the contractors, who are well known all over New Brunswick and throughout Canada, entered into an agreement with the Restigouche and Western Railway Company to build the road. They were ready to deposit any amount from \$50,000 to \$200,000 as evidence of good faith and ability to build the road. They are prepared to do that any day. In consequence of the offer made by the contractors, the company entered into an agreement with them to give them the contract for the whole road. But before entering into this agreement they made a stipulation that the debts of the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company should be assumed by Messrs. Malcolm and Ross. The contractors agreed to assume the just liabilities of the old company,—that is, the debts incurred in locating and surveying the road. The agreement to give the contract was then entered into. After that, application was made by the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company for legislation from this Parliament, to confirm a charter, which, I contend, had lapsed before the application was made. Under the limitations of the charter, it lapsed on the 21st April, and no application was made until the 22nd April. Now, in this circular to which I have referred, there are charges of collusion on the part of the engineer with parties in Campbellton against the

Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, and also a charge against the stockholders of that company of intriguing against the party promoting this Bill, since the transfer was made. Let me say that there is not a word of truth in these charges. To substantiate what I say, I may relate what took place here in Ottawa after the transfer was made in 1896. Mr. Boselly, the president of the company, approached me time and again about endeavouring to get a Dominion subsidy for the whole line. I assisted him in every way I could. Not only that, but I got a promise from the Government that the whole line would be subsidized. This seemed to be satisfactory to Mr. Boselly. He went down to the province of New Brunswick to get legislation passed to confirm what had been done in the way of transferring the property and the stock. Messrs. Mott and Laballois, the local representatives who are charged with being in league against him, gave him the most hearty support, as the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) knows. They assisted him in every way possible. I assisted him also up to the time when the company broke faith with the people and would not carry out what they undertook to do. As a natural result every one having any connection with the road or any interest in it, opposed the company. The further charge is made that I am opposing the Bill from party motives. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a word of truth in that. As evidence of this I may tell you that the president of the company, Mr. Shives, is a well known Liberal in New Brunswick. He is, in fact, one of the vice-presidents of the Liberal Association of the province of New Brunswick. Mr. McKenzie, another of the directors, is also a well known Liberal. He is the secretary of the Liberal Association of the county of Restigouche. These facts do not indicate that there is any party feeling in the matter. But Mr. Shives and Mr. McKenzie are men of honour, men of integrity, business men, men who have the interests of the country at heart, and who would not allow party politics to interfere with anything likely to benefit the county. The other three directors are Mr. Kennedy, agent of the bank of Nova Scotia in Campbellton, Mr. David Richards, the well known lumberman, who lives in Campbellton, and Dr. Lunam. All these are men in whom every person has the fullest confidence. All who know them know them to be gentlemen of honesty and honour, men who would despise doing a mean act.

The board of directors is composed of five men in whom the people of the county of Restigouche have the most implicit confidence. These men have not undertaken to put this road through for the purpose of making anything out of it; they do not expect to benefit to the extent of one cent from that road, but their whole object

and desire is to have the road built. Now, to show further the feeling in the county against the granting of this legislation, I will read to you a protest that has been entered by the municipality of the county of Restigouche. As we all know, that county is not composed exclusively of Conservatives; there are a good many Liberals there. Our municipal council is not composed altogether of Conservatives; I think there are nearly, if not as many Liberals as there are Conservatives in the council. When notice of this application came to their attention, a special meeting of the council was called for the purpose of taking into consideration the advisability of opposing this legislation. They met on the 20th of May, and I will read the resolution that they passed. I may remark that the resolution was passed unanimously, every councillor being present, showing the interest the people took in the matter. The resolution makes reference to another Bill introduced here, which has not yet come from the Railway Committee, called the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company, and the resolution protests against both:

To the Honourable the Parliament of Canada:

At a meeting of the municipal council of the county of Restigouche, province of New Brunswick, held at Dalhousie, in said county, on Thursday, the 20th day of May, 1897, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:—

Whereas, the application is being made to the Parliament of Canada, at its present session for the passage of two several Acts, entitled respectively, "An Act respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company," and "An Act to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company," and

Whereas, the said Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, as we are informed and believe, have allowed their charter to lapse, by reason of not filing the necessary surveys of said railway, as provided for by the Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick passed in the year 1894, and a company called the Restigouche and Western Railway Company, incorporated this year, are now making arrangements to construct the same line of railway; and

Whereas, the company seeking incorporation for the purpose of constructing a bridge across the Restigouche River connecting the said line of Railway with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway at Cross Point, largely represent the interest of the said Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company, which is adverse to that of the said the Restigouche and Western Company, and we believe the connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company and the traffic over the same would be seriously affected by the grant of the said bridge charter, and that the interests of the said Restigouche and Western Railway Company would suffer by the passage of the said above-mentioned Acts; and

Whereas, we deem it advisable, taking into consideration past experience of the company first above named, that no obstacle should be placed in the way of the construction by the said the Restigouche and Western Railway Company:

Be it, therefore, resolved, that a copy of this resolution be at once forwarded to the Parliament of Canada, with a prayer from this Municipal Council of Restigouche, that the said Acts

do not pass, or, at all events, that they be not considered until the session of 1898 ; and

Further resolved, that a delegate be appointed by this board to attend a joint meeting of the councils to be held at New Carlisle on Saturday, the 22nd instant, for consideration of the matter.

Therefore, may it please your Honourable Body, we, the warden and secretary of the municipality of Restigouche, for and on behalf of the county council of the said municipality, ask that the Acts entitled "An Act respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company," and "An Act to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company," do not pass, or, at all events, that they be not considered this year, or until your session of 1898 ; and, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

THOS. HAYES, Warden.

A. A. JOHNSON, Secretary.

Mr SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of Private Bills having expired, the Committee of Supply will resume its sitting.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Grenville Canal—Enlargement ..... \$90,000

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not intend to detain the House very long. We have heard so much upon the question of dismissals during this session, that I will not inflict a long speech on the House at this stage of the session. But again this matter appears to have been brought up this afternoon by the members of the Opposition, and the Minister of Railways and Canals is charged with dismissing civil servants without just cause or provocation. I feel that I cannot allow the present opportunity to pass without expressing my opinion in regard to those parties who appear now to be incensed at the action of the Government. It is well known to every person who understands business that the present Administration is charged with the conduct of the affairs of the country, and therefore they have a perfect right to surround themselves with men in whom they have confidence. Would any member of the Opposition who should be entrusted with the conduct of a large business surround himself with servants, clerks and others in whom he had no confidence, and they no confidence in him? Would he not surround himself with men in whom he had confidence, and who were always willing and ready to do anything their masters required. The fault I have to find with the Government is not that they have dismissed too many, but that they have not dismissed one to every five they should have dismissed. Indeed, if the strong partisans who surround the present Government in the various departments of the service were dismissed, there would be five dismissed to every one who has been dismissed in the past. Hon. gen-

Mr. McALISTER.

tlemen opposite, and particularly the leader of the Opposition, appear to be very much incensed at the cruelty that is being inflicted, from their standpoint, on those who were in the service. Does the hon. gentleman not remember what he did when he was one of the leaders of the Conservative Government in 1879? Does he remember well that the Government, which came into power on November 18th, 1878, dismissed during the first year they were in power far more in number than the present Government have dismissed during the year they have been in power. Why, the heads of civil servants were cut off right and left, and one had hardly time to reach the floor before another followed.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the hon. gentleman who said "oh, oh," studied present history, and also examined the history of the Conservative party, he would find some interesting reading, and if he studied the number of dismissals in the first year of the Conservative regime he would find that for every man dismissed by the present Government, two, three or four were dismissed at that time from the permanent civil service. There was a return asked for in 1880 in regard to the number of dismissals from 13th February, 1879, to 23rd February, 1880, and a return was brought down answering that question, and that return is before me. I find by analysis of it, which contains the names and causes—and they were very flimsy ones—given of the dismissals, that of permanent civil servants there were between those dates eighty permanent civil servants dismissed; no less than sixty-nine superannuated, many of them against their will and at comparatively early ages; seventy civil servants were retired, having been threatened, and preferring to retire than be dismissed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask my hon. friend what return that is?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will read the heading of the return. It is: "Statement showing the names of persons dismissed or removed from the public service, the reasons for such dismissals or removals; also the names of persons who have resigned or been superannuated or transferred from one office of employment to another, between the 13th day of February, 1879, and the 23rd day of February, 1880; also the occupation and residence of each, together with the reasons for the superannuation or transference, and the amount of superannuation or allowance paid to each, as called for by an Order of the House of Commons, dated 23rd day of February, 1880." In answer to that request the return before me was brought down. I find there were 153 dismissals and superannuations; there were twenty-nine officers transferred from one office to another, and seven resigned their positions. There were 153 vacancies

created during that year, and those were filled by the friends of the new Government. But they had more friends than they had positions after the dismissals had taken place, and the result was that instead of practising principles of economy, they created offices for their friends and put them in, not by the score, but by fifties and by hundreds, into these new offices thus made during the first year of their Administration. I should like to ask the leader of the Opposition if that is not true?

Mr. FOSTER. Does that appear in the return?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am asking the leader of the Opposition this question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I do not think it is.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman has a most tenacious memory regarding some events that occurred twenty or thirty years ago, but in regard to this matter with which he was particularly connected, standing in rank next to the then leader of the Government, and who in all probability gave advice that these offices should be created in order that their friends should receive compensation at their hands, does not recollect this fact. When the Government dismissed eighty civil servants, they maintained it was necessary to do so in order to reduce expenditure, to cut down the extraordinary expenditure of the Mackenzie regime, and therefore we find it frequently stated as the cause for these dismissals, "not required." That, in fact, is the only reason given for the dismissals. We must therefore come to the conclusion that this was done for the purpose of economy, and for the purpose of carrying out principles of economy. It was unfortunate for the Liberals that they were always picked out as the men to be dismissed, while the Conservatives were kept on in the service. I will now come to the denial made by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman has stated that there were no offices created in order to make room for his friends. I may inform him that while there were dismissals numbering 153, by superannuation and by dismissal, only 153 offices were thereby rendered vacant, but during that year I find there were no less than 533 appointments to the service. I can prove my statement; in fact, I do not wish to make any statement unless I can prove it. A return was asked and obtained in regard to the appointments made by the Government then in power. The Government were asked to submit a statement showing the names of persons appointed to office in the public service between 13th February, 1879, and 23rd February, 1880, the particular offices to which such persons were appointed, the remuneration or emolument attached thereto, whether by salary or fees," as called for by an order of the

House of Commons dated 23rd February, 1880. In answer to that request the return was brought down, and I find here 533 appointments, the names given one after the other. It was an impossibility to make 533 appointments by opening 153 offices, and therefore no less than 380 new offices were created for the friends of the Conservative Government in that year. These are the very hon. gentlemen who are now speaking in such strong language in regard to this matter, as the leader of the Opposition is always able to do, for he speaks in the superlative degree, and he wishes to leave the country to believe that the Government is guilty of malfeasance of office in dismissing these parties. I should like to ask the leader of the Opposition what answer can he give as regards this extraordinary number of appointments. Is it possible that he, the right-hand supporter of Sir John Macdonald, the then Premier, advised the First Minister to create 380 offices for the purpose of filling them with his friends, when he had dismissed so many officials on the ground of economy and to save expenses to the country. We have these very men who have been guilty of all that, and we have the men who support them, sustaining them now and trying to make the country believe that we are doing wrongly towards those who are in the civil service to-day. I rose, Sir, to put this piece of ancient history upon the record, so that hon. gentlemen opposite may have an opportunity of seeing themselves as others see them, and in order to show the country that when they were in power, and during the very first year of their regime, they went on extravagantly in filling up offices, and creating new offices, by which the country was mulcted in a large expenditure. These facts are now before the House, and when hon. gentlemen opposite speak further as to dismissals, I hope they will remember the conduct and character and history of their own party.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I thought I should say a word or two in connection with this matter of dismissals, because I have been more particularly arraigned by some hon. gentlemen opposite on account of my alleged misconduct in this connection. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has gone so far as to charge me with cruelty to persons whom, he says, I dismissed from the public service, and with having degraded that service by the manner in which I have discharged the duties of my office in this respect. I cannot help thinking that many of the hon. members opposite are in entire accord with the views expressed by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), when he stated to the committee that it would have been more becoming, if gentlemen opposite who have been whining and complaining with respect

to dismissals, should let the matter rest, and recognize the force of circumstances which have transpired, and which impelled the Ministers who are administering the affairs of the Government, and the members of Parliament supporting them, to take the course which commended itself to their best judgment. There is, I am sure, not one member in this Administration who took any pleasure at all in removing any of the employees in the public service. There are, I am sure, no members in this House, upon the Government side at all events, who took any pleasure in making these recommendations. These gentlemen were acting from a sense of duty, and they felt constrained, by reason of what had transpired, to advise the Government in respect to these dismissals. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has left the Chamber.

Mr. FOSTER. He will be back in a moment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to call the attention of that hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to his own record, and to make a comparison between it and the course which he now urges should be adopted by the members of the Government. I have before referred in this House to changes made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) when he was in power, not in respect to permanent civil servants, but with reference to temporary employees and temporary employees upon the Government railway, the administration of which was assumed by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) after the defeat of the Mackenzie Administration. In this same month of February, 1880, the question of dismissals upon the Intercolonial Railway came before Parliament. A motion was made by Mr. Anglin asking for a return of the persons who had been dismissed from the Intercolonial Railway, and in the course of the discussion which took place, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) admitted that he had, shortly after he assumed the duties of Minister of Railways, dismissed at least 400 persons—and it is quite safe to suppose that he removed even more than that number. He did not stop to consider that these 400 were poor men, nor was he influenced by the consideration that he was taking the bread out of the mouths of these people. He did not stay his hand from any consideration of kindly feeling or kindly thought. The hon. gentleman then told the House that these dismissals did not take place on any political ground, but that a considerable proportion of the 400 were removed for the sole purpose of promoting economy in the public service. That is the ground on which the hon. gentleman justified an act, which, if done by me, he would characterize as wholesale dismissals from the Intercolonial Railway. I believe a return was then brought down showing who

Mr. BLAIR.

were the persons, and the cause assigned for their dismissals, but I regret to say that I have not been able to lay my hand on that return, although I have been at some pains to obtain it. However, I am procuring it from its original source, and will have it available for future reference, when the hon. gentleman, in accordance with the habit which has apparently possessed him, next ventures to rake up in season and out of season, this question of dismissals from the public service. I find, that on this occasion, when Mr. Anglin brought the subject up, Sir Charles Tupper made the following observations:—

I would suggest to the hon. gentleman from Gloucester, that he change the terms of his motion, and add the words "dispensed with or dismissed." I draw a great distinction between those terms. If he asks me to make a return of the number of persons dismissed, I am happy to say the return will be a very small one; but if he asks me to make a return of the number of persons whose services have been dispensed with, it will be a very large one. I can state to the hon. gentleman, that I am prepared to lay upon the Table of the House a return of all the persons in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway in September, 1878, and a corresponding return, covering the same portion of the road that was in the possession of the Government in 1878, that is, to Rivière du Loup, showing 400 less persons on the staff as officers or employees. The hon. gentleman will, therefore, see that the number of persons whom he would cover by the word "dismissed," would be a large one. I am happy to say, the number of persons who have been dismissed, is not large, and I do not think the hon. gentleman would consider it right that we should put in the same category persons who have been dismissed from the service for misconduct or neglect of duty, and men against whom there was no charge whatever, but whose services were dispensed with because the road could be operated with equal efficiency, and, at the same time, effect the saving of a large amount of money. I would, therefore, suggest that the hon. gentleman use the term "dispensed with or dismissed," because I would mark those who have been discharged for failure in duty or misconduct, and draw a distinction between them and persons whose services have been dispensed with to save cost.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that is all right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "All right," says the hon. gentleman, and no one would complain if the leader of the Opposition, from a sense of duty in administering his department, had concluded that it was in the public interest to dismiss four or five hundred employees of the Intercolonial Railway, but I think I will be able to prove that the record does not bear out the statement he has made. I think I can convince even the hon. gentleman that economy in the public service was not his object in dismissing these 400 men. In February, 1880, there were in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, as the official documents show, 2,596 persons. That was the number which remained on the pay rolls of the Intercolonial Railway after the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had

plied his little axe, and had decapitated the 400, as he says—but as I am inclined to think, more than 400—from the public service on the alleged ground of economy. We know that the services go on from year to year in the ordinary, regular way, the only changes occurring being those rendered advisable in certain seasons of the year, when it is necessary either to cut down the staff somewhat or when, as the service increases; it is necessary to put them on again or to augment the number of employees. Any changes resulting from that fact, I could well understand and approve; but whether that was the reason that influenced the hon. gentleman in making these changes, I think we shall discover. When we come down to the corresponding month of 1881, we find that he had added about 800 people above the number employed in February, 1880. Whereas in February, 1880, there were 2,596 people on the pay-roll of the Intercolonial Railway—the hon. gentleman, having reduced the number to that figure, impelled by his desire to economize—in February, 1881, a corresponding period of the year, when business would be in the same condition, and when any greater staff than in the previous year would be unlikely to be required, he had increased the number to 3,310. I think it would tax the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman himself to justify such a condition of things; and it strongly convinces me, as I think it will carry conviction to the mind of any fair person in this House, that, instead of the hon. gentleman being moved to make that number of dismissals solely with the view of reducing the cost of the service, to put it on a plane more conformable with the public interest, he was moved solely by the desire to decapitate the people whom he wanted to get out of the way in order to make places for his own friends and supporters. In this connection it may be interesting to hon. members that I should furnish some information showing how the services has grown, and how the number of employees increased under our friends opposite. I find that in the month of June, 1895, there were in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, 3,941 persons, as against 3,310 in February, 1881. But in 1896 there came to be a most marvellous increase in the business of the Intercolonial Railway, demanding more labour, and filling up the shops; because I find that in the corresponding month of June, in that year, there were on the pay-rolls on the Intercolonial Railway no less than 5,296 persons. And this is the condition of things which the hon. gentleman justifies and sustains with such majestic intrepidity, getting up in this House and charging people who have been trying faithfully to do their duty in this regard with being cruel to public employees and degrading the public service. While I am referring to this point, I may state that during the month of April—I have not the re-

turn for the month of May, but I know there is no substantial difference one way or the other—according to the information furnished me, the number on the pay-roll was 4,083, a difference of 1,213 between the month of April, 1897, and the month of June, 1896. Now, I would have thought that hon. gentlemen opposite—I believe many of them do, but I thought they all would have realized the unwisdom of pursuing the policy they have been pursuing from day to day, and from week to week in this Parliament. I would have thought they would have realized that there was a possibility that these unfounded and unjust attacks, repeatedly made from their places in the House against this Government and their friends in Parliament, might go beyond the limit which the forbearance of even the members of the Government would allow them to withstand. Since I have been in this office, I have felt no disposition to yield to legitimate demands beyond what I could reasonably support and justify. I have felt averse to making these changes. I would have very much preferred that there had been fewer than there have been, although I will show the committee, before I sit down, that the number of those who have been removed is comparatively small; but I want to tell hon. gentlemen that they can, if they persist, force the members of this Government to go further than they have gone, and yet within limits which they could fully and entirely justify. Now, Sir, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen to some facts with regard to this matter. I have been accused of having dealt unjustly, harshly and cruelly with the employees on the Intercolonial Railway and in other services of the country. The hon. gentleman has hazarded the statement that I have dismissed hundreds of people from the railways and the canals. He dwelt on the statement as if he had positive knowledge, and was justified in making the accusation from facts in his possession. He has not furnished us with these facts, and he cannot furnish them. He cannot examine the statements which will be brought before this House without seeing that in the administration of my department I have dealt most tenderly with the employees in following the rule laid down as a guide for our conduct in matters of this kind by hon. gentlemen opposite. He has circulated broadcast the statement that six or eight hundred people have been dismissed from the Intercolonial. Now, I have a statement of the number who have been dismissed, and it will show how complete and ample a justification I would have had if I had gone ten times further. I know it will create a feeling of disappointment on the part of some of our friends that I have not meted out to those people even a small measure of the justice that I would have been fully warranted in doing. The statement gives the total number removed down to the

11th of May last, and since that time no changes have been made of which I have any knowledge. I telegraphed to the general manager at Moncton to send me a full statement of every man who had been removed in any riding at my instance, or under my direction, or at the instance of any member of Parliament or candidate since the change of Government down to the date at which I asked for the information. I have the return in my hand, and I will read it to the committee; and the result of reading it will be to show hon. gentlemen opposite that in thus recklessly hurling accusations against me they have been utterly astray and have been guilty of erecting tremendous charges upon the slimmest possible data. I will give the names of the different counties, starting with the province of Quebec. I find that in Lévis county there were 18 employees of the Intercolonial dismissed; in Bellechasse, 9; in Montmagny, there were 8; in L'Islet, 3; in Kamouraska, 9; in Temiscouata, 5; and in Rimouski, 29. In the great majority of these cases, the dismissals were made upon the representations on their own personal knowledge, of the gentlemen who represented these counties in this Parliament; that the parties for whose dismissals they asked had been guilty of offensive partisanship, as we understand the term. Now, looking over the names of these several counties in the province of Quebec, and taking the number of dismissals in each, I find they made the total of 81. Among those counties, the one in which the greatest number of dismissals was made was Rimouski, and I would have wished that the whole House could have followed the hon. gentleman who represents that county (Mr. Fiset) in the statement he made, a statement which he made from his own knowledge, and which I am able from what the general manager of the Intercolonial told me himself, to confirm. That hon. gentleman told the committee that when hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, the Minister of Railways and Canals of that period (Sir Charles Tupper) did not wait for any charges of offensive partisanship in order to dismiss employees on the Intercolonial. Why, Sir, the general manager of the Intercolonial was instructed that if the member representing the county of Rimouski—and that by no means was the only county in the various provinces regarding the representations of which the general manager was given the same instructions—called for the dismissal of any one in the employ of the Government—not alleging offensive partisanship but simply calling for his dismissal—it was the duty of the division superintendent to make the dismissal, without even being under the necessity of referring the matter to the general manager at Moncton or even to the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) told this committee

Mr. BLAIR.

that the general manager at Moncton—whom no one will charge with having political bias or at all events with being friendly to this Administration or likely to colour his statements in our interest—informed him that it was not necessary in these days, under the mild, considerate and humane administration of the hon. member for Cape Breton, (Sir Charles Tupper), for the member representing the county—and supporting the Government, to make any charge against any employee of the Intercolonial, but that all he had to do was to demand his head, and off it went. I fully realized when a number of these demands came to me from the county of Rimouski, the position in which the hon. member representing that county was placed. He knew how, in times past, when he had contested that county, the Government employees who dared to vote for him were dismissed from office ruthlessly, and dismissed, not because they had actively taken part in the election or made themselves obnoxious by public and offensive partisanship, but merely because they had voted for him. That fact alone was deemed by the gentleman who succeeded in the elections against the Liberal candidate, a complete reason for their instant dismissal.

Then we come to the province of Nova Scotia and I find that in the county of Cumberland there were four employees on the Intercolonial dismissed; in Halifax, 4; in Pictou, 4; in Antigonish, 8; and in Richmond, 1; making 22 employees of the Intercolonial removed by this Administration in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How many in the county of Inverness?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How many in the county of Colchester?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None. There were none dismissed except in the counties I have named, and they total up the tremendous number of 22.

Now, we come to the province of New Brunswick, for which I am perhaps myself personally and in my private character more particularly answerable, and for the dismissals in each county, I suppose, I will be held directly responsible. Here I have had a free and fair field. Here these cruel impulses, this hard, unfriendly disposition, these heartless, cold-blooded tendencies of mine to decapitate employees, to send them out of the public service, and do all these horrible injuries described to-day—here, in this province of New Brunswick, where I may be supposed to have free will and be able to give full scope to these hereditary impulses of mine without restriction at all, I have cut off the magnificent number of seven heads in all, employed on the Intercolonial.

Mr. POWELL. Why there were sixty dismissed at Moncton alone.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I challenge the accuracy of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. I reiterate it most positively.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will not allow the hon. gentleman to contradict the statement which I make. I make it with the full knowledge of the facts. Of course the hon. gentleman can take the responsibility of denying it, but I do not yield to his contradiction, and I assert with all positiveness that the information I now give this committee is absolute verity and capable of establishment by proof which cannot be controverted. Let not the hon. gentleman tell me that fifty or sixty people have been dismissed, I will tell him what has taken place. I will show him the correspondence, I will produce the officer and put him on oath and let him tell the whole story. And what will he tell? He will say to any committee of this House, under the solemn sanction of his oath, that he himself communicated to me that the season of the year had arrived when it would be proper and necessary to reduce the number of employees on the Intercolonial. And what was my reply? I said to Mr. Pottinger: If it is right, you should do it. How many do you think you will have to dispense with in that way? And he gave me an idea of the number. I then said to him: I will tell you what to do. Let those who have been most recently employed by the gentlemen on the other side be the ones you will select for setting aside for the present. And now I can say, in addition, that a large number of those very men who were set aside have been reinstated and are now in the service. I am moving in these matters with a full sense of the responsibility which attaches to my position and with the knowledge that what I am doing and shall do will be fully made known, because I know that among a large number of the employees upon the Intercolonial I am surrounded by men who are not my friends.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They were put in just before the election.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they were and I have acted with caution, perhaps with even greater caution than I would have thought necessary under other circumstances, knowing that every deed I did, every instruction I gave throughout my official connection with the railway would be known to the men who are the bitter opponents of this party, and who are making every effort to destroy this Government. It would not be very long before every act would be made known to hon. gentlemen opposite. These are the

facts, and I think they are such as must carry conviction to the minds of hon. gentlemen, and I trust will have some effect on the country in dispelling the illusion, if there has been any created in the minds of those who have followed these debates and have read the statements which have been so plentifully put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite. They will see how utterly fabulous, how utterly without foundation these statements are, and I think I can claim from the independent and enlightened and fair-minded judgment of this country that if I have erred at all in administering my department with respect to the dismissal of employees, I have erred on the side of leniency and against what I might honestly and justly and fairly have been expected to have done.

Mr. McINERNEY. Will the hon. gentleman give the counties of New Brunswick in which dismissals have taken place?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The counties of New Brunswick in which the dismissals took place on the Intercolonial Railway are: Gloucester, 1; Westmoreland, 5; King's, 1.

Mr. McINERNEY. None in Kent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No dismissals took place from the Intercolonial in Kent since the advent of the present Administration to power down to the 11th of May last.

Mr. McINERNEY. Michael Swift was dismissed in Kent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If Michael Swift was dismissed, he was dismissed not with my instructions or knowledge, or in consequence of any suggestion, directly or indirectly, made by me. He was not dismissed on the representation of any candidate in the interest of the Liberal party or of any political organization, so far as I know, and so far as the general manager, who has given me this information, has been willing to disclose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He is Tory enough.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so. We in the maritime provinces have heard a great deal about the conduct of the persons managing the Intercolonial Railway in June, 1896, and statements have been made upon the subject in a general way. I was led to believe that the way in which the Intercolonial Railway had been used in the last election was not only most injurious to the interests of the Liberal party, but disastrous from every point of view. I felt that the Intercolonial Railway had been simply prostituted, that it had been converted into a political machine, and had been used in the most ruthless way to serve the purposes of the Conservative party, in order to insure their success in that election contest. So strongly

was I impressed with the reports which reached me from various sources, that I felt it my duty to direct that a formal investigation should be made, at all events, as to the conduct of those concerned in the management of the road at Moncton, as a commencement at least, and in order that we might be put in possession of actual facts on sworn testimony, and in order that there might be no shadow of question as to the extent to which, if at all, the Intercolonial service had been used in the manner which I have intimated. A gentleman was sent there for the purpose of holding an investigation. He went there in November and held a very lengthy inquiry. He called up the various officials of the road from the general manager down, including the chief engineer, the divisional superintendents, the secretaries, the clerks, the train despatchers, and other officials charged with being implicated in this work of a political character, which it was alleged, had been going on. And all this evidence has been furnished. It is available, it can be seen and read and used. Hon. members of the House and the people generally will have an opportunity to reach their own conclusion from this sworn testimony as to whether or not the imputations cast upon the bona fides of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway have been well-founded or not. The results of the investigation startled me. They proved beyond all peradventure that almost from the head, in a sense the head at Moncton, down to the leading officials and officers of a permanent character, all of them, almost without exception, were banded together in order that that machine, that organization should be turned to the best and most profitable account so as to perpetuate Conservative rule in this country and to defeat the hopes, the aspirations, and ambitions of the Liberal party. Why, Sir, it appeared that almost the first thing that took place was a meeting of many of the divisional superintendents. They were summoned from Nova Scotia, they were brought from the northern part of New Brunswick, and they met there in solemn conclave, and they came to the conclusion—that it would be necessary that action should be taken in order to control the employees of the Intercolonial Railway who might have Liberal proclivities and could not be depended upon to vote for the Conservative party. That is not a controverted statement. I am not giving you that which is in dispute, but the admissions of the men themselves who met in conclave. And you shall hear the state of things as I develop it to you as briefly as I can, which has existed under the regime of my hon. friend opposite (Sir Charles Tupper). I do not know how often in times past, during how many elections, that state of things I shall disclose existed, but I do know that it became more marked, more conspicuous, more reckless and indefensible under the administration of the hon. gentleman and

Mr. BLAIR.

after he assumed power than ever before. Is it any wonder that I have sat here transfixed with amazement when I have heard him delivering himself of these high-sounding platitudes with regard to propriety of conduct in office? Is it any wonder, I say, with such a record before me? No man will say that the officials of the Intercolonial would have dared to go out of their way, to trammel, and hamper and destroy the free will of the employees on that road unless they knew that what they were doing they were doing with the entire approval of the men who were their superiors in office. I should be sorry to think that as to the general manager of the Intercolonial at Moncton. I am free to say—and I say it with all candour and fairness to him—that I do not regard him as a man having strong political opinions or leanings one way or the other. I do not think he cares whether the Conservative party or the Liberal party is triumphant in Canada; I believe that his thoughts are largely centred upon the work of his office. Therefore, I am bound to believe that that gentleman could not have countenanced what was going on. He admits that he winked at it, but he would not even have winked at it if he had not felt confident that his course in that regard was in complete accord with the wishes of his superiors, the head of the department and the leader of the Government of that day. Well, Sir, these officers held their conclaves, and what was the result? Why, the fiat went forth that they should put themselves—these divisional superintendents, secretaries, and other officials—into immediate communication with the officers and secretaries and leading members of the various Conservative associations in the different counties. The county of Westmoreland was immediately visited by one or more of these officials. The same is true of the county of King's. And we have not yet begun to learn the facts. We have only got upon the threshold of this investigation; we have had only a little peep into the procedure that took place in connection with that organization. What we have discovered, as I was going to say, shows that the various canvassing committees in the counties of Westmoreland and King's, and I presume in other counties, though I am bound to say that I have no direct evidence upon that point, but as for those counties these gentlemen went to these committees and procured from them, or had prepared, lists of the voters who were upon the Intercolonial Railway pay rolls and who were in the Intercolonial Railway service; and they were requested to make, and did make, out of those lists, records of the political complexion of the persons whose names were on the list. You can take up those lists, I have them in my possession, containing the crosses, containing other marks indicating what the political stripe of the men were. I have one of these lists, I do

not know but I have more, but one was enough to satisfy me as to the character of the work that was going on. I have not had time to pursue an examination into the vast mass of papers which were forwarded to me, further than to get an inkling of the nature of these doings. Take the list for one of the divisional districts in the town of Moncton, and upon that list there are 130 or 160 names. I forget which, and opposite those names are crosses to indicate that they were Tories, and other signs to indicate that they were Liberals, and then opposite the name of every Liberal was written the word "out." What was that for? Well, when it came to be interpreted by the people who know, by the very officers themselves, it was frankly acknowledged that that meant that the whole machinery of the railway was to be put in motion to get these people out of the way so that they could not vote. That was the fact, and these lists were checked over by the Conservative association in King's county, and other lists were treated in the same manner. This was the Government which, according to my hon. friend is so tender in its sympathy for the poor workmen; this is the Government whose hearts are bleeding for those people who were dismissed from the public service in this way, who are driven out to seek other employment and seek their bread as best they might. But while they have this profound sympathy for the poor workmen who are dismissed from the Government employ upon these grounds, and were obliged to go out and seek their daily bread elsewhere, they had no sympathy for the exercise of the freedom of that right which I maintain should belong to every man in this country, whether he is a servant of the Government or not. These are the gentlemen, I say, who have set in motion this style of converting the great Intercolonial Railway of Canada into a political machine. Well, Sir, that is not all. After they had got these names settled upon, when they ascertained how the employees of the Intercolonial Railway might possibly vote, when they had reason to believe that A, B, C and D, who are on these lists, would be likely to vote Conservative; then they set their ingenuity to work, and they sent a man to Dan, and another to Beersheba, they sent one man down to the end, almost, of Nova Scotia in order to pay a bill of \$3.50 that had been standing for months. Why, Sir, who will say that our friends opposite are not endowed with ingenuity? Who dares to say that they are not equal to almost any emergency that might arise? Well, they did that, trains were sent out, special trains of men were sent forward in all directions in order that they might not have an opportunity of depositing their ballots according to their judgment, in the exercise of their free rights as citizens. Well, Sir, that was not all. I am only able to give you a little taste, just a mere sip, from this flowing bowl which I would like to tender to you.

They thought that probably it would not be enough, that it would not answer the purpose, if they simply resorted to that method of coercing the voters. They must apply other methods; and, Sir, the official examination which has taken place has enabled us to establish out of the mouths of these people themselves, it has been admitted, that the issue of passes had reached such a phase as almost passes belief, and must exceed the credulity of any one on this committee. Why, Sir, passes were sent out unlimited—they were only limited, I suppose, by the capacity of the printing press to produce them. We have obtained, I suppose, but a tithe of the number of passes that were sent out. Books of passes were distributed here, there and everywhere. Why, all that was necessary in order to give a man a title to a book of passes over the Intercolonial Railway, was that he should have the endorsement of the Conservative committee for that county. Well, we found fourteen of them, but there are fourteen at least that are missing.

Mr. McCLURE. We saw them in the county of Colchester.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the books did not come back just as they went out. It would be idle to take it for granted that they came back just as they went out; they were somewhat emptied of their contents. Except fourteen of the books which, according to sworn evidence, were sent out, we have no tidings of the others in any shape or form. We have only got, as I say, a portion of the record, and on this record we hope to be able to reach a little deeper into this mire of political outrage, and we hope to get somewhere nearer the bottom of the facts. But what we have discovered suffices, at all events, to show that these gentlemen should for ever hereafter hold their peace in this House and elsewhere on the subject of this discussion. Why, Sir, as I say, I have evidence before me, not as I say contradicted evidence, not evidence in which you have a witness on one hand meeting a witness on the other who swears the other way, not evidence about which any person could have any doubt at all, but admitted facts coming from the people who did it themselves, constrained to acknowledge under the press of circumstances, probably, and when compelled to make a disclosure under oath. Why, Sir, we find the officials of the Intercolonial Railway allowed as many people as they pleased, as long as they were of the proper complexion, we will assume, to travel on passes. It was not necessary that his name should be on it; his name need not be upon it so long as he was known to be engaged in the election campaign. And these men were passing backwards and forwards on the Intercolonial Railway, along that great stretch of railway in the province of New Brunswick and in

the province of Nova Scotia during election times. I find on looking at the evidence as reported that there were at least 2,575 people who are transported for election purposes on passes and from one point alone. We find that at that locality, and within the reach of these three or four counties, 2,575 people were given free passes for election purposes upon the Intercolonial Railway. Why, in connection with the election of 1896, we find that on 203 passes, 430 people were permitted to travel for election purposes; the evidence is that on 157 passes, 312 more people were permitted to travel; the evidence is that on 97 passes, 372 people were permitted to pass on the Intercolonial Railway, and that on the whole, there are 1,427 passes missing of which we can get no tidings whatever. Now, Sir, I do not think it would be possible to exaggerate the gravity of such a state of things as that. I would not have dreamed it, no man I believe in Canada would conceive it possible that these things could have been done by the Government under the regis and direction of my hon. friend opposite, who has many excellent qualities, and whom, for many personal qualities, I greatly admire. I know that he does not do things on a small scale. I am constrained to believe that it is nothing but the colossal attitude of the hon. gentleman which enabled him to use passes to the extent to which he used them in the late elections. That is not all. That does not entirely exhaust the evidence of the ingenuity of our hon. friends opposite. Since this discussion on the Estimates for railways came up there has been a little bit of curiosity in regard to a gentleman who filled an office on the Intercolonial and was dismissed, who, I think, is a close connection of the hon. leader of the Opposition—and the hon. gentleman mentioned his name—Mr. Hillson. He can claim the distinction of being a nephew of the hon. gentleman. Great powers were conferred on Mr. Hillson in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and large discretion was vested in that gentleman. It appears from the evidence that his will was law, largely due to the fact that there is this strong family relationship, and probably the consanguinity between the two gentlemen gave a better status than almost any one else possessed. There were some interesting features connected with the experience of this friend of the leader of the Opposition. The commissioner who held the investigation naturally had his curiosity aroused by some peculiar facts. He discovered among other things that came under his observation that wherever this gentleman happened to be on the days which immediately preceded the election, there arose an unaccountable demand for shingles for that particular locality. That hon. gentleman, we will say, was at Amherst at ten o'clock in the morning. A telegram was flashed over the wire to the

Mr. BLAIR.

chief engineer, Mr. Archibald, of Moncton, desiring that there be immediately sent to him at that point 25,000 shingles. In another hour or two another telegram from a more distant point flashed over the wire, "send at once 50,000 shingles." At some other point, almost within speaking distance, there would arise the same extraordinary and unexplainable demand for more shingles. "Send immediately 75,000 shingles." So the demand for shingles increased with startling rapidity in all these different points on the line within the purview of Mr. Hillson, just preceding the election. It will not be surprising to hon. members that such an unusual and unprecedented demand for shingles at various points, particularly when it happened to be accompanied by the presence of the nephew of the hon. gentleman, excited the attention of the commissioner, who was investigating these railway matters, and he took action to ascertain why the demand had arisen. Pursuing the inquiry a little closer, there was proof of an understanding between the chief engineer of the Government railways and this official, by which it was agreed that a demand for shingles would mean a demand for passes. This matter was kept a profound secret from the general public and no one was allowed to know about it; but even at the telegraph office there is sometimes a little leak, and accordingly this ingenious method was adopted, no doubt with a feeling of security that the general public would not acquire knowledge of it, and this aided those gentlemen in this conspiracy against the country in their improper use of passes and in their undeniable prostitution of the railway for election purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was Foster's home market.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I felt it was right, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman has taken occasion to assail me on every possible opportunity for having treated the people in the employ of the Government in the cruel and heartless manner he has described, to throw a little bit of light on the methods and procedure followed by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. I want to say here, in drawing my remarks to a close, that the course which the late Government adopted in its management and use of the Intercolonial, the way it converted it into a political machine, the means taken to convince every man employed on it that in order to be sure of permanence he had to be a tool in the hands of a political party, have done much to disorganize the railway service of Canada and have increased the difficulties connected with my administration of the office and in dealing with those people in the way they ought to be dealt with, and in the lenient way in which I endeavoured to treat them. It has tended to weaken the loyalty

which the employees should have to the road, it has tended to weaken the discharge of their duties, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen will all admit that it were infinitely better in the interest of the whole country, even in the interest of the political party which might, for the time being, be in power, that the Government should discountenance in every possible way such an improper use of the railway service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not suppose that if I were to address the House for a much longer period than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has addressed it, and endeavoured to portray the want-of-candor characteristics of the Minister of Railways, I could not do it half so effectually as the hon. gentleman has done it during the brief period he has addressed the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman commenced his statement by giving the number of persons who had been dismissed, by stating that 400 had been dismissed by me when I assumed the management of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman then drew the attention of the House to the fact that at a later period he found a large number of employees added to the Intercolonial service, and he said he found the staff of the Intercolonial Railway had been greatly increased. Then the hon. gentleman went on to a further period to show that a still greater number of employees were engaged in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I put it to the hon. gentleman himself whether it be possible in the English language to address a more false argument to the House than the one he has presented. I ask the hon. gentleman if he, as Minister of Railways, is not ashamed to stand up in the presence of this assembled legislature and attempt to practice one of the grossest pieces of duplicity to which I have ever listened from any hon. gentleman in any place. When I tell this House that the Intercolonial Railway, of which the hon. gentleman has been speaking as an entity and that he was making comparisons between the number of employees occupied on the work from one period to another, but there could be but one opinion entertained, and that was that he was making a fair and candid comparison, which would show how the number of employees had been increased on the same work. But did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) tell the House what had led to this increase? He did not. I will let a little daylight into these disingenuous and false statements of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair); and I would be warranted in using stronger language to describe the dishonest attempt made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to mislead this House. In 1878 when I succeeded the late Hon. Sir Alexander Mackenzie as Minister of Public Works, (which then embraced the Department of Railways and Canals) I found that during

the year, the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway was nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, or, subject to some qualifications and deductions, it was still over half a million dollars. That was taken out of the pockets of the people to run the Intercolonial Railway after all the receipts derived from it had been expended. I called upon the ablest men in the department to make me an exhaustive report towards a remedy for this grave state of affairs. The gentleman whom Mr. Mackenzie placed at the head of the Intercolonial Railway, put over his own signature the statement, that it would cost the country three-quarters of a million per annum to operate the Intercolonial, over and above its receipts. Was not that a startling fact? Was not that sufficient to warrant a Minister of Railways to set before himself the important task of ascertaining how half a million dollars a year could be saved to the people of Canada.

With the assistance of the ablest men connected with the road, I made a thorough examination and I found that a great reduction could be made. I first reduced the salaries paid to the officials, and I frankly expressed my regret to these gentlemen, that I was compelled to do so in the public interest, and I told them also, that when the condition of the Intercolonial Railway would admit it, I would gladly consider the question of increasing their salaries again. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) accuses me of dismissing 400 persons. Sir, I am not aware that I dismissed any person. After a most exhaustive examination which has doubtless been made by the Minister (Mr. Blair), and with all the documents under his hand, he has been able to parade a single case before this country in which a young man was dismissed from the service I take it for granted that he is obliged to limit the extent of the dismissals to that one case. Even in that case, I have been able to show that the person was guilty not only of offensive partisanship, but that he had gone to the length of using physical force at a public meeting in support of his opinion. And, suppose I did dispense with the service of 400 employees, was I not justified in doing it, when the ablest men in the department told me that I could make the reduction without impairing the efficiency of the road. What was the result of that? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) examines the documents under his hand, he will find that the deficit of over half a million was reduced to below \$100,000, during the first year of my administration of the Intercolonial Railway. He will find further, that up to the time I resigned the portfolio of railways to go to England as High Commissioner for Canada, I continued to bring down that deficit on the Intercolonial Railway until the accounts more than balanced. I ask the House: was I not justified in dispensing with the ser-

VICES of 400 unnecessary employees, when the result was that a saving of over half a million a year was effected for the benefit of the tax-payers of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has the very men in his employ to-day who can confirm my statement, that I asked these gentlemen to make the reductions in the staff without favour or affection. I asked them to retain the services of men appointed by Mr. Mackenzie, the warmest supporters of the Liberal party, wherever they felt that in doing so, they were retaining the services of the best men. I dispensed with the services of hundreds of supporters and friends of the party to which I myself belonged, because I felt that in making the reductions, I must look at the interests of the public service alone, and regardless of political considerations must retain the services of the best men whether they were Liberals or Conservatives. I have in my mind's eye at this moment a gentleman who was retained in one of the most influential positions of the Intercolonial Railway, a man with hundreds of men under his control and influence, and who was one of the strongest supporters of Mr. Mackenzie, and one of the most ardent Liberals in Canada. That was the manner in which I discharged the duties which then devolved upon me.

But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has asked, why is it that a few years afterwards the staff of the Intercolonial Railway was swollen by hundreds, and he obtained the plaudits of those behind him, whom he deluded into the belief that he was making a fair and candid statement worthy of an honest man. What will these gentlemen say, when I tell them, that a more complete delusion never was attempted to be practised in the face of an intelligent assembly, when the hon. gentleman concealed the fact that during this period the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway more than half doubled. When I tell the House that the hon. gentleman concealed that fact, I brush away with one sweep his entire argument about the increased number of employees.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** How many did you add between 1895 and 1896?

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.** I will tell the hon. gentleman how the mileage stands. When I took charge of the Intercolonial Railway, and made that reduction of 400 employees, in endeavouring to balance the account, the distance from Halifax to Rivière du Loup was 560 miles, from New Glasgow to Truro, 41 miles, and from Moncton to St. John, 90 miles; in all 691 miles; and, adding the 32 miles of road from Halifax to Windsor, which was then and is now under the control of the Intercolonial Railway and practically forming a part of it, the whole mileage of the In-

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.**

tercolonial Railway was 723 miles. And, Sir, had the hon. gentleman had the candor, the honesty, to state to the House the mode in which this mileage had been increased? When I tell the House that to-day and for many years there has been added to that mileage the distance from New Glasgow to Sydney, 175 miles, from the Intercolonial to Pugwash, 15 miles, from Pugwash Junction to Pictou, 69 miles, and from Rivière du Loup to Lévis, 120 miles, these figures show that not less than 379 miles were added to what the hon. gentleman called the Intercolonial Railway without giving this increase. I wonder that the hon. gentleman could have the powers of face to look at intelligent men, and attempt to practice such a miserable deception upon them. Does that not account and more than account for all the increased number of employees? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that you can raise a railway from 723 miles to a railway of 1,186½ miles, which it is now, without increasing the number of employees? A more monstrous attempt at deception never has been made by any gentleman on the floor of this House; and if I had spent hours—ay, days—in depicting the character of the hon. gentleman, I could not have done it better than he himself has done it in the miserable attempt he has made to mislead and delude this House? What more? The hon. gentleman complains of my statement that he had dismissed hundreds of employees since he has held the position he now holds. I repeat it, Sir. I say if the Government had dared, which they have not dared, to comply with the order of this House which I moved for—if they had dared to furnish this House with the information I moved for, and pressed them to bring down and lay on the Table, it would have proved my statement that the hon. gentleman had dismissed hundreds of honest, intelligent and industrious employees since he assumed the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, to have been under the mark and not over it; and until the hon. gentleman does lay upon the Table of this House a statement of the number of employees dismissed from the public service in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals, he is not in a position to challenge my statement with any confidence. Now, Sir, I do not require to prolong this discussion. The whole superstructure which the hon. gentleman built up has been swept away simply by letting a little daylight in upon this miserable attempt to mislead the House. But I think the hon. gentleman went a little beyond what might have been expected from a gentleman in his position when he undertook to discuss on the floor of this House the conduct and character of a relative of mine. I had not complained of the dismissal of that gentleman. I never named him or referred to him in this House in any shape or form.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You referred to him yesterday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not name him. I referred to the fact that the hon. gentleman had dismissed an official who for many years had held the office of inspector of public buildings. The father of Mr. Hillson married a half-sister of mine; and when I tell hon. gentlemen that on the 22nd day of last May I had been forty-two years in public life, and that for a considerable portion of that period I had represented the county of Cumberland, my native county; when I remind them of the official positions I have held, which would have enabled me to provide for relatives and friends; when I tell them that you can count on the fingers of one hand all the relatives I have in the public service of Canada to-day, and that, among them all, the gentleman holding the highest and most important position held by any of them in the maritime provinces was Mr. Hillson, who held the office of inspector of public buildings; and when I tell them that that gentleman discharged his duty to the department with such fidelity, that, without any suggestion from any person, the officials who are charged with the duty of representing to the Government who of their employees are entitled to promotion recommended that in consequence of the able, diligent and effective manner in which he had performed his duties for many years, his salary should be advanced from \$1,300 to \$1,500 a year; hon. members will, I think, agree with me that the hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself for attempting to bring such a question as that before this House. The hon. gentleman was hard driven; he was occupying a very indefensible position when he felt compelled to so violate every gentlemanly instinct as to make the references to that gentleman which he did. I say that there was not in the public service a man who had more faithfully, more zealously, or more in the interest of the public service, discharged his duty; and I drew the attention of the hon. gentleman yesterday to the fact that the services which he was performing for \$1,300 a year, and ably performing, are now costing under the administration of the hon. gentleman over \$2,000 a year, in addition to a large increase of travelling expenses. Now, Sir, I have said enough to expose the attempt which the hon. gentleman, with every desire to wound but without the power to strike, has exhibited here on the floor of this House to-night. Has the hon. gentleman been able to touch my position? Has he ventured to point to one single act in my whole public career that would reflect any discredit upon myself? With respect to the management of the Intercolonial Railway, I could point with pride to the position I occupy. Well, if there was anything that would war-

rant a gentleman in claiming the confidence not only of his friends behind him, but of every intelligent man in this country, it is the record made by myself during the period when I was Minister of Railways and Canals. I found that railway taking from the revenue over half a million dollars per annum, and I rescued it from that position. In the first year I reduced the deficit to below \$100,000, and before I resigned office, I completely wiped it out. When the hon. gentleman can show such a record, when he can show that while charged with the painful and unpleasant duty of interfering with the positions held by the employees of the Intercolonial and effecting, in the public interest large reductions in the staff, he acted in the independent and fair and impartial spirit in which I am prepared to prove that I acted, he will then have some title to claim consideration for the services he has rendered his country. Instead of striking down opponents regardless of their worth and ability, I retained in the service my strongest political opponents and dispensed with the services of many of my friends, when I found that the public interest demanded it. And when the time came when I was able, in the changed condition of things, to increase the salaries of the employees and replace from time to time those with whom I had been compelled to dispense, I again set an example to the hon. gentleman, which he is not at all disposed to follow. But the hon. gentleman's whole misconduct in this matter is summed up in the single word that he used in characterising these dismissals. "Petty dismissals," he called them. Petty dismissals—what does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he mean that to deprive an honest man, who is discharging his duty to his country from Monday morning to Saturday night, and against whom he can bring no charge—does he mean to say that to deprive such a man of his bread and turn him out of his house and home, to deprive his family of their means of support, is a petty matter? Is there a man with a spark of manly feeling in his breast who would so describe it? Does he consider a starving wife and hungry children as petty objects, fit objects for his contempt on the floor of this House? That is the spirit in which the hon. gentleman has entered upon the discharge of his duties. He is drunk with power, he is drunk with the idea of finding himself a mighty autocrat who holds the fate of these poor men and poor women and children in his hands. He is drunk with power and regardful only of one thing—not what justice and fairness and regard for the interests of his country demand at his hands, but how he can best gratify the demands of his supporters in this House and out of it, even at the ruin of honest, hard-working men and their families. Sir, I would be more or less than a man if I could witness this utter violation

of every principle that should govern a man with a heart or feeling without raising my protest against it. I would be more or less than a man if I did not, on the floor of this House, as I will in the presence of my assembled countrymen in every section of the country, hold up to execration the man who, having obtained a position of power and influence, abuses that position by crushing the helpless, and then adds insult to injury by turning round to his friends and seeking their plaudits by saying that he did not cut off half enough heads. "Petty dismissals" is the idea running through the hon. gentleman's mind. If it be the case of a man of influence and position and means, no gentleman is more ready to do everything to buy and obtain his support by any means than the hon. gentleman himself, but if it be a question of some one in a humble position, some one who is helpless in his grasp, why the autocrat of all the Russians could not trample on the serfs of his dominions with more ruthlessness than the hon. gentleman has exhibited. I need not detain the House further. The hon. gentleman himself has given us an insight into his public character and into the means he is prepared to adopt. He seeks to cover up his own misdeeds and mislead the House by trying to show that a state of things existed under my administration which I have proved did not exist. His statements, I have shown, were utterly without the slightest foundation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Explain about the shingles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the first time I have heard of the subject and therefore know nothing about it.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to make a remark or two concerning the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways respecting the number of dismissals in New Brunswick. I am sure that the people of the constituency of Westmoreland, which I have the honour to represent, will be very much surprised to find that by some process of calculation peculiar to the hon. Minister of Railways, the number of dismissals in that county has been reduced to five. Why, I could show the hon. gentleman letters by the dozen—and I have one particularly in my mind—which show that there were sixty men dismissed in a block. The hon. gentleman knows it well. Whether the dismissals were justifiable or not is another matter which I shall not attempt to argue, but the fact remains that these dismissals were made. I know the fertility of resource of the hon. gentleman, I know what a happy faculty he possesses of reducing by his brilliant imagination exaggeration to a fine art; but I know further that so far from these dismissals being the dismissals of men who were employed but a short time before the election, the contrary is the case. I

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

have in my mind the instance of one old servant, who had been on the Intercolonial from ten to fifteen years—a Conservative it is true, an Acadian Frenchman—and who had been four or five months on his sick bed, and who, the day after he was able to go to Moncton, received notice of dismissal, and his family have since been obliged, I understand, to look to the parish for help. The hon. gentleman has the records before him, and I state boldly that there were not sixty people put on the pay-roll of the Intercolonial immediately previous to the election. I refer to permanent employees.

The hon. gentleman gave another evidence of unfairness which escaped the attention of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman took the number of employees on the road in February and compared that with the number in the month of June. But does he not know well that every year special men are employed for the purpose of ballasting the road? Does he not know that generally from one to two thousand extra hands are taken on in the summer for the purpose of ballasting the road, and that therefore there can be no possible comparison between the number of employees on the road previous to this addition and the number on it in the month of June in 1896, when the ballasting was done. I know whereof I speak when I say that the largest shops of the Intercolonial Railway, the constructive and repair shops, and the largest number of employees in any constituency in Canada on that road, are to be found in the constituency I have the honour to represent. And I make this statement boldly, that if the hon. Minister meant to convey the impression that the permanent employees on the Intercolonial Railway had been increased in one year by some 1,300 by the late Government, he sought to convey an impression which is utterly unfounded. Far from that being the case, I have it from the mouth of the chief commissioner, who told me, when time and time again I applied to have people put on that road—and he told me that also a year previous to the election—that so far from increasing the staff, the late Government were decreasing it, and that their policy was to continue decreasing the number of ordinary employees on the road. But when the hon. gentleman asserts that this road is used for political purposes, he sets forth as facts things which are not known to me. But I will say that while things may have taken place during the election, I am not prepared to take the word of the Minister of Railways when he states that these things appeared from sworn testimony. I have never seen the sworn testimony he speaks of, I have never heard of it, and I venture the assertion that no gentleman on this side of the House has ever heard of it. There may have been such an examination as he speaks of; I am not in a position to deny it. But I will say that,

so far from that railroad, in my constituency, being run on political principles, the very opposite was the case. During my short term in office as the representative of the people here and previous to my election, when I had something to do with the administration of patronage when my friend Senator Wood represented the county, at no time was any man put in the works unless there was a demand made for him by the head of some mechanical department. The hon. gentleman has gone further. He says that the railroad has been run entirely to promote the interests of the Conservative party. And some hon. gentleman—I think it was the chief whip of the Government side (Mr. Sutherland)—in the course of the debate challenged any gentleman on this side to name a single individual from the Liberal ranks who was appointed to office under a Conservative Government. I will give him the names of some not in the shops, but in the general office, of men on the permanent staff of officials of the Intercolonial Railway. Messrs. Walker, Sutton and Cruise were so employed. We employed a man, not on the railway, but in the post office—Mr. Atkinson—who voted against me and whose vote has always been given in the interests of the Liberal party. Not only that, but when the raises of pay were recommended, and when some were made by the late Administration before they went out of power, so far as the county of Westmoreland is concerned, there was not the slightest interference on the part of myself or the members of the Conservative party with these increases. They were allowed to be made and made alone on good, wholesome principles of public policy, without any political interference whatever. Some of the gentlemen I have mentioned were on the list for the raise of pay, and Mr. Walker, a respectable young man and an intense Grit, who has been but a few years in the employ, has been given an increase amounting to \$200 or \$300.

Now, the hon. gentleman has waxed warm over this matter. The delicate sensibility which is characteristic of the hon. gentleman has been touched, and he has indulged in great weeping and wailing over the wrong wrought by the Conservative party contrary to the high-toned principles of statesmanship so dear to himself. I shall not enter upon a discussion of his course in those spheres of political life which he has occupied in our province. But I must say that when the hon. gentleman acceded to power in New Brunswick in 1883, he found a province that, in respect of public morality, in respect of high ideals of statesmanship, had no superior in this Dominion; and during his short regime from 1883 to 1886 he brought more vileness into the politics of the province, he debased public sentiment more than all the other men combined who had been in power in that province. This

is not the occasion to enter into these questions, or to take up the time of the House to expose the misdemeanours which has called down upon his head the denunciations of the leading men of his party; even of gentlemen who are now supporting him in this House. They have charged him, charged him publicly, through the columns of the newspapers, though not upon the floor of this House, with these misdemeanours. And this is the gentleman who is displaying to-night this delicate sense of public propriety. Who has not heard of the Northumberland deal? Who has not heard of the thousand and one offences against public morality chargeable to the hon. gentleman which I shall not attempt to discuss to-night? I am sorry that this discussion has taken so wide a range. We all feel like getting home next week, if possible, and I would wish the discussion to be brought to a close as soon as possible so that we may get on with the pressing public business before us.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I shall make but one or two observations and shall not attempt to answer generally either of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the committee, for that, I think, would be unnecessary at this time of the night. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition evidently is touched in a tender spot. I think that the temper, the excited feeling which the hon. gentleman exhibited bears abundant testimony to the completeness of the answer which he received from me to the attacks to which he has not scrupled to make upon me from time to time with reference to my conduct in regard to these dismissals. I leave the hon. gentleman just where I left him at the close of my remarks a little while ago. Let him take what comfort he feels he is able to take out of his reference to my reply, references which, as he made them, were a complete perversion of the statement which I made to the committee and by means of which he very skilfully and cleverly evaded the point which I presented to the committee on the subject of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. I pointed out that between February, 1880, and February, 1881, there was no reduction, but a very slight increase in the number of persons employed—at all events, there was no substantial reduction. The hon. gentleman seems to think that he can answer the conclusion which has been drawn from that fact by referring to extensions made on the Intercolonial anterior to 1880 and to extensions made long subsequent to 1881. I called the attention of the committee to the fact that in June, 1885, there were on the pay-rolls of the Intercolonial Railway 3,941 men, and that in the corresponding month of 1896 that number had increased to 5,296. Does the hon. gentleman think that he is making an argument against that which I presented when he states that anterior to June, 1885,

there was an extension of the Intercolonial Railway of three or four hundred miles? I do not know how an extension of the road which took place long years previously could have the slightest bearing on the number of men employed in June, 1895, and in June, 1896, for which period the comparison was made. Were extensions of the Intercolonial made between February, 1880, and February, 1881, or between June, 1895, and June, 1896? Everybody knows that there was none. The hon. gentleman catches at what he thinks will be a clever evasion of the real point I was making with a view to misleading the judgment of the committee and fastening upon me some perversion of the facts. The statement that the hon. gentleman characterizes as inaccurate is a statement I received from the general manager of Government railways at Moncton. I wired him to send it to me, and he sent it. I have had no other information from him on the subject. I assume that the information he gave me is accurate. I know no reason why he should mislead me. If there is a misstatement it belongs to him and not to me. I venture to give the statement to the committee as he has given it to me, abating nothing and adding nothing. I leave it before the committee as a correct statement of the facts. I do not answer the allusion by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) to matters of provincial politics. On many occasions have I heard this speech of the hon. gentleman in the local legislature, but more extended and prolonged. It has become an old story all over the province. But so little effect has it had that the party that he belonged to failed to make any impression, failed to maintain its numbers, became reduced and dwindled away, until the hon. gentleman himself thought it well to leave provincial politics and find a more fitting and larger sphere in the politics of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he would kindly read the question in which he asked information from the general manager, and the answer to that. I have not been able distinctly to find out what was compassed by the general manager.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated to the committee what my question was. There were two or three different questions, but the question as to the number of persons who were on the pay-roll was in these terms: I asked him to send me the numbers of the employees on the pay-rolls at the several dates which I have read to the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the dates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not read the committee all the dates, but I could read them all if they were desired.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend need not read all of them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give the dates which I referred to awhile ago. I asked for the pay-roll, for a statement of the number of employees who were on the pay-roll of the Intercolonial Railway in February, 1880, and in February, 1881, in order that I might have the corresponding date with that which the hon. gentleman referred to in his statement, in that month of February, 1880. I asked the general manager also to furnish me with a statement of the number of men on the pay-roll in June, 1895, and the pay-roll in June, 1896, and the last full month of 1897. The information which I have given to the committee is the information which that gentleman furnished me. I also asked him if he would forward me a full statement of the number of persons who had been dismissed from the Intercolonial Railway service by my direction, or at the instance of any member of Parliament, or of any candidate—I think I included that—on political grounds; and the information which I have given to the committee is precisely the information that was furnished me, and having given this truthfully before, I could not give it any differently now. That is the information that I asked for, and that is the statement that he furnished me. I have already stated that the general manager himself stated to me that the season of the year had arrived when, having regard to the necessities of the railway, it was customary to make a reduction in the staff, and he asked me if it would be agreeable to my wishes that such a reduction should be made.

Mr. FOSTER. At what time was that reduction made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot exactly say, but I can procure that information; the general manager will no doubt be able to furnish me with it. I think that Mr. Pottinger was here at the time. I am not sure but that the conversation took place in the presence of the Deputy Minister, but on that point I would not like to state positively. I stated to Mr. Pottinger that I wanted him, in dispensing with the services of men, to have regard to a proper principle, and I said that I thought—I tell the committee frankly what I did say—that I thought, in dispensing with the services of the men, he should apply this rule to those who were last taken into the service of the Intercolonial Railway prior to the change of Government, as far as he could possibly do so. I may unhesitatingly say that those were my instructions. If he has varied or departed from them in any particular, I believe it has been only to the extent to which he himself felt it necessary to do so in the public interest. Those were my directions, and they are directions which

I thought I was justified in giving, and which I can defend under all circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what month it was in 1897 for which he got the information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The month of April. I got a statement in May.

Mr. FOSTER. How many in the month of April?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The number was 4,083.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the numbers in June, 1895, and June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In June, 1895, 3,941; in June, 1896, 5,296. I can supplement the information which I gave the committee, since the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has endeavoured to make a point which it is not open to him to make in accordance with the facts. I may state that while, in the month of June, 1895, it was found necessary to have upon the pay-roll 344 men who would not be required probably as permanent men, or as men who would be employed all the year round, in the month of June, 1896, the number had swollen to the unaccountable figure of 1,569. Now, my hon. friend can compare the two figures and see how far this usual rule, this imperative need which arises in that season of the year, in the month of June, had led to the increase.

Mr. POWELL. If my hon. friend will consult his chief engineer or Deputy Minister, he will find that the balance of 1895 was appointed in July, and the balance of 1896 was appointed in June, and that would explain the rise. It had to be done in either June or July, and this time it was done in June. That is the explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. It only needs a very little analysis and close questioning to find out that the airy statements of the Minister of Railways will not bear criticism. The hon. gentleman is frankness itself so far as words go, but so far as his statements go, he is devious, intricate, indistinct and misleading; and the statements that he has made in the last five minutes in answer to half a dozen questions have proved that, beyond a doubt. And the quick little man by the side of him, the Minister of Finance, when he saw that the hon. gentleman had hopelessly put his foot in it by neglecting to tell what he knew, or if not, he is not fit for his position, that whereas, in making a comparison between the month of the year when the ballasting was done with a similar month in the year in which the ballasting was not done—in which case his argument went for nothing, and worse than nothing—the quick gentleman beside him, in order to help him out, thought he was do-

ing him a service by asking the question as to why it was done in June and not in July. The two hon. gentlemen who sit together ought always to sit together. They understand it, they have gone through the mill, but it did make one laugh inwardly who had lived in the province of New Brunswick and who knew something of my hon. friend who to-day is Minister of Railways and Canals in this House, and who lectures the Liberal-Conservative party for devious election tricks and knowing "how to do it." The hon. gentleman may well laugh. There are gentlemen sitting in this House who know his tricks just as well as I do. The hon. gentleman knows them himself, and he knows that when the Queen's county election case comes on, as it soon will, some of these peculiar cases will no doubt be open to the public gaze. But my hon. friend assumed great political virtue when he turned to this side of the House and accused us of being immersed in the mire of political corruption. The hon. gentleman needs more than a small nozzle hose to purify himself from the mire of corruption, of which he proved himself past grand master in the election of Queen's and Sunbury. If there was any idea that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) grasped clearly when the Minister of Railways and Canals was making that triumphant declaration that only seven persons had been dismissed in New Brunswick, it was this, that all the dismissals which took place amounted to 7, while we wicked Tories declared there were from 60 to 90. When asked the reason, his answer became whittled down to a different thing. What he asked his chief was, not how many had been dismissed but how many were dismissed on political grounds? Does not the hon. member for Grey see what a great difference there is between these two things. The hon. gentleman grasped the one and applauded it; he grasps the other but does not applaud it. The hon. Minister has done to-night what he may think to be a very clever turn in political debating, but it is a turn which stamps him as an unfair man in debate—I was going to add another adjective to "unfair," which would be the opposite of brave. If there is anything an hon. gentleman holding the position of a Minister should do, it is certainly to give the House an opportunity of sifting facts which have been presented to the House and ascertaining if they are true. The hon. gentleman has been appointing political commissions for the last six months. He has had his provincial henchmen acting as judges and travelling from one end of the province of New Brunswick to the other, sitting on men as much their superiors in all that makes for respectability, character and standing as it is possible to imagine. I asked him in the early part of this session for a return of those commissions and the evidence and of the findings of those

commissions. The hon. gentleman has quoted to-night information he has got from those commissions. To this day neither he nor any member of the Government has implemented the promise the leader of the Government made over and over again in this House, that I should have that return before the discussion on the Estimates took place. The hon. gentleman, keeping this information up his sleeve, refusing it to the House, refusing it to myself, to whom the House ordered him to give it, refusing it to myself to whom his leader publicly pledged himself in this House that it should be furnished before the Estimates were discussed—the hon. gentleman is brave enough and ingenuous enough to use that information in bits and in shreds, refusing the document to his opponents so that it could be criticised fully and with the force that would come from a criticism made when in possession of all the facts. When two, three or four questions were put to the hon. gentleman, analysing some of the information furnished, he had to make a statement to the House that bore on its face a diametrically different meaning and a different aspect. Are all his arguments of the same tenor? From one, learn all. From the four which I punctured by four short questions, until they had to stand in a very different light, we may learn that possibly, if all the facts of the case were available, we would be able to show that the hon. gentleman's statements were as unreliable in the other case as they have been in this. But does the Government think it honourable, does this Liberal Administration think it honourable to refuse to the House information which was ordered, which was said by the leader would be brought down before this time, and then for one of its members to use shreds and bits of it to support his argument? Is it honourable and brave political warfare? I leave it to the press and I leave it to the people of the country to say. So far as I am concerned, I want to say that I wish to obtain that return. I want to have an opportunity of analysing it to the full before this House prorogues, and it is my intention, if that document is not forthcoming, so far as my endurance enables me and any friends of mine who choose to join with me, to draw it from them by the only constitutional means available to members who are deprived of their just rights. I would not have said anything if the hon. gentleman had not used information which so far he has refused to furnish to the House. Will he lay on the Table now the instructions given to his chief superintendent, and which he quoted here to-night?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table the information he telegraphed for, and the precise way in which the answer came back?

**Mr. FOSTER.**

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How generous this is on the part of the hon. gentleman, after he has already used the information! I asked the hon. gentleman, because I thought the hon. gentleman would repeat his answer of last night, viz.: that I had not asked for or moved for that order, and he did not think it worth while giving it. What the hon. gentleman did last night, was to come down and make a statement on an important question when he had not laid a scrap of information in respect to it before the House. What the hon. gentleman has done to night is to follow on the same line; and that hon. gentleman lectures us on parliamentary methods, lectures us on parliamentary and political purity. That hon. gentleman refers to his record in New Brunswick. Yes, his record is known; and that record will not assist me a single whit in believing one single statement that hon. gentleman makes, unless I have the proof of it. The different gloss he had to put on these statements after I had asked a few questions, from the meaning he conveyed when he was sailing on in the plentitude of his hysterical oration, is proof of what I have stated. The hon. gentleman should give the House this information, and then we can sift it and find out how far the assertion is in accordance with the facts. To lead this House to believe that on the whole of the Intercolonial only seven men had been dismissed by the hon. gentleman in New Brunswick is to undervalue altogether the intelligence and memory of his own supporters from the province of New Brunswick, and it is to make a draft on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House which we do not propose to honour. The hon. gentleman will have to learn one thing—he will have to learn to treat this House as a deliberative body ought to be treated. Was anything more humiliating than the absolute tangle in which the hon. gentleman involved himself this afternoon as to his position about dismissals of officials? Was anything more unparliamentary and unmanly than his heated threat to-night, that if we dared open our mouths about dismissals, more men would be dismissed than have been already? Does the hon. gentleman think a threat of that kind is going to shut the mouths of one honest man on this side of the House? If he does he is mightily mistaken, but it is an evidence which I would not care to give; it is an evidence which my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) may be disposed to give; it is an evidence which would do neither himself nor myself credit if we did give it: to threaten, that if too much is said about petty dismissals, more of the dismissals will take place. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) may call them petty or not; it all depends upon the point of view. From the point of view of common humanity, from the point of view of the

bread winner's anxiety to provide for his family, these are not in any sense petty, and I think my hon. friend's characterization of them might well have been spared, to the credit of our common humanity, and to the credit of my hon. friend's reputation as well.

Mr. McCLURE. The request of the last speaker for information from the Government in regard to these investigations, impresses itself strangely upon my mind. While I had no access to these investigations and had no communication with the Government upon the question—the hon. Minister' when he referred to the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway had been used as a political machine in the elections of 1896, did not state a single fact which is not well known in the county in which I live. If hon. gentlemen opposite are ignorant of the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway was used in the elections of 1896, then I charge them with being recreant to their duty as Cabinet Ministers, for there was not a man in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway in the county of Colchester, who did not know that the statements of the Minister (Mr. Blair), with regard to the coercion of employees by the Tory Government, were absolutely true. I would be willing to let the record of the Conservative party in connection with the Intercolonial Railway be buried in the past, if gentlemen opposite did not have the audacity and effrontery to stand up here, after their record of eighteen years, and charge this Government with doing the very thing which they themselves have been perpetrating in this country during their long term of power. These gentlemen opposite need not think they are talking to persons who know nothing about this. I live in the town of Truro, one of the principal railway centres in the province of Nova Scotia, where there are nearly 400 employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that every man of the 400 will admit, that during these eighteen years he held employment under the condition, that he should vote Tory or get out. Sir, have I not seen these men ordered on certain occasions to attend Conservative committee meetings in the town of Truro, and if they failed to attend they were marked men, and soon lost their places. The leader of the Opposition told the House to-night, that he allowed many strong political opponents to remain in office when he went out of power in 1873. Where are these men on the Intercolonial Railway? I know these employees as well as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does, and I tell him, that there have been no strong political opponents of his among these employees who dare to open their mouths. There have been a few men who during these eighteen years have dared to be Grits in a weak and trembling way, and who with fear and trembling may have

gone to the polls and cast their votes, and Sir, if they did not lose their jobs, their pay was cut down to a pretty small figure. I know men who to-day are working on the Intercolonial Railway for \$30 a month, and who are doing the very same work that other men are getting \$60 for. And why? It is because the \$30 man was suspected of being a Liberal, and the \$60 man was known to be a Conservative. If they did not dismiss the Liberal employee, they kept him back, and he could get no promotion. I was not surprised that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) should close his speech with a pathetic appeal that this debate should stop. I do not wonder that his friends should desire that the debate should stop, because they are not in a position to have their record investigated. The statement of the Minister about the distribution of passes on the line is absolutely true, to my own personal knowledge. I have seen the books, I have seen the passes distributed, and I have had them in my possession. Friends of mine obtained them, not from officials of the Intercolonial Railway, but from chairmen of Conservative committees, who circulated them throughout the county of Colchester. In June, 1896, they brought Tory voters into the county of Colchester on these passes. Not only that, but they brought a special train from the county of Pictou, and they stopped it, not at a railway station, but out on the line near a polling booth, and they landed thirty men on free passes to cast their votes against me at that election. If ever there was a political party that had a strong temptation to exercise the power of dismissal, it was the Liberal party in the county of Colchester, and yet, not one of the 400 employees in the town of Truro was dismissed? Why is that? Sir, it is because, as far as I have any voice in the matter, I felt that it was not the employees of the Intercolonial Railway who were to blame, but it was the hon. gentlemen opposite who when in power made these employees slaves, and compelled them to do that which they did not want to do. There was an election run in the county of Colchester since the general elections of June, 1896, and I defy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and I defy any of his political friends—since they are so ready to hurl defiances across the floor, to show that this Government, or any agent of this Government, ever exercised the slightest influence, to compel, or to induce, or even to persuade any employee on the Intercolonial Railway to cast his vote in any other way than as he wished. There was even a free pass circulated in that county during the by-election when the Liberal Government was in power. Not even an employee of the line could get a pass during that election. Outsiders got free passes, and employees got free passes, and everybody got free passes in June, 1896, but when we fought the election in

April, 1897, not a man, not even an employee was carried over the Intercolonial Railway on a free pass. And, what was the result in that election? In the town of Truro a large number of the railway employees, as they had a perfect right to do, abstained from voting altogether, and some few of them voted for me and some against me. I assume from the results, although I do not know otherwise, that some voted for me and some against me, but the great majority stayed away as they had a perfect right to do so. Those who wished to vote against me were not sent away, as those who might vote against the Conservative Government were, to my personal knowledge, sent away in 1896. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is very anxious that we should give him information. I am not a member of the Government. I am not a member of this commission, and I had nothing to do with this investigation, but I could give him the names of gentlemen of his own party who could give him all the information the Minister gave him to-night. I am not going to believe that the hon. leader of the Opposition, with all the vast sagacity and experience he has, could be at the head of a Government in this country, and permit all this kind of thing to go on under his supervision, and know nothing about it. He taxes me too much when he asks me to believe anything like that. I heard some gentlemen say here this afternoon that up in the province of Ontario the employees of the Government were not partisans. I was glad to hear it. I was glad to hear that there was a province where they were not partisans. But down in Nova Scotia, where the Conservative party has been nurtured upon the doctrines of the hon. leader of the Opposition, a man in the employ of the Government would not be there very long unless he was a partisan. They were not content that these men should vote for them, but they must shout for them, they must attend committee meetings, they must show that they were on the right side, or they were marked men. I wish to tell hon. gentlemen that so far as I am concerned there is no spirit of revenge in my breast. I do not want any revenge on these men. I have not asked for dismissals on the Intercolonial, and I do not intend to ask for any; but I want the House to know, what the hon. gentleman knows very well, that the Intercolonial Railway was a political machine, and was used by the Conservative party for political purposes. The hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Railways was drunk with power. So, we may say that some hon. gentlemen opposite, judging from their language, are drunk with the loss of power. Because this political machine has been wrenched from their hands, they get up here and shout in the hope that they will frighten us and the Government, and frighten the country by their much speaking. I think the hon. gentlemen might

Mr. McCLURE.

just as well leave this question alone. I do not think they will make anything by the investigation. I simply wish to make this statement, that the political methods of hon. gentlemen opposite are well known, and that they have used the Intercolonial Railway as a political machine in the past. I make this further statement, that so far as the information we have goes—and I think I know something about the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway—it has not been a political machine under the present Government, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to bring their evidence to show one single case, so far as the county of Colchester is concerned, in which a single person has been dismissed, disturbed, approached, or made uncomfortable; and the county of Colchester is an important county, having a large number of employees, and I do not think the Minister of Railways or the Government had any special reason for treating it differently from any other county. In fact, there was a tremendous temptation for treating it the other way, because we had a by-election, and we were anxious to carry the county. But under the present Government the employees have been treated fairly, and will be treated fairly so long as they continue to discharge their duties and leave politics alone.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is evident, from the course pursued this afternoon and since dinner time by the Minister of Railways and those supporting him, that they are not very anxious to get on with business. I know nothing about the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and I am not going to say anything about it; but I presume, from the speech made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that some hon. members from the province of New Brunswick or the province of Nova Scotia will be disposed to say something more. But I wish to ask the Minister of Railways a question. He gave some figures a few moments ago of the number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway. I understood him to say that in 1878, when the Mackenzie Administration left power, there were 3,300 employees. As I understand that the mileage of the railway at that time was about 700 miles, that would be about five men to the mile. The next figure he gave was 2,900, to which the number had been reduced for the same mileage by the hon. leader of the Opposition when he became Minister of Railways in the new Administration. Next, the hon. Minister gave the number of employees in June, 1895, as 3,241. At that time the mileage had increased to about 1,000 miles, so that that is less than four men to the mile. In June, 1896, the number was 5,296, during the time they were ballasting; but even then that was only five men to the mile, no more than the number required to run the railway without the ballasting under the Mackenzie Administration. The last figure

the hon. gentleman gave was 4,083 as employed in the month of April, 1897. The mileage has not increased from June, 1895, to the month of April last; yet the regular staff has been increased from 3,941 to 4,083, or an increase under the present Administration of 142 men.

• The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I did not speak of the regular staff. I spoke of the number on the pay-rolls.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I presume that that was the number of the regular staff, because you would not be ballasting in April. It is evident that they were ballasting in June, 1895, and in June, 1896, while in April, 1897, they were not ballasting. It is a comparison of the number of men per mile that I want to make. Under the Mackenzie Administration, it took five men to the mile, whereas under the Conservative Administration it took only four, except when they were ballasting, according to the figures the hon. gentleman gave. If the figures are not correct, I would like him to correct them.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that shingles meant passes, and that in one telegram a man had called for 75,000 shingles. Does my hon. friend mean the House to understand that each shingle meant a pass, and that he called for 78,000 passes? It is very important to know for that is rather a monstrous thing.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think 1,000 shingles meant one pass.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before this vote passes, I wish to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Militia to a dismissal, and I will do it in a very few words. At the English military tournament, the Toronto Highlanders has just beaten all comers in the bayonet contest. Last June the Royal Military College cadets beat the Toronto Highlanders in the military tournament bayonet contest. The cadets were trained by Sergeant-Major Morgan, late of the Scotch Guards, and I would like to know if it was for that service Sergeant-Major Morgan was dismissed from the staff of the Military College?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That is a question I certainly cannot answer. If Sergeant-Major Morgan has been dismissed, it was on the report of Colonel Kitson, the present commandant, who, I know, would make no report advising the dismissal of any man without good cause.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). Before this resolution is adopted, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whether any of these commissions are now outstanding in the pro-

vince of New Brunswick, with respect to the dismissal of officials from the Intercolonial Railway? I was very much surprised, indeed, to hear the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that only four men in the county of Halifax had been dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway. I am bound, of course, to accept his statement, but it is a matter of great surprise to me, because I would venture to say four times that number have been dismissed.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have given the hon. gentleman my source of information; I have not any personal knowledge.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). There must be some misapprehension because I am sure that four times as many men have come to me and told me they were dismissed. Perhaps the reason for the misapprehension is this, that while they have not been dismissed at the instance of a member or a defeated candidate, they may have been dismissed at the instance of some one else. I do not know how that may be, but certainly the statement of the hon. Minister is very surprising. I would like to know whether any commissions for the purpose of investigating the conduct of officials are now outstanding in the province of Nova Scotia, particularly with reference to the hon. gentleman's department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. gentleman means whether there has been any commissioner appointed and is open to hold any further investigations if instructed to do so, I know of no investigations that are now pending. There have been some. Mr. John T. Ross has been commissioned to hold some inquiry, but there is none now pending which I can call to mind.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I would like to state, with regard to that, that I consider Mr. John T. Ross a very capable and worthy gentleman to fill that position, and I would be the last person in this House or elsewhere to question both his great capacity and his perfect integrity and fairness, and I believe he has acted throughout in a way that commends itself to all those who have had any opportunity of forming a judgment. But I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister one circumstance that seems to be slightly inconsistent in the matter. As I understand it, the principle upon which the Government has proceeded is this, that Government employees are not free to express their opinion except by the simple act of voting, and that any participation in an election contest, either by canvassing or by representing a candidate at the polls or otherwise, is held sufficient to justify the dismissal of such a person, although he may have efficiently performed the duties

of his office and have in no way transgressed the discipline of his department. That principle is one which I never could quite acquiesce in, because it seemed to me that offensive partisanship to justify dismissal, must mean a partisanship which either interferes with the discipline of the office or with the efficient performance of its duties. But what I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister is this: that if men are to be dismissed for participation of that character in elections, it is only right that the men sent to judge them should refrain from similar partisanship, and I desire to point out, without any reflection upon Mr. Ross, for whom I have the highest regard, that that gentleman was an active member of the Liberal committee during the last local election in the county of Halifax and had charge of a district on behalf of the Liberal party. If participation in public affairs is to be construed as political partisanship, then the men sent to judge these officials should not be guilty of the same act, while acting as judges. They should not, while in the position of judges, commit the same offence which they were appointed to try. It might be well that the instructions given these gentlemen in Nova Scotia and elsewhere should contain some intimation of that kind. I do not think that the participation of Mr. Ross in political affairs would, in the slightest degree, swerve his judgment. I have every confidence in his judgment, although he is a strong Liberal, and no better man could have been sent there, but I think that the fact that he himself has indulged in participation in political affairs while holding this position as judge of such conduct on the part of Government employees is a striking commentary on the course of the Government, and is pretty good evidence that the whole proceeding is a farce from beginning to end. To say that postmasters getting \$50 and \$100 a year are to be dismissed from office for the sole reason that they have canvassed a man or represented a candidate at the polls seems to be carrying the doctrine altogether too far.

It has been charged over and over again in this House that men were dismissed from positions which they held during the regime of the Liberal-Conservative party because they took an active part in political affairs. Now, I thought it worth my while to make some investigation in the province of Nova Scotia, and I have documents under my hand with which I shall not trouble the committee, but which I am ready to produce if any gentleman sees fit to question the accuracy of my statement. I can produce the names in at least eight or ten counties in the province Nova Scotia of office-holders, postmasters and custom-house officers, who openly and repeatedly, year after year, took an active part in opposition to the Conservative party during the last eighteen years

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

and against whom complaints were made on that score, and who were not dismissed from office. I know that in the county of Antigonish, to which I will refer only as an instance, some half dozen officer-holders, Liberals, actively participated in political affairs in opposition to the late Sir John Thompson, that complaints were made to him in regard to the matter and that his answer was—what I think should be the answer of any Government under similar circumstances—If you can show that these men have not efficiently performed the duties of their offices, I will dismiss them; if not, I will not dismiss them. That is only one instance out of many throughout the province of Nova Scotia. I can give similar instances in counties now represented by Ministers of the Crown in this House, and I venture to say that when hon. members have made statements such as I have heard over and over again, it is because these gentlemen have not seen fit to investigate the facts. I do not say that some officials may not have been dismissed for this reason, but I say that I have made a pretty careful investigation in some of the counties in Nova Scotia and up to this time I have not found any official such as a country postmaster or custom-house officer who has been interfered with by the Conservative Government even though he may have participated in elections in the most open manner while holding office.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is very late in the evening to continue this discussion, but I can hardly allow the committee to pass the item without making a reference to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). If he had made an investigation in the county of Halifax such as he has made in other counties east of Halifax and west of Halifax, he would have satisfied his mind that there had been dismissals in that county for political reasons by the Conservative party. I have investigated that matter because I felt bound to know what the precedents were under our provincial and Dominion practice as well as the constitutional rule laid down by the constitutional authorities who have written on the question. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) does not care for the constitutional authorities on this question; he demonstrated that in his speech last session. But the fact that the hon. gentleman does not care for the constitutional authorities on this question does not in the slightest degree invalidate their doctrines. If the hon. gentleman had taken the pains to consult the books on this interesting question, he would have seen it laid down as a constitutional principle—

That active interference—

Not an offensive interference, though the words mean the same to my mind—not that it must be something violent, furious, ex-

ceptional or out of the way, but "active" interference—

—in politics on the part of a non-political office-holder would be a case of misconduct sufficient to justify his dismissal.

I do not want plainer words, I do not want to have a principle more clearly laid down. So clear is this that it is not necessary for me to go to the original authorities upon which this statement of the rule is founded :

It is a well-understood rule of constitutional government, that all such functionaries should abstain from taking an active part in political contests, and should observe a strict neutrality therein.

I will not trouble this committee with any further quotations from constitutional writers, but I may say that the principle has been thoroughly well established, and that it has been well established in this country, certainly since 1849, when Earl Grey sent his despatch which will be found in the journals of the House of Assembly, with which my hon. friend must be acquainted. The hon. gentleman tells us that he does not know of a case of a postmaster being dismissed for political reasons. I will read a document which he must have seen in print showing that there are cases of postmasters having been dismissed for political reasons. It is brief, or I would not trouble the committee with it. This is the statement of a man whose word will be accepted by any one who knows him. It is the statement of Mr. Gilbert W. Walker, hotel-keeper :

I, Gilbert W. Walker, of Halifax, in the county of Halifax, hotel keeper, do solemnly declare that I was postmaster at Milford for four years and upwards, and in 1887 I was removed from my office as postmaster without any cause being assigned, and without any inquiry or investigation, and without any charge made against me, and an active Tory was appointed my successor. The reason for my removal, as I verily believe, was that I was an active Liberal. I had always discharged the duties satisfactorily, and no complaints had ever been made against me, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and of the same force and effect as an oath under the Canada Evidence Act.

GILBERT W. WALKER.

Solemnly declared before me this 5th day of December, A.D. 1896, &c.

Now that is a statement which I think nobody will question, which nobody can question. But when you look below the facts of the case and into the philosophy of the thing, it must be seen that a postmaster, above all others in the public service, should be above suspicion of being an active political partisan. The postmaster has a great deal of opportunity to do political mischief. I am not a political campaigner to any great extent, but when I was engaged in a political campaign about a twelve month ago, I remember seeing copies of eloquent speeches which were delivered in this House and sent through the post office

with the compliments of the talented gentlemen who delivered them. And we know that our friends have suffered through the action of the post office in such matters. Is it not possible that when a political postmaster finds campaign literature coming in that expresses ideas contrary to his own political faith and feeling, he will take good care that it does not reach the persons to whom it is addressed but that it shall go to his wood-house or scullery or some annex that he may have to his premises, and shall not be perused by the persons and in the way in which it was intended, but by entirely different persons in an entirely different way? I remember a speech delivered by the ex-Minister of Finance, whom I will not call "a sophistical rhetorician," though he is sometimes "intoxicated by the exuberance of his own verbosity," in which the hon. gentleman, who does not mix anything else, had mixed his figures and talked of nailing his compass to the standard of truth, justice and right, or something of that kind. I would never have made the discovery of that speech had it not reached the hands of the person for whom it was intended. Now I think it is very necessary and proper that a postmaster should be above the suspicion of political partisanship. I think that it is right, therefore, that when a postmaster mingles actively in political contests, he should be dismissed, because in every community in this country, and especially in rural communities, there is great suspicion aroused if the postmaster has very strong political feelings. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House (Sir Charles Tupper), to whom a fresh access of power seems to have come since the festive event of an evening or two ago, made some observations—and that reminds me, by the way, that history repeats itself. I was reading a few nights ago from Lord Malmesbury's Memoirs, of a great party that was given by Lord Palmerston. He says :

There was a great party last night at Lord Palmerston's and the language of the Opposition was very bitter—

That is the kind of party that they had the other night.

—they look upon office as their birthright, and upon those who deprive them of it as brigands who have robbed them of their property.

It occurred to me when I heard the ferocious attacks of the leader of the Opposition made upon the Government last night, and again to-day, that something had occurred of this sort which Lord Malmesbury tells us of in his memoirs. And I was struck this evening with the statement he made that during the Conservative regime no poor man, no labouring man, had ever been dismissed from his position, no man who earned his bread by the sweat of his brow was ever removed from his place, that it was a "brutal thing" to deprive him of his bread

and butter. I thought I ought to read to him, so that he should not go away with a false impression, a couple of statements that were published in the newspapers at Halifax, statutory declarations, upon which the parties can be convicted and punished if they are not true, and which show the way in which things were managed when the hon. gentleman was a member of the Government, for if not actually in office at the time, certainly he was in entire sympathy with that party which he now leads, and I think he was actually a member of this House and of the Government. I am going to read two declarations and it will only take me five minutes to do it—I would not think of imposing upon the patience of the House for any longer time. One is that of Mr. Samuel Case, of Halifax, shipwright.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the date?

Mr. RUSSELL. This declaration was made in or about December, 1896.

I, Samuel Case, Halifax, in the county of Halifax, shipwright, do solemnly declare as follows:—

I had been in the employ of the Government about three years down to the year 1878, having been first in the railway service, in the repairing department, on steady work by the Mackenzie Government. I was dismissed about four weeks after the election and almost immediately after the Tory Government came into power. I immediately called on the two Conservative members representing the county, by one of whom I was referred to the other. On calling upon the latter I asked him why I was dismissed. He said "Because we have to make room for those who supported us." I said, "How do you know that I did not support you?" He made very little reply that I can remember. I thanked him, however, for the satisfaction he had given me. The man who took my place was an active canvasser and committeeman who had worked hard for the Conservative party. I had taken no part at all in the election, or in any election before that, beyond voting. At the same time that I was dismissed, a number of other employees in the railway department were also dismissed, all of whom were Liberals. No Tories that I know of were dismissed, but a number of Tories were put on in the places of the Liberals who were dismissed. Several of the Liberals so dismissed were obliged to leave the province and seek employment in the United States. In no case of such dismissal was any inquiry held, or any charge made against the persons so dismissed.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and of the same force and effect as an oath under the Canada Evidence Act.

SAMUEL CASE.

Declared before me, &c.

I have another declaration from a gentleman who was a carpenter, Mr. Edward Warner, who was permanently employed on one of the Government steamers:

I, Edward Warner, of Dartmouth, in the county of Halifax, coal merchant, do solemnly declare as follows:—

In 1878 I was carpenter on board the steamer "Newfield," having been appointed by the Mackenzie Government, and had been so employed for about three years. On the day of the Dominion election in 1873, I remained on board the steamer all the morning at Dartmouth, where she was undergoing repairs on the Dartmouth marine slip. In the afternoon she went to Halifax and was moored at the wharf. I remained for the most part on board and took no part whatever in the election, having no vote. We then went from Halifax to Pictou a few weeks after the election. When at Pictou Captain Purdy handed me a paper to be filled up with the particulars as to my appointment, stating by whom I was appointed and on whose recommendation; and similar papers were handed to the other hands and the captain as well. I filled up my paper, stating, as was the fact, that I had been appointed by Hon. Mr. Jones and the late Mr. Power, and on the recommendation of Mr. Dominick Farrell, Mr. James W. Turner, Mr. F. C. Elliott, Mr. George Adams and others. The steamer proceeded from Pictou to Whitehead, thence to Sable Island, and from there to Halifax. On our arrival at Halifax Captain Purdy, who had been appointed by the Mackenzie Government, was discharged, and a few days afterwards Captain O'Brien, who took charge of the "Newfield" after Captain Purdy's dismissal, told me he had the papers containing my discharge. I was paid off with only half a month's wages, although I had been employed and paid by the month. At the same time that I was dismissed all the other employees and hands who were understood to be Liberals were also dismissed, and only those who were believed to be Tories were retained. We had no trial or investigation of any kind, and there was no charge against us of incapacity or violation or neglect of duty, and we were dismissed solely on the ground that we were Liberals and had been appointed by the Mackenzie Government, and that our places were wanted for supporters of the Tory party.

I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, under and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

EDWARD WARNER.

Declared before me at Dartmouth, &c.

Now, I think after these declarations, and there were half a dozen others of the same purport that were published about the same time in Halifax papers, and the originals of which I myself saw, it is too late in the day for any person to say that it was not the policy of the Conservative Government to dismiss persons not even because they were actively engaged in politics, but solely because they were supporters of the other side, without any activity at all, and simply because their offices were wanted in order to make room for Tory applicants; it is too late in the day for anybody to say that this was not a common practice with the Conservative party. I do not think it is a right practice, or one that I would ever support this Government in following, for I will not support them in following it. But, I say there is certainly a principle of respectability and decency that should prevent those gentlemen on the other side of the House from bringing accusations of this sort against the Government, even assuming that this Government did exceed the bounds of propriety in the dismissals that they have

Mr. RUSSELL.

made. I say they have not done so, but that on the contrary they have not satisfied the legitimate expectations of their party friends in the different counties in that province. I say they have not satisfied the fair and reasonable expectations of their political friends in the different counties of Nova Scotia, and I say it for this reason: Reports have been made, I believe, against different persons in the province of Nova Scotia of having been guilty of active partisanship, but these reports, through the clemency of the Ministers in the various departments, have not yet been acted upon. It has required the greatest amount of activity, persistence, and pressure to be brought to bear upon the members of this Cabinet to induce them to make dismissals for political reasons. Even after cases have been clearly presented to them, they have allowed matters to rest for months. Some cases have been made out against parties in the Government service, establishing the charge of partisanship with perfect clearness, and yet the parties have been retained in office for months and months after the facts were proved clearly. Now, I say these persons ought to be dismissed. All those persons who, in the language of Mr. Alpheus Todd, and of all great constitutional authorities, have been shown clearly to have actively interfered in the practical work of party politics, are liable to dismissal, and they ought to be dismissed upon those facts being proved to the reasonable satisfaction of the Minister of the department. I think the country would support the Government in doing that; but in going a single step beyond that I will not for one support them, and I do not believe the country would support them. I do not believe anybody asks for dismissals to be made upon the spoils system, I do not believe dismissals have been made upon the spoils system. It is a mere attempt to humbug this country to assert that dismissals have been made upon the principle of the spoils system. The hon. gentleman knows how averse this country is to the spoils system. He knows we do not want it, that it is unpopular on both sides of the House. Therefore he is seeking with great ingenuity and persistence to convince this country that dismissals are being made on that system, but he will fail in bringing home that conviction to the minds of the people, of common sense people, who know that the spoils system has not been introduced. I do not know how many hundred Dominion officials and Government employees there are in the city of Halifax, but I do not believe that you will find that half a dozen have been dismissed. I believe that there were not more than four men dismissed in the whole railway department in the city of Halifax; I can only think of three men having been dismissed from the service of the Railway Department. There may have been four, I suppose there

must have been or else it would not be so in the return which has been sent to the Minister of Railways. But there have been men discharged because there was no work for them to do. That is an unfortunate thing that always happens; and to my certain knowledge men have been dismissed from the employ of the railway against my remonstrance, and against my strong desire that their services should be retained, simply because there was no work for them to do. This was done not by the Minister, not by myself, but by order of the general superintendent, that there must be reductions made in the staff. With the exception of the dismissals made in this way, it is a fact, as the Minister of Railways has stated, that there have not been in his department more than four dismissals in the county of Halifax on the complaint of active partisanship at elections. I can think of two other cases of dismissals in the city of Halifax in other departments, and in each case active partisanship was clearly proved. I can think of two or three cases in East Halifax, which has a population of 30,000, and one or two cases in which dismissals have been called for, but I do not believe yet made, in West Halifax, with several thousand inhabitants. With the exception of perhaps a dozen dismissals for political reasons in the county of Halifax, where there are hundreds of officials in the city and all over the county, no dismissals have occurred, and none have occurred there at all except in cases where active political partisanship has been proved. In connection with some of the departments, the Government has sent a judicial commissioner to investigate the facts on sworn evidence, and an opportunity has been given for cross-examination, and dismissals have been made after such investigation has taken place. I should imagine that these facts would have some weight and consideration from hon. gentlemen opposite. Was this policy ever pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power? When did they ever make such an investigation, or send a commissioner, or give an employee an opportunity of being heard before dismissal? Nothing of the sort ever occurred under the regime of those hon. gentlemen; yet because this Government has given these employees in various departments the opportunity of being heard and having their cases investigated, and by gentlemen who are perfectly reliable and trustworthy, as my hon. colleague has freely admitted, instead of the Government obtaining credit for the judicial and deliberate manner in which they have proceeded in this matter, they have received tirades of abuse, day after day, and in fact, I think, this is about the tenth occasion on which we have had a field day upon this question in this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this resolution is passed, I should like to say a word or two in reply to the observations made by my hon. colleague from Halifax

(Mr. Russell). The hon. gentleman considers that a "constitutional principle" is in existence which supports his position and which has been properly applied in these cases. I would hardly suppose that the policy which he advocates could be called a "constitutional principle." But we will let that pass, and we will assume that a constitutional principle is involved. I desire the Postmaster General to listen, because my hon. friend has laid down rules of conduct for the hon. Minister, which I propose to invoke. My colleague has stated that a postmaster above all other men is a man who should not interfere in the slightest degree in election contests, because he may purloin letters and delay correspondence and political literature. I would suppose that if a postmaster committed that offence it would be ample ground for dismissal, and that it would not be necessary to invoke this constitutional principle. I recall the fact that D. W. B. Reid, of Middle Musquodoboit is the centre of Liberalism in that district, and he is also postmaster. He was postmaster for a number of years during the Liberal-Conservative regime, and he was not dismissed. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to this case, and to point out that under the constitutional principle which has been laid down, this postmaster should be dismissed for actively interfering in election contests. He takes charge of all Liberal interests in his district. He comes to Halifax and attends political conventions, then he returns to Musquodoboit and runs around the county from one end to the other during each election, while at the same time he occupies the proud position of postmaster. He resides within a few miles of a gentleman who was dismissed without investigation for the very same reason, and who was postmaster of Upper Musquodoboit. I invite the attention of the Postmaster General, also, to the case of Mr. Hall, postmaster at Sheet Harbour, who takes an active part in every Liberal campaign, and yet who held office during the Liberal-Conservative administration. Under the constitutional principle invoked by my hon. friend, and on account of the peculiar circumstances which surround the position of postmaster, he should be dismissed in all common honesty and decency if other postmasters have been rightly dismissed without investigation. I also call attention to the case of Mr. Kidd, postmaster at Musquodoboit Harbour. He is an active and offensive partisan, and even my hon. friend from Halifax will not deny that he takes a very active part in elections. I also call attention to the postmaster at Crook's Brook—I do not know his name.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that in Halifax county?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know such a place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has forgotten it. It is near Musquodoboit, which is one of the finest districts in Canada. He took an offensive part as a Liberal, and yet he was not disturbed by the Liberal-Conservative Government; but as the constitutional principle has been invoked, I trust the Postmaster General will also look into his case. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman will depend on assurances given by members on this side of the House; but I can give him this assurance, that this information has been supplied, as regards those three gentlemen, on the very best authority, and so far as Mr. Reid is concerned, I personally know that he is an active and offensive partisan within the definition laid down by the members of the Government. My colleague read a number of newspaper clippings from the "Morning Chronicle" with respect to events in 1878. They are couched in somewhat vague language, and their effect depends a good deal on the belief of the men who read them and of the young newspaper men who took down the reports.

Mr. RUSSELL. They were made on sworn statements.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not notice anything very definite beyond the impression those gentlemen derived from the fact of their dismissal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read a statement showing that the men were asked to fill up a schedule setting forth by whom they were appointed, and on whose recommendation; and when it was known that they were appointed by the Mackenzie Government and recommended by good Grits, they were always dismissed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is well aware of the extent to which a witness often varies his statements under cross examination.

Mr. RUSSELL. These statements were published in the newspapers, and not contradicted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's recollection is different from my own.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the House that my statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In regard to the newspaper controversy, which I did not closely follow, all the affidavits and statements made were answered by correspondents or comments made in a paper published in the city of Halifax by the Liberal-Conservative party. That is ancient history, and I need not go over it now. As far as my hon. friend's position is concerned, it is this, that if he carries out as a member of this Parliament the principles which he has announced here to-night, and

in which he considers that he is supported by the reference to the constitutional work which he has quoted, it would be his duty to instantly recommend to the Postmaster General, that he should dismiss Mr. D. W. B. Reid, postmaster at Musquodoboit, Mr. Hall, postmaster at Sheet Harbour, Mr. Kidd, postmaster at Musquodoboit Harbour, and the nameless gentleman at Crook's Brook. I have too much confidence in the desire of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) for fair dealing, to doubt for a moment that if he has no personal knowledge of these matters, which I think he has, he will instantly make the necessary inquiries, and forward the necessary recommendations to the hon. the Postmaster General, which I hope and believe would of course be followed by the usual result.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) that there were no dismissals made on the spoils system, is in the language of the school boy "too thin and won't go down." If the hon. gentleman had confined his remarks to his own locality—

Mr. RUSSELL. I did.

Mr. TAYLOR. He did not.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman made a general statement. If he confined his remarks to his own locality, and to dismissals which he is supposed to know something about, I would not have referred to the matter. But to my mind, there is no explanation of why 22 men were dismissed on a small canal, but a quarter of a mile long, and not one of them reinstated. I asked the Minister of Railways if there were charges of active and offensive partisanship against these men, and he answered, that so far as he knew there were not. Even the dismissed men did not themselves know why they were dismissed. So far as my information goes, and I believe it to be correct, because I have had it from some of the men themselves, there was no investigation given, they had no opportunity to defend themselves, and they were not told why they were dismissed. In view of this, I cannot believe the statement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell).

Mr. RUSSELL. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) thinks that in regard to any man, whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, or whatever he is, I am going to hunt around for reasons for dismissing him, the hon. gentleman misjudges me. I will never ask for the dismissal of any man until I am absolutely compelled to do so, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) knows, that to ask for the dismissal of any man is the last thing I would care to do. But, in every case where a complaint is made to me, and I am set in motion by persons whose advice I am honourably and

honestly bound to accept, I shall take good care that justice is done in the premises.

Mr. BORDEN. I agree, that I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) has any desire to dismiss officials. The only criticism I desire to make of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) is, that perhaps he might possibly have made a little more resistance in some of these cases.

Mr. RUSSELL—

What's done you partly may compute,  
You know not what's resisted.

The principle I laid down, was simply that which is stated by Todd: that active interference in politics was misconduct sufficient to justify the dismissal of a civil servant.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall end up this discussion fittingly by recalling to mind a certain fact of not very old date. I shall read a short extract from an old and well established authority in this House, to wit "Hansard." In the "Hansard," of 1897, page 62, appears the following:—

We announced on the floor of Parliament last session, that no member of the civil service, whether of the inside or outside service, would be dismissed, except for cause. We declared that every man against whom a charge was brought, would have an opportunity of defending himself before a court of inquiry.

That was a statement made by the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the head of the Government which at this time is cutting off the heads of the civil servants now without inquiry.

There is one question which I wish to ask my hon. friend. With reference to a civil servant who has been dismissed, we will say for undoubted partisanship, against whom there is no charge as to his having conducted his office fairly and done his work well, and who has paid into the superannuation fund—in the case which I have in view the official was dismissed, the office abolished and economy introduced—has it been considered by the Government, or will it be considered by the Government, that it is but fair to make such an officer a recompense for the money which he has actually paid into the Receiver General's fund?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I believe there was a legal doubt as to whether that could be done, and we have to pass an Act to enable ourselves to do it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Notice of the resolution has been given.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the extent of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). To the extent of the payments into the superannuation fund, and interest thereon.

Resolutions to be reported.

## FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 134) respecting Interest—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Bill (No. 135) to amend the Companies Act—(from the Senate).—Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

## EXPENDITURE ON HARBOURS.

Mr. PENNY asked :

In reply to a question put on the 6th February, 1893, by Mr. A. T. Lépine, Member for Montreal East, a statement was presented by the Department of Public Works showing that \$17,835,420.22 had been expended from 1st July, 1867, to 30th June, 1892, on construction and improvement of harbours, breakwaters, rivers, etc.

1. What amount has been expended on that account from the latter date up to the present time ?

2. And what amount, if any, has been spent on the harbour of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No. 1. The amount spent by the Department of Public Works on the construction and improvement of harbours, breakwaters, rivers, &c., from the 30th June, 1892, to the 1st June, 1897, is \$2,600,000. No. 2. No amount has been spent during that period on the Harbour of Montreal.

## CERTAIN QUESTIONS NOT IN ORDER.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Is it a fact, and are the Government aware :—

1. That in the course of the summer of 1896, a newspaper called "La Libre Parole," of Montreal, published an article against one of the Ministers of the Cabinet, viz., the present Minister of Public Works, Hon. J. I. Tarte, in which the said Hon. J. I. Tarte is, among other things, accused of having extorted money from the Conservative party ; of having obtained by unlawful means divers sums from one Whelan and one Demers ; of having diverted for his own use certain sums subscribed into his hands by members of the Liberal party for political purposes ; of

Mr. FOSTER.

trafficking in public situations and contracts ; of being a "boodler," and of having introduced "boodling into the Department of Public Works.

2. That some time after the publication of the said article, the said Hon. J. I. Tarte instituted criminal proceedings for libel against the editor of "La Libre Parole," one Grenier ; and also civil proceedings against the same, before the competent courts sitting in and for the district of Montreal.

3. That the said Grenier, the defendant in the above mentioned proceedings in answer to the charge brought against him by the said Hon. J. I. Tarte, pleaded that the facts alleged in the aforesaid article were true, and published in the public interest.

4. That since the said proceedings were instituted the said Hon. J. I. Tarte has done nothing to bring them to trial.

5. That since the said proceedings were instituted there have been four terms of the Court of Queen's Bench, criminal side, in the district of Montreal.

6. That the defendant in the above proceedings, the said Grenier, has, during the said terms, declared on several occasions that he was ready to proceed and demanded a trial, but owing to the absence from the court of the said Hon. J. I. Tarte, the said proceedings and trial have, from time to time, been postponed.

7. Do not the Government consider that the public interest demands that no person lying under such grave charges, so publicly made, should, without active efforts to clear his reputation, continue to occupy the position of a Minister of the Crown ?

8. What action, if any, do the Government propose taking with respect to such charges, and with respect to the Minister of Public Works in regard thereto ?

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to question No. 6 (the above question) I do not think it is at all in order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I would ask the privilege from you, Mr. Speaker, to allow the question to be put, as I wish to answer it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a single word. If the Speaker rules that a question of that kind is not in order, I think it should not be put, even at the request of an hon. Minister. I may say that I have had no communication whatever with my hon. friend who put this question on the Order Paper, but I can see the great abuse to which questions of that kind might lead in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think I can allow the question to be asked or answered. There are several reasons why this question should not be allowed. It is dealing with a matter which is under adjudication by the courts, and it is perfectly clear that it is not a proper question.

A matter whilst under adjudication by a court of law should not be brought before the House by motion or otherwise.—(May, 10 Ed., p. 264.)

It is improper to put questions with regard to proceedings pending in the courts of law, and to make animadversions thereon.—(Dennison, in Blackmore's "Speakers' Decisions," p. 268.)

Again, this is certainly a question which makes or implies charges of a personal character, and that is not allowed.

A question is not permitted which makes or implies charges of a personal character.—(May, p. 239.)

Again, this question asks for an expression of opinion merely, from the Government and a question of that kind is not allowed.

The expression of an opinion cannot be sought for by a question.—(May, p. 238.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Will you permit me to say one word, Mr. Speaker. Of course the hon. Minister, as I understand, submits to your ruling; but you will see what a very great injustice may be done to some hon. gentleman, if questions of this kind are allowed to go on the Order Paper at all. The House understands the willingness of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to answer it; his anxiety and desire to answer fully, but he is not allowed to. This question goes out to the country, and is commented upon in all the newspapers, and thousands of people will not understand the reasons why the Minister of Public Works was not permitted to answer. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, whether such highly improper questions should be allowed to find their way on the Order Paper, in the first instance. They are contrary to the rules of the House, and they reflect seriously upon the character of an hon. member of this House. They should be struck off in accordance with some well established order of the House, as being highly improper, and hereafter it should be understood that they will not be allowed on the paper.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a great deal in the suggestion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), that questions going so far in the wrong direction as this question does, should not appear on the Order Paper. It is undoubtedly open to the Minister of Public Works to make a personal explanation, if he desires to do so, when the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as this question has been a little discussed would you allow me to say one word. I entirely agree with your ruling in this regard, and I hope it will be strictly enforced from this time on. But, I must call the attention of the House to a practice which prevails here for a considerable period before the last Government went out of power, and by which practice questions of this kind were put by the then Opposition day after day. They were improper questions without doubt, and it is not a species of political warfare which either side of the House should wish to indulge in. On the other hand, it is pretty difficult for you, Mr. Speaker, to constitute yourself a judge of what shall go on the Order Paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Speaker has to judge ultimately.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing that this abuse, so far as it is an abuse, should be stopped. I do not like that kind of warfare at all. On the other hand, I should not like to see the privileges of the House curtailed on any legitimate question.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is another consideration which arises out of this, and which I would like to mention to the House. A practice had been in vogue in former sessions, it has gone on to some extent since I have had the honour of presiding over this House, and it is a practice which I think should not continue. Some hon. gentlemen select quotations from newspaper articles, and then ask whether certain hon. members have seen those, and what their opinion is on them. That should only be properly done, if the hon. member who puts the question holds himself responsible for what the newspaper contains. I think we ought in future, change the rule in that respect.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. While we are on this question, Mr. Speaker, would you permit me to make a few observations. I wish to draw your attention to what I consider are very irregular proceedings on the part of members of the Government in answering questions. A question that is put on the paper should be succinctly answered as asked, but I do not think it should be permitted to the Minister to enter into an elaborate argument, and go into a long disquisition that is not called for by the question. I think I shall have the concurrence of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is now leading the House, and who has such great experience, in the statement, that if that course is to be pursued, it would almost inevitably lead to a motion for the adjournment of the House in order to deal with the answer given by the Minister. That would not tend to facilitate public business. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the necessity of a question being answered exactly, and nothing more.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In a general way, there is no doubt the leader of the Opposition is right, but I may point out to him, that it is possible so to word a question as to make it almost absolutely necessary for the Minister to reply at some length. I think something must be left to the discretion of the Minister in a case of that kind. As to the mode suggested, I may recall to the mind of the hon. gentleman (I am not sure whether he was in the House then) that once or twice when we were on that side of the House, we tried that, and we were not permitted to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of replying.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That must have been because the House was not so great as it is now.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Under the predecessor of the hon. the Speaker, some ruling of the kind was laid down. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that it is not desirable, that in replying to questions, lengthy disquisitions should be inflicted upon the House, and I do not think, under correction, that there has been much disposition to do it.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The rule on that question renders it somewhat difficult for the Speaker to interfere, because, by a number of English decisions which I shall refer to, it is made quite clear that Ministers are allowed a great deal of latitude. It is laid down :

In reply to a question more latitude is given to a Minister than to a private member.

A Minister in replying to a question relating to an individual, and the action of the police, is allowed to give full particulars illustrating the case.

Great latitude is allowed to a Minister in answering a question, with a view to making his answer complete.—(Denison's Decision, Blackmore, pp. 274 and 275.)

In view of these decisions, it is difficult for Mr. Speaker to interfere, and it must be largely left to the discretion of Ministers. I have no doubt that what has been said in the House to-day, will have its effect.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I agree, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is a sound one. I can see that the Speaker must allow a Minister considerable latitude in answering a question which does not raise counter charges and reflections upon the preceding Government.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** Nothing should raise a discussion.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I would like to ask attention to your ruling with regard to the right to ask questions based upon an article in some newspaper. Now it seems to me that that the rule is clearly laid down in the wording of it.

A question may be put to a Minister relating to public affairs, and to other members relating to any Bill, motion or public matter connected with the business of the House in which such member may be concerned.

Suppose, for instance, that in respect to the fast steamship line some member wished to ascertain from a Minister whether an article in a newspaper was correct, and represented the views of the Government, would it not be in order for any member to base a question upon that, reading the article and then asking the question ?

**Mr. SPEAKER.** Such points as this have been decided in England :

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.**

An hon. member reading telegrams from newspapers and founding questions upon them, objection was taken. The Speaker pointed out to the House and the hon. member the extreme inconvenience of founding questions on every telegram in every newspaper. I am bound to say, that it does appear to me that, before questions of such gravity are put, an hon. member should take some measures to ascertain the truth of the telegram.—(Brand's decision, Blackmore, p. 270.)

I think that quotation answers the hon. gentleman's question. Certainly no charge should be based on a newspaper quotation alone.

#### RAILWAY COMMISSION.

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton)** asked :

Is it the intention of the Government during the present session to bring in a measure to create a railway commission for the Dominion ?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** It is not the intention of the Government to create a railway commission during the present session.

#### ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the following resolutions, of which notice has been given :—

That the Governor in Council having entered into a contract under the terms of the Act, 59 Victoria, chapter 3, section 3, with Messrs. Petersen, Tate and Company, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, England, for a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, it is expedient that this House do ratify and approve the said contract, which is as follows :—

Articles of agreement made this twenty-fourth day of March, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, between Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, herein represented by the Honourable Sir Richard Cartwright, Knight of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, Her Majesty's Minister of Trade and Commerce for the Dominion of Canada, hereinafter called "the Minister," of the one part ; and William Petersen, of the city of Newcastle-on-Tyne, in that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called England, and Arthur Tate of the same place, trading together under the name and style of "Petersen, Tate & Co.," shipowners, hereinafter called "the contractors," of the other part.

Whereas, by an Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in the fifty-seventh-fifty-eighth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter eight, entitled "An Act further to amend the Act respecting Ocean Steamship Subsidies" as amended by a further Act passed in the fifty-ninth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter three, and entitled "An Act further to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies," His Excellency the Governor General of Canada is authorized and empowered to enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, on such terms and condi-

tions as to the carriage of mails and otherwise as the Governor in Council deems expedient, for a subsidy not exceeding the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year; and whereas in a despatch from the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, to His Excellency the Governor General, bearing date the twenty-first day of November in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, respecting the proposals as to steamship communications made at the Ottawa Conference, it is stated that "As it appears that the Canadian Government is unable, without assistance, to secure an improved service, Her Majesty's Government are now prepared to contribute towards the cost of such a service," and further, that Her Majesty's Imperial Government "consider that all the arrangements for the new services should be under the superintendence and control of the Dominion Government, and that the responsibility of this country should be limited to a fixed contribution to cover all services rendered in connection with the transmission of mails;" and whereas the Government of Canada did, in reliance on the said in part recited despatch, on the second day of May now last past, by advertisement duly published invite tenders to be received up to and including Wednesday the tenth day of June then next, "for the performance of a weekly steamship service, including the carriage of mails, between Canada and Great Britain, by first-class steamers, to make an average speed from port to port of not less than 20 knots per hour, and according to terms and conditions particulars of which may be obtained on application at the office of the High Commissioner for Canada, 17 Victoria street, London, S.W., England, or at the Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, Canada; and whereas in response to such notices two tenders were made, one by Mr. James Huddart, of 22 Billiter street, London, subject, however, to a letter written by him accompanying his tender, offering, subject to the conditions in the said letter stated, for the sum of one million one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to perform the said service; and another tender from or on behalf of Messrs. Hugh and Andrew Allan of Montreal and Messrs. James and Alexander Allan of Glasgow to perform the said service for the sum of two hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds sterling, which, however, was accompanied by a written communication which imposed certain qualifications on the tender as submitted, and attached conditional interpretation upon some of its clauses; and whereas neither of the said tenders were considered satisfactory nor was either of them accepted by the Government of Canada, who were not bound to accept the lowest or any tender; and whereas on or about the 13th day of March instant the contractors proposed to perform the service required with vessels of a better class and for a subsidy much less in amount than the offers previously made, complying nevertheless in all essential matters with the terms and conditions referred to in the said notice, but giving other and improved conditions and terms on the whole much more advantageous for the Dominion, amongst the said improved terms being the following, that is to say:—

(a.) To furnish steamships of 10,000 gross registered tons, instead as therein required of 8,500 gross registered tons, and to maintain on a round trip from port to port across the Atlantic an average speed of 500 knots per day, being nearly 21 knots per hour.

(b.) To have a cargo capacity of from 1,500 to 2,000 tons.

(c.) To have accommodation for not less than 300 first-class passengers, instead of 275.

(d.) To carry on each outward trip 150 emigrants to be designated by the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, at a price not exceeding the sum of \$15 per head.

(e.) And in connection with the said service and as forming part thereof, to provide and maintain a fast tender of the torpedo boat type, of a speed of not less than 22 knots per hour, to meet the steamers on their approach to the ports in Canada, to act as a pilot boat, so as to ensure in the navigation of the said ships both safety and speed.

(f.) That the said steamships should be constructed, fitted and maintained in all respects equal to the best Atlantic steamers now afloat, say the "Campania" and "Lucania" of the Cunard line, and that the Canadian port should, in summer, be Quebec, to continue to Montreal when navigation permits of their doing so; in winter, Halifax, N.S., or St. John, N.B., at the option of the contractors.

And the said contractors offered to establish and maintain the said line, to consist of four steamships for the period of ten years, for the annual subsidy or sum of one hundred and fifty-four thousand five hundred pounds sterling; and

Whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada, in reply to such proposal, offered to accept the same on the understanding that Her Majesty's Imperial Government would contribute or pay of the said annual subsidy the proportion or sum of fifty-one thousand and five hundred pounds sterling, leaving the sum of one hundred and three thousand pounds sterling to be paid by the Government of Canada, subject, however, to the approval thereof by resolution of the House of Commons, in pursuance of the provisions of the statute passed in the fifty-ninth year of Her Majesty's reign, hereinbefore in part recited. And whereas the contractors have agreed thereto on the condition that the assent of Her Majesty's Government to the payment of the said proportion of the said subsidy, as hereinbefore stated, should be obtained and communicated to them on or before the first day of May next ensuing the date hereof.

Now this agreement witnesseth that the contractors for and in consideration of the promises and of the covenants and agreements on the part of Her Majesty hereafter contained, for themselves, their executors and administrators, do hereby covenant, promise and agree to and with Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors, in manner following, that is to say:—

1. That they, the contractors, shall and will either personally or by a company which they may form (and it is hereby understood and agreed that this contract may be executed, performed and fulfilled by a duly incorporated company, formed or to be formed by or at the instance of the contractors, which company when formed, shall be accepted by Her Majesty instead, in lieu of and in substitution for the contractors)

(a.) To build, equip, provide, establish, and during this contract to continue and in the manner hereinafter mentioned, a regular steamship service between the port of Liverpool and the Canadian ports hereinafter named, of four steamers of not less than 520 feet in length, with a draught of water not exceeding twenty-five feet six inches, when fully equipped, loaded and ready for sea, such ships to be of not less than 10,000 tons gross register, designed to carry from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of cargo, of which 500 tons at least shall be suitably fitted with cold storage accommodation and appliances.

(b.) The said steamers shall be constructed, and each of them shall be constructed, fitted and maintained in all respects equal to the best Atlantic steamers now afloat, such as the steamship "Campania" or steamship "Lucania" of the Cunard line of steamers—and having accommodation for not less than 300 first-class, 200 second-class, and at least 800 steerage passengers, with seating accommodation in the first-class dining saloon for at least 300 persons. The area space for passengers and cargo, and the general details and specifications to be in accordance with the plan, figures and specifications which have been submitted to the Minister, and which marked as "Plans and specifications for Fast Atlantic Service by Petersen, Tate & Co." are incorporated with, and are to be read and treated as part of this agreement, subject however to such changes and modifications therein as the Minister may, from time to time, approve.

(c.) The said vessels are to be built under the supervision of the Admiralty, and in conformity with the requirements of Her Majesty's Imperial Government, respecting armed cruisers, and also of the British Board of Trade.

(d.) The said vessels are to have a speed of twenty-one knots per hour.

2. The contractors do further agree,—

(a.) That the said line of steamers so to be established shall run between the port of Liverpool and in summer to the port of Quebec, and if and when navigation permits, to the port of Montreal, and in the winter season to the port of Halifax, N.S., or the port of St. John, N.B.—at the option of the contractors, such option to be declared by them before the date hereinbefore fixed for the commencement of the service—and the said vessels are to make and maintain on each and every trip a speed of five hundred knots in every twenty-four hours from port to port in ordinary weather.

(b.) During the summer season when the Canadian port is Quebec (or Montreal as aforesaid), the steamers are in sailing from or to Quebec, to stop at or near Rimouski, or other port in the Lower St. Lawrence, if required by the Minister, to receive and discharge the mails, and to embark and disembark first-class passengers. Provided always that the Canadian Government is to provide a steam launch to be in attendance at Rimouski or such other point in the Lower St. Lawrence as may be determined on to carry to and receive from the ship the mails and passengers to be taken on board or discharged or disembarked as aforesaid.

3. The said steamers are,—

(a.) To carry all mails sent under the authority of the Postmaster General of Canada for transmission from Canada to the United Kingdom and the Continent of Europe, irrespective of their origin or ultimate destination, and under the authority of Her Majesty's Postmaster General from the United Kingdom to Canada, irrespective of their origin or ultimate destination.

(b.) Except such letters as are not required by law to pass through the post office, the contractors shall not receive or permit to be received for conveyance on board any mail ship any letters other than those mentioned. No mails shall be conveyed by any such steamship on behalf of any colony or foreign country without the permission of the Minister or Her Majesty's Postmaster General. The whole postage of any mail conveyed by any mail ship shall, under all circumstances, be at the disposal of the Minister.

(c.) The term "mails" to include all boxes, bags, baskets or packets of or containing letters,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

books or printed papers or parcels, and all other articles which under the Post Office Act and regulations for the time being are transmissible by post, without regard either to the place to which they may be addressed or to that in which they may have originated, and also all empty bags, boxes, baskets or other receptacles, and other stores and articles, used or to be used in carrying on the Post Office service.

(d.) The contractors, at their own cost, to provide sufficient and convenient accommodation and space for the mails in each steamer to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General of Canada (such accommodation to be as far removed from either end of the ship as may be reasonably possible), to be under lock and key, and to be fitted up, lighted and heated as he may approve for keeping the mails whilst under conveyance therein; and the services of the crew of every vessel shall from time to time be given in the conveyance of the mails to and from the mail room or rooms.

(e.) The mails are to be received and delivered respectively by the contractors at the post offices at Quebec or Halifax, or St. John, as the case may be, and the expense of conveying the mails to the steamships from the post office at the said places and from the steamships to the same, to be borne by the contractors, and in like manner the embarking, landing and transfer of all mails in the United Kingdom shall be performed by the contractors at their own cost and to the satisfaction of Her Majesty's Postmaster General.

(f.) The contractors shall be responsible for the loss or damage of any parcel or registered postal packet of any kind conveyed or tendered for conveyance under the contract, unless such loss or damage be caused or occasioned by act of God, the Queen's enemies, pirates, restraints of princes, rulers or peoples, jettison, barratry, fire, collision, or perils or accidents of the seas, rivers and steam navigation, and in the event of any such loss or damage except as aforesaid, the contractors shall be liable to pay to the Minister in respect of each parcel or registered postal packet so lost or damaged subject to the proviso hereinafter contained, such sum of money as shall be equal to the amount which may have been awarded and paid by the Minister at his sole option and discretion to the sender or addressee of such parcel or registered postal packet as compensation for the loss or damage thereof, but not in any case exceeding one pound sterling per parcel or two pounds sterling per registered postal packet instead of penalty.

4. The contractors further agree,—

(a.) That two of the steamers shall be ready and complete in all respects to commence the service before the thirty-first day of May in the year 1899, and the remaining two steamers shall be in like manner ready not later than the first day of May, in the year 1900, and at the option of the contractors all the said steamers on or before the first named date, and the service shall, from the time at which the said first two steamers are ready (not later than the said 31st day of May, 1899), be a fortnightly service, and from the date (not later than the aforesaid 1st day of May in the year 1900), the service shall be a weekly service, that is to say, a fortnightly and weekly service respectively, from and to Great Britain and Canada.

(b.) The days and times of sailing from the port of departure of the steamers are to be fixed subject to the approval of the Minister.

(c.) The right is hereby given to the Minister from time to time, on three months' notice to the contractors, to change the time of sailings from the port of departure.

(d.) The Minister to have the right in case of need to delay the sailing of any steamer for a time not exceeding twenty-four hours.

(e.) The contractors are to advertise both in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and in the Dominion of Canada in such manner as the Minister may direct.

5. The contractors are further to provide and maintain during the continuance of this agreement a fast tender of the torpedo boat type, of a speed of not less than twenty-two knots per hour, which said tender is to meet each steamer on her approach to the Canadian coasts when required and pilot her in or towards her destination so as to ensure her safety and enable her to reach port without delay.

6. And Her Majesty, for herself, Her heirs and successors hereby covenants to and with the contractors, their executors, administrators and assigns that the said contractors, well and faithfully performing all and every the covenants, agreements and stipulations hereinbefore set forth and contained by the said contractors to be done and performed, shall well and truly pay or cause to be paid to the contractors, their heirs, administrators or assigns, during the continuance of this contract an annual subsidy of the sum of one hundred and three thousand pounds sterling from and out of the Consolidated Fund or other proper moneys of the Dominion of Canada (which said sum includes the sum of ten thousand pounds for the cold storage accommodation herein provided for), and the further sum of fifty-one thousand five hundred pounds sterling out of the moneys provided by Her Majesty's Government (should the sum be furnished to the Government of the Dominion of Canada, but not otherwise), the same to be paid and payable in the city of London in four equal quarterly instalments, payable on the first days of January, April, July and October in each and every year during the continuance of this agreement: the first instalment of the proportionate amount that may then be due to be paid on the first of the said days falling after the commencement of the said service.

7. Provided always that when the contractors are only giving a fortnightly service but one-half of the said respective sums of one hundred and three thousand pounds and fifty-one thousand five hundred pounds shall be due or payable to them.

8. Her Majesty further covenants and agrees that the contractors are to be free from and are not to be required to pay to or for the Government of Canada any Dominion light or similar dues except the rate of duty payable in respect of every vessel to the Sick Mariners' Fund and except harbour dues.

9. And it is mutually covenanted and agreed by Her Majesty and the contractors that this contract is to continue in force for the full period of ten years from the time when the first trip is made by any of the steamers to be provided under the terms thereof.

10. And it is further mutually agreed and understood that the contractors are not to be allowed to receive or accept any subsidy or aid, pecuniary or otherwise, from any colony or foreign country, or any provincial, civic or municipal authority, and should any such subsidy or aid be received by the contractors Her Majesty may deduct the amount thereof from the amount of the next quarterly payment due and owing under this contract, and so from time to time and as often as the contractors receive such subsidy or aid from any colonial or foreign government, provincial, civic or municipal authority, but this provision is not to be deemed as a permission or

authority for the contractors receiving any such subsidy or aid.

11. And the contractors, for themselves, their executors, administrators and assigns hereby covenant and agree to and with Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors, in manner following, that is to say: that no discrimination shall be made by them, their officers or agents, as regards passengers or freight rates either directly or indirectly against Canadian railway routes, and they are further to engage to land passengers and freight at Quebec during the St. Lawrence season on such side of the river as may be desired by the Minister.

12. And further, that the contractors shall and will on each on every trip or passage from Liverpool, if thereunto required, carry emigrants not exceeding one hundred and fifty in number on any one trip who may be named by the agent of the Government of Canada appointed for that purpose, at a rate of passage not exceeding the sum of \$15 per head, and it is understood that for such price or passage money, the emigrant shall have all the service including good wholesome food usually supplied to emigrants on first-class steamers; provided always that due notice be given to the agents of the contractors at Liverpool of the names of the said emigrants three days at least before the sailing of the steamer for which they are to be booked.

13. And the contractors do hereby further promise and agree that they shall and will within sixty days from the time that they shall be notified that Her Majesty's Government is willing to pay towards the said subsidy of one hundred and fifty-four thousand five hundred pounds sterling, the proportion which it is anticipated Her Majesty's Government will contribute, namely the sum of fifty-one thousand five hundred pounds sterling:

(a.) Deposit with the Minister of Finance of Canada the sum of ten thousand pounds sterling, and

(b.) That at the same time they, the said contractors, will give to the Minister a guarantee to his satisfaction for a further sum of ten thousand pounds sterling, which said deposit of ten thousand pounds and the guarantee for the further sum of ten thousand pounds are to be deposited and given as security that they, the contractors, will supply the steamers in accordance with the terms of this agreement, and within the time or times hereby contracted therefor (for which purpose it is agreed that time is to be of the essence of this contract).

14. And it is agreed and understood that in the event of the contractors making default in having two of the great steamers ready by the time hereinbefore named in that behalf, that then the said deposit of ten thousand pounds and the guarantee for the said further sum of ten thousand pounds is to be forfeited to Her Majesty as agreed upon and as liquidated damages for such default; and it is further agreed that should the contractors furnish the first two steamers in accordance with the provisions of the contract that the said default and the said guarantee shall remain as security for the said contractors' performance of the agreement in respect of the remaining two steamers, and that should default be made in supplying the said lastly mentioned steamers within the time hereinbefore limited in that behalf, that then and in that event the said deposit and the said guarantee shall be forfeited to Her Majesty as and for the agreed on and liquidated damages in respect of such default.

Provided always and it is hereby distinctly agreed and understood that, should the contrac-

tors be unable to have the said vessels built and equipped as herein agreed within the time limited in this behalf by reason of a strike or strikes of ship-workers or engineers, or other causes beyond the control of the contractors, that then the loss of time occasioned thereby shall be added to the periods hereby fixed for the completion of the said steamers as may be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

Provided, always, secondly, that Her Majesty is to pay to the contractors semi-annually interest on the said deposit of ten thousand pounds from the day of the date of the deposit thereof at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum until the same is either repaid or forfeited for the default of the contractors under the provisions hereof, and after the service of the said four steamers has been commenced the said deposit is to be returned and the said security released.

15. And the contractors do further covenant and agree with Her Majesty that the steamers belonging to the said service are not, nor are any or either of them while this contract exists, to call at any foreign port.

16. Provided always and this contract is made and entered into on the express conditions following, that is to say:—

Firstly.—That subject to the conditions hereinafter contained, there shall be paid to Her Majesty as liquidated damages agreed to by the contractors,—

(a.) The sum of five hundred pounds on each occasion when the contractors fail to provide at the appointed Canadian or British port a mail ship in accordance with the contract ready to put to sea at the appointed time or when such mail ship shall not actually put to sea and proceed on her voyage at the appointed time.

(b.) A further sum of one hundred pounds for every successive twenty-four hours which shall elapse before such mail ship shall actually put to sea and proceed on her voyage, but so that these sums shall not in the aggregate exceed by more than one thousand pounds the proportionate part of the subsidy applicable to a single voyage.

(c.) On each occasion when the contractors fail to perform a voyage between the appointed Canadian and British port within the stipulated time, there shall be forfeited and paid by the contractors to the Minister the sum of eight pounds ten shillings for every hour or portion of an hour consumed on such voyage beyond the stipulated time, provided always that the total sum thus forfeited shall not exceed the proportionate part of the subsidy applicable to a single voyage.

(f.) Provided always that should any failure or default for which the payment of damages are herein stipulated or provided for, happen or be occasioned, or occur from any circumstance or accident beyond the control of the contractors, and not due in any way to the default or neglect on their part or on the part of any officer, agent or servant of theirs (the burden of proof of which shall be on the contractors), then and in that event the damages stipulated for, or the sum or amount forfeited shall not be payable or be forfeited notwithstanding the apparent default.

17. And it is further provided and agreed that in the event of any of the said vessels being at any time disabled, so as to be obliged to be docked for repairs, that the failure to fulfil the terms of this contract, owing to such accident, and for the time reasonably occupied in the repairing of the damaged ship, shall not be taken as a default or breach of any of the terms or stipulations of this contract—or subjecting the contractor to any claim for damages by Her Majesty, under the terms hereof; and should any of the vessels be wrecked or be so much disabled as to prevent the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

said vessel being employed in making her trips for a period of one month, then and in that case the contractors shall be bound, with all reasonable despatch, to replace the vessel so wrecked or disabled by another of equal class, speed, equipment, character and capacity to the satisfaction and approval of the Minister, and continue the service herein contracted for with such substituted steamer, provided, however, that there shall be deducted from the subsidy hereby agreed to be paid a proportionate amount for each trip or passage which for any reason aforesaid the contractors are unable to provide a steamer for.

18. And provided always, that the Government of Canada has the power to determine the contract at any time in case the vessels furnished by the contractors for the service are not capable of performing the voyages contracted for at an average speed of 500 knots per twenty-four hours, or ordinarily or frequently fail when on service on the round trip, from port to port, across the Atlantic, to maintain such speed, or should the contractors in any other respect fail to fairly carry out the terms and conditions of the contract according to their true intent and meaning.

19. Except to the company to be formed by the contractors as hereinbefore provided for, to whom this contract may be assigned, no other assignment thereof, either by the contractors or by the said company, is to be or shall be made, nor any right or interest therein without the consent in writing of the Minister having been first obtained.

20. It is a further condition of these presents that no member of the House of Commons of Canada shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract nor to any benefit to be derived therefrom.

21. It is further agreed and understood that this contract is subject to the approval by resolution of the House of Commons of Canada, and until so approved, is not to be binding on any of the parties hereto.

22. And it is also further agreed that this contract is not to be binding on the contractors unless on or before the first day of May next ensuing, the date of these presents, Her Majesty's Imperial Government consent to contribute the said proportion of fifty-one thousand five hundred pounds sterling of the said subsidy, and such assent is notified to them by the Minister as hereinbefore provided for.

In witness whereof the Honourable Sir Richard Cartwright, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, "the Minister," hath hereunto set and affixed his hand and seal as such, and the contractors have hereunto set their hands and seals by the hand of William Petersen, one of the partners of the firm of Petersen, Tate & Co. aforesaid.

R. J. CARTWRIGHT, (L.S.)  
Minister of Trade and Commerce.

PETERSEN, TATE & CO. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of  
(Sgd.) JOHN J. MCGEE.

He said: In requesting the consideration of the House to the contract lately entered into between this Government and Messrs. Petersen & Tate, of Newcastle, I think I need not dwell on the fact, which has been universally admitted on both sides of the House, that it is very desirable, so far as our means will permit, to obtain an improved service between Canada and the United Kingdom. There is no doubt that when the present line of steamers, known as the Allan Line

was first established, that service was fairly well performed, but in the process of time it is equally clear that the service has fallen far below what a country like Canada requires, and should expect. On that point, I think there was no difference of opinion. There was undoubtedly great difference of opinion among many members, I believe, on both sides of this House, as to whether the resources of Canada permitted of so large a subsidy as \$750,000 a year being granted; and I must confess, for my own part, that I always entertained very grave doubts indeed as to whether it was expedient. Nevertheless, a statute was passed and an Act now stands on our Statute-book whereby a sum of not more than \$750,000 is authorized to be granted for that service, and the British Government, having been approached by our predecessors, consented to supplement that by a further vote of \$375,000 a year, in round numbers, making, in all, provision for this service of \$1,125,000 a year. As is known to the House, certain contracts were asked for about a year ago; I think the contracts were proposed in the month of May, and the tenders were opened some time in June of 1896. Under these, two parties seemed to have proposed to complete this service, the Messrs. Allan and Mr. Huddart. It is open to serious question whether either of the so-called tenders submitted by these gentlemen could be considered as tenders in any proper sense or degree. In the first place, they failed by having stipulated that it should be open to them, after a lapse of four months, in one case, and of six months in the other, to proceed or not as they might see fit; and in the next place, the Messrs. Allan added a letter in which they qualified to a considerable extent, their acceptance, and laid down certain proposals which, in my judgment, would have rendered it very doubtful indeed whether anything approaching to a 20-knot service could have been exacted from them. However, it is not necessary for me to spend much time in dwelling on that point. The details of that proposition, and also the details of the present contract, are well known; they have been before this House and before the public for some weeks. I think I may say that the contract to which the Government now solicits the consideration of Parliament, and which they have entered into, is in every possible respect very greatly more to the advantage of Canada than the contract which it was proposed to enter into with the Messrs. Allan. The ships are larger, the standard is higher, the ships must be faster, and the whole service is to be obtained for a much smaller sum than it was proposed to pay to the Messrs. Allan. In place of vessels of 8,500 tons, we are to obtain vessels of 10,000 tons; in place of a speed, and doubtful at that, of 20 knots per hour, these vessels bind themselves to cross the Atlantic, from port to port, at an aver-

age speed of 500 knots per day, being as nearly as possible, 21 knots an hour. We have obtained a larger amount of space for the transshipment of merchandise, and a considerable portion of that must be under cold storage. The type of vessel is improved. The vessels are to be equal in accommodation and general construction to the "Campania" and "Lucania," which are of the highest type now known in the Cunard service. We have also got the right of sending across at our own pleasure a number of steerage passengers at a very moderate rate, \$15 per head.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
What is the freight accommodation?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Two thousand tons. You will see that in clause "a" of section 1:

Designed to carry from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of cargo, of which 500 tons, at least, shall be suitably fitted with cold storage accommodation and appliances.

On each outward trip, 150 emigrants must be carried at a price not exceeding \$15 per head, to be designated by the Minister of the Interior. Now, Sir, I think there is only one question as to which exception can be taken in this contract, and that is the question which has been raised as to the ability of the contracting parties to perform the contract that they have entered into. As to that, all I can say is that after making a careful inquiry, the Government have every reason to believe that Messrs. Peterson & Tate will succeed in completing their financial arrangements, and so far as that is concerned, we are not afraid but that the contract can be satisfactorily carried out. In any case, I need hardly point out to the House that if these gentlemen do not perform their contract, we will not be called on, on our side, to provide any funds. The consent of Her Majesty's Government, to whom this scheme is submitted, has also been obtained, they have agreed to furnish a proportionate sum, equal to that which they formerly agreed to furnish. Under the original scheme they were to give one-half the amount that we gave, that is, £75,000, we furnishing £150,000. Under the present scheme they will give £51,000 in round numbers, as against our £103,000. I will say to my hon. friends that they are not to suppose that this proposal will entail a further cost to the country of \$500,000 per annum, or anything like it; on the contrary, I hope that between the saving on the Allan subsidy and between the saving on certain other subsidies which are now granted, and which, I think, may fairly be discontinued if this scheme goes into operation, the total cost will not much exceed \$250,000, or, at the outside, \$300,000 additional to the sum that we now pay. On the point of a winter port, that matter has been left optional with the contractors. They are to decide whe-

ther they will select the port of Halifax or the port of St. John, and they must make their option before the contract goes into operation. Such, briefly, are the terms of the contract, and such are the reasons which have induced the Government to recommend its acceptance to this House. I think that both sides will agree with me in saying that so long as it can be done, with due regard to our means, so long as we do not pay too heavy a price for the luxury, it would undoubtedly be a great advantage to Canada at large if we possessed a fast service across the Atlantic. We are, in some respects, I have always felt, at considerable disadvantage, owing to the comparison which has been made between the service lately rendered by the Canadian steamers and the service obtainable, particularly at the port of New York; and, bearing in mind that we have the advantage of a much shorter route from land to land, I think there is considerable ground for hoping that a large amount of traffic, at any rate, from the north-western states, may be diverted to the present route. As I have said, it is a question of cost and come to. The thing is desirable; the Government have endeavoured to obtain it at the cheapest possible rate, and, I think—although, on that point I am aware there has been some hesitation and doubt—I think that the proposition to obtain a service of 21 knots per hour, or thereabouts, at an additional cost not exceeding \$300,000 a year, is one which may be fairly considered by the House. At any rate, the matter is now before the House: we have obtained the concurrence of Her Majesty's Government, and I think I may fairly recommend it to the consideration of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have listened with very great pleasure to the statement which has just been made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). I need not remind the House that I have always, from the time this subject was first taken up, attached the greatest possible importance to the establishment of this fast service. I felt that nature had given us geographical advantages that it was absolutely imperative we should avail ourselves of in order to place Canada in a position to be the shortest and most direct means of communication between Europe and America. Therefore, I need not say how glad I shall be to find that the arrangements that have been made by the present Government prove to be successful. I should think that, perhaps, the most convenient mode of discussing this question would be, as each clause is moved separately, to make any remarks that require to be made in connection with the clause. But I may just say, Sir, that my fear is—and I hope I may be altogether wrong—that it will not be possible to obtain the service that has been stated by my hon. friend for the amount that is set

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

forth in this contract. My main reason for making that statement is that Mr. Huddart, a very energetic and enterprising man, who had the advantage of being at the head of the steam service between Canada and Australia and who thus occupied an especially advantageous ground in connection with this measure, spent a year of most active and energetic effort among the financial men in Europe, not only in England, but on the continent as well, for the purpose of obtaining financial support to carry this measure through, for a subsidy of the same amount now provided—\$750,000. Lord Brassey, who was one of the directors of the Naval Armament Construction Company, one of the great ship-building firms, parties who are most anxious to enter into such enterprises—gave his most hearty support and co-operation. Other parties deeply interested in ship-building and matters of this kind also were very anxious to co-operate. But, despite all that, Mr. Huddart, with all his energy and activity, with all the special advantage he possessed as being at the head of the Australian service, with which, to a certain extent, this would be connected and with which it would co-operate, was utterly unable to obtain the financial aid necessary to carry out the enterprise. Under these circumstances, I was directed to approach Her Majesty's Government, and I was able, as my hon. friend just stated, to obtain from the Secretary of State for the Colonies a pledge that they would make this an Imperial as well as a Canadian service, and that they would contribute one-half of the amount that was found to be necessary, assuming that it was \$750,000 or £150,000 sterling, for the purpose of securing this impartial service. I think we cannot attach too much importance to this matter, and I am quite sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce will fully appreciate the immense importance and advantage it is to Canada to have Her Majesty's Government joining with us in providing so large a portion of the subsidy, and recognizing therefore, its Imperial as well as its colonial character. The fear that I expressed is based upon the fact I have stated that a service which, so far as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has stated it to the House, possesses some advantages over that proposed could not be obtained at the subsidy which is now named. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce whether there is a difference in the character of the ships, whether these are to be what is known as turret ships, or whether they are to be of the class that the contract would lead us to suppose—the type of the Cunard service and—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I laid the plans on the Table of the House at the same time that I presented the contract, and I suppose they are in the custody of Mr. Clerk. The type is undoubtedly what is called the turret ship, and that,

after considerable discussion, I understand, has been approved by the Admiralty and by other parties to whom it has been submitted.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I am afraid that that is a very important qualification, because one of the very first considerations in reference to a service which is to compete with the Cunard steamships, the White Star line and others now running into New York must be an equally attractive service, as every person will at once perceive; and, if the fact that these are turret ships is to render the line less attractive—I will not undertake to say that it will, but I may assume that to be the case, because I am not aware of any fast line of steamships of that character in the world—while it may account for the difference in the expenditure required to equip the service may have a very important effect in deteriorating from its character and thus defeating the great object that Canada has in view. The object that Canada has in view is to take advantage of our geographical position and establish not only the fastest but the best—or at least as good as the best—service and having the geographical advantage which we possess, to establish a more rapid communication between Europe and America than now exists. I should be very sorry if speed is obtained by the adoption of a class of ships that would be less attractive than the others, and that will, therefore, fail to enable us to become what, I think, under the circumstances, we should become—very successful competitors for ocean travel and traffic.

What the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said is undoubtedly correct—that there were some qualifications in the tender sent in by the Messrs. Allan and Mr. Huddart. So far as the Messrs. Allan are concerned, they were virtually removed by a communication which was subsequently made to the Government. As the House will remember, at the close of a session in which the Government were not permitted to do any business except with the approval of the Opposition, owing to the peculiar position in which they were placed, an Act was passed which authorized us to ask for tenders and obtain them promptly in the hope of saving a year. Now I want to call my hon. friend's attention to another very important qualification, as I understand it, in this tender as compared with the one we had before us which the Messrs. Allan and Mr. Huddart sent in. Those tenders specifically provided for a weekly service to come into full operation after two years, the same time as is provided for the commencement of this service. As I understand it, this provides for a fortnightly service, and the weekly service is only to come into effect in three years.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It is a fortnightly service for the first year.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is a most important qualification. The House will at once see the difference between our commencing this service as a complete service, and commencing it fortnightly with a view to making it a weekly service in a year. I regret extremely that it has been found necessary on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to make such a qualification, because the very fact of this being a fortnightly instead of a weekly service is, in my opinion, going to deprive it of the opportunity of fair and equal competition with the steamers already running between England and New York. I am afraid we shall start in a very unfortunate position to meet the competition that—

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It becomes a weekly service a year after the fortnightly service begins.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is at the end of three years, instead of at the end of two, being for the first year, a fortnightly service. But I think the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will appreciate the point I make, that, in starting the service, it is vitally important that it should start in a position to provide the best means of competition. The fortnightly service cannot possess the advantage that a weekly service would possess as a competitor with those lines of steamers running constantly between England and New York.

I think, perhaps, it will be more convenient—and I presume there will be no objection—if the hon. Minister will move the contract clause by clause, and, as each comes up we may be able to ask for information and offer any comments that may be deemed necessary. I presume there will be no objection to that.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** My hon. friend sees that we have to present the contract as a whole. I do not object, however, to answering any number of questions.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I quite understand that the contract must be accepted as a whole, and that it cannot be modified by the House without involving a new contract. But I wanted to draw the attention of my hon. friend to certain points which I think require some attention, and I thought that might be more conveniently done by taking it up clause by clause. I am quite in the judgment of the House, however.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I do not think we require to go into committee on this.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** I do not wish the hon. gentleman to close his speech under any misapprehension. I think this is not a matter that can be taken up clause by clause. The reference to the House is provided for by the Act of 1896, which contains a clause

providing that such contract shall not be binding upon Canada until it is laid before the House of Commons and is ratified by such House. We are considering the contract as a whole, and I think there is only one motion required.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to introduce any innovation. I will say, in the first instance, that I think there would have been an enormous advantage if we could have had this service undertaken by the Messrs. Allan, who were the pioneers in this great question of an Atlantic service between England and Canada, and who, from their long experience, their knowledge of everything connected with the trade, and the great resources which they possess on both sides of the Atlantic, would have given us an undoubted guarantee of their ability to carry the work to completion; and I cannot conceal from myself the danger that, unless there is something in the character of the ships and in the mode of constructing them as turret ships to reduce enormously the cost of such ships as the "Lucania" and the "Campania" of the Cunard line, and the "Teutonic" and the "Majestic," it may not be possible for any firm, however strong and energetic, to secure the necessary capital to carry out the project. My hon. friend, having admitted the great importance of this question to Canada, knows that it becomes a very important consideration to us that it should not fail. In fact, if the parties who are obtaining the contract should not be able to carry it through, it would be a great disaster. It would not only throw us back, but it would place us in a worse position than before we entered into the contract; and I am afraid that the security the Government have exacted is altogether insufficient, unless the contract were made with parties of such undoubted wealth and resources as to place beyond all doubt their ability to finance it. I am afraid the amount of the penalty, £10,000, is altogether inadequate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. £20,000—£10,000 cash and £10,000 guarantee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Satisfactory guarantee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A matter of £20,000 may become altogether inconsiderable, and the forfeiture of that amount to Canada would be no compensation whatever for the failure of the contractors to carry the enterprise through. Now that we are all agreed, happily, at last as to the importance of having not only a new service, but a fast service which can compete with any other service that crosses the Atlantic, we are equally and deeply interested in having such a contract, and having it in such hands, as will without any question secure its being carried to completion. Now, I am

Mr. SPEAKER.

advised by parties who have some knowledge of the matter, that it is very doubtful whether ships of the tonnage required, when fully equipped and loaded and ready for sea, can reach Montreal, with the draught of water stated—that, in fact, it is very doubtful whether it is practicable to construct ships of the tonnage of these ships so that when fully equipped and ready for sea they will not draw more water than is provided for in this contract. While on this point, I may say that the adoption of this service is an additional reason why the improvements in the navigation between Montreal and Quebec should be completed at the earliest possible moment, so as to be ready by the time the service will begin; because it will become a very serious matter if any impediment should arise to the service being promptly carried out, from any want in that navigation. The clause which says that Montreal is to be made the ultimate terminus of the line if and when navigation permits, is, I am afraid, a very indefinite clause, and one that will leave it very uncertain indeed whether the object the Government have in view under that clause can be at all secured. It is provided that the steamers are:

To carry all mails sent under the authority of the Postmaster General of Canada for transmission from Canada to the United Kingdom and the Continent of Europe, irrespective of their origin and ultimate destination, and under the authority of Her Majesty's Postmaster General from the United Kingdom to Canada, irrespective of their origin or ultimate destination.

I presume that this contract is intended to provide that on all mail matter obtained either in Europe or on this continent, all postage shall accrue to the Government; and that if it will be possible by the Canadian route to deliver the mails in New York earlier than they can reach New York by the most direct line and means of conveyance known, all the postage will accrue to the Government, and no portion of it is to be shared by the contractors.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a fact.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because there is some statement here about paying mail matter being carried to any other colony or any foreign country, and I supposed that it was intended to secure that whatever receipts should be derived from that source would go to the Government in return for this service. Then, in clause 5 there is a statement which I do not quite understand:

The contractors are further to provide and maintain during the continuance of this agreement a fast tender of the torpedo boat type, of a speed of not less than twenty-two knots per hour, which said tender is to meet each steamer on her approach to the Canadian coast when required and pilot her in or towards her destination so as to ensure her safety and enable her to reach port without delay.

Now, in case of detention by fogs or ice, I do not quite understand how this torpedo boat going out from the Canadian port is going to be of any material service. I do not see how, in such a case, it can find the steamer. But if it is important that such a service should be rendered, it appears to me equally important to pilot the steamers outwards as well as inwards. It is well known that the majority of accidents that occur in connection with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, have occurred in going out from Canada, and there appears to be no provision for any assistance on the part of this torpedo boat when assistance is most required, that is, on the outward passage, as well as on the inward passage. Then, I find a very serious clause—clause 7:

Provided always, that when the contractors are only giving a fortnightly service, but one-half of the said respective sums of £103,000 and £51,500 shall be due or payable to them.

That, I assume, is intended to apply to the period up to the commencement of the service at the end of three years, because, if not, it is a most dangerous clause, as I think the House will at once see when it is shown that as these steamers will probably have during the winter season to incur a very heavy loss, five or six thousand pounds per trip, the penalty of not making a weekly trip and only making a fortnightly trip will be possibly found ineffective, as it would be to the advantage of the company to make only fortnightly service and incur the penalty. As I read the contract, it would pay them to fail in the performance of keeping up a weekly communication because instead of sustaining any loss thereby they would be really in pocket.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think we have full power to determine the contract if they fail in performing it. Undoubtedly that power would be used if they attempted any such proceeding as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I quite see the point the hon. gentleman raises, but I do not think it covers the case, because you have a specific provision in the contract for a certain penalty and you cannot impose any other. If they fail to perform the weekly service in winter and only make a fortnightly service, you can deduct a portion of the subsidy, but that is all, and you have no provision for determining the contract in such an event.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Look at clause 18, and you will find that meets the case.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. That clause reads:

18. And provided always, that the Government of Canada has the power to determine the contract at any time in case the vessels furnished by

the contractors for the service are not capable of performing the voyages contracted for at an average speed of five hundred knots per twenty-four hours, or ordinarily or frequently fail when on service on the round trip, from port to port, across the Atlantic, to maintain such speed, or should the contractors in any other respect fail to fairly carry out the terms and conditions of the contract according to their true intent and meaning.

You cannot say that they have not carried out the contract according to the true intent and meaning when they say it is true we were bound to run once a week and we have only run once a fortnight, but we propose to incur the penalty provided by our contract, and you cannot impose any other. At all events, I draw my hon. friend's attention to this, which I consider a very serious matter. I consider the penalty altogether inadequate, and I am not at all confident it will ever operate as I should like it to.

Then there is another clause, clause 14, which reads:

Provided always and it is hereby distinctly agreed and understood that, should the contractors be unable to have the said vessels built and equipped as herein agreed within the time limited in this behalf by reason of a strike or strikes of ship-workers or engineers or other causes beyond the control of the contractors,—

So that if the contractors cannot raise the money, where will you be? That will be another cause quite beyond their control. If they are unable to get the money to carry out the contract, you have no remedy. This clause appears to me to be very loosely drawn. It appears to me to enable those gentlemen, at any period, to say that from causes not under their control they will not be able to carry out the contract without a year or two additional extension of time. What I fear is that the service undertaken by these contractors is not one that will secure the confidence of the financial men able to supply the means of carrying it to completion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Surely the hon. gentleman will read that clause as meaning all other clauses beyond their control of a like character to those mentioned. Every lawyer knows that if he specifies in a contract a certain number of reasons and then adds "or others," the others must be reasons coming under the same category.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that, because he is a lawyer and I am not. But I believe there is a legal maxim that common law is common sense. If that be true, having defined strikes of ship-workers and engineers and then added "any other causes," it would appear to cover other causes beyond the control of the contractor.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. In the letter of Messrs. Allan of

the 9th of June, to my predecessor, they use precisely these words :

It may prove impossible to obtain delivery of the four mail steamers in time to begin the service on the 1st of May, 1898, as their construction may be delayed by strikes of ship-workers or engineers or other causes beyond the control of the contractors. We assume that, if all diligence is used in obtaining speedy delivery, no penalty or forfeiture will be incurred for unavoidable delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has quoted the best authority he could, and that is the course pursued by his predecessors, and which we are always ready on this side to recognize as removing every possible ground of complaint. But I am inclined to think he will find that we took exception to the clause as suggested by the Messrs. Allan, and did not adopt it. I remember now distinctly that our attention was drawn to it, and that we thought while strikes were a matter beyond the control of the contractors, which might take it out of their power, whatever their resources might be, to implement the contract, it would not do to allow so wide a latitude as "other causes beyond the control" of the contractor. But I will assume for the moment that is not the case. Every person knows that the financial resources of Messrs. Allan are beyond question. Any person who has any knowledge, to say nothing of the eminent firm so well known in Canada, of the Allans' house in Glasgow, who were one of the parties to this contract, knows that they are people of immense wealth and resources, and therefore you have a guarantee in that fact alone, apart from any question of penalty or anything of this kind, for the prompt and efficient carrying out of the contract. In fact, I may say that the firm of the Messrs. Allan in Glasgow and in this country occupy such a position that they could not afford to fail in carrying out any contract with which they made with the Government of Canada or anybody else. But no such knowledge has been supplied to us as regards the financial ability of Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. I notice that the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a question on that subject in the House of Commons in England, was only able to say, not that Her Majesty's Government had satisfied themselves of the ability of Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. to carry this contract through, but that Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. had been able to satisfy the Government of Canada to that effect. Therefore, our responsibility is a very grave one, and I call the attention of the House to it as one of considerable importance.

Here is the clause to which I have already referred :

(c.) On each occasion when the contractors fail to perform a voyage between the appointed Canadian and British ports within the stipulated time, there shall be forfeited and paid by the contractors to the Minister the sum of eight

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

pounds ten shillings for every hour or portion of an hour consumed on such voyage beyond the stipulated time, provided always that the total sum thus forfeited shall not exceed the proportionate part of the subsidy applicable to a single voyage.

So that if these gentlemen do not make the voyage at all, the only remedy provided by the contract is that they shall forfeit the proportion of the subsidy for one voyage, and if it be true, as I am advised it is, that during the winter every voyage will cost them £5,000 or £6,000 more than they will receive in subsidy, it will pay them to make a fortnightly service in the winter instead of a weekly service, and pay the penalty, which is no way commensurate with the advantage they shall obtain by their default.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would again point out to the hon. gentleman that those penalties are precisely the penalties which were proposed by himself and his Government in the case of Messrs. Allan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can give my hon. friend the credit of producing the strongest argument he can, and I must say I feel greatly complimented to find that my hon. friend should be able to rest his case always on the unanswerable argument that our contract was open to the same objection. I think that will go a great way to satisfy the House that he had a pretty valid excuse.

I find in clause 18 the following :—

18. And provided always, that the Government of Canada has the power to determine the contract at any time in case the vessels furnished by the contractors for the service are not capable of performing the voyages contracted for at an average speed of five hundred knots per twenty-four hours, or ordinarily or frequently fail when on service on the round trip, from port to port, across the Atlantic, to maintain such speed, or should the contractors in any other respect fail to fairly carry out the terms and conditions of the contract according to their true intent and meaning.

I would ask the attention of the House to that clause, and call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the right to determine the service would not be sufficient compensation for Canada. If that is all the penalty, then, if they cannot make this pay, they will be in a position to abandon the contract at any moment. If they find they cannot carry out this contract they are in a position to abandon it without losing anything except the very inconsiderable sum to which attention has already been drawn.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I shall only be too glad—no person in this country will be more glad or more ready than I—to congratulate the Government upon the success of their action in this matter, provided the result proves that they are able for the amount payable, to secure such

a valuable fast Atlantic service for Canada. I wish for a moment to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) to a question of law which is involved, and that hon. gentleman is, of course, a very high authority. Where was the authority found for making this contract? We passed an Act in this House to provide for a fast weekly service, but that Act which authorized the Government to contract for a fast weekly service only, did not enable them to make a contract for a fast fortnightly service.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). As the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows, the Act authorized a fast weekly service, but it did not state from what date that weekly service should start. This contract which we have made, provides for a weekly service on, and from the year 1900, and in the meantime it provides for a fortnightly service.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** In making a contract under an Act of Parliament, you must take the spirit of the Act, and I hold that the spirit of the Act, and the authority we receive from Parliament, was not to establish a fortnightly service at all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Of course not.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** But, to establish a fast weekly service.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Certainly.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** And as a matter of fact, the Messrs. Allan and Mr. Huddart, had either received the contract, were bound to commence a weekly service at the end of two years, and not a fortnightly service for the first year. I admit, that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) is a much higher authority on that legal point than I am. It appears to be running very close to the wind, and I believe that lawyers have a faculty of doing that upon legal questions.

I would like to ask my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) if he has obtained any information, as to the relative cost of these turret ships as compared with the "Campania" and the "Lucania" of the Cunard line, or the "Teutonic" and "Majestic" of the White Star line. I do not at all hesitate to say, that I would have been quite satisfied with ships of the character and speed of the "Teutonic" and "Majestic," although they are not quite as fast as the "Campania" and "Lucania," because, with the geographical advantages we possess, with the "Teutonic" running between Liverpool and Quebec or Halifax, we could deliver in shorter time than they could be delivered by either the "Campania" or "Lucania" at New York, notwithstanding their greater speed. I would have been satisfied with that, but what I

would like to know is: What is the character and cost of these turret ships, which as I understand have never hitherto been used for fast mail and passenger communication in any part of the world. If there is anything in the construction of these ships of the type of the "Teutonic" and "Majestic," I should like to know it.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** As a matter of course I will offer any opinion as to this new type of ship with great diffidence. I believe, that men whose experience entitles them to speak with authority, entertain a high opinion of the possibilities of this particular type of ship which is depicted in these plans laid on the Table of the House. I am rather inclined to think it is a misnomer to speak of them as turret ships although they approximate more or less to what is known as a turret ship. I do not think, however, that they are exactly a turret ship.

As to the other point which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) mentions, it is expected that they can be built for £500,000 sterling or thereabouts; a little more or a little less.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is, each.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Each. The total cost will be, I imagine, two million pounds sterling (£2,000,000) for the four when completed. I am told, that because of various causes, improvements in construction and reduction in the price of the particular class of iron and steel employed, and other things of that kind, that these ships can now be built at a considerably cheaper rate than ships of a similar quality could have been built, even so short a time as a year or eighteen months ago. That probably has had a good deal to do with the tendering at this reduced rate. Of course, those are matters upon which you will find a great divergence of opinion between shipbuilders and shipowners all the world over; and I understand there is some rivalry between the shipbuilders of the Clyde, and the shipbuilders of the east of England where these vessels will probably be constructed. Each of them fancies his own work, as is natural, much better than that of his neighbour. I think, one thing the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will find is, that the Messrs Petersen and Tate will receive substantial financial backing. We made all reasonable inquiries into that, and I think there is no doubt they will be well supported, and that they will do their very best, as will the shipbuilders employed, to produce a class of vessels which will be quite equal to the types we have referred to. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had time to look over these plans we have laid on the Table, he will see that the convenience and comfort of passengers has been

very fully provided for. Of course, he has made, like myself, a good many Atlantic voyages, and a study of the plans will show him, that particularly as regards the second-class and steerage passengers, an unusual amount of care and pains has been taken to see that these classes of passengers are fully provided for and accommodated. I have taken careful note of the remarks of the hon. gentleman on the other points, and I think he will find, that we have reserved sufficient authority to deal with them; and while it is, as he says, always more or less of an experiment to deal with new firms, still I think that these men have every possible inducement to give us a good service. I myself formed a favourable opinion of the energy and ability of Mr. Petersen, the person with whom I had conversation on this subject. My hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Dobell) made a voyage across the Atlantic especially to satisfy himself and us on this point, and he brought back a very favourable report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure we would be very glad to hear our hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) who has a personal knowledge of the matter, that others of us have not.

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity of laying before the House a few details, and explaining briefly some of the striking features of what is commonly called the turret type of steamers. I will say at first, and in a general way, that I believe the introduction of this style of steamer will earn for the Government of this country the congratulations of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I believe, that after these steamers have been running for twelve months, the hon. member (Sir Charles Tupper) will frankly admit that we have performed a good service by departing from the old style of steamer, and that their introduction will cause a revolution in the Atlantic fast steamship service. I admit that no large steamer of this type has been built up to the present time, but for some years Canada has derived great benefit from steamers somewhat of the type of these new steamers, and the introduction of which enabled the coal trade of Nova Scotia to be developed, and the coal to be brought to Montreal at a much less cost than was ever anticipated.

If I mistake not, a contract was made some years ago at a price that was called by every one that knew the trade, to be absolutely impossible to fulfil. I think the rate of freight was 70 cents per ton, against the ordinary contracting price at the time of \$1.50, and although ruin was predicted, and it was stated that they could never carry out the contract, the result has been satisfactory. Ever since Petersen, Tate & Co. entered into this fast steamship contract we have heard the same prediction as to the results. I believe it is absolutely incorrect. Although I do not claim for Petersen, Tate

& Co. that they are a wealthy firm, I know they have the confidence of the large ship-builders in Newcastle and Sunderland, and also of the financial firms in London. I need give no other instance than the head of Lloyds, perhaps the largest underwriter in Great Britain, who told me himself that whatever Mr. Petersen undertook we could rely upon him to carry out. Well, I consider that better testimony regarding this firm than a statement that a firm is backed by very large means, but lacks character. I would rather at any time enter into a large contract with a firm possessing limited means and a high character and intelligence, than with a firm, no matter how large their means may be, but who do not inspire confidence in other respects. In saying this, I am not at all referring to, or reflecting upon the Messrs. Allan. When I was in Great Britain looking into this question, my first letter, written after a visit paid to the Messrs. Allan, in Glasgow, contained a sentence to the effect that we should exhaust every effort to continue with the firms that had been carrying the mails under contract with us for so many years; and I claim that we did exhaust every effort, and gave the Messrs. Allan every opportunity to offer us a service more in accord with this country's wishes. They distinctly laid down that they would co-operate with no other firm, that they must have all or none. And when I saw them they said that the indecision of this Government and the delay that had taken place prejudiced their position, and they were not sure that they could carry out the contract then, as the cost of building such steamers as they would tender had advanced 15 per cent. But I do not mean to convey the idea that they did not lead me to suppose that if we would then and there close a contract on their proposal they would not be willing to do so. We maintain that we never had a complete tender, and to my knowledge we never had a straight tender, and it was in my hands that the first papers were submitted for a report, and I had no hesitation of taking the responsibility of condemning the proposal as too extravagant to the country and too loose in its provisions. True, I did advocate an 18-knot service, because it could be obtained at much less cost, and I stated before this House that I considered \$750,000 a year was too large a sum for this country to pay even for a 20-knot service, and I at that time advised my colleagues rather to give \$500,000 for an 18-knot service than to burden the country with such a heavy annual payment as \$750,000.

The leader of the Opposition has criticised the clauses of the contract, and very fairly, too; but if he will only look at the Allan contract, he will find that there is scarcely a clause through which you cannot drive a coach and four. The conditions for the fast performance of the service were absolutely in no degree binding upon them, while they would bind us. It is perfectly clear that we

would have had to pay the Allans \$750,000 a year, but on the other hand, the Allans could have given us almost any steamers they liked so long as they were of 8,500 tons. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say more as to the merits of this kind of steamer known as the turret steamer. This is an improvement on the turret steamer. A turret steamer will give no deck space, while these steamers give you fifty per cent more deck space than either the "Campania" or the "Lucania." They provide a walk for passengers, without any impediment, sixteen feet wide and a fifth of a mile round, no boats in the way, nothing at all to prevent passengers from promenading a fifth of a mile. They give you fifty per cent more cabin accommodation. Now, and you can easily understand that if they were simply of the turret type of steamer, they could not do that. Another advantage is that it makes the steamer much more rigid and strong, and, therefore, it has less vibration. If any of you have made a passage on any of the fast Atlantic steamers, or any other ocean steamship, you have noticed the long, wall-sided vessel, and there is a vibration running through the whole length of them. You may have a steamer of extreme size, and immense horse-power, say from 20,000 to 25,000, and her engines capable of forcing this through the water at a speed of 20 knots or over per hour, but unless she is exceptionally strong you cannot avoid this vibration. Now, if you will only study these plans, you will see in a moment the immense advantage that will be derived from the adoption of this new style. It is the difference between a long straight sheet of iron and the same made in the form of a girder. These ships have a bend in them, and that bend will provide the additional strength, and also another advantage, which is that when a sea strikes the side of the steamer, instead of its running up the side and on to the deck, it will be broken up by this bend or curve, and will be thrown out. Besides that, it does not give the same air space to lift the steamer up; therefore, the steamer will roll less than an ordinary steamer. The leader of the Opposition drew attention to the 25 feet 6 inches depth, which he thought was a drawback.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** No, I suggested that it would not be possible to build a 10,000 ton steamer that would only draw that depth of water.

**Mr. DOBELL.** Then I misunderstood the hon. leader of the Opposition. But the advantage is this, that that bend lightens the upper part of the steamer materially, and it makes her draw much less water. I claim that a steamer that draws 25 feet 6 inches, instead of over thirty feet, has the advantage, because there is far less bulk to be forced through the water, and it can be driven much easier than a steamer drawing 30 feet, besides the additional safety in

ascending our river. Now, if you will look at these plans, you will at once admit the advantage of the feature of what may be called the bottle-necked steamer. It is like the neck of a bottle, and will afford more passenger accommodation and enable the builder to bind the steamer together and make her firmer from end to end. The drawback in many of these steamers is the large area that you have got inside without any means of bracing them. I believe this very type of steamer that Petersen, Tate & Co. are to supply under their contract will prove very successful, and my prediction is that that contract is going to be a very profitable one for them, that they have hit it exactly at the right time, and that they will get all the money that they require. In fact, I had a private cable lately saying they had secured it already to carry out this contract, and that they are only waiting for the ratification of the contract to put these vessels in hand and have them completed. The leader of the Opposition has criticised certain clauses in the contract regarding the frequency of the trips. Those clauses are in almost every steamship contract that is made. They are the ordinary phraseology of steamship contracts, and I think there is every provision safeguarded that we can consistently ask Petersen, Tate & Co. to agree to. I cannot see the slightest room for the contention that this only provides for a fortnightly service, and that we cannot insist upon them making a weekly service with four steamers. That clause "a" of section 1 distinctly provides that the contract is for four steamers of a certain class definitely laid down, and there is no room to say that we will only have a fortnightly service. I think the leader of the Opposition could not have been serious when he stated that there was any very serious damage in our only having a fortnightly service the first year. The Cunard line and the White Star line only commenced with one or two. I remember when the "Persia" was first built she was a great departure, then the "Scotia," and so it ran on. I believe these steamers will be a profitable investment, and that they will give satisfaction to the people of Canada.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would ask the hon. gentleman whether any of these bottle-necked monsters are travelling around now, or is this the first experiment in the matter?

**Mr. DOBELL.** I admit that we are embarking upon a venture; that these are the first of this class of vessels to be put on the Atlantic service. And I say that we deserve credit for this. I remember the time when Canada did lead in the Atlantic service in the steamers, both as regards speed and capacity. I know that of late years we have fallen much behind, and I will tell you why: It has been because the wealth of the firm in question, to which the hon. leader of the

Opposition has drawn attention to, has become so great that they are afraid of losing their money. I do think that they have taken a very unworthy part in the way they have criticised our contractor's position. They have descended to a line of criticism that they should not have adopted, and that it has had the effect of causing them to lose their influence, and they have not maintained their ancient reputation. In England they like open fair-play. The Messrs. Allan state that they would not touch the contract on the terms we have made, and at the same time, they have done all they possibly could to damage Petersen and prevent him carrying out his contract. I say that this is unworthy of a great firm that have made their money out of Canada—for they have made their money out of Canada. They say that we have treated them indifferently; I say we have extended to them every consideration, and I may say this—that when Mr. Petersen arrived in this country the first man I introduced to him, telling him the purpose for which Mr. Petersen had come over, was Mr. Hugh Allan, of Montreal. I sent for Mr. Petersen, and introduced him and left them together that they might talk things out. After acting in that way, they should not say that we had gone about things secretly, or that we used their tender to secure better terms. We used no tender for the purpose of securing better terms. Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company approached me in England; I told them to perfect their plans, prepare their scheme, come to Canada, and, in a straightforward way, lay their scheme before the Government and make their offer. No other conditions nor progress was arrived at in England. Mr. Petersen came out here and made his offer, which was accepted; and I claim that it is a creditable contract. It is a very severe reflection upon hon. gentlemen opposite, for the \$500,000 that we save on this contract is a substantial amount, and is worth a little trouble, and repays us for taking a little risk; and I maintain that we not only get a far better service, but we get a service that will be a credit to us for the ten years that it is running. I contend that we have put the matter on a true footing. Because one firm have had the contract for thirty or forty years, I do not admit that they should have the grappling-irons on us and must continue to have the contract for ever. I think we have done wisely and well, and I am satisfied that before long we shall receive the congratulations—because he is always frank—of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) when this line is perfected and running.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question. The hon. gentleman said, as I understood him, that none of these vessels have been plying as passenger boats. Do I understand that any of them have been plying as freight vessels?

Mr. DOBELL.

Mr. DOBELL. None exactly the same. The turret steamers have been plying as freight vessels; but these are a combination of the turret and the bottle-neck steamers. I believe they are building three passenger steamers, one for a Glasgow firm and two others at Sunderland. But I believe they are the first passenger steamers that have been built. But the best evidence that there is something in this line is that the Admiralty have approved of these plans; and not only that, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am informed that Mr. Dunlop, the active manager for the Allans has actually written an article in a marine paper advocating the use of the turret ships. I do not speak of that with authority; I say that it has been told to me. Not only is there no question that the Admiralty approve of this type, but I may say that the Right Hon Joseph Chamberlain told me that he was very much interested in the plans.

Mr. SPKOULE. But they have never been proved by practical experience.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). In view of the fact that the Government and the Opposition are almost united upon this question, it seems almost useless for anybody on the back benches to say anything against it. But, Sir, I wish to enter my protest against the expenditure of such a large amount of money as this will entail upon the country for a service that, I contend, is not necessary in the interests of Canada. I oppose this on three grounds: In the first place, it is not necessary; in the next place, it is altogether too expensive; and in the third place, the St. Lawrence is an unsuitable route for a fast service. This contract has been entered into, signed, sealed and delivered without consulting the members of this House or, in fact, consulting the House at all. The reason that is given is, I believe, that at the last session of Parliament a resolution was passed authorizing the Government to enter into such a contract with any persons for a fast service. But, Mr. Speaker, since that time those who proposed that resolution have been condemned by the people. On the 23rd of June last the country decided against the policy advocated by the late Government, and brought the present Government into power.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) allow me to remind him that the Act authorizing the late Government to invite tenders at a cost to Canada of \$750,000 per annum passed this House unanimously.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It may be so, Sir. But since then, the country has declared against their policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes. I believe that on many hustings this very question

was brought up and discussed and it was declared that the country would never support a fast service at such an enormous expense. Therefore, I say that this Government were not bound, either legally or morally, to make a contract for this fast service; and on behalf of my own constituency as well as on behalf of a great number of voters throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, I declare that this contract is not in the interest of the country from my point of view. I object to it on the ground that the St. Lawrence is an unsuitable route for such a service. I have crossed the Atlantic oftener, perhaps, than any gentleman in this House, except the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) who spoke just before me, and it has been a rare exception for me to cross by the St. Lawrence route, either backwards or forwards, without being detained for hours by fogs and ice. I contend that it is not possible to run a fast line service on the St. Lawrence, because of the fog and ice consequently to be found on the route. We all know why the Allan line ships met with such disaster in the first instance. They undertook to carry the mail within a certain length of time, and in order to keep up with the contract, they had to drive through the fogs wherever they found them, and the consequence was that in many cases they came to grief. Latterly, when they were not bound to such great speed, when the fog came on, the steam was turned off; and I myself have laid there in the midst of a fog bound up in the ice for ten, or twelve, or even twenty-four hours at a time. When hon. gentlemen tell me that a course subject to such difficulties is suitable for a fast line, it satisfies me that they do not know the route they are talking about. I do not know that even the leader of the Opposition has crossed by that route very often. He may have gone that way sometimes, but I think he usually takes the New York route and leaves the St. Lawrence route for other people to travel. We know what took place last August. On two occasions two steamers collided going at about four miles an hour. Suppose that these vessels had been running at the rate of 20 miles an hour—the vessels would inevitably gone to the bottom with the sacrifice of a vast amount of property and of many valuable lives. Therefore, I think the Government should stay its hand before entering into an enterprise of this kind. There is no need for this fast service to justify such a large expenditure. We have the New York route which we can always rely upon. As for the Government securing 300 passengers for each ship by this route, where are we to draw them from? Certainly not from Canada. We are told that we may expect to attract the traffic of the north-western states. Gentlemen who know something about travelling will tell you that those who travel are going to take the most popular route. What have you to offer the

people of the north-western states coming to this section of the country? For a month or two in the summer time it may be a very pleasant route, provided it is free from fog or ice; but the great bulk of the North-west travellers from the North-west will go via New York, where they will see that city, and where they will have a choice of fast ships every day in the week. So I am quite satisfied that you are not going to attract a very large amount of traffic from the North-west. Then, supposing you could manage it in the summer time, how are you going to do it in the winter time? You are going to ask people to travel to Halifax a thousand miles, taking all the risk of being snowed up on the way. Gentlemen may laugh, but I presume there are no snowstorms and no danger of passengers being snowbound on the Intercolonial Railway. People are not going to take that risk when they can reach in a very few hours one of the best ports on this side of the Atlantic, and get out to sea at once.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
Where is that?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). New York. There fore I say we are asked to expend \$500,000 a year for a service that is really not required in the interest of the business men of this country, but to provide a few passengers with a service a few hours shorter than what they have at present. So far as cold storage is concerned, I am quite at one with the Government. I am prepared to support the expenditure of a very handsome amount to provide cold storage, so that the farmers of this country can place their products on the London markets at the earliest possible date; but that is a very different thing from paying \$500,000 a year to provide a fast service to give a few passengers a day less on the way. I have no doubt that many gentlemen have read Mr. Sandford Fleming's pamphlet on this subject. He is a gentleman who knows this route perhaps as well as any other man in this country. He has travelled it, as I have done, many times, and he knows the dangers to be met with in travelling a route of that description, which is constantly subject to fog and ice. He says:

It appears to me that the time has arrived when the Canadian people may profit by the experience which has been gained in subsidizing public undertakings. Many will remember cases when subsidies have been granted to enterprises that have been found impossible of successful accomplishment. The result has been grievous loss and disappointment, and sometimes ruin, to innocent investors, with much discredit to Canada. As more directly connected with the present question, I may refer to the experience gained in the history of Canadian mail steamships, though I do not wish to recall the series of disasters which at one time befell the Allan line, when eight passenger ships were lost in eight years, or the shipwrecks and losses sustained by the Dominion and Beaver lines. I have been called to account

by the press of Quebec for mentioning that the navigation of the St. Lawrence offers many dangers to the rapid steaming of vessels of heavy tonnage. Some writers state that my knowledge of the navigation is very limited, and my opinion respecting it not worth much. As they will possibly recognize a Quebec authority as more competent to speak on this point, I would refer to the work of Mr. Henry Fry, published so recently as 1896. This work, entitled "The History of North Atlantic Steam Navigation," has been carefully prepared by one of the most respected residents of Quebec, long familiar with every circumstance connected with the St. Lawrence route. In this volume will be found a record of details fully supporting all I have stated respecting the difficulties in the way of fast steaming, and the dire consequences to which these difficulties have already too frequently led, even in the case of comparatively slow steamships.

Among other things stated by Mr. Fry, is, that the distressing loss of life and property were not due to any want of skill or experience on the part of the owners or captains. He, however, expresses the opinion that the Government was not blameless in exacting speed, in the face of the serious obstacles which were presented to rapid steaming, and in imposing heavy duties for non-punctuality in the delivery of the mails within the periods stipulated by contract.

Obviously, no one wishes to see similar losses repeated, and it is to prevent them being repeated, possibly in an aggravated form, that words of caution are now being used. It matters little who proclaims the necessity of caution.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** If the hon. gentleman proposes to continue his remarks, I would suggest that he move the adjournment of the debate, because the hour for the adjournment of the House has arrived.

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).** I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

MONDAY, 14th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SAFETY ON RAILWAYS.

**Mr. CASEY** moved :

That that part of the Report of the Select Committee to which were referred Bills Nos. 2 and 3, recommending the printing of the evidence for distribution, be adopted, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

He said : I have merely to say that that evidence is of great importance to the understanding of the question. Whether the measure passes the House this year or not, the

**Mr. WOOD (Hamilton).**

evidence is of such value that I think it should be laid before the public.

Motion agreed to.

### FISHERY BULLETIN REPORT.

**Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk)** (for **Mr. Lemieux**) asked :

Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries aware that the Fishery Bulletin Report is not sent regularly on the Gaspé coast?

2. What are the regulations concerning that report?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (**Mr. Davies**). 1. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not aware that the Fishery Bulletin Report is not sent regularly to the Gaspé coast, and inquiries will be made from the officer in charge of that service. 2. The bulletin is to be posted up daily at the telegraph offices of the most important fishing centres along the sea-coast of the maritime provinces.

**WM. O'BRIEN, OF SS. "LANSDOWNE."**

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)** asked :

1. Has William O'Brien been dismissed from the position of coxswain on the SS. "Lansdowne" ?

2. If so, when was he so dismissed?

3. On whose complaint, for what cause and on what charge was he so dismissed?

4. Was there any, and what, investigation into any such charge?

5. For what length of time has he been in the service of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (**Mr. Davies**). 1. Mr. O'Brien not now in employ. 2. Discharged on the 31st November last when "Lansdowne" went out of commission. 3. Not aware of any complaint. Mr. O'Brien was a member of the crew of the "Lansdowne" and served as boatswain. The crew is not permanently appointed but subject to changes from time to time as deemed expedient. 4. No. 5. In service for some years, but have no record of his appointment at Ottawa.

### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (**Mr. Fielding**) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

**Mr. SPEAKER** read the Message, as follows :—

#### ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimate of a sum required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1897, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North Amer-

ica Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends this Estimate to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, 14th June, 1897.

### SUPPLY—DISMISSALS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish briefly to refer to two cases connected to the subject of dismissals. One is a case that was mentioned last session and in reference to which some papers were laid on the Table of the House. I refer to the case of special agents of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Pictou, and I desire to point out to the hon. Minister that last session he laboured under a totally erroneous impression with regard to the action these agents had taken in the late elections. I was not myself aware of the facts at the time, and I admitted the possibility of these gentlemen having been members of an election committee, but subsequently I ascertained that so careful had these gentlemen been that they had refrained from taking any active part in that election and were not members of any political committee. Now, I do not know that it is possible to induce the hon. gentleman to look into this matter again or take further action looking to the reinstatement of Messrs. Noonan and Davis. It may be—and I am not concerned in discussing that question one way or the other at present—that the hon. gentlemen regards these positions as quasi-confidential in connection with the administration of the service and the distribution of patronage at that port, and for that reason he might possibly desire to have some one not identified with the Conservative party discharging the duties of special agent; but I desire to call attention to the fact that he has based his action upon totally erroneous information, and I would ask him to reconsider this matter in the light of the policy which I understand the Government have already adopted of granting officers retired under certain circumstances from the civil service allowances to recoup them for the amounts paid in by them to the superannuation fund. I think some allowance should be made to these men for having faithfully discharged their duties and having been removed without any negligence or misconduct on their part. I think if the opportunity were afforded, they could satisfy the hon. Minister that in no respect had they done ought to forfeit his confidence or the confidence of the head of the department, be he Conservative or Liberal. Again, I want to point out to the hon. gentleman what seems to me, from the papers, to be an irregular action on his part, and one which, in any event, must be made regular. These men held their appointments by Order in Council, approved by the Gov-

ernor General. That Order in Council has never been cancelled, and, consequently, the appointments have never been properly cancelled. Their dismissal was made simply by a letter which, I fancy, would have no legal effect on a claim that might be pressed by these special agents for their salary up to the time the Order in Council under which they held office was rescinded. The letter is dated 28th July, 1896, summarily informing the special agents that Mr. Oliver had been appointed in their place as special agent, but the Order in Council under which these gentlemen held office, was dated 15th July, 1890. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take that as a ground—if he is disposed to deal with this matter on broad and just grounds and avoid the investigation I have suggested—for allowing these men their salaries up to the time their dismissal is put in regular shape by the rescinding of the Order in Council, because the hon. gentleman cannot override an Order in Council by departmental instructions or letter. I may say, before leaving that case, that the hardship of the hon. gentleman's action is shown by the fact that if the hon. gentleman were to search the county of Pictou over—and it is a large county with a very large electoral list—he could not have found a more bitter opponent of my colleague and myself than the gentleman whom he has appointed to succeed Messrs. Noonan and Davies. Mr. Oliver has always been an active and energetic and perhaps unscrupulous canvasser in every political contest in which I have taken part, and from the best information I can get, he has never ceased his active partisanship since he has been put in office as special agent for the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Leaving that case for the consideration of the Government, I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the case of Mr. J. W. Hughes, in which there does not seem to have been, as far as I can judge, any regular course pursued. Mr. Hughes, who is well and, I think, favourably known to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was appointed to the position of clerk in connection with the Sault Canal at a yearly salary of \$800. Before the year had run out, without any charge whatever having been made against Mr. Hughes, his salary was stopped and his duties ceased, but he has not received, that I am aware of, any formal notification of dismissal from the service, or, at any rate, if he has received one, it is only within a short time, whereas his salary, which is payable monthly, was stopped some time in December last. Mr. Hughes has ever held himself in readiness to go on with his work, and assumed his work would go on, as usual, at the opening of navigation, but navigation has opened and he has not been ordered to return to his duties, and I think there are circumstances in his case which

will warrant the hon. Minister—if Mr. Hughes is to be discharged or if the action taken is intended as severing his connection with the department—in paying him up to such time as formal notification was given him that his services were not further required. It seems to me he is entitled, at any rate, to a full year's salary unless some charge of misconduct or neglect has been preferred against him. But I understand nothing of that kind is contended, but it has been assumed by the department that a message instructing him to dismiss the staff was sufficient notice to him that his own services were also to be dispensed with. It seems that about December 12th, 1896, he was instructed to dismiss the staff, and he wired to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals as follows:—

Staff dismissed to-day. Waiting your instructions here. Considered position permanent.

(Sgd.) J. W. HUGHES,  
Clerk.

And, as I said before, he was appointed, wisely or unwisely, so far as he was concerned, at a salary of \$800 a year, and, when this notice was sent to him, he very properly assumed that it in no way referred to his position. On the 15th December, 1896, this rather ambiguous letter, in this connection, is received by him from the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals:

In reply to your letter of yesterday's date, I may explain, that all the employees on the canals hold office merely during the pleasure of the Government, and, as it was considered that the full staff for the season of navigation was not needed during the winter months, whilst the canals were closed, instructions were issued to dispense with the services of such members of the staff as were not considered necessary to conduct the business of the canal during the period during which the canal was closed, hence it is that you received the notice from the superintendent to which you refer.

I am, of course, always sorry when circumstances necessitate the dispensing with the services of employees.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,  
Chief Engineer.

Hon. gentlemen will see that even that letter does not refer, in terms, or, I think, even inferentially, to the particular case of Mr. Hughes, who was not one of the employees, in the sense of the letter, was not on the same footing as the staff who were laid off during the winter on the understanding that their employment was temporary, by the month, but was an officer with a yearly salary, and, therefore, in a different class altogether, being nominated as a clerk over all these so-called employees. Since then, Mr. Hughes has been endeavouring, by correspondence with the head of the department to ascertain his status and exactly where he was. As I am informed, it was not until recently that he got anything in

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

the way of a conclusive answer from the Minister of Railways that his services were not to be re-engaged. Under these circumstances, if I have correctly stated them, and considering the nature of the engagement of Mr. Hughes and the fact that he did discharge his duties efficiently, I hope that at least the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in considering his case, will give him his full salary, even if he cannot re-engage him and send him to the position to which he was appointed or to one with similar duties.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Just a word with reference to the first case which the hon. gentleman mentioned—the dismissal of Messrs. Noonan and Davis as agents of the Department of Marine at Pictou. The hon. gentleman assures that there were circumstances connected with the change which require further investigation at my hands, and, of course, if he thinks there are, I shall be very happy to reopen the matter and give it further investigation. But my recollection of the case is perfectly clear. The papers have been brought down. In my humble judgment—and I am sure the hon. gentleman will coincide with me—the agent of the department at Pictou ought to be a person with whom the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could hold confidential communication, and that, therefore, I should have a person in whom I have confidence. The hon. gentleman is under the impression that Messrs. Noonan and Davis were appointed by Order in Council. I do not think that that is the case. The first appointment of Messrs. Noonan and Davis was for them to act under commission. Afterwards the department commuted that appointment for an annual payment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) allow me to read to him the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to state it as I understand it first. After commuting the commission for an annual allowance of \$200, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) when Minister of Marine and Fisheries, applied to the Governor in Council to fix a higher salary than had been allowed departmentally. He had the impression—and I think he is right—that it would be well to have an Order in Council sanctioning the increase. He went into the Council, not to have them appointed as agent, but to fix their salary. They were not appointed by Order in Council, as no duties were fixed under that order, but the amount to be allowed them was fixed at \$400. There was no appointment in that Order in Council, in my opinion. If he thinks that it is an appointment, I shall be happy—as I have respect for his opinion—to go into the papers and see if I am wrong.

At present I cannot see that I am wrong, but I shall be happy to go into the matter. As to repaying them, if they paid into the superannuation fund—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, they did not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, of course, they did not come under the Superannuation Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, but it is the spirit of that that I appeal to. But I may be allowed one word. Instead of discussing the point that the hon. gentleman raises as to the Order in Council, I will barely refer to what I think was the only tenable point to be advanced—the necessity of having an agent in whom he had confidence. I appeal to him to deal generously with these men, if he finds that their record in the department is a satisfactory one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has called my attention to the case of Mr. Hughes who was an employee in the office at Sault Ste. Marie. I am not, at the moment, in possession of the particular circumstances which belong to this case, but I think Mr. Hughes was supposed by the Deputy Minister and the chief engineer of the department to come within the rule which had been laid down last winter after the close of the canal. It was deemed desirable and eminently proper that all the employees on the canal who were not required in the winter season should be set free, and a circular to that effect was sent to the superintendents of the canals, and they were instructed to inform this class of employees that their services would not be required during the winter, and that, if they were required when the canals opened in the spring they would be notified. They understood that Hughes came within that class of employees, and I think from what the hon. gentleman has read, that notice was received by him which he understood, at all events, to mean that his services were dispensed with for the time being, and he did not continue in the employ during the winter season. I am advised in a general way, that Mr. Hughes' case belongs to a class and does not involve any special circumstances. However, I should have no objection at all to giving my personal attention to the matter at the earliest moment, and looking into the case to see whether there is any ground on which Mr. Hughes can reasonably claim his salary after his services were dispensed with.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The main difference. I would remind the hon. gentleman, was that there was a yearly salary.

## TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to call the attention of the House to a matter which, I think, must be regarded as of importance. Now that we are adopting a vigorous immigration policy, it is of the utmost importance that the reports of the Government, especially the Trade and Navigation Returns, should be compiled so as to show the products exported from the different provinces. I am sure there was no intention on the part of the late Government to mislead anybody or misrepresent anything, but the difficulty arose in entering the goods as from the different ports from which they are shipped, regardless of the province in which they were produced. Now that we have immigration agents in the old country and in the United States as well, it is of the utmost importance that if our Trade and Navigation Returns fall into the hands of parties in those countries that are looking into the condition of affairs in Canada, a correct representation should be made. For instance, in the matter of wheat, I find, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the exports were, from Ontario, 7,490,530 bushels, while from Manitoba the exports were only 1,216,450 bushels, and the North-west exported only five bushels. Now that the reports have gone abroad that Manitoba and the North-west are raising large crops of wheat, if the Trade and Navigation Returns fall into the hands of any person in England inquiring into the condition of things in the several provinces, he will naturally come to the conclusion that there is something wrong. Then, in the matter of butter, I find that the exports from the province of Ontario were 102,352 pounds, while from the province of Quebec the exports were 5,115,000 pounds. That is certainly not a correct representation, according to the products of the two provinces. The exports of butter from Nova Scotia were 445,812 pounds, from New Brunswick, 40,207 pounds; Manitoba, 66,994; British Columbia, 12,828; and Prince Edward Island, 92,184. I think that, perhaps, these returns are nearly correct, except as between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. According to these returns, we find that the province of Ontario exports 27,667,000 pounds of cheese, while the province of Quebec exports 134,861,000 pounds. This is certainly not a correct statement. Then, take the case of animals—that is, horses and cattle. Horses over one year old, exports from Ontario 4,248; from Quebec, 15,452; from Manitoba, 183; from New Brunswick, 1,199; from Nova Scotia, 224. I think that here again the discrepancy is between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, all our cattle and horses being shipped from the port of Montreal. It would be an easy matter for the two commissioners who have to examine all the animals put on board the vessels there, to

ascertain where they were produced and to give the annual returns of the same. Of cattle one year old. I find that, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, 97,005 were shipped to Great Britain, of which Ontario sent only 389, whereas the province of Quebec sent 95,619. This discrepancy arises from the fact of all the cattle having been shipped from Montreal. Nova Scotia is credited with 1,883; New Brunswick with 2,082; Manitoba, 1,684; British Columbia, 3; Prince Edward Island, 1,226; and the North-west Territories, with all those vast ranches, and the large number of cattle that I know are exported out of that country, according to these returns, are only credited with 5 cattle exported. Now, I hold that in justice to this new country the exports from each section should be fairly represented. It is of great importance that our Trade and Navigation Returns should be compiled with as great exactitude as possible. While I do not believe that there has been any intention to mislead. I still think that proper care and attention have not been exercised in the past. I do not bring this up in a party spirit, or in any spirit of provincialism, but because I think these facts should be correctly set forth in our Trade and Navigation Returns. The immigrants coming from different countries would like to know the products of the different provinces, and what the exports are which they send forth. I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Controller of Customs will give this matter their attention, and have the Trade and Navigation Returns compiled so as to show as correctly as possible the source of our agricultural exports.

**THE CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The subject the hon. gentleman has mentioned is one of great importance, and the end he has in view is very desirable. The House has observed that he has found no fault with the department in its manner of doing this work hitherto, nor in the way the work is done at present; but he is seeking, if possible, that we may have statistics that will more accurately describe the exports sent out from the different provinces and territories. This subject no doubt engaged the attention of my predecessors in office. Whether the department may be able in future to arrive at results that will more clearly indicate the place of production of our different exports, I am not yet able to say. It is evidently a very desirable object judging from the manner in which the case has been presented by the hon. gentleman. But there are difficulties that might arise as I find on having given some thought to the subject, although I have not yet been able to see how we could reach results with anything like accuracy. For instance, take the shipments of wheat from Quebec and from Montreal. A great deal

of this wheat, if it is Manitoba wheat, will be manifested on Fort William, as it may go into store at Fort William. It may be manifested on Montreal, it will lie in Montreal, some of it may go into home consumption at Montreal, and another part of it be exported. If the export entry was made directly at the port of shipment, there would be no trouble, but the trouble comes in where it is manifested on some other Canadian port, and goes into storage there, a portion of which may go into home consumption, and another part be exported. That explains largely how it is that our cheese and butter exports from the port of Montreal are manifested on Montreal; they lie in storage there, and after a time may be exported, and go out as exports from the port of Montreal. I mention these points to show the hon. gentleman how difficult it is to arrive at the source of production. I have no doubt my predecessors have given the subject attention, and have not been able thoroughly to solve it. It is only by the census taken every ten years that we ascertain with some accuracy the source of production of these exports. Of course the different provinces and the leading cities through, their boards of trade, perhaps, are able to gain information and tabulate it, information that is of importance to the different provinces; and I suppose it has not been considered by the department hitherto that it would be proper to take the statistics gathered from outside sources instead of through officers of the department. Whether any improvement can be made in that direction, I am not able to say; I know, however, some improvements may be made. But to be able to get an accurate compilation of the exports from the various provinces and territories, is a subject that will require considerable thought. I recognize the value such a compilation would be. I have no doubt the desire of the hon. gentleman is the desire of the House, and if the department are able to devise any way by which that can be done in future, I will be glad to carry it into effect.

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.** I am glad the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. McMillan) has brought this matter to the notice of the Government. While they are giving it consideration, I wish to draw their attention to a matter still more important, in my judgment, because it is desirable that Canada should have due credit for its trade. When in England my attention was called to a matter with reference to which I had some correspondence with the board of trade, although without reaching so desirable a result as I could have wished; I refer to the fact that a large portion of the trade of Canada is credited to the United States; a large portion of the trade of Canada going to Great Britain and sent via the United States, appears in the trade returns of the United Kingdom to the

credit of the United States instead of to Canada. I think that is a subject which might be followed up with advantage by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and by the Controller of Customs, with a view, if possible, of getting such an alteration made by the board of trade in the United Kingdom as would give Canada full credit for all her trade, both exports and imports.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** Could the hon. gentleman tell me if, in the compilation of British statistics, Canada has credit for exports the product of the United States passing through our ports?

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER.** I think it very likely we do, but that is so much smaller than the trade of Canada going through the United States, that it leaves a large balance in favour of the United States against us. I will send my hon. friend a copy of the correspondence that I had with the boards of trade, which will put the Government in possession of the facts from our standpoint.

Mr. **MACDONELL.** I think this difficulty could be easily settled by compelling the railway companies to make returns of their shipments of produce from each of the provinces. At present the province of Quebec really gets credit for material shipped from all western provinces, because it is shipped at Montreal and the city of Quebec.

#### DISMISSALS FROM LAND OFFICE, MANITOBA.

Mr. **TISDALE.** I have taken no part so far, or very little, in discussions in relation to dismissals. But some one has sent me, I presume as being an ex-Minister of Militia, a quotation from the Winnipeg "Nor'-Wester" which I wish to call to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. I do so with the desire that, if it is true, to call his attention to it and to leave him responsible for it, because it is a matter relating exclusively to men in the militia force who risked their lives in the rebellion that took place in the North-west. If it is true, I hope that the Minister will rectify the complaint. I am not in a position to say whether it is true or not, but it seems to me a serious matter.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). Does the hon. gentleman refer to the case of Mr. Perrin?

Mr. **TISDALE.** There are two or three cases. The quotation is as follows:—

Much has been heard of late regarding offensive partisan officials, by a set of Ministers who have zealous partisans of their own side desirous to get an office. Two cases of dismissal are reported from the Interior Department illustrating the merciless way in which the spoils system is being applied. The Winnipeg "Nor'-Wester" says that

one of the clerks dismissed from the Dominion Lands Office is Mr. Herbert B. Perrin. Mr. Perrin is a young man who, on the breaking out of the Saskatchewan rebellion, offered his services as a trooper in Major Boulton's troop of scouts. He was one of the first men shot in the engagement at Fish Creek. His left arm was shattered; and he is mentioned in General Middleton's despatch among those wounded seriously. It was necessary to amputate his arm, and his recovery was for a long time doubtful. He lived; but his prospects in life were blasted. It was then that the Government, as an appropriate, if not adequate, recognition of his sacrifice in the cause of his country, gave him a small position in the Interior Department. That position he has filled most efficiently. He has never been guilty of an act of partisanship, and there is no blot in his official record. Surely this was a case in which the most remorseless of spoilsmen might have been expected to stay his hand. But not so Mr. Sifton. He has thrown this young man suddenly into the street, without reasonable notice, with a wife and family dependent upon him, with the official experience attained during twelve years of faithful service quite useless to him, and handicapped in acquiring a new calling by the loss of the arm the rebel's bullet shattered.

Another similar dismissal is that of Mr. M. O'R. Jarvis, of the Minnedosa Land Office. Young Jarvis, when the rebellion broke out, was a member of the 90th Battalion. He, too, was shot in the arm at Fish Creek; and he, like young Perrin, was given a minor position in the Interior Department by the late Government as a recognition of his sacrifice in the cause of his country. Like young Perrin, too, he has, without any cause, been made a victim of Mr. Sifton's heartless partisanship, and has been turned adrift to make a place for a camp-follower of the army of Reform. Still another dismissal, equally odious to every loyalist, may be mentioned. Miss McLean, who, with her father, was captured by Big Bear during the rebellion, and who suffered all the suspense and hardship of a prisoner during that chief's celebrated northward flight, was given a small position in the Indian Office in Winnipeg by the late Government. She has been an exemplary official; and her familiarity with the Indian dialects is of the greatest service to the department.

I would call the attention of the Minister to these cases. Personally, I know nothing of the matter, but the Minister undoubtedly does.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale). I may say that the officials to whom reference is made in that newspaper article are employed in the office of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands at Winnipeg, and it being the intention to abolish that office, nearly all the officials have received notice that their services would not be required after the 30th of this month. I was not aware of the facts of the particular cases which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has referred to. With the exception of the case of Mr. Perrin, they have not been called to my attention. It has been stated to me that Mr. Perrin was given this position on account of the fact that he had served the country in a military capacity, and that he had suffered injury

which incapacitated him from being as well able to take care of himself in the ordinary affairs of life as he would have been if he had not been wounded. Immediately upon those facts being brought to my attention, I at once gave instructions that he should be retained and that his notice should be recalled. As for the other cases, I will be very pleased to consider them and see what can be done.

#### MICMAC INDIANS—MEDICAL ATTENDANT.

Mr. GILLIES. There is another matter connected with the Department of the Interior to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister. It is in the knowledge of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) that we have in the province of Nova Scotia a band of Indians called the Micmac tribe. Several of these Indians live on the Island of Cape Breton and are placed on the different reserves in different counties. A certain number of them live upon the Salmon River reserve in my county. For many years this band was attended medically by Dr. John A. Macdonald, who was employed in 1884 by the Rev. Mr. McDougall, Indian superintendent of the division. Although the Rev. Mr. McDougall differed from me in politics he was a personal friend of mine, and inasmuch as he differed so strongly from me in politics, I assume that he had no political predilections in favour of employing the medical gentleman to whom I refer. For years and years Dr. Macdonald attended upon that Indian band with every satisfaction to the Indians, and they had the utmost confidence in him. Last September in this House, I had a petition sent to me from the Indians upon that reserve strongly remonstrating against the medical attendant being changed and the services of another medical gentleman being retained. They sent a petition to the Department of the Interior through me, and I had it transmitted to the hon. gentleman (Senator Scott) then in charge of the department. Weeks passed on, and I had no answer from that gentleman. I then waited upon Senator Scott, and he said he had been so beleaguered and beset by correspondence from hon. gentlemen on the Liberal side of the House that he had not time to attend to any other matter in his department, except to answer these letters. Having failed in getting an answer from Senator Scott, I had the matter brought up in the House, and the hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who was then answering for the Department of the Interior here, was good enough to give me the assurance that the matter would be looked into, and that there would be no change in the medical attendant of the Indians on Salmon River. I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) acted up to his word given on that occasion. Now, I take the liberty of reading to the Minister (Mr. Sifton) the petition

Mr. SIFTON.

which was sent to the Interior Department last year by the chief of the band and his three captains. I will read it for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), because I assume that he has not been in possession of the facts, or otherwise he would not have acted as he evidently has done. The petition reads as follows :

St. Peter's, Cape Breton,  
September 3rd, 1896.

To the Minister of the Interior :

Sir,—We, the undersigned, in behalf of the Indians of Salmon River Reserve, desire to bring to your notice the gross injustice of being coerced by the Indian agent here of employing a physician who is objectionable to us. We deplore the prospect of being deprived of the services of our old physician, Dr. J. A. Macdonald, who has treated us for years successfully, in whose generosity, ability and skill we have the most implicit confidence, and for whom we entertain every feeling of respect. In politics he has never been known to be an active partisan ; on the contrary, we are well aware that during party conflicts he has quietly attended to the duties of his profession.

We have full confidence in your generosity and sense of justice to have our grievances remedied, and humbly desire you to have our old and trusted physician's services continued.

On behalf of the Indians of Salmon River Reserve.

Your obedient servants,

JOHN DENNIS, Chief.  
THOMAS W. SCOTCHMAN,  
ALEX. SCOTCHMAN,  
PETER RICHARD. } Captains.

I then asked the hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) if any change had been ordered direct from the department, and he gave me this answer :

Mr. DOBELL. No order has been given to change the physician and to discontinue the services of Dr. Macdonald, and no order on the subject will be given without grave consideration.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. Minister see to it that instructions are at once sent to the Indian agent at St. Peter's to have Dr. J. A. Macdonald's services engaged?

Mr. DOBELL. I cannot promise that ; I can only promise that the matter shall receive favourable consideration, and all the more after what the hon. member has said to the House.

Matters went on in this way. Dr. John A. Macdonald's services were not continued. He had some claims against the department for his services, but he could not get a reply in answer to his letters. I wrote myself on several occasions on his behalf. This is peculiar courtesy introduced into the Department by this new Minister. In February last, Dr. Macdonald received this letter from the department, shortly after the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) had taken charge. It will be noticed that the letter is dated 15th February, and is in reply to one sent in October by Dr. Macdonald. It is as follows :—

Department of Indian Affairs, Canada.  
Ottawa, 15th February, 1897.

Sir,—With reference to your communication, dated the 6th October last, I beg to inform you

that the delay in replying to the same is regretted; it was, however, unavoidable, as the Superintendent General had under consideration the subject of medical treatment, &c., to be afforded the Indians of the Salmon River Reserve, with the result that in future Dr. Bissett's services will be called upon.

In inclose herewith cheques Nos. 185 and 184, amounting respectively to \$38.50 and \$31.10, in payment of your accounts for professional attendance given to Indians of the above-mentioned reserve during June and September quarters, 1896. I regret the necessity for the reduction of these bills from the amounts rendered. This is, however, unavoidable, as funds are limited. You have been allowed mileage at the rate of 35 cents, in pursuance of the policy of economy.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) HAYTER REED.

Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

John Macdonald, Esq., M.D.,

St. Peter's, Richmond County, N.S.

The scale that had been in vogue up to this date was 50 cents a mile. That was reduced by the department to 35 cents a mile. With that I have no quarrel, because it was done on the ground of economy, and I assume that the reduced scale will be continued for the future. But I want to ask the Minister how he came to change the medical attendant at St. Peter's in the face of the remonstrance sent by the Indians themselves, asking that the services of Dr. Macdonald be continued, and in the face of the statement of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who was then representing the Indian Department in this House, that no change would be made in that service without the gravest consideration. I ask what the reason was for that change. No political reason can be assigned, because the contrary was represented by the Indians themselves. If it was on the ground of the professional efficiency of one man over the other, that cannot be set up, because the Indians themselves in their petition set forth that they have the most implicit confidence in the professional skill and ability of Dr. Macdonald, who had been in attendance upon them for twelve years previously. I ask the Minister to give me now the reason why Dr. John A. Macdonald's services were dispensed with, in the face of the remonstrance of the Indians, and in the face of the statements given and made in the fulness of Ministerial responsibility by the hon. member for Quebec West.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the history of the particular matter to which he has referred was not brought to my attention in any way when I was dealing with the matter, and I am not able at this moment, without the correspondence before me, to say what the exact reason for the change was. I may say that I found considerable difficulty in regard to the question of medical attendance for the Indians in Nova Scotia, by reason of the fact that its cost had been constantly increasing; and

steps were taken for the purpose of reducing the cost and also for the purpose of placing it on such a basis that the department would know what it was going to cost in any one year, and they would not be receiving bills for a larger amount than they had estimated for. Several suggestions were made with the view of paying for the medical attendance by salaries instead of by fees. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a pledge was given that no change would be made; but I do not understand that anything further was promised than that the petition of the Indians would be fully considered. That was not brought to my attention, and, therefore, it was not considered before the change was made. As to the exact reason why the change was made, I am not able to say without looking at the correspondence, and, therefore, I shall have to defer giving a more definite answer until I have an opportunity of seeing the papers.

#### GAME LAWS OF QUEBEC.

Mr. POUPORE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) if he has heard anything further from the Quebec Government with regard to the game laws, so far as they affect the Indians in the Abbitibi district. On the 19th of May, in answer to a question, he stated that the Government intended to ask the Quebec Government to relax the game laws so far as they affected the Indians in the Témiscamingue and Abbitibi districts; and I would like to ask him if he has any further information on that subject?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no further definite information to be given; but the statement I made to the House on that subject is being carried out. An Order in Council has been passed setting forth fully the views of this Government in regard to the matter, and has been forwarded or will be forwarded in a day or two to the Quebec Government for its consideration, and I have no doubt the matter will be dealt with at a very early day.

#### DISMISSALS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) whether he has reconsidered the dismissal of Mr. Tennant from the Gretna sub-collectorship. It seems to me, from the facts which have been brought before me, that this is a case in which, if the hon. Controller of Customs reconsiders the matter, he will find it very hard indeed not to remedy what he has done by reappointing Mr. Tennant. What seems to have happened is this. Mr. Hastings got a letter from Mr. Scott informing him that he had been instructed from Ottawa to dismiss him, as his services were no longer required. On inquiry, he heard that there was some charge against him of offensive partisanship; but on going over

his memory he was unable to charge himself with any action whatever of a political character. The only meeting he ever attended was a meeting of local politicians, and the only thing he ever did was to reply to a statement about his co-religionists. It seems that he is a Roman Catholic, and hearing a statement made about his co-religionists, he got up and spoke about it. Any of us, if our religion were aspersed, would be inclined to do that. As we know, Roman Catholics are more sensitive than any other body of Christians, and are much more likely to resent any aspersion cast upon their religion. This case is an exceptionally hard one. Mr. Tennant has not only been a long time in the public service, but he has a wife and seven children. In a letter to John McDougald, Esq., commissioner of customs, he says :

As you are aware, I have paid superannuation for many years, and I have now to ask what amount the Government intend to offer me as a gratuity in lieu of my superannuation allowance, which, I hope you will agree, I am honestly and equitably entitled to, because of the years of service and the payments made.

On looking at these papers, I think that the Controller of Customs, instead of considering what gratuity he is to give, should consider how he could reinstate this man once more in the public service.

Now, as we are cleaning up, and as the session is drawing to a close, I will, with the permission of the Controller of Customs, before he answers that question, call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to one or two matters. I understand that Mr. John Dobbin, of the Regina agency, has been removed. I have not yet learned why the Minister has removed him, but if he has done so on any political ground, I am quite sure that he has been misinformed, because I cannot believe for one moment that Mr. Dobbin took any part in politics. He was a strong Conservative, an Orangeman, and a strong supporter of mine; but apart from that, I do not think he took any part in politics. Since I have called the Minister's attention to the dismissal of Mr. Stemhorn, I have had a letter from him containing what I think is a reasonable request, that we should get the letter which charges him. As long as there was a Liberal opposed to me in the field, Mr. Stemhorn could not be got to speak a word in my favour. So long as Mr. Grant was in the field, he would not utter one word, because he thought that occupying the position he did as a civil servant, he should not take any part in politics when taking part would be taking a side. Afterwards the supporter of the Prime Minister withdrew, and then I was fighting, not Mr. Grant, but a Patron, and fighting, mind you, not a Patron who said he was supporting the Liberal party but a Patron who had been the other day a Conservative and who had been denouncing me for years as not

Mr. DAVIN.

sufficiently Conservative. Whenever I spoke in this House independently, he assailed, what he called, my want of loyalty to the Conservative party. Well, that gentleman came out as a Patron, and again, and again, did I try and get him to say that he was a supporter of Mr. Laurier, but failed. He would always repudiate Mr. Laurier.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the reason he was defeated.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall not go into that, but I may tell my hon. friend that Mr. Grant, who came out strong for Mr. Laurier, retired, and I think that if I could have got Mr. McInnis to come out straight as supporting the Liberal party my majority, colossal as it was, would have been still more mountainous. However, I am not going to make a political point but simply appeal to the justice of the hon. Minister and to what I hope he has behind his sense of justice, a large amount of the milk of human kindness.

Mr. FOSTER. Unwatered.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course. I hope that when he comes to consider those cases, the milk of human kindness will be all unadulterated. I would urge the hon. Minister to reconsider the case of Mr. Dobbin. A better or more faithful servant no Government ever had, just as walking this earth to-day there is no whiter soul than the soul of that same John Dobbin.

I wish also to call the attention of the hon. Minister to some dismissals up north. The last dismissal is that of Mr. Almon at Edmonton. Mr. Almon was not only a good officer but politically one of the most colourless persons you could find.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Notice was sent to Mr. Almon because I could not see that there was any necessity for two officials in addition to the agent. I consulted the member for the constituency, Mr. Oliver, and he said that one of the clerks spoke French, and it was necessary to have in the office some one who understood French, so I kept the one who did.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, I would urge, if there should be a vacancy elsewhere, the appointment of Mr. Almon. In the early part of this session I asked a question with reference to Mr. P. J. Williams, who was Indian agent at Battleford. I asked whether he had been dismissed, and why, whether Mr. C. M. Daunais had succeeded him, whether it was the same C. M. Daunais who was instructor on Red Pheasant's reserve, Battleford, why he left the department, and whether he was dismissed for immorality. The hon. First Minister gave me an answer which was copied in full in the Saskatchewan "Herald," in which he said that Mr. Williams had been dismissed and that Mr. Daunais had been appointed in his place. It seems that Williams, so far as I have

been able to learn—and I have made special inquiry—is one of the most deserving servants of the Indian Department. I wish the hon. member for Russell were here, because the family of Mr. Williams is well known to my hon. friend the member for Russell. Mr. Williams is the son of a prominent farmer and a supporter of the hon. member for Russell, and went up in 1879 as farm instructor to Fort Pitt. At that time it was taking one's life in one's hand to go to Fort Pitt, and Mr. Williams was so successful that he was afterwards promoted, and I may say that with regard to the Sarcee Indians, whom he has had to deal with, that these Indians who are hard to manage, he managed with great success. Well, this man has been removed, and I am told not a very creditable substitute provided.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Williams was removed after consultation with the Indian Commissioner because he was represented to have neglected to make proper provision for the wintering of the cattle, in consequence of which neglect they lacked food and a very large number died. He was unable to give any satisfactory explanation, and upon consulting with the Indian Commissioner we decided that there was no excuse for his conduct and dispensed with his services. I do not know the gentleman and have nothing against him except the official report. His successor was appointed on consultation with the member representing the constituency and on reference to the Indian Commissioner, Mr. Forget, who for a long time has been in the Government service and enjoyed the confidence of the preceding Government as he does of the present one, and who is a most efficient officer. I asked him if he thought the person named would make a competent and efficient officer, and he unhesitatingly replied that he thought a better appointment than Mr. Daunais could not be made.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I want to call attention to the dismissal of Mr. Justus Wilson, removed from the Red Pheasant reserve. He was a lieutenant in the volunteers at Duck Lake. I also wish to call attention to the dismissal of F. A. D. Bourke, and a man named J. C. DeGear, who, I am told, were first class men. In place of some of these we have the appointment of Maxime Lepine and Chas. Nolin. The hon. Minister is aware who Maxime Lepine is.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where was he appointed?

Mr. DAVIN. Nolin was appointed at One Arrow. Louis Marion, farm instructor, was dismissed, and Nolin appointed in his place. Maxime Lepine was appointed to another agency as farm instructor. Now, I do not want so much to speak of the men appointed as to condemn the dismissals. Louis Marion succeeded

Dumas, and in 1895 was farmer to One Arrow and Beardy's Band. He was chosen because he was the best man to quiet the feelings among the Indians and succeeded admirably. In Five Hills, Mr. A. J. McNeill has been appointed agent of the Sarcees. I am told that he is related to the Minister of Marine, but I do not care if he is a good man. I know this that McNeill was sent to Sarcee and J. P. Wright was in suspense. Mr. Wright was an old agent and a most competent, honest and upright man. His agency was one of the best run and most economically managed and yet he has been dismissed and so has Keith. I knew Keith, and I must say he was a most capable man and if there is any partisanship charge against him there cannot be the least ground for it. I should like to get from the Minister of the Interior some explanations of the dismissals that have taken place on the Saskatchewan. I suppose the hon. Minister has received an account of the meeting that took place at Regina.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have heard of it.

Mr. DAVIN. So far as I know only one Conservative was at that meeting. Looking at the report in the "Free Press," every name I see is that of a prominent opponent of mine in the last election. For instance, there is Mr. J. W. Smith, Mr. McInnes, the gentleman who ran against me; Mr. Walter Scott, who is known, I think, to be a strong opponent of mine, and so on. And, at this meeting, they emphatically condemned two things. They condemned the taking away of the Indian Department—and I hope that at the suggestion of a powerful meeting of his own supporters, my hon. friend will leave the Indian Department at Regina—and they condemned the reduction of the Mounted Police. Strong resolutions were passed on these subjects. I need not read the resolutions, because, no doubt, the hon. Minister has received a report of the meeting, or it will be sent to him. These strong Reformers held that the police should be restored to its full number of 1,000 men. However, the hon. Minister (Mr. Laurier), who deals with the Mounted Police, is not present now. What I would urge at the present moment is that these representations from his supporters ought to be attended to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) and the Indian Department left at Regina.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has referred to a circumstance which illustrates the dangers which beset the path of a Minister who endeavours to effect any economy. It will be within the knowledge of hon. members who have been in this House longer than I have, that the establishment and continuance of the Indian Commissioner's Office at Regina has been under discussion before, and the advisability of its continuance there

has been questioned. I found, upon looking up the evidence taken before the Civil Service Commission a few years ago, that Mr. Vankoughnet, the late Deputy Superintendent General, strongly recommended that the office should be abolished, and, upon consultation with the officers of the department and with the Commissioner himself. I came to the conclusion, a conclusion which I see no reason to change, that the large staff maintained at Regina was entirely unnecessary for the proper conduct of the business there. It is an extremely unpleasant thing for any Minister to have to dispense with the services of the employees of an office of this kind. There is nothing against the officers themselves, there is no reason why they should be retired from the service, except the simple fact that they are not required. That unpleasant duty I have had to perform. As to the question of location for the Commissioner at Regina, and the two or three assistants that he will have, I have not changed my mind on account of the receipt of the resolution which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and which, I have no doubt, as the hon. gentleman says, were passed at a meeting composed almost entirely of supporters of the Government. I have the matter under consideration yet, and it cannot be said that the decision is final. It is merely a matter of convenience to the Commissioner in transacting the duties of his office. If, after consultation with the Commissioner, I come to the conclusion that Winnipeg is a more convenient place for him to do his work, he will have to go to Winnipeg. I recognize that in connection with changes of this kind there are always sure to be difficulties. In the reduction of this staff and of the Mounted Police, no doubt the people of the North-west will see something to find fault with. The expenditure of the Government amongst themselves, is of course, something of an assistance in a territory where the towns are small. But, having made up our minds that the expenses of this department had to be reduced, I do not think that the hon. gentleman can reasonably expect that, for the purpose of avoiding a little local friction of that kind, we should allow ourselves to be deterred from carrying out a policy that we think in the interest of the department and in the interest of the country.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). As the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has referred to some dismissals in the riding which I have the honour to represent, I want to say something about these dismissals. He spoke first of Mr. P. J. Williams, the Indian agent at Battleford. I may say that Mr. Williams is quite incapacitated from looking after the Indians of his division. He is now in Ottawa and not able to do anything through illness. His office was not looked after last winter, and a

Mr. SIFTON.

great number of the cattle died, and that was the reason why Mr. Williams was removed from office. I hope the Minister will do something in the way of superannuation for Mr. Williams, seeing that he is not able to do anything to support himself. Now, the hon. member for West Assiniboia has mentioned the gentleman who succeeded Mr. Williams, Mr. C. M. Daunais, and has insinuated that he has not a very savory reputation. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Daunais has a first-class reputation. He was in the Indian Department years ago. The hon. gentleman asked if Mr. Daunais was the gentleman who was dismissed from the department on account of some charges made against him. I may say that Daunais was dismissed. He was an employee of the department, appointed during the Mackenzie Administration. Charges were trumped up against him, but no investigation was held, and he was dismissed from the service simply because he was a Liberal, and not because there was anything wrong with him. He has mentioned Mr. Justus Wilson. I may say, in connection with this case, that the object of the Government in spending so much money on the Indians of the North-west Territories is to teach the Indians to become self-supporting. If the Government employs men to teach the Indians how to farm, they should be men who know something about farming. Mr. Wilson has no knowledge of farming and never had. He hardly knows one end of a plough from another. I have seen him trying to fix up a plough when he had to send for one of the Indians to show him how to do it. I do not think that the Government would be right in keeping a man like that to teach the Indians how to farm. Another gentleman had charge of the Government cattle, and he let the cattle die. There is no reason for their dying because the settlers' cattle all around the district of Battleford came on in good shape, while the Indian Department cattle were dying like flies. We found during the administration of the late Government that on each reserve they had a man, which was not necessary. Many officers dismissed have not been replaced. Instead of having one instructor on each reserve in the Battleford district, there is only one instructor to two reserves, and that is quite enough. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Louis Marion. I do not know whether he is aware that Mr. Marion was a very active partisan. But I know. Personally he was an active canvasser, and worker, and was not attending to his duties on the reserves. For that reason he was dismissed, and properly dismissed. He has also mentioned Mr. Nolin. Mr. Nolin is a practical farmer, and if he is appointed to this position, will show good results for his work. He understands farming and he understands the Indians, and he will give a good account of himself. The hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Lepine

has been appointed as Indian instructor. Such is not the case; Mr. Lepine was appointed as interpreter. It is necessary to have a half-breed as interpreter, as you cannot have anybody else who can talk with the Indians. Now, as to Mr. Keith, who was also mentioned, I do not know what has been done in this matter. I should think, however, the hon. gentleman should hesitate about bringing up this case. Mr. Forget, the Indian Commissioner, is going to investigate charges of intemperance made against Mr. Keith, and if he finds them true, no doubt he will report against him. I may draw the attention of the hon. gentleman and of the Government to the fact that Mr. Keith's house was a sort of committee room for the Conservative party, and that his clerk, Mr. Halpin, was the deputy returning officer in the June elections. He has always been a partisan of the most pronounced type. I have nothing more to say other than that the officials in my district have been treated very leniently, taking into consideration the fact that every one of them has been an active partisan. In fact, the Conservative committee in my district was composed chiefly of these gentlemen. One could hardly walk about without stumbling over officials, whose duty seemed to be simply to attend meetings and applaud the Conservative speakers. We could get on with half of them. Take, for instance, the land office in Prince Albert. We have two men drawing large salaries for the work that one man could do. Reductions could take place with the result of saving to the country a great deal of money.

Mr. DAVIN. The Controller of Customs did not answer my question regarding Mr. Tennant, the sub-collector at Gretna.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My remembrance of that is that Mr. Tennant was dismissed, and, speaking from memory, there were very explicit and direct charges made against him by the member for that riding, and by other gentlemen. Of course, as to Mr. Tennant, personally, I know nothing of the statement that the hon. gentleman makes in reference to him. However, I will look the papers over again. I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman does not know the whole facts of the case. I am sure a recommendation went to Council, and I acted upon the evidence I had. With reference to the superannuation, that question will be considered when we get power, because I think he has been in the service for some time.

#### DISMISSAL OF MR. DOBBIN—LAND OFFICE AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a word with regard to Mr. Dobbin, who has been dismissed at Regina, and who is referred to by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He was originally

a resident of my county, and a man whose family was very much respected there, an intelligent man, and very attentive to his duties, and a man who, I am quite sure, would not be a partisan anywhere. I am told that the place that he occupied must be filled by some one, therefore his services could not have been dispensed with for reasons of economy. If the place is to be filled again, I respectfully submit that no better man could be put in the position than Mr. Dobbin. While I am on my feet I would like to say a few words with regard to doing away with the Indian agency at Regina and the land office at Winnipeg. I remember some years ago, when it was difficult to settle troubles in that country, both in regard to the Interior and to the Indian agency. Applications were made down here, members of Parliament were written to, and when you went to the department, the department was obliged to get a report from some of its agents in the North-west, and it took a long time before the information was available here upon which they could deal with the cases. From time to time, requests came from the people of that country, from those who were doing business in the interests of the settler, that the Government would establish a land agency in Winnipeg and an Indian agency somewhere in the North-west. At last the Government established an agency there. I know, as a member of Parliament, something of the difficulties that took place in connection with the original settlers in that country. It was a great convenience to the original settlers when the land office was established in Winnipeg. It was an easy matter for the agency there to send out some person to investigate the claims, and report upon them in a short time. The cases were dealt with much more satisfactorily than they could be dealt with by the department in Ottawa. I think it was one of the best improvements made in the Interior Department, when the land agency was established in Winnipeg. It gave great satisfaction to the settlers, because they could apply to that agency when they could not deal directly with headquarters here. So also with those dealing with the Indians out there. I know it saved us writing a great many letters, and relieved us of much work that we had to do before that time. In my judgment, it was not in the interests of the people up there to do away with the land agency, nor do I think it will conduce to the best management of the department to have the work done down here. I have no doubt that the Minister meant to do what was right, and that he thought he was acting in the public interest and the efficiency of the service; but I think he will find in a short time that the same work which was done there can still be done there more easily and to better advantage, and to the greater satisfaction of the people, than it can possibly be done down here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say to the hon. gentleman that careful observation of the correspondence between the commissioner's office at Regina and the office here, and the commissioner's office at Winnipeg and the office here, shows that the work is simply duplicated; that the officers there cannot and do not take the responsibility of acting in matters of importance, and it simply means that the work is duplicated. In many instances the establishment of the office there and the fact that there is a commissioner's office there rather delays the performance of the work than otherwise; because, instead of reports coming in directly here and being dealt with here, they go to the commissioner there, and if the matter is important, he refers to the head office, the head office has to write back to the commissioner, and the commissioner has to transact the business there. But it is necessary, in the case of Indians, to have a responsible office there, and to have a commissioner there to deal with matters as they arise. That office will be still carried on, the commissioner will be there; that which is being abolished is the large staff which practically carries on a duplication of the work that has been done down here.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking with reference to the land office in Winnipeg, my experience is that many difficulties are settled up there without referring them to headquarters afterwards.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend the Minister did not say anything with regard to Mr. Dobbin. He is a gentleman with whom I have been acquainted for a long time, he goes from my own constituency. I hope that my hon. friend will deal with him as leniently as possible, because I am quite sure that he is a very good officer.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It seems to me that Mr. Dobbin has a great many friends among hon. gentlemen opposite, he evidently is very popular there. The report I got indicated that in the election he was trying to make himself still more popular, and the evidence to that effect was very strong. But I want to make it clear that, on the other hand, there is nothing to reflect upon Mr. Dobbin's character, either as an officer or as a citizen. When a man is dismissed for political partisanship, I think he is entitled to such a declaration as this, and I cheerfully make it. But I must say to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that the evidence which was laid before me, while there was not a formal investigation, was very clear. I think that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) must have been wilfully shutting his eyes to what was going on in the neighbouring office of the committee at Regina, and that he did not know that Mr. Dobbin was taking the active part in the election. In fact, I am surprised at

Mr. SPROULE.

the lack of knowledge of the hon. gentleman as to what was going on in his neighbourhood at Regina. But, knowing, as I do, that the member for Western Assiniboia is a man of truth and veracity, and that he would not mislead the House, I am compelled to come to the conclusion that he adopted the tactics of the ostrich and hid his head in the sand while some of these things were going on. As to Mr. Dobbin, I am quite prepared to say that, so far as I recollect, nobody has yet been placed in his position. In view of what my hon. friends have said, I am prepared to look into the matter again, and if the evidence is not conclusive, I am prepared to reconsider my action.

Mr. DAVIN. I may say to the Minister that I never saw Mr. Dobbin in a committee room.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has really no right to speak again—nothing more than a word or two.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has spoken several times, he is wasting the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the leader of the House when I may expect to get those poor neglected returns of mine that I asked for on April 5th and May 3rd respectively.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I suppose he alludes to those he mentioned in a note to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I admit that the hon. gentleman ought to have these returns. I will endeavour to get them for him.

Mr. MARTIN. I would remind the Minister of Public Works of an order of the House passed some time ago for returns which the hon. gentleman promised to lay on the Table.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is it?

Mr. MARTIN. It is an order for papers and correspondence in reference to Belle River Breakwater. The Minister promised to lay the return on the Table of the House a few days ago, and I am sorry to say he has not done so. I trust that this return will be a little more complete than some other returns that I have asked for from the Government. I hope the Minister of Public Works will include all the correspondence.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.**  
Hear, hear.

**Mr. MARTIN.** Including, if possible, a letter which I wrote to the department about a week ago.

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

(In the Committee.)

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada..... \$35,000

**Mr. WILSON.** I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) why Captain Holmes has not been employed as immigration agent this year? He was at the head of the staff in the United States, and I think did some good work.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton).** Mr. Holmes was not in the employ of the department, so far as I know, when I took charge of it. In arranging for the work in the United States I selected the men as a rule with whom the department was acquainted, and Mr. Holmes, as far as I know, made no application for service, and his name was not officially brought before me at all; I am satisfied upon that.

**Mr. WILSON.** Captain Holmes was in the regular employ of the department as immigration agent, for years, I believe. He had charge of the work in the United States for some two or three years.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** He must have been dispensed with before I took charge, as his case never came before me. Of course I was aware from current newspaper reports, that Captain Holmes was in the employ of the department, but he was not in the employ when I took charge.

**Mr. WILSON.** Is there any correspondence in the department from Captain Holmes with reference to his being employed this season again? I understood he had written to the department.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** If there is I am not aware of it. I never remember having Captain Holmes's name before me.

**Mr. WILSON.** Will the Minister make some inquiry about it, and let the House know at an early day?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I will.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Would the Minister give us the names of the agents employed in Canada, where they are employed, and their salaries?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The officers whose salaries are chargeable to this item are as follows:—J. A. Kirk, Halifax, salary \$1,200.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Is that the place offered to Mr. Ross, and which he refused?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Yes.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** In whose place?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** In the place of Mr. E. M. Clay, who was removed on account of the results of the investigation which took place with regard to the accounts of the institution.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Would the hon. gentleman state what was wrong with the accounts?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** A charge was made by one of the men connected with the institution, that Mr. Clay had been guilty of some embezzlement in connection with the accounts of the immigration building there. A commission was issued to investigate the charges, and the result was, that it was proven that accounts had been falsified by Mr. Clay. I was, therefore, compelled to remove him from the position.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I have been informed that the facts were: That Mr. Clay had made a charge for cleaning the office and doing certain things of that kind, and as the work had been performed by his wife, he did not wish to have his wife's name appear in the account, and so the name of a servant was substituted. But there was nothing wrong so far as the public money was concerned, as this money was actually paid for the purpose for which it was intended. It was a proceeding which has not been confined to Mr. Clay alone in the past. He substituted the name of another person when drawing the money.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Several charges were made, and the charge which was clearly proven was something in the nature of that referred to by the leader of the Opposition. It was not shown upon the investigation, that the amount of money that was paid by the department had been expended, or that value had been given for it. It was simply shown that the agent had put in a fictitious name, but it was not shown that work was done to the amount charged. It is perfectly clear to my mind, that the transaction was improper, and was one which the Government cannot possibly overlook. I may say, that there was no pressure of any kind brought on me to dismiss this gentleman, and I did it most reluctantly. There was no desire to remove him to make place for anybody else, and I had no knowledge of the man except that I saw his name in the lists of the officials of the department. He was reported, I believe, to be a good officer. It was in the knowledge of all the other officers in con-

nection with that institution, that there had been some crookedness in connection with the accounts, and I could not see how it would be possible that we could expect the officials to be careful in their dealings, if this offence were allowed to go. There were circumstances connected with the case which made it most unpleasant to take the course I did, but unfortunately I had to do so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) used rather a strong term when he said "embezzlement." These accounts amounted to a very small expenditure, and the explanation given to me is such as I have given to the House: That the work had actually been done for which the money was charged, but the name or another person had been used in order to avoid the name of Mr. Clay's wife appearing in the accounts. I can say that Mr. Clay is the son of a very highly respectable man, that his connections are of a very respectable character, and that so far as I have any opportunity of knowing him, he was a most painstaking, efficient and energetic officer, who always attended to the discharge of his duties. I am very sorry that any question of the kind should have arisen.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall proceed to give the names to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). T. E. Clay, clerk, Halifax, salary \$720; M. Kennedy, caretaker, Halifax, salary \$410.62; Charles Stemshorne, guardian, Halifax, \$228; William Evans, Gideon Martin, W. H. Corrigan, guardians, salary \$228; Mrs. Cullen, matron, salary \$300; Joseph Martin, nightwatchman, salary \$480; F. Gardner, St. John, N.B., salary \$740; P. C. Doyle, agent, Quebec, salary \$1,400; L. Stein, clerk, Quebec, salary \$1,200; Wm. Anderson, interpreter, Quebec, salary \$730; John P. Stafford, Quebec, salary \$912; T. Lamontagne, clerk, Quebec, salary \$900; F. O'Reilly, messenger, Quebec, salary \$456.25; Edward Talbot, chief guardian, Quebec, salary \$700; T. M. Deschene, guardian, Quebec, salary \$456.25; three guardians, namely, E. Galarneau, Marc Lessard, James Fitzgerald, salaries \$388.25; Mrs. Corneil, matron, salary \$600; John Hoolahan, agent, Montreal, \$1,200; Joseph Daigle, salary \$1,200; A. Rachimbai, messenger, \$700; J. M. McGovern, agent, Port Arthur, salary \$1,000; W. F. McCreary, commissioner at Winnipeg, \$2,200; W. G. King, clerk of statistics, Winnipeg, \$1,200; John W. Wendelbo, interpreter, \$800; Charles Hislop, clerk and caretaker, \$800; Miss K. Duff, clerk, \$540; Dr. S. C. Corbett, medical officer, \$600; Leon Roy, French interpreter, \$900; C. W. Speers, agent at Brandon, \$1,500; W. Braun, clerk and caretaker at Brandon, \$800; C. W. Sutter, agent at Calgary, \$1,200; John Cushing, caretaker at Calgary, \$600; Thos. Bennett, clerk at Edmonton, \$720; J. Moat, caretaker at Dauphin, \$400; A. Akerlinah,

Mr. SIFTON.

interpreter, &c., at Ottawa, \$1,000. I was asked the other day, when this item came up, to specify the changes which have been made, that is to say, to name the men who have been placed in the positions of others who have been dismissed. John Cushing, caretaker at Calgary, has replaced C. F. Herbert. The cause of the dismissal of Mr. Herbert was active political partisanship. At Montreal H. Hurteau and A. J. Charlebois have been removed, and Joseph Daigle has been appointed in place of them. Mr. Daigle had the qualifications which would enable him to perform all the duties required. The medical officer at Winnipeg has been changed. The officer was appointed not as a permanent official, his services being simply called in as required. Dr. Gray was removed when Dr. Corbett was appointed. A French interpreter at Winnipeg, G. P. Cloutier, was removed, and Leon Roy appointed in his place. The cause of Mr. Cloutier's dismissal was that he devoted a large part of his time to political work. At Quebec three guardians, men who were employed temporarily and were paid by the day, named Hamel, Lepine and Mullins, were removed, and three others named Deschene, Galarneau and Lessard put in their positions.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the salaries of Hurteau and Charlebois, why were they dismissed, by whom were they replaced, and at what salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Hurteau and Charlebois were removed, and Joseph Daigle was put in the position. Daigle receives \$800. I have not a memorandum of the salaries paid to the two officers whom he replaced, but if I remember rightly they amounted to about \$1,200.

Mr. BERGERON. Why were they dismissed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were removed because it was believed that there was no necessity for two officials there—that a man who was able to perform the work of a clerk efficiently could perform the duties of both; and the change was made accordingly.

Mr. BERGERON. In Quebec I understand that three guardians were also replaced. What were their salaries, and by whom were they replaced?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salaries are the same. They were men whose employment was merely of a temporary character, and under these circumstances I thought it was quite proper for me to place men in those positions who were friends and supporters of the Government.

Mr. MONK. Was there any complaint at all against Charlebois or Hurteau?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None whatever. The information I have received from the officers of the department was that Charlebois was appointed on the day before the election on the 23rd of June, or within two or three days of it. I inquired and ascertained that that was the fact, and the indications were that Charlebois had been placed there at that critical period for political reasons, and not because there was any special duty for him to perform.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know much about Charlebois, but I can tell my hon. friend that Hurteau was appointed ten years ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was speaking about Charlebois.

Mr. MONK. The charge is that Charlebois was appointed on the eve of the election. I think the Minister might have taken the trouble to investigate that charge, because it is not true. He was appointed a considerable time before the election, and he was a perfectly qualified civil servant, and there was no complaint against him.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understand the Minister, the three guardians at Quebec were dismissed because they were Conservatives, and they were replaced by three Liberals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be well if the hon. Minister could give us the number of agents employed in Halifax before, and the number employed there now, and the same information with regard to the other places. The list of names he has given us does not afford information on which to base a comparison.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no change in that respect, so far as I am aware. Some men have been taken on at Quebec and some at Lévis, at the request of the officials in charge, who stated that it was necessary to do so at this period of the year; but there has been no change in the organization or in the number of officials, so far as I am aware. I have not had time to overhaul the system for the purpose of satisfying myself whether or not the work can be done with fewer officials.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the same at the other stations—Montreal, Port Arthur, Winnipeg, and Brandon?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was one officer at Port Arthur, and there is one now. At Winnipeg the organization has been changed altogether. The work was done by some employees at the immigration building, who were under the

charge of the Commissioner of Dominion lands, and the papers connected with immigration were kept in his office. One of the changes I thought it necessary to make at once was to separate the Dominion lands work and the immigration work. The officials connected with the Dominion lands office are not men who naturally take an interest in immigration work, or who can devote their time fully to it; and after some conversation with Mr. Smith, the late commissioner of Dominion lands, which indicated the difficulty he had in looking after the immigration work, I became fully satisfied that it was quite impossible to handle the immigration work properly unless there was an officer there who had not other matters on his mind, or other duties to perform; and the operations of the staff this spring have fully justified the change. The staff employed under the new commissioner, Mr. McCreary, has been very fully occupied—in fact, has been hardly able to keep up with the work in connection with the new immigrants coming in. The staff is partly composed of the men I have named, and partly of new officials. In as much as the work was done hitherto largely through the Commissioner of Dominion lands and his staff, it is not possible to make a comparison.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. McCreary the mayor of the city of Winnipeg, and Mr. King an alderman of the city of Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McCreary is mayor of Winnipeg; Mr. King is not an alderman.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any other official in Winnipeg an official of the city?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not that I know of. Referring to the point raised by the hon. gentleman, which is quite worthy of consideration of the committee, I had great difficulty in selecting a person who I thought would give complete satisfaction in that position. Mr. McCreary's acceptance of the position implied that he would not accept the position of mayor in future.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume those men employed in the land office and doing the double duties of that office and as immigration agents would have more knowledge of the work and that, therefore, the hon. Minister, when reorganizing his office, would avail himself of the services of those men who were discharged from the land office, as far as possible, by putting them in the immigration office. I presume they would be more valuable for that work than new men coming in. How many men employed in the land office previously are now employed in the immigration office?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where men with some special qualifications

are not required in the immigration office, I am making use of men from the lands office. For instance, the gentleman referred to by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), Mr. Perrin, I have given a position to in the immigration office. And where it is possible to make use of the services of any gentlemen in the commissioner's office, I am doing so. James W. Wendelbo and Miss Duff are employees who are being kept on. Mr. King, clerk of statistics, is a man who speaks four or five languages and able to converse with any European immigrant who comes in. One or two of the other men are also employed for special reasons. Generally speaking, I have filled vacancies in the immigration office with men from the Commissioner of Dominion lands' office, which is to be abolished.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

In the case at Halifax, I believe the offence alleged to have been committed is one that was committed several years ago. If the facts were such as the hon. Minister has mentioned, no great complaint could be made of his action, but how does it contrast with his appointment as immigration agent of a man branded by the Supreme Court of his own province as a perjurer. I refer to the case of Mr. W. J. King, who swore to an affidavit which enabled a petition to be presented against the return of one of the members of this House, and who, on being cross-examined as to the contents of that affidavit, gave such evidence that the court forthwith ordered all further proceedings to be stayed on the ground that the statements sworn to by this man were false, and that the action taken on his affidavit was an abuse of the procedure of the court. That was the case of King versus W. J. Roche, one of the members of this House, and that affidavit was made as recently as the 23rd of December last. The judges unanimously decided that the affidavit of Mr. King, since appointed one of the hon. gentleman's immigration agents, was false and made the order to which I have referred. That case excited considerable comment.

**Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).** As much as the ballot box stuffing did.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

Whether the offence was ballot-box stuffing or perjury, the House should give its expression of opinion on the appointment of any person guilty of such a criminal offence or, otherwise, there might be no limit to such appointments. When the hon. Minister asks the House to support him in dismissing an officer for conduct, criminal or quasi-criminal, he is bound to explain to us how it is he came to appoint such a man as Mr. King to any office in his department.

**Mr. SIFTON.**

Under an amendment to the Election Act, passed some sessions ago, the petitioner must swear that he believes that each and every allegation set out in the petition signed by him is true. In this case of King versus Roche, the petitioner practically charged the respondent with having violated every section of the law, and he subscribed to the affidavit that he believed and had reason to believe that each and every allegation of his petition was true. On examination he had to admit that he knew nothing of the matter, that he had no reason for believing that any one of the charges was true, and that he had not even read the petition, to the truth of which he had sworn. He confessed sufficiently to be practically branded as a perjurer by the court, and the judges unanimously dismissed the petition and declared that to take any action upon such an affidavit was an abuse of the procedure of the court.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** If a statement such as that which has just been made by the hon. gentleman had been made by a gentleman who had not the advantage of legal training, I would not be, perhaps, very much surprised; but I must confess to my astonishment at hearing a gentleman who has occupied the very high position of Minister of Justice make the statement that this man King was branded by the Supreme Court of the province of Manitoba as a perjurer. The facts show that there is no foundation whatever for any such statement. In order that a man be guilty of perjury, he must have made a statement on oath, not only that was untrue, but that he knew was untrue. And I put it to any lawyer in this committee if it would not be a most absurd and ridiculous contention to hold that any man who makes an affidavit and who should, upon cross-examination be shown not to have been fully aware of all the facts which would furnish sufficient ground for that affidavit, was a wilful and corrupt perjurer? There is no lawyer who knows anything of the proceedings of the courts who does not know that it would be perfectly absurd to lay down any such doctrine. No doubt Mr. King was culpably careless in connection with the matter; but every lawyer who has any practice knows that, under those circumstances, the blame would very largely lie, not with the man himself, but with the solicitor, under whose advice and direction he gave the affidavit. Men engaged in litigation know that most constantly affidavits are made by litigants with regard to proceedings, the tenor and effect and meaning of which they do not understand. Of course, it is careless on the part of clients to do so, but it is none the less the fact that conscientious and honest men often do it. They go into a lawyer's office, they look the paper over, and the counsel in whom they have confidence advises them that it is a correct statement.

It is couched in legal language which very often they cannot understand, setting forth certain facts which must be deposed to. Why, even when the most honest men make affidavits, you cannot absolutely rely upon them as full and correct statement of facts, and we have, therefore, provided for cross-examination. Our law provides that any man who makes an affidavit may be cross-examined about it. There is no lawyer of the least experience who does not know that it is of every-day occurrence for men who have made affidavits to be cross-examined and to find out that they have made misleading affidavits without, perhaps, having had the slightest intention of so doing, and to lay down the doctrine that a man who makes an affidavit under the advice of his solicitor and who, under cross-examination, the court decides had not sufficient grounds for making it, is a wilful and corrupt perjurer, is to lay down a doctrine which has not the slightest foundation, and I do not think that any member of the legal profession, in a calm, unbiassed frame of mind, not desirous of making a political point against an opponent, would think of submitting a proposition of that kind.

I have known this man King for a number of years. He was appointed by me if my recollection is correct, before this judgment was given by the Court of Queen's Bench—certainly before this judgment was drawn to my attention. He was appointed by me solely and entirely for what I believe to be his peculiar fitness for the duties of his office. He was a civil engineer by profession, had spent years in various countries, had been a farmer in Manitoba and had had the benefit of a varied experience in knocking about the world, besides having command of several languages. My attention was drawn to this matter to which my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has referred, and I looked over the proceedings and judgment of the court for the purpose of ascertaining the ground for supposing that the man had not been guilty of any direct or intentional impropriety. I could not see that there was the slightest proof of anything of the kind, and I say now that, so far from agreeing with my hon. friend from Pictou, I think that the charge he makes is unwarranted; and if he will read the proceedings carefully I am sure he will see there is no ground for making the charge that this man had been branded by the Supreme Court of Manitoba as a perjurer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am rather surprised, indeed actually pained, that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has taken such a light view of the case which I have drawn to his attention. I am satisfied that he cannot lay the evidence given for that court by King before his own colleague the present Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) and bring down

to this House a report from the Minister of Justice that will support his own view of the conduct of King. I undertake to say that the Attorney General in almost any province outside of Manitoba would, in a similar case, consider it his duty to proceed against the man for perjury. I have read every line of it, and I say that not only does he there disclose what the Minister himself has admitted to be culpable negligence in connection with an affidavit which it seems to me, and I think will strike most lawyers in this House as sufficient to support a charge of perjury—but he is forced to admit that he knew nothing in reference to the statements that were made and could give not the slightest shadow of an excuse for having stated that he believed these different charges to be true. For the hon. Minister, himself a member of the bar, to suggest that where a man has made a reckless affidavit, false from beginning to end, he is not to be held guilty of perjury, the man says that he subscribed his name to the affidavit because counsel drew it, and that he swore to the statements because he was advised by counsel to swear to them, is something entirely novel to me. I venture to say that no member of the bar in this House, on either side of it, will agree with the hon. Minister in the opinion he has so quickly given. I hope that, on reflection, he himself will withdraw that statement. It is very well for his colleague, the Minister of Justice, to be dealing with the criminal law in the other Chamber, but what is the use of criminal legislation if a colleague in this House of the Minister of Justice is to be permitted to say that it is no offence but only an irregularity for a man to swear to an affidavit false from beginning to end, so long as he is advised by counsel to swear to it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the purport of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sifton's) argument. If not, what was there in it? Why did he take me to task? Can he deny the statement I make that King swore to the truth of a petition without knowing or being able to give any reason for the statement that the facts alleged were true? Can he deny that King himself confessed that he made this affidavit without taking any trouble to inquire into the actual facts of the case? Or can he deny, or does he deny, that the judges to whom I have referred, characterized that affidavit as dishonest? And will he tell me that the judges were right in characterizing that affidavit as dishonest and that there was culpable negligence on the part of King in making it, and then say that all the elements that constitute the crime of perjury were not present? It is a novel doctrine that the Minister has assumed to lay down to-day, and I hold that it is making en-

tirely too light of so serious an offence. There are the facts that will not down; there are the facts that inform the Minister that this man whom he appointed, and whose appointment he now justifies, was branded, not by me, but by the court of his own province as a perjurer. And with the facts stated in court, it was the bounden duty of the Attorney General, the late colleague of the Minister of the Interior, to prosecute him. But instead of that officer doing his duty, we are now told that the offence was one of carelessness only, and that the man who commits an offence characterized by the judges of the land as amounting to dishonesty, is entitled to recognition at the hands of the Department of the Interior and that any member of the House who stands up and protests against conduct of that kind is to be twitted with having no knowledge of the criminal law. The only reason that can be quoted why this man should not be called a perjurer should have induced the hon. Minister to refrain from speaking of another officer as an embezzler—the fact that he has not been convicted after trial. It is true that the man was not convicted in the ordinary course, but certainly he should have been given an opportunity to clear his skirts of this serious charge fastened upon him by the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, before being put in a position of trust under the Crown.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before you take up the next resolution—though it is not strictly regular—I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a rather disturbing telegram from Winnipeg which has been published in the "Free Press," and in regard to which I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to relieve the public mind. The telegram, with its heading, is as follows:—

INDIANS ON THE WARPATH.

More of Them Killing Cattle in the North.

Mounted Police Out.

Efforts Being Made for a Voluntary Surrender. Special to the "Free Press."

Winnipeg, June 14.—An unofficial despatch yesterday from Regina stated that Indians yesterday killed all the cattle on the farm of Mr. Gerudon, near Duck Lake, and then went to another farm, where they contented themselves with threats. In consequence of the report, a detachment of eight police and a corporal left Regina to proceed to the spot, where they will join a small detachment recently sent to Nut Lake. An official report from Regina, received at an early hour this morning, says the later news about the Indians up north is to the effect, that it is not known positively that any cattle were killed, though it is highly probable. The Indians belonged to the reserve where Almighty Voice was living. They complained they did not receive rations and had no food; therefore, they left the reservation to dig roots, and it is believed they did not hesitate to kill cattle. These facts were telegraphed by Commissioner Herchmer to Commissioner Forget to-day. He is on a west-bound train, and re-

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

ported from Swift Current, that if the men would go back to the reserve, they would be fed. Inspector Wilson, at Duck Lake, has, therefore, been instructed by wire that the police will endeavour to persuade the Indians to go back to the reserve. Only those Indians who have been cattle-killing or stealing have been arrested. Every effort will be used to induce a voluntary surrender.

My object in drawing the attention of the hon. gentleman to this matter is the hope that he may have some information to relieve the anxiety which will naturally arise and avoid the injury that would be caused by the publication broadcast over the country of statements calculated to produce the impression that the Indians are in an uneasy condition, and that there is apprehension of trouble.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the disturbance took place caused by the attempt to capture the Indian, Almighty Voice, I sent instructions to the Commissioner, Mr. Forget, that he was to keep me fully advised with regard to any possibility of difficulty or turbulence amongst the Indians, and he replied that he would keep me fully advised by telegram. I have not received any advice from him in regard to this particular matter, and I am perfectly satisfied, from my knowledge of Mr. Forget's carefulness in carrying out my instructions and also his competency, that there can be nothing serious or else I would have been advised. The fact that I have received no official telegram is, to my mind, conclusive evidence that there is no such difficulty as that to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). As this difficulty occurred in my riding, I may state that I am in constant communication with people there. I am satisfied that there is no such difficulty as reported. There was a rumour that the Indians had killed certain numbers of cattle, but on investigation, it was found that there was nothing in it. It arose from a mistake in the wording of a telegram, which should have read that the Indians are disturbing cattle. The police investigated the matter and found that there was nothing in it. But after an occurrence of the kind, and the exploits of Almighty Voice, the settlers do feel a little nervous. I think it would be well for the Indians to be kept on the reserves and that rations should be given them, especially the Indians on the reserves of One Arrows and Nut Lake.

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Great Britain ..... \$25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a large increase in this item over last year. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to give us the names of the agents employed, where they are employed, and their salaries?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The names of the agents employed in Great

Britain and Ireland, and their salaries, are as follows:—C. R. Devlin, headquarters at Dublin, salary, \$2,000, new appointment.

Referring to the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper a few moments ago, I may say that I hold in my hand a telegram received from Commissioner Herchmer, of the Mounted Police, indicating that there is no serious difficulty of any kind, and that the reports have been exaggerated.

Edward O'Kelly, agent, employed for the south and west of Ireland, salary \$120 per month. W. L. Griffith, Wáles, salary \$1,200. Alfred Jury, \$150 a month; directed to work mostly in the north of England, reporting to the office at Liverpool.

Mr. BERGERON. Why are some employed by the month and others by the year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps I was wrong. The engagements are all by the month, except Mr. Devlin's, who is hired by the year.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the difference between engagements by the month and those by the year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Those who are supposed to be employed more or less in a temporary way, and whose services it may be desired to dispense with during the year, or to remove from duty, we employ by the month, so that we may not give them any tenure of office. Thomas Duncan, working from Glasgow, \$100 per month. John Dyke, who has been in the service of the department for a long time, \$3,200. G. H. Mitchell, clerk in the office at Liverpool, \$958 per annum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad you still retain Mr. Dyke.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is still in the employ of the service. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have under consideration the question of the retention of Mr. Dyke's services; and if it is possible, I will have him come over here that I may consult with him with regard to the matter. I am desirous of retaining his services if he is able to perform the duties that will be required of him. I fully recognize the fact that Mr. Dyke's long services in the Government require consideration at our hands, and from the fact that he has great experience in immigration matters, we desire to retain his services. Then there is Mr. E. Rothweiler, clerk in the office at Liverpool, who gets \$379.60 a year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is there an increase in the salary of Mr. Mitchell? Mr. Mitchell is a very able as well as indefatigable officer, his services are of the greatest value, and I would be extremely glad if it had been possible for the hon. gentleman to increase his salary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have decided to increase his salary from

the 1st of July, but I have not finally decided as to how much the increase will be. Then there is Thomas Grahame, Glasgow, an officer who has been for years in the employment of the Government, \$2,151. He is still retained in the employ of the Government, but correspondence is going on as to the question of his retirement. John Webster, working in the north of Ireland, a new appointment, \$900. E. J. Wood, Birmingham, \$1,200; W. G. Stuart, Inverness, \$1,200; P. Fleming, Dundee, \$1,200; E. McLeod, junior clerk in the office at Liverpool, \$126 a year. Those are the officers in Great Britain and Ireland.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

The House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Hamilton):

That Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.

Mr. McALISTER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman has already made his speech on this matter. He talked an hour the other night.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) has the floor.

Mr. MORRISON. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would ask a favour of the House, and that is that No. 66 on the Order paper be permitted to be proceeded with. It will only take a very few moments.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot change the Order paper like that.

Mr. MORRISON. I am asking the permission of the House. It will only take a short time. I am afraid if that is not done, I may not get another chance of taking up my Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the hon. gentleman cannot intervene without the consent of the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister).

Mr. McALISTER. I consent, with the condition that I may go on afterwards.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I shall object to any other Bill being taken up till this Bill is disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, that puts an end to the proposal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I appeal to the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) to allow these Bills to get through. Afterwards we are very anxious to hear his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Hamilton has objected.

Mr. McALISTER. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has any interest in that Bill, I would like to hear it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have no interest in that Bill, but I have an interest in some of the others. I think we can get the hon. member for Hamilton to withdraw his objection.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). No, you cannot.

Mr. MORRISON. With the hon. gentleman's permission again—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this ought to go on all the time. The hon. member for Hamilton has objected to changing the order.

Mr. MORRISON. I think if the hon. member had a moment to reflect upon the consequences of taking this step, he would withdraw his objection. The only motive he can have in objecting to these Bills being heard now is that it may take up time which he might have to consider his Bill. Now, I would point out to him that it does not at all lessen his chances by granting this indulgence. I am sure there is no member in this House who can afford to stand strictly upon his rights, as the hon. member is doing, because they are not disputed. I am only asking the hon. member now for an indulgence which he may in a short time desire for himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. member a motion to make? If so, I will put the motion.

Mr. MORRISON. I move that order 63 be now proceeded with.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I object in toto to any Bill taking precedence of the Bill that is under my charge. The hon. gentleman opposite objected in the first place, because my Bill was not printed in French; then he talked it out on the second reading. Next, he occupied the whole time in the committee when it was in committee. Then on the motion to go into committee, he talked it out another hour; his sole object is to talk the Bill out. I do not think that it is fair that an arrangement should be made between that hon. gentleman and any other hon. gentleman in the House to put my Bill to one side and to take up other Bills. The only chance of getting this Bill through is in maintaining its position on the Order paper, and I think I have a right to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman objects to this motion being passed; therefore, I rule that it is lost, and we will proceed with the order.

Mr. McALISTER. In reply to the hon. member for Hamilton I may say that I did

Mr. LANDERKIN.

oppose this Bill all through. I did not offer any factious opposition to it. It is a Bill that has no right in this Parliament, as I think I will show before I am through. I did not occupy the time of the Railway Committee, nor half the time, when this Bill was before it. The greater part of the time was taken up by the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) and his friends. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) for supporting his Bill, but he should not impute improper motives to me for opposing it. It is my privilege and right to oppose, and I shall avail of that privilege. When you left the Chair on Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, I had just read a unanimous protest against this Bill which was entered by the municipal council of the county of Restigouche. That protest clearly shows that my opposition to the Bill is not factious and that it is not prompted by any party spirit. It shows that there is a strong feeling in the county against the Bill, and it shows that I am only carrying out the request and the desire of the constituents whom I have the honour to represent. The request made in that protest is to defer the consideration of the Bill until next session, is not unreasonable, and when such a unanimous protest against legislation is entered by any constituency it ought to be treated with respect by this House. The county of Victoria represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) is equally opposed to the passage of this measure. I characterized, the other night, certain statements contained in a circular distributed amongst members, as untrue and misleading in every respect. One statement in that circular is, that over \$20,000 has been spent in surveys on this railway. Now, as a matter of fact the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company spent in surveys only \$2,375, and in addition to that they paid \$2,000 to the old company for the work they had done. The company transferred the charter without asking one cent, but they asked that they should be reimbursed the two thousand dollars spent in surveys. In face of that, the president of the company and others interested make the statement in this circular, that there was \$20,000 expended. We find the following names attached to that circular:—Francis R. Boselly, president; Herbert C. Secord, secretary; George de Mets, Edmund A. Charters, Wm. Murray, and the contractors, Pigott and Ingles. I am much surprised to find that Mr. Pigott, whom I have met and formed a very favourable opinion of, should attach his name to statements which he could know nothing about. I thought he was a straight and upright man, and the fact of his signing such a circular as this does not elevate him in my opinion. The Restigouche and Western got a charter granted by the local legislature of New Brunswick at its last session on the 6th of March, 1897. There is no question about that charter being in existence, and those

who are supporting this Bill admit it. The Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company are claiming that they have a charter which is in force. That charter was passed on the 21st of April, 1894, and it therefore lapsed on the 23rd of April last. That charter provided that all the necessary surveys should be made within three years of the passing of the Act, and I have already shown that only 35 miles out of 110 miles was surveyed. In support of my contention, I will read a letter from the Hon. H. R. Emmerson, commissiomer of board of works for the province of New Brunswick. Mr. Mott one of the local representatives wrote to him in the month of May last asking his opinion as to the validity of the plans that were filed in his department on the 21st of April, which was the very last day allowed by the Act, and the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, replied as follows:—

Dorchester, May 21st, 1897.

My Dear Mott,—With reference to the Restigouche and Victoria Colonization Road, I can only say that the plans filed are not at all in accordance with the requirements of the Act, and it would seem to me that the charter lapsed. If it were not for the new Act passed at the last session, you would, in my opinion, be unable to go on with the road; that, of course, would enable you to do so.

The Hon. Mr. Emmerson says that, in his opinion, the charter lapsed, as the plans filed were not at all in accordance with the requirements of the Act. I think considerable importance should be attached to his report from any point of view. Now, what does this Bill ask? It asks us to confirm the local charter of 1885, and its amendments. Section 2 of this Bill provides:

The company, as now organized and constituted under the statutes of New Brunswick, is hereby declared to be a body corporate and politic within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada.

If the charter of the local legislature is dead, I ask how can you confirm a dead charter? Unless you put life into that dead body, how can you clothe it with powers? You cannot do so; and therefore I contend that this Bill, in asking us, not to revive, but merely to confirm a dead charter, is entirely out of place, and this Parliament has no right to take it into consideration at all. The last charter, granted in 1897, is, beyond question, in force; but here is a charter which we contend is dead, and as soon as the charter lapses, the company under it ceases to have any powers whatever. But for the sake of argument let us admit, that there is a doubt whether the charter is dead or not. If there is a doubt, why should this Parliament pass legislation of a doubtful character? But I will go further, and take for granted that the charter is still in existence. If it is still in existence, it will continue in existence for three years longer.

The section I refer to provides that all the necessary surveys on the whole line must be made within three years, and the work shall be commenced within six years. If the charter remains in force for three years longer, and this legislation is refused, no injustice will be done to the Restigouche and Victoria Company, and they will not be denied any privilege that they should have. If their charter is in existence, they will have the same rights and privileges that they ever had; and why should this Parliament interfere with local legislation and confirm this charter. I trust that this House will not attempt to pass any legislation of such a doubtful character. If this Bill is passed, it will be doing an injustice to the counties of Restigouche and Victoria; it will be doing an injustice to the new company, the Restigouche and Western Company, and to all parties connected with it; it will be doing an injustice to the province of New Brunswick; it will be overriding legislation passed by the legislature of New Brunswick because that is what it practically does. The promoters of this Bill said: "We will go to the Dominion Parliament and get legislation passed there to override your charter." The Restigouche and Western Company protested against it in the strongest manner; the county which I have the honour to represent protested against it unanimously through its municipal council; the county of Victoria, the other county through which the railway passes, has also protested against it; and all but one of the members from the province of New Brunswick have protested against it. I appeal to every member of this House who is present to reject this Bill. If this were his own case, if legislation of this character were sought to be enforced against the interests of the people he represents—legislation which, to say the very least, is doubtful, and which we maintain is entirely out of place—I think he would feel that he and the province he represented were being treated very unfairly. Therefore, I appeal to this House to reject this Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

### RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 122) relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask if there was any amendment made to this clause in the Railway Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There was not.

Mr. OLIVER. I received a very strong resolution from the city council of Calgary declaring that the time for the completion of this railway should not be extended, and I would like to ask the hon. mover of the Bill (Mr. Davin) if he would agree to shorten the extension that is granted here which is for two years. Would the hon. gentleman allow it to be cut down to one year, in deference to the expressed wish of the city council of Calgary?

Mr. DAVIN. I should be very glad, Mr. Chairman, if I could see my way to oblige my hon. friend, but I cannot do so, because the representations made to me are different from these made to him. I should like very much to assent, but, under the circumstances, I can hardly do so.

Mr. OLIVER. The city of Calgary is very much interested in this railway and they have sent a strong resolution that the time should not be extended, on the ground that the charter has been in existence for a number of years, that there has been no proper effort made to build the road, and that the extension of the charter would not be in the interest of the country or be likely to secure the building of the line. I presume that the company have made representations to the Railway Committee that have satisfied that committee as to their standing, but I think that this committee will agree with me that the extension granted is unusually long, considering that this Bill is for the revival of a charter that has lapsed by a effluxion of time. If an extension of one year were granted, that would be sufficient to enable the committee to show what their standing is, and this would probably meet the wishes of the people who are most deeply interested.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

### CATARACT POWER COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 124) respecting the Cataract Power Company.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

In the Committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). By accident the Mr. McALISTER.

clause limiting the time for commencing and completing the work was omitted in committee. I move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

The construction of the said work shall be commenced within three years and completed within six years of the passing of this Act; otherwise the power granted by this Bill shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said work as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not make it two years to commence and five years to complete?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reason is because in a previous Act, that to incorporate the Welland Power Company, which was to take the water from these very locks, the time limit fixed was the same as I have proposed—three years to commence and six years to complete.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported, and read the third time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The title of the Bill requires some amendment. As introduced the Bill was to amend a local charter, but we have made a new charter, and the word "respecting" should be replaced with the word "incorporate." I move:

That the Bill do now pass and it be entitled an 'Act to incorporate the Cataract Power Company (Limited)."

Amendment agreed to, and Bill passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of private Bills having expired, the Committee of Supply will resume its sitting.

### SUPPLY:

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Immigration—Agents in Great Britain and Ireland ..... \$25,000

Mr. SPROULE. Before six o'clock the hon. gentleman had given us some information concerning the agents in Great Britain and Ireland, and their salaries. I notice that Mr. C. R. Devlin has \$2,000, the highest salary of any. Has he supervision over the other agencies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Over the other agents in Ireland.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly it was to the effect that the other agents were sent to certain localities. For instance, Mr. O'Kelly was sent to the south and west of Ireland; another agent whose name I did not catch, was sent

to the north of Ireland. I notice that the agent in the north of Ireland gets \$800, the agent in the south and west gets \$1,800, and the central agent, \$2,000. How does the hon. gentleman account for the difference in the scale of salaries?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Mr. Devlin is the general agent for Ireland, and has supervision over all the other agents. In fixing the salaries we have been guided by the general rule of people employing men, who pay them salaries commensurate with their abilities as nearly as they can, and we did the same thing.

**Mr. SPROULE.** What general rule was the hon. gentleman guided by in giving the agent for the north of Ireland \$800, and the one for the south of Ireland \$1,800? Are the immigrants which he gets from the north of Ireland not as good subjects as those from the south and west?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I account for it in the way I stated. If a man is employing different persons to do certain work, he pays them in a manner commensurate with their abilities. The hon. gentleman knows that in appointing agents we cannot measure their character and their capacity until they prove it. These are new men, and it remains for them to show whether they will be able to prove their capacity to be commensurate with their salary or not. Of course, these appointments, with the exception of Mr. Devlin's, are temporary, and they are made upon the understanding that their retention in their employment depends upon the nature and satisfactory quality of the work that is done.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Still I cannot understand why this difference between the salaries. If one was only worth \$800 and the other \$1,800, I would imagine that the hon. gentleman would not employ an inferior agent for the sake of giving him a smaller salary, because the work that he must do will be equally important with the work done by the other.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Are these men paid anything else besides their salary and travelling expenses?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The agents get their actual expenses.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Does Mr. Devlin get nothing more than his actual expenses, and do any of these gentlemen have offices?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I am not in a position to say whether a permanent office has been procured for Mr. Devlin, but there will be one. That is all he gets besides his expenses.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Has he also a clerk, or some person in the office?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Not as yet. Whether he will have, will depend upon the way in which the work develops.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What does my hon. friend think of the way the work has developed so far?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I am not in a position to say. Mr. Devlin has only been there a short time, and he has been occupied in writing to the newspapers, and making himself generally known, getting the work started.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It would seem that the newspapers have been doing the writing and not Mr. Devlin. The reception given to this gentleman does not seem to have been very cordial. Does my hon. friend think Mr. Devlin will be able, by the sweetness of his disposition and his sunny ways, learned here, to overcome all that rough and ready greeting?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I am afraid we cannot account for Mr. Devlin's reception except it might be that some of our hon. friends opposite have some of their missionaries over there. But, speaking seriously, I have not the slightest idea who is the author of the attack made upon Mr. Devlin or his work. As the hon. gentleman is aware, I presume, from what he says, the appearance of Mr. Devlin there as our agent was made a signal for a very violent attack upon Canada, and particularly upon Manitoba and the North-west. It is evident that some person has been preparing an attack, with what motive we have not been able so far to ascertain. There were a considerable number of people who were applicants for employment, and it is barely possible that some disappointed applicant is at the bottom of what is taking place.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Has the Minister received any reports from Mr. Devlin, or any other agent over there?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We get reports from all of them.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Can they be brought down?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The reports can be brought down, if they are moved for. Of course, it is not customary to bring down monthly reports. The custom heretofore has been to print in the report of the Department of the Interior, the report of each agent.

**Mr. SPROULE.** How do these agents carry on their operations?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** They are expected to carry on their operations by canvassing, by making themselves and their work known through the newspapers, by visiting agricultural fairs and

exhibitions, and by giving lectures wherever it is practicable to do so with any prospect of success.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Are they all hired by the year or by the season, or is their salary fixed upon the number of men they send out? It seems to me that if the selection is made from among good men, there should not be the difference in their salaries that we find here. If the men are employed during the same period of the year, and are doing the same work, why this difference in their salaries? I ask the Minister, if some of these men are employed the whole year and some of them only a portion of the year?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have already told the hon. gentleman, but I have no objection to repeating it.

**Mr. SPROULE.** You speak so low we cannot hear you.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Mr. Devlin is employed by the year, Mr. O'Kelly is appointed by the month, Mr. Griffith by the month, Mr. Jury by the month, Mr. Duncan by the month, Mr. Dyke, who gets a salary of \$3,200, by the year. Mr. Dyke has been in the service of the Government for fifteen or twenty years, and for some years past the salary has been the same. Mr. Mitchell is employed by the year. He is an appointee by the late Government. Mr. Rothweiler the same. Mr. Graham, who gets \$2,150, is appointed by the year, his tenure of office being the same as under the late Government. Mr. Webster is a new appointment. He gets \$900. I paid him \$900 because I thought probably he would be worth that. Wood, Stuart, Fleming and McLeod, all employees of the late Government are engaged by the year.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is it understood that those who are paid by the month are not to be employed the whole year?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have employed these gentlemen by the month so that if their work does not justify their continuance, it can be terminated at any time.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Then if it is found that they are successful at the work, they will be continued the year through.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Their continuance in office depends upon the work they are doing being satisfactory. Their engagement may be terminated at any time.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Assuming it is satisfactory, is it the understanding that their services will be retained the whole year through?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** There is no understanding about it. It rests with the department and it can terminate their appointment at any time it so chooses.

**Mr. SIFTON.**

**Mr. SPROULE.** Well, I must be too obtuse to understand what the hon. gentleman means, or else he does not understand what I have asked. My question had reference to the men employed by the month, and I asked him if it was the intention to continue them at work the whole year if they are successful. The Minister has not given an answer to my question.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** If they are successful I have no doubt that I shall continue them.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What allowance is given to each of these agents?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The actual expenses.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What is meant by "actual expenses"; their living expenses while they are at headquarters, or, their travelling expenses?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The usual rule is, that when an officer is at headquarters his living expenses are not paid. When he is away from there, his living and travelling expenses are paid. That is the rule, but I do not know that there is any specially logical reason for it.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What expenses for travel have been incurred by these agents so far, in addition to their salaries?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I can bring down a return.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Is the Minister not prepared to state it now?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Certainly not. I have no objection to bring them down, but I have not got them here.

**Mr. WALLACE.** When the Minister is asking for the expenses of these men in addition to their salaries, he should bring down their expense account so as to show us what the amount is.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** When we get a little further I will show the hon. gentleman what we estimated for the expenses. If the hon. gentleman desires me to bring down a return of the expenses so far, I have no objection to do it.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The information given to the House with regard to the work of these agents and the different remuneration allowed to each, is not satisfactory. When I consider what we see in the public press as to the reception given to Mr. Devlin, I am forced to the conclusion that he is not in a very promising field for emigration to Canada, and that the money expended for sending Mr. Devlin there might as well be thrown away. The newspapers representing the great majority of public opinion in that part of Ireland, have declared bitter hostility at the very idea of emigration to Canada, and the Minister had

better consider whether it would not be proper to recall that agent, because evidently he is going to get no assistance in his emigration scheme from the representative press or the representative people there. Mr. Devlin, has, I think, the largest salary paid to any emigration agent, and I have no doubt we will have a very handsome bill for his expenses in addition. We ought to know upon what ground the Minister is sending men there to attempt to bring emigrants to this country, and also what ground he had for sending Mr. Devlin in the first instance. Did he know that Mr. Devlin was going to get such a very hostile reception, or did he know the conditions that existed, of open hostility to the proposal of emigration to Canada? If the Minister did know, it was an unwise thing to send Mr. Devlin or any one else there, and particularly Mr. Devlin who apparently has provoked this hostility. It was an unwise thing to send an immigration agent there at all, because apparently there will be no emigration of a good class from that part of the country. That hostility is apparently an hostility largely inspired by hostilities to British institutions. If men are hostile to British institutions we do not want them here. We do not want a class of men in Canada who are inspired by the sentiments expressed in these Dublin newspapers. That is not the class of emigrants that will assist in building up this country and making a loyal population, because the only ground for hostility to Canada is the very fact that we are a loyal portion of the British Dominions. The Minister had better explain more fully, and justify to this House why he sent immigration agents there, or else he should admit he has made a mistake, and assure us that he proposes to recall the immigration agents that he has sent to that portion of Ireland. It is quite evident that there can be no satisfactory results in sending out a class of men who will not be loyal to our country, and loyal to British institutions; even if he sends out the other class his mission will not be satisfactory. The Minister in starting out on his career to promote immigration, has made a false step, and he should retrace that step as quickly as possible. I do not think the Minister made a very happy choice any way, in selecting the man he did, to be an immigration agent anywhere. From what I know of Mr. Devlin I do not believe he would be a successful immigration agent to any country. We all know that he holds extreme views on many questions, and we know further that Mr. Devlin was quite hostile to certain portions of the policy of the present Government. We know more than that, for it is no secret that on account of his hostility to the Government, it would not be very pleasant for him to come to this Parliament and support their policy. In order to get rid of him, I presume, so that he would not be a thorn in their side, a position was pro-

cured for him as immigration agent, not because of his fitness for that office, but in order to relieve the Government from difficulties and embarrassments. That is the way it looks to me, and I think we should fairly look to the Government, when they are promoting immigration, to do it on justifiable lines, to promote the emigration of desirable men to come to this country, and to send men who will have the confidence of the people from whom they are sent to invite emigration to this country; and none of these conditions exist in the case of Mr. Devlin, and what has proved so far his abortive mission to Ireland.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know that I would go so far as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Wallace), that Mr. Devlin would not be successful anywhere; but I think I can explain why it is that Mr. Devlin has not been successful, and is not likely to succeed in Ireland. The reason Mr. Devlin was received with the carressing chorus that met him on his arrival is, I apprehend, this. Mr. Devlin had the reputation here, which went before him to Ireland, of being a Nationalist. He was also known to be a devout professor of that religion which is the religion of the majority in Ireland. Anybody who is acquainted with Ireland knows that no one can be more unwelcome to the Nationalists of Ireland than a man who goes to promote emigration—who goes to urge forward a thing which they abhor, and to do that which, if he is successful in it, would make Ireland less populous than it is, and thus do again one of the things which they abhor. Again, if the population were reduced, according to the opinion of many political economists, Ireland would be more prosperous, and prosperity on these terms is not a prosperity that is desired by the Nationalists. Then the Catholic Church in Ireland, either by its officers or by its ordinary professors, does not believe in emigration; it does not want emigration. If you talk to a bishop or a priest or to any devout Catholic, you will find that he does not want the people to emigrate from Ireland. So that when it was known that a man who apparently had two qualifications eminently fitting him to appeal to the mass of the population of Ireland, the Nationalist press naturally put their readers on guard lest this man should persuade them by his blandishments. I should be very far indeed from concluding that the Minister could have done other than supposed, as anybody would have supposed, that a man like Mr. Devlin would have been successful; because, though born in Canada, he is eminently an Irishman, a Nationalist, a Home Ruler, and not only a devout Catholic, but one who proclaimed the fact to the four winds of heaven; and anybody would naturally have supposed that among the mass of the people of Ireland he was likely to make a strong impression. But the mass

of the people of Ireland, and especially the Nationalists, and the leaders among the Nationalists, would regard such a man, in seeking to induce the people to emigrate, as dangerous, and as something of a traitor to the class to which he belongs. So that I entirely excuse the Minister. He naturally came to the conclusion that Mr. Devlin would be successful; but after the carressing chorus with which Mr. Devlin has been received, I think the Minister must come to a different conclusion. I must say, after what occurred, that I think Mr. Devlin's usefulness in Ireland is gone; because nobody who knows the Nationalist press and the Nationalist character can doubt that they have with great success prepared beforehand the people whom Mr. Devlin will approach. They have prepared them for receiving Mr. Devlin with distrust, and for resenting his proposals and arguments. I would therefore suggest that Mr. Devlin be removed from Ireland and sent to England or France. He speaks French well, and he might succeed in France or he might succeed in some part of England or Scotland; but if there is one part of this earth where Mr. Devlin has lost his usefulness, it is that Green Isle about which he could grow so eloquent, and of which he was in a remote way so distinguished a son; and it is because of the qualifications which from a superficial standpoint he seemed to possess that he has been a lamentable failure.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask whether or not the removal expenses of these gentlemen from Canada to the places of work have been paid by the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And have their families gone with them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The families of Mr. Devlin and Mr. Jury, I think, went with them.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the removal expenses of the families paid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There were certain proportions of the expenses paid, which I cannot at the moment give. I will give them to the hon. gentleman to-morrow, if he wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the expenses of Mr. Devlin and Mr. Jury out west paid before they went?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that altogether it is a pretty expensive propaganda which my hon. friend is undertaking, and I must say I do not think my hon. friend can expect to get commensurate results from it. It has always appeared to me, and I think it has always been generally agreed on both sides of the House, that Ireland was a

Mr. DAVIN.

pretty difficult place from which to get immigrants. The reasons stated by my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Davin have been well stated, and I believe they cover the ground; and it does seem to me that the amount of money my hon. friend proposes to expend in Ireland under the present circumstances, with the reception that has been given to the superintendent and organizer of the whole emigration business there, does not give the House much reason to hope for good results. I was a little surprised at my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) floating around so long before he came to the right reason why Mr. Devlin went to Ireland. Mr. Devlin went to Ireland because the Government and Mr. Devlin thought it better that he should go—not so much for Ireland's sake or for the sake of immigration, but for the sake of Mr. Devlin and the Government. Mr. Devlin was to be provided for, and there was no other thing which seemed good and appropriate, and which could serve as so good an excuse as to send him to Dublin, the city of learning and the capital of the Green Isle; and it was, we might well understand first as last, rather for the sake of getting a place for Mr. Devlin, that this nice little billet was prepared. What is the use of my hon. friend saying that he is taking these men just by the month, after he has paid a round sum of money to teach them what the country is like, and then a round sum to take themselves and their families across the Atlantic? Of course, they will go on by the year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I made that statement with regard to the temporary agents I had appointed—not with regard to Mr. Devlin.

Mr. STENSON. During the speech of the hon. ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), I tried to listen as attentively as possible, but I was unable to catch all he said. Nevertheless, the impression remains with me that in one portion of his speech he said that the immigrants that might be brought from the south of Ireland might not be loyal subjects to the Dominion of Canada. I would like to ask the ex-Controller of Customs if he meant that, and I would ask him to speak with a voice loud enough to be heard in this part of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry I was not able to make myself heard. What I did say was that Mr. Devlin was sent to a place where the whole population apparently, as represented through the public press, the press representing the people, did not give him any encouragement, but on the contrary had vilified both him and the country he represented; and that the only ground that I knew of for the vilification of Canada by those people was that we were a portion of the British Empire, and a loyal portion too; and that if that was the only ground they had for attacking Canada and

Canada's agent, it was not a good place to seek immigrants, and I say so still; and I will say it a little stronger if the hon. gentleman does not understand it.

**Mr. STENSON.** I am quite aware that the hon. ex-Controller of Customs has said things a great deal stronger than that. But I am not ready to accept newspaper reports when, according to them, the Irish people of the south of Ireland or of any part of Ireland condemn Canada. There are in Canada people from all parts of Ireland, the south, north, east and west, and these people are all equally loyal and good citizens of Canada. And even though some newspaper reports should condemn Mr. Devlin because he goes to Ireland to seek immigrants, I think these reports should be taken with the same allowance as the reports we have read in the newspapers of statements made by the hon. ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace). We should not believe all, and it would not be to the credit of the country or of the ex-Controller of Customs that we should believe all the newspaper report of him. I am glad therefore to see that the ex-Controller does not maintain what I understood him to say, that the people from the southern portion of Ireland would not be good settlers in Canada.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Will the hon. Minister be good enough to tell us when these several agents were appointed and from what dates their salaries began?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** Speaking from recollection, Mr. Devlin began his duties on the 1st of May and so did Mr. O'Kelly. Mr. Griffith began on the 1st of April. With regard to Mr. Jury and Mr. Webster, I could not give the exact dates without referring to the books.

**Mr. SPROULE.** The question asked by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was whether these men were under pay when they were travelling in British Columbia, and I understood the hon. Minister to say they were. If that be so, we must conclude that Mr. Albert Jury was under pay in Toronto when he was lecturing there on the Sunday car question.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I explained that item when it was brought up in the House some time ago. Mr. Jury was given a week to go to Toronto for the purpose of preparing his family for removal to Europe. The address he delivered was apparently delivered when he was there in that week. My information is that he did not intend to take any part in the campaign, but was at a meeting and was called on to express his views, and did so.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is aware of the fact, but it is currently reported that Mr. Jury

has always been an atheist and boasts of it, and I would ask the hon. gentleman if he finds that class of man suitable to send to any country.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have not inquired into the theological tenets of Mr. Jury, and am not in a position to say whether he is an atheist or not, I have seen that stated in the newspapers and have seen it vehemently denied, but am not in a position to give a positive opinion. We do not put the immigration agents through a theological examination.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I think they would have to go to some other school, if you did.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I wish to say in reply to the statement of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Stenson), who said that I had made some statements, not to the credit of myself.

**Mr. STENSON.** I did not say that you made the statements; but I said you were reported in the newspapers as having made statements in your speeches, which reports I did not wish to credit, because the statements were not at all creditable to you.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I invite the hon. gentleman to quote any statements of mine that I am not able to justify on the floor of this House. I am not in the habit of making statements in one place and making contrary statements in another place, as some hon. gentlemen I could easily point to have done and are doing. When I make a statement in one place, I believe it is true, and am prepared to stick to it on the floor of this House or any place else.

Salaries of agents in foreign countries.... \$17,500

**Mr. OLIVER.** Before this resolution is adopted, I beg to call the attention of the House to the necessity of greater care being exercised by the agents of the Government in foreign countries in the selection of immigrants. The work of the agents in the province of Galicia, in the Empire of Austria, has been remarkably successful in point of numbers for the past year or so, but I am sorry it has not been as successful in point of quality, if quality is reckoned by wealth. As a matter of fact, there has been a large emigration from the province of Galicia to the North-west Territories, and a large proportion of these immigrants are very poor. A great many of them are absolutely without means, and I wish to warn the Government that if that immigration continues, they will find that they will have to issue a very large amount of relief to those people for the first two or perhaps three years that they are in the country. Although the section to which they come is fertile and offers advantages for settlement, the settlers must have some means to support themselves until they can make the

ground produce enough to support them. If people come barehanded into a country where there is no employment to be had at fair wages, and there is not in the Territories, they are simply going to be a burden on the other settlers or the Government until such time as they either leave the country or finally get on their feet, which is a slow process. In the meantime, the fact that they will be dependent on charity from some source will be held up as proof that the particular part of the Territories in which they live is a failure because the people are starving there, whereas the fault may not be with the country or the people but merely with their circumstances. I shall not discuss the merits of these people, but I say that it is a great mistake to suppose that all the people who come from Galicia are of the same nationality or the same desirable class. We have in the district in which I live, and to which these people are coming, a number of settlers who are in many ways very desirable and who come from Galicia. They are of German nationality. They came out poor but have been successful. They did not, however, come out actually barehanded, but had some little means and by thrift and industry are succeeding in life. But these other people, so-called Galicians, are Russians, a different race altogether from the Germans, who have not the same ideas of thrift and economy and industry; and if the Germans, with their industry and thrift, found it hard enough to get along with little means, certainly the Galicians, who have not those ideas and have still less means, are likely to be a burden on the community or the Government. As a representative of the North-west, I wish to say that the quality of immigration is of much more importance than the quantity. A small number of a desirable class is very much to be preferred to a large number of undesirable people, and while it is right and proper that every effort should be made to induce people to come and settle in our country, it also should be the effort of the department to bring out only desirable settlers who will not be a hindrance but a help to the country. We are poor enough, and do not want our poverty increased by the importation of paupers from Europe. If we are to be asked to vote a large sum for immigration, that money should be expended in the attempt to bring out, not an inferior but a superior class of people, having some means to develop our resources.

I will go just one step further in criticising the immigration policy of the late Government, not from a party point of view. I believe that the efforts of our immigration department have been directed too low. We have tried to get quantity rather than quality; we have tried to get numbers rather than people of a good class, and I contend that has been a mistake and that it would be better to spend the same amount of

Mr. OLIVER.

money getting people of a desirable class rather than going about spending as large an amount as we have been spending in getting a large number of people who are of an undesirable class, who are not able to stay with us even if they wanted to, and who, in a large number of cases, do not want to. It is a notorious fact that a large part of our immigration money has been spent to bring people from Europe through Canada to the United States, people for whom the field of settlement in Canada was not suitable, people belonging to the poorest class, who had to find work or they could not live, and who, not being able to find work in Canada, had to go to the United States, and who, as a matter of fact, started from Europe for the States, so that the assistance they received from our immigration fund was simply to help immigrants to the United States. At present the United States have an alien exclusion law under which they exclude pauper immigrants from their shores. It is the business of the steamboat companies, so far as we use them as agents, to get passengers; it does not make any difference to them whether they are settlers or not. Now, if the United States excludes the pauper class, the only thing the steamship companies can do is to turn the paupers our way. So that we are in a different position now from that we occupied before. If these people are going to emigrate, the steamship companies on whom we depend, to a certain extent, for assistance in this matter are liable to take the good passengers to the States and the poor ones to Canada. In asking the House to vote this large amount of money, it is, above all things, desirable that the agents of the Government on the continent of Europe should be charged with the duty of a careful selection of the immigrants they bring, not only as to the persons themselves, but as to their means, because, as I said before, there is no use turning a man out on the prairie barehanded and asking him to make a living—the thing is impossible.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister in what foreign countries he employs agents, what fields they are operating in, the names of the agents and their salaries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The names of agents in foreign countries are as follows:—Hector Fabre, Paris, France, \$1,200; D. Fortin, Brussels, \$1,800; M. D. McInnes, chief agent of the staff in the United States, \$1,500, general headquarters in Detroit; C. O. Swanson, \$1,400; R. H. Swallow, \$900; James Greene, \$1,200; J. Crawford, \$900; E. L. Coffin, \$900; J. B. Morin, \$800; O. Corbell, \$500; and J. H. Rousseau, \$500. Those whose names I gave without their location are travelling agents, having no permanent headquarters. They are travelling in different parts of the United States. Messrs. McInnes, Swallow,

Greene, Crawford and Coffin, are working in the states of Michigan, South Dakota, Kansas, Illinois and Iowa. Messrs. Morin, Corbell, Rousseau and Swanson are working largely in the New England States. The four last named gentlemen, with the exception of Mr. Rousseau were in the employ of the department before I became Minister, and their duties and their salaries remain unchanged.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I saw an item in the newspaper the other day to the effect that an agent of the Government of Canada—it did not say whether provincial or Dominion—carrying on his operations in Massachusetts, endeavouring to repatriate the French Canadians, was offering them, if they would come to Canada, 100 to 120 acres of land, and at least \$500 in cash to help them to begin operations. Was the agent seeking to mislead the people, or was the report incorrect? Does the hon. Minister know anything about it?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I saw the report to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers. I think it was an exaggeration of what the agent said, probably. If I remember aright, the name given was the name of one of the gentlemen I have mentioned. Of course our agents are not authorized to offer any such munificent terms.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would like an explanation of the modus operandi by which the Minister proposes to carry on the work in the United States. The other day one of his colleagues read us the figures of sixty-one agents scattered throughout the United States who were to be paid by results. Would the hon. Minister please explain?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** These names, of course, do not appear here because these men are not upon salaries. These men whose names I have given are doing in the United States for Canada what was, for many years, and until very lately and I presume even now, is done in Canada of American railways. We have employed the ticket-agents of American railways in towns and villages of the western states and we pay them a commission for the people they send to settle in the North-west, and the commission is paid upon the report of our immigration officer at Winnipeg, which report he makes after the settler is located in the North-west to his satisfaction.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What commission is paid, and how does the hon. gentleman propose to make it certain that the payment is made to the right person, and that it is the actual work that is paid for, and now claims simply.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The amount paid is \$3 for each mail adult. That is the whole arrangement. We have a

system whereby there is a certificate given to the settler by the agent who sends him to the North-west. The immigrant presents that certificate to the immigration commissioner when he reaches Winnipeg. They have a system of checking, from time to time, to see that no frauds are committed, but the immediate process is the presentation of the certificate that the agents has given to the immigrant to the immigration commissioner. After the settler is located to the satisfaction of the commissioner, he gives an order for the money which he forwards here and the money is sent from here to the person entitled to it.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Are these all the agents employed in foreign countries, or has the hon. gentleman any agents in Germany or in Norway and Sweden. I understand that we get some very desirable immigrants in Norway and Sweden, and I would like to ask if he is making further effort to secure more immigrants from that country.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We have no agents in Norway and Sweden. We have sent over there a gentleman for the purpose of making a report to us upon the possibility of commencing work successfully, but he is permanently located. The gentleman is one concerning whom, I think, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asked a question early in the session—Mr. Jones, late of Montreal.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Has the hon. gentleman no agents in Germany?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** No.

Contingencies, Canadian, British and Foreign Agencies, and General Immigration Expenses..... \$96,500

**Mr. FOSTER.** Will the hon. gentleman give us the amount for contingencies alone, as nearly as possible?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I can give the hon. gentleman the details. For the expenses of all the agencies in Canada, including Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Winnipeg, and of all the men whose names I have given as being agents in Canada, \$12,000; for the contingencies in Great Britain and Ireland, including the travelling expenses of the men whose names I have mentioned and the expense of the Liverpool office, \$16,000. The expenses of the agencies in foreign countries, including the United States, are, altogether, \$6,000. We estimate for bonuses on settlers from the United States, \$2,000. That, of course, we can only estimate very roughly; it depends upon the number of people that we get. We estimate for advertising in Canada and United States newspapers, purchasing special editions, &c., \$3,000. Hand-books and other pamphlets, printing and stationery, \$6,000. Then we

estimate for the repatriation society of Montreal, a society the operations of which I explained some days ago, \$3,050. We estimate for the treatment of immigrant patients in the North-west hospitals, \$1,500. Inspection of pauper children, \$1,000; for bonuses on these children, \$3,500; British and continental bonuses to steamship agents, \$8,000; for veterinary inspection fees upon settlers' cattle, which has been customary for some years past, \$2,000. For the expenses of delegates, and special transportation of persons who sometimes have their expenses paid for the purpose of sending them to different parts of the country when they come here to make special reports, \$1,000. Freight charges at the head office, \$250; expenses at the High Commissioner's office in London, connected with immigration, \$15,934.64. Hon. Hector Fabre, agent in Paris, publisher of a newspaper called "Paris-Canada," the same grant he received last year, \$1,000. Printing pamphlets for circulation upon the continent, \$4,000; postage, \$583; advertising, \$2,000; total, about \$94,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Minister if it is out of this item that money has been given for bringing back some of the Canadians who went to Brazil last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What we are discussing is the vote for next year. We have paid out of the immigration appropriation this year a sum of \$3,370, speaking from recollection, for passages of French Canadian people—I think they were altogether French Canadians, so far as we are aware—who went to Brazil and there became destitute, and were sent back to this country. This was charged in the first instance to immigration, and I am asking for a supplementary vote to recoup the immigration appropriation, which will be presented to the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the Minister to say that that money was paid for the repatriation of French Canadians. The people who went there last year when I called the attention of the Government to their departure, were French Canadians; but I am told, and this is what I want to find out, that the money which was paid lately was not for the repatriation of the French Canadians who went to Brazil from Montreal, but it was paid for immigrants who had come from the other side of the water at our expense, and who had gone over to Brazil, and whom now we are bringing back here, that is to say, we are paying three times for the transportation of people who do not belong to Canada. I was told this the other day in Montreal, and I want to find out if it is true. Has the Minister any means of finding out whether the money was paid for French Canadians or other Canadians, or paid for immigrants who had

Mr. SIFTON.

come here from Europe, and who then went away to Brazil, and are now coming back here at our expense again?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The money was paid on a draft of the British Consul at New York, according to my recollection. But I think that I am in a position to say to the hon. gentleman that the money was paid for people who had gone from Canada to Brazil. Of course it is possible that in a case of that kind there may have been one or two people who did not come within that category; but our information is to the contrary, and I am satisfied that it is correct.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like definite information. I am informed by people who have returned from Brazil that the money that was paid out was paid principally on behalf of people who had come from Europe and not for Canadians. Canadians who came back lately from Brazil have complained that they could not get money, because it was all expended on immigrants who came from abroad.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that is the case, but I will take means to satisfy myself.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman give me his information before we come to concurrence?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman mentioned one item of some \$3,000 for pauper children coming to this country. Will he be good enough to tell us for what particular purpose this money is expended?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. For the inspection of pauper children, the expenses of officers going around and inspecting the children. There has been for some years an arrangement whereby a Government officer inspects these children, and makes a report, on certain forms, to the local Government boards in England, giving information as to how these children are getting on.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that all that is given to these institutions who bring them in?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is for inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a bonus mentioned.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a bonus of \$2 a head to certain philanthropic societies in the old country, to persons who have for some years past been recognized by the department, on juvenile immigrants brought out under the auspices of these societies. I may say so far as that is concerned, it is carrying out an arrangement that has obtained in the department for years past. I have some doubts in my own mind as to the wisdom of the arrangement, but I have not felt dis-

posed to change it without full examination.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that some \$3,300 were paid already. Is it the intention of the Minister to pay any more money to the same end?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Instructions were sent forward a few days ago that the Government would honour no more drafts except under very pressing circumstances, an intimation in a gentle way that if it was possible to avoid paying any further expenses, we would like to do so. We are placed in a difficult position. The question was as to whether, when our unfortunate countrymen were deluded into going away—and I am told they went after the strongest remonstrance from the officers of the department—having got themselves into that unfortunate position, whether it was proper for the Government to allow them to remain there and to refuse to pay their expenses altogether. It is a debatable question, and the Government would not be justified in going very far in that direction, but we thought that under all the circumstances it was a very special case, and reports came to the effect that people were enduring great hardships, that under the circumstances it was only the part of humanity for us to furnish the necessary money for them to get back. Of course, we recognize the fact that this is a thing that cannot be carried very far, and we hope it will not happen again.

Mr. BERGERON. Last September I called the attention of the Government to the fact that, about 300 of our people were being induced to go to Brazil. The Prime Minister then did not seem to understand the matter, or else he treated it in a very light way. He said in a chaffing way: That this was a better country and that Canadians should stay at home. I then pointed out to the Prime Minister, that the governments of Italy of England and of France prevented such emigration by forcing the agents or the steamship lines, to deposit a certain amount of money which would be used to bring the emigrants back in case the representations were found to be false. The suggestion was not seriously taken, as was evidenced by the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If my advice had then been followed, and if these Brazilian immigration agents were compelled to make a deposit, we would not to-day be voting money to bring them back. This may happen again, and I hold that it is the duty of the Canadian Government to copy the policy of the Italian, British and French Governments in this respect. The tales of these people who have returned from Brazil are heart rending, and the whole proceedings in connection with the matter were disgraceful. Even though the Government is guilty to a cer-

tain degree, it would be patriotism to bring them back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How do you hold the Government guilty?

Mr. BERGERON. They should have prevented them from going away.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How could they do that?

Mr. BERGERON. By forcing the shipping companies or agents to make a deposit as these other Governments have done.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We cannot prevent people leaving Canada if they want to. I inquired about this matter from Mr. Burgess the late Deputy Minister, and he told me that the officers of the immigration department at Montreal, had taken the strongest measures to induce these people to remain. They went to Brazil in the face of the strongest remonstrances from our officials. If people make up their minds to leave the country, all that the Government can possibly do is to advise them not to go. If they are so foolish as to leave Canada and go somewhere else, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) cannot hold the Government responsible. In bringing them back we acted largely in the spirit of performing an act of charity, and I do not think the House will find fault with us for so doing.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be better to not let them go; but since they are there, it is an act of mercy to bring them back. The money devoted for this purpose, was given not to Canadians, but to foreign immigrants who came to Canada and who had to be brought back here again at the expense of this Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The draft came from the British consul at New York, but the British consul at Rio was the person who superintended the embarkation of these people. The impression we got from the correspondence was that he was extremely careful, and I do not think it at all likely, that to any serious extent, the facts stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) are correct.

Mr. SPROULE. What supervision does the Minister exercise over immigrants from European countries, to ensure that they are suitable for Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers to the question raised by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). That would require considerable time to discuss, but I am not at all adverse to the discussion if hon. gentlemen on the other side desire it. These Galicians are brought here through the efforts of two or

three persons who are somewhat prominent in the service of the Austrian Government. These people have hitherto followed agricultural pursuits for a livelihood, and out of the 1,800 who arrived at Winnipeg during the last three or four months, not more than 100 or 150 have given any difficulty to the officers in providing for them. Considering that all are well adapted for agriculture, and do not suffer from a cold climate, that is not at all a discouraging result. The great majority are well able to take care of themselves and have some money.

Mr. SPROULE. What country do you refer to?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not this spring received any considerable number from continental Europe, except the Galicians. The immigration that is coming, is coming as a result of the distribution of literature. We take the people who come, and we have no means of winnowing them out. I considered the advisability of making an inspection at the port of landing, and insisting upon any who are found to be destitute being returned, but I am free to say that I found that impracticable. The result would be, that we would place ourselves in antagonism with the steamship agents, and after an examination of the question I am satisfied, that would stop people from coming here at all. They would direct the people to New York or possibly South America, and the immediate result in all probability would be, that we would lose the whole immigration. Unless we are prepared to face that probability, it is not possible at the present time to take any steps in the direction suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. I also refer to the immigrants from Great Britain and Ireland, because in times past our agents were operating in the towns and villages where they could hardly expect to get agriculturists. What instructions are given to the agents with regard to the localities in which they should operate, and the class of persons they should bring out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We feel that the supply of labouring men and mechanics in Canada is quite equal to the demand, and our agents have positive instructions not to encourage that class. We tell them to encourage none but those who are accustomed to agricultural life.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the literature distributed by the department, largely giving information about Manitoba and the North-west Territories, or is there also information given with regard to the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Heretofore the information has largely related to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I have in preparation a pamphlet

Mr. SIFTON.

which will deal with the whole of Canada, and which will be printed in sections so that the different sections can be distributed. The desire is that the information shall be with regard to the whole of Canada. The largest portion of the literature is devoted to that portion of Canada lying west of Lake Superior, viz.: the Lake of the Woods district, Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. There are also sections referring to the eastern provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe, with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that we should have the best immigration possible; and when he speaks of these Galicians, I am ready to believe what he says, because he saw them himself. But I desire to say that two or three weeks ago, there landed in Montreal about three hundred Galicians, and the people who saw them all declared that among them were the finest lot of men and women that ever landed on the shores of Canada; and the Montreal papers on both sides of politics congratulated the Government, and expressed the hope that many more of these people would be brought to this country. I will congratulate the Minister if he can bring more immigrants of that sort.

Mr. OLIVER. I have only to say that a number of these Galicians were begging around the streets of Edmonton last fall, and, from the number that have come in this summer, I expect that there will be a great many more begging next fall.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear whether there are any immigrant agents in St. John, N.B. Has that city been left out in the cold?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Gardiner has been there for some years, I think.

Geological Survey..... \$57,000

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that there is a decrease here. With the mining boom that is on, and the great desire that exists for information regarding mining locations in our country, does the hon. Minister think it wise to ask for a smaller amount of money, or to curtail the operations that are being carried on by this branch?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount asked last year was \$60,000. After consultation with Mr. Dawson, the chief of the Geological Survey, I came to the conclusion, and he agreed with me, that the work of the season could be prosecuted without curtailing operations to any appreciable extent, for \$50,000. I went into the matter pretty carefully with Dr. Dawson, and he thought we could do the work pretty well for that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the result of the artesian boring in the North-west?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no satisfactory result as yet. No deposit of oil has been found so far, and the intention this season is to put down, under Dr. Dawson's supervision, two bore holes near Athabasca Landing.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many men he has now in the field making these explorations, and where they are located ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Bell, on the north side of Hudson's Bay Straits; Professor Macoun, at the foot of the Rocky Mountains; Dr. Ells, in the counties of Lanark, Renfrew, Frontenac and Addington, in Ontario; Mr. Hugh Fietcher, in the Cumberland coal fields of Nova Scotia; Mr. McConnell, in West Kootenay, B.C.; Mr. Tyrrell, about Lake Winnipeg; Mr. Low, on the south side of Hudson Bay Straits; Mr. Robert Chalmers, at various places in the province of Quebec; M. Fairbault, in Nova Scotia; Mr. William McInnes, in the Manitou region of western Ontario; Mr. A. E. Barlow, near Haliburton, in Central Ontario; Mr. James McEvoy, in West Kootenay, B.C.; Mr. C. W. Willmot, in collecting specimens in various localities; Mr. A. W. Brock, in West Kootenay, B.C.; Dr. Frank Adams, in Central Ontario, in the neighbourhood of Haliburton; and Mr. L. W. Bailey, in making an examination into the mineral resources of New Brunswick. Each of these gentlemen has a certain amount of assistance with him.

Indians—Removal of Lake of Two Mountains  
Indians from Oka to Gibson..... \$200

Mr. SPROULE. Every year for a great many years I have noticed in the Estimates an item for the removal of these Oka Indians—I think every year since I have been in Parliament, which is nineteen years. They appear to be very hard to remove, or there must be a large number of them. Has the Minister any knowledge of how long it will take to get them removed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The information I have is to the effect that there has been an average expenditure of \$200 a year for seven or eight years. A reserve was set apart in the township of Gibson, by arrangement with the Ontario Government, and efforts have been made to get the Indians to go there. When any particular Indian signifies his willingness to go, his expenses are paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Minister tell us whether any Indians were moved last year to the township of Gibson ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no information as to that.

Manitoba and North-west Territories—  
Indian Supplies, &c..... \$751,374

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call attention to something that seems to me anomalous.

The information given in calling for tenders for 1896-97 differs materially from that given in calling for tenders for 1897-98. In the schedules for 1897-98, there is no information for Manitoba, and it would seem, therefore, that there is no intention of calling for tenders, and yet bacon, biscuits, flour, soap, tea, powder, shot, and a dozen other things have to be supplied. I want to call attention to what actually occurred, and what I fear may, therefore, become general, looking at these schedules. I asked for some correspondence, in the early part of the session, between the Department of Indian Affairs at Ottawa and the officers of the department at Regina and Winnipeg respecting the furnishing of supplies to the St. Paul Industrial School, and also correspondence between the department at Ottawa and the Hudson Bay Company, at Winnipeg. On turning to October 10th, I find that Mr. Chipman, on page 25 of the returns, wrote a letter to the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Ottawa, stating that the Hudson Bay Company, for the year ending 30th June, 1896, had secured the contract for the above school, and since the expiration of the contract had been furnishing supplies at the same rates, when it would have been quite within their right to have exacted the ordinary selling price of the goods. He complained that the privilege of furnishing these supplies, from the 1st of October, had been awarded to Mr. J. H. Cockburn, a local grocer, without tenders having been called for, as had always been done in previous years, and he asked whether the present arrangement was of a temporary nature or whether the department intended to call for tenders as in the past. On page 23, there is a letter addressed to Mr. McColl, inspector of Indian agencies, at Winnipeg, by Mr. Hayter Reed, as follows:—

I have your letter of the 12th instant. Until its receipt I was unaware that you had called for tenders for the supply of meat to the Rupert's Land Industrial School.

Kindly forward the meat tenders to the department; also, tenders for groceries or other supplies, should any such have been received by you.

At page 7 of this return, we have the answer of Mr. McColl. He says:

Winnipeg, Man., 24th October, 1896.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, and in reply I beg to inclose herewith, as requested, copies of the tenders received by me for the supply of meat, groceries, coal and wood to the Rupert's Land Industrial School during the current fiscal year.

In this connection, I may say that, on the strength of your letter of the 30th July last, directing me to be guided by the instructions of the Indian Commissioner for Manitoba and the North-west Territories with regard to expenditure during this year, I asked that officer for authority to call for tenders for the above-mentioned supplies, and he referred me to the Hon. Joseph Martin for a list (copy herewith inclosed) of the parties whom he would recommend for the

patronage. Forms of tender were, therefore, sent only to the dealers mentioned in the list, and the contracts were awarded to the lowest tenderers, as follows:—

J. W. Cockburn, for groceries.

F. Sagrott, for meat.

Hartstone, Windatt & Co., for hard coal.

D. E. Adams, for soft and blacksmiths' coal, and

T. D. Robinson, for wood.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) E. McCOLL,

Inspector of Agencies.

On page 4 we have a letter from Mr. Hayter Reed, addressed to Mr. Chipman:

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th ultimo, respecting the supply of groceries and other supplies required by the St. Paul's Industrial School; and, in reply, I beg to inform you that the Indian Commissioner directed that tenders from a limited number of local merchants, as formerly, be asked for, and contracts were let to the 30th June, 1897, under conditions similar to last year.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) HAYTER REED,

Deputy Supt. Gen. of I. A.

Before this, what used to be done was to issue schedules such as I have in my hand, and the public got the advantage of proper competition, and so did the Government, but, under the present system there is no proper competition. On page 9 there is a letter which was evidently addressed to these few people, with schedules, but nothing was done at all commensurate with what—I think the hon. Minister will agree with me—should have been done. I do not want to delay the committee, but I point out that what was done was to peddle these contracts around Winnipeg to the friends of Mr. Joseph Martin. That was a very improper proceeding. I want specially to call attention to the fact that in the return I ask for we have only schedules for the North-west Territories, and none for Manitoba. I wish to have an explanation of the course taken at the instance of Mr. Forget, and then I want an assurance from the hon. Minister that care will be taken to call for tenders in the future, in the proper way, for Manitoba supplies.

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The practice has been to call for tenders when large quantities of supplies were wanted, but where only small quantities were wanted from time to time, it has been the custom to send written applications to three or four or half a dozen merchants and thus save the expense of advertising. I may mention that the matter to which the hon. gentleman referred happened before I took office, but I discussed the question with the Indian Commissioner and the officers of the department, and I directed that there should be no change in the practice. The instructions were that the tenders should be called for in the usual way, and I think the hon. gentleman must be under a misapprehen-

**Mr. DAVIN.**

sion in thinking that has not been done. I am satisfied that tenders were called for as on former occasions, but I can inform the hon. gentleman positively to-morrow.

**Manitoba and North-west Territories—**

Indian Education: Day, boarding and

industrial schools..... \$295,231

**Mr. OLIVER.** I wish to call attention to this item of Indian education. In my opinion, this is an item on which economy could be practiced to advantage. It has been found necessary, I understand to economize in many ways with regard to governmental offices in the North-west Territories, to reduce the officers in connection with the land department and also to reduce the Mounted Police. I think no item, could better be reduced than that for the education of the Indians. The amount that is asked to educate the Indians in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is greater than the total amount of their annuity and the total amount of the supplies furnished them. That is to say, the treaty obligations entered into by the Government are not as heavy as this obligation which has been assumed since the treaty was made. I do not wish to argue the point as to the desirability of educating the Indians, but I may say that in the North-west Territories there is one branch of this Indian education which is fitted out with buildings, which in cost and appointment would be considered desirable additions to any city in the Dominion; buildings that have cost, I suppose, something like half a million of dollars. They are used in teaching the Indians different industries, which industries, even if the Indians acquired a proper knowledge of them, there would be no field for them to carry on satisfactorily. The position is this—that we are educating these Indians to compete industrially with our own people, which seems to me a very undesirable use of public money, or else we are not able to educate them to compete, in which case our money is thrown away. In any case, I contend, this education of Indians not being a treaty obligation is a matter in which economy might very well be used. When it has been found necessary to cut down the expenditure on the Mounted Police I think that economy could well be used in this matter of Indian education. I took the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to this matter last session, and I see that there has been a slight reduction in the amount. Still, the amount is altogether out of proportion to any possible benefit that can be derived from it.

**Indians—British Columbia—Surveys and**

reserve commissions..... \$10,000

**Mr. FOSTER.** Is this surveys and commission business pretty well through yet?

**THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I have asked here for a re-vote of what was provided last year. I have not had time to make a very definite estimate of what will

be required, but I do not think that so large an amount as this will be necessary. The Songhees Indians are upon a reserve that is inside the limits of the city of Victoria, and it is proposed to remove them.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is for surveys, and the hon. Minister could not use it for the removal of Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to cover the expenses of the survey of a new reserve and the removal of the Indians as well as the expense of conducting the work. The hon member (Mr. Foster) will probably remember that before the change of Government the arrangements were entered into. I have not seen my way yet to complete the arrangements, because we could not come to an exact understanding with the provincial Government as to what should be done. The provincial authorities are very desirous that the Indians should remove and are ready to provide a reserve, but the dispute was as to the terms to be made.

Mr. FOSTER. Has an agreement been reached yet?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically. Mr. Turner, the Premier of British Columbia was here the other day.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to get the old reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Arrangements have been made between us that the old reserve shall go to British Columbia Government if they furnish a reserve of equal value. I may say that the difficulty heretofore has been that I insisted that when the change was made the difference between the reserve the Indians are leaving, and the reserve they are entering upon should be paid by the British Columbia Government and funded for the benefit of the Indians. They refused to entertain a proposition of that kind, but from what Mr. Turner said it appeared that there had been a misunderstanding, because he said there would be no question about the matter, as the reserve they propose to furnish was more valuable than that in the city. I said that that would do, and I was very glad to hear what he said because it will avoid necessity for further delay. Immediately after the session, I hope the arrangement can be carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. The new reserve might be of equal value so far as the Indians are concerned, that is larger, but it might not be at all worth the same amount of money in the market.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I insisted that it should be worth the same amount of money, because the Government, being in the position of trustee for the Indians, was bound to require that the new property should be of equal value.

Mr. FOSTER. It should be of equal value or the difference should be paid over for the benefit of the Indians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the position I have taken and that will be provided for.

Indians—General—Two inspectors, 1 at \$1,400, 1 at \$1,000..... \$2,400

Mr. FOSTER. Who are these inspectors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McRae and Mr. Chitty.

Mr. FOSTER. The same ones as before?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

North-west Mounted Police—Pay of Force..... \$200,000

Mr. DAVIN. I would appeal to the Minister and to the Government generally in regard to this vote. I think that they will have received from their friends in the North-west Territories, as they have recently received from the capital, Regina, strong representations against the decrease that this vote represents. Those who know the North-west will know that the Mounted Police have been of the greatest possible advantage to the North-west Territories, and will continue to be of the greatest possible advantage to that country until it has become more thickly settled and perhaps long afterwards. Naturally the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sifton's) attention, before he became Minister, was more directed to his own province, but since he has been a Minister, his attention must have been directed largely to the North-west Territories, and facts must have been brought before him to shake his convictions if he had such convictions in regard to the decision arrived at by the Prime Minister and the Government to reduce the North-west Mounted Police and to cause him to see the advantage of increasing the grant. I would urge the Government to reconsider whether next year they will not place the Mounted Police upon its old footing of strength.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many officers and men the force consists, and where they are distributed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not give the hon. gentleman the distribution. There are 742 officers and men.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed some time ago there was a contingent of the North-west Mounted Police sent to the Yukon District. Was the selection made from the force in Manitoba and the North-west, or were they new men enlisted for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were not new men. I think on a former occasion I made unwittingly a misleading statement. The hon. member for North

Victoria (Mr. Hughes) asked me one evening when the Prime Minister was out, whether a newly enrolled detachment had been sent, and I, not catching the whole of the question, answered in the affirmative. But it was not a newly enrolled detachment, it was a part of the force that had been in the North-west Territories.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say that in the estimation of a large number of people in the Territories, the reduction of the Mounted Police at the present time is a mistake; and I think that view will be greatly strengthened by the events which have taken place within the last few days. I do not wish to put myself in the position, and I do not think the representatives of the west should put themselves in a position before this House, of opposing economy. There has been an idea, perhaps too prevalent on the part of the people in the Territories, and of representatives of the Territories, that any expenditure, so long as it was territorial expenditure, was desirable; and as a consequence, a majority of the members of the House have taken the position that the Territories are merely a sort of sink hole into which money is poured, and from which adequate results are not received. Therefore I say that it is good policy for every territorial representative to support any reasonable measure of economy that is brought before this House; and therefore I do not wish to oppose a reduction of the police force in so far as it is a measure of economy. I do not ask for a dollar's expenditure in the territories that is not necessary on the police force; I wish to see economy in the territories as well as everywhere else. But if it is a fact that a certain force is necessary, and that that force requires a certain expenditure in order to make it efficient, then it becomes a grave question whether the reduction in the amount of the expenditure is real economy. That is the question that is before us now. I know it is said that many years ago when the territories were in a much more turbulent state than they are now, a smaller number of policemen managed the country to very good advantage. That is a fact. The country was in a more dangerous condition than it is now, and they did manage it very satisfactorily with a smaller number of men. But while the country is not in the same condition that it was then, while in one way it has become more peaceable, in other ways it has not become more peaceable. It was possible at that time, by making a sort of treaty with the Indian tribes, to have the support of the several tribes towards the maintenance of law and order, at the present time, owing to the disorganization of the tribes, and the general disorganization of the Indian element of the country, it is not possible to enter into any such arrangement. Therefore you have to deal now with the Indian

Mr. SIFTON.

as an individual instead of dealing with Indians in tribes; and as a consequence, a larger number of men are required to deal with the same number of Indians as law breakers in the ordinary sense of the word. That is the reason why it is not possible at the present time to preserve law and order in the territories with the same number of men that it was some years ago. I know a great many people figure on the matter in this way: They say, The population of the territories is about 100,000, and 100,000 people in Ontario do not require the services of more than one or two policemen. But the circumstances are different in the territories from what they are in any other part of the Dominion of Canada. There is a small population and a very large territory. A few people here, a few people there, and a few people yonder; and it is not possible to enforce law and order in a country of such geographical extent as the territories on the same terms as it can be enforced in a country where the population is dense, as it is in the older provinces of the Dominion. I think if people would look at the matter in this light, especially in view of the circumstances that have occurred within the last couple of years, they will realize that one or two or three Indians can make trouble for a whole settlement, a whole country side, and require a large force to deal with them. That would not be the case if the country were in a different condition, but it has to be dealt with as it is. While the Indians have changed their condition and are not as warlike as they were, and there is not the same necessity for a large military force in the territories as there was some years ago, I want especially to point out certain duties that are required to be fulfilled in the territories in their present condition that were not required many years ago. In the first place, there is a drift of cattle from the south side of the boundary line into the territories. There is something like 700 miles of an imaginary line dividing the prairie belonging to the States from that belonging to Canada. On the south side of the line there are herds of cattle numbering thousands and hundreds of thousands. The grass there is to a great extent exhausted, and the cattle have a natural tendency to drift north into our prairies where the grass is better any way, and where it is not exhausted. That drift of the herds is increasing steadily from Montana; the tendency to come northward is increasing every year; and unless we intend to allow our prairies to be eaten out by the cattle of our neighbours, we will have to take some steps to prevent them from coming north. Now, the Mounted Police force is there to be used for that purpose; if they are not there, some other men will have to be engaged in order to do that duty. Another duty that requires to be attended to is that of preventing prairie fires. As you know, the

territories are principally prairies, but are partly timbered. Because they are principally prairie and only partly timbered, the timber is very valuable, not as a commercial commodity, but in promoting the settlement of the country. Where the country is settled the settlers can look after the prairie fires, but where the country is not settled, on the public domain, the timber that belongs to the Crown is year after year decreased in quantity, and decreased in value by those running fires. The settlers are not to be expected to put out the fires which do not damage or endanger their own property. This is public property, and it is for the Dominion Government to say whether they will attempt to preserve that property or not. Then there is an extension of trade into the Mackenzie River country and the Yukon, and it has been found necessary to send men into those regions in order to preserve law and order. There are these three services that require to be performed at present that were not required years ago; and if the Government can meet the case, can satisfactorily perform these services with the smaller number of men they will have at their disposal, certainly I have nothing to say against a reduction of the force. But I want distinctly to point out that these services require to be performed, that it is of value to the country that they should be performed, and it is a question for the Government to consider whether there is any economy in restricting the number of men if, as a consequence, these interests will be neglected. Then there is another side of the question to which I would like to draw attention. The cost of the police force is charged up against the North-west Territories, as an essentially a North-west Territories' expenditure, as if the North-west Territories were responsible to the Dominion for that expenditure. That is not a fair way of looking at it. If this Dominion sees fit in its wisdom to support a military force, a force of infantry, of artillery and of cavalry in the eastern provinces, some in St. John, N.B., some at Quebec, and some at Kingston, there is no reason why this Mounted Police force should not also be considered as a part of the military establishment of the country, and there is no reason therefore why that force should be charged against the North-west Territories any more than the force which is stationed at Kingston should be charged against Ontario, or that at Quebec should be charged against that province. If it is necessary to support a regular force in this country I claim that the Mounted Police Force is entitled to be considered part of a military force, and not to be charged against the North-west Territories as a special expenditure on behalf of that country.

Grant for Schools, North-west Territories..... \$248,979

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move to reduce that item by \$6,000. There was a mistake in making up the figures.

Mr. OLIVER. Is there any intention on the part of the Government to increase the grant to schools and to the Government of the Territories this year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have it under consideration.

Dominion Lands..... \$90,938

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the commissioner was dismissed and that the Government were closing up the offices in Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The commissioner will do the work here that has been done in Winnipeg by the commissioner there.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there would be no economy in it? The only difference is that the office will be here instead of at Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will look at the item he will see that there is a decrease of \$27,000.

Mr. SPROULE. But there will be no saving with regard to that particular item for the commissioner. I think the Minister will find, after a trial, that a great deal of the work could be done much more satisfactorily in Winnipeg, than it can possibly be done from headquarters here.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a matter which I think is of very considerable importance in connection with surveys. I hope the Minister has taken some steps towards delimiting the boundary between British Columbia and the Territories. I have no doubt that that process will require some preliminary negotiations with the British Columbia Government, but I would like to have an assurance from the Minister that he will shortly take the necessary steps.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say that I have taken any preliminary steps. I have had it under discussion with the Surveyor General and it is one of the matters to which I propose to give my attention when the House rises, for the purpose of seeing if an arrangement can be arrived at. I cannot assure the hon. gentleman that any progress has been made yet.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. (Payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act)..... \$10,000

Mr. SPROULE. Can the Minister of Finance give us any information as to what

state of advancement the settlement of these accounts is in ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The matter I am afraid is not likely to be settled at a very early day. It has made very considerable progress, but it is one of those very slow matters and will occupy some time.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Could the Minister give us any detailed information as to what line of settlement they have reached ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I would rather promise to give the information to the hon. gentleman on concurrence, than to attempt to give it from memory now.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Very good, give the information on concurrence.

Amount required to pay the city of Winnipeg one-half of the expenses incurred by the city in respect of an outbreak of small-pox among European immigrants in 1893..... \$6,389 36

Mr. **JAMESON**. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if any provision has been made for the expense that was incurred by the city of Winnipeg in connection with the epidemic of small-pox at the end of last year ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that no claim was made on that account, and in consequence no provision has been made for it.

Mr. **JAMESON**. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if this vote is the result of any arrangement with the civic authorities, because the amount actually expended by the city of Winnipeg was some \$15,000.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. This is half of it. This liability arose from the fact that when small-pox broke out amongst some immigrants who landed in Winnipeg and who had to be taken care of by the city, the city authorities telegraphed to the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Daly) and he telegraphed back that he would contribute to the expenditure. The question of what that telegram meant was referred to the Department of Justice, and that department gave the opinion that the interpretation of it must be that the Government would be called upon to pay one-half of the amount. I do not know by what process of reasoning that opinion was arrived at ; but I presume it was in this way. When a contribution is agreed upon between individuals, if no definite proportion of the contribution is provided for, it is supposed to be in equal shares. I suppose that is the process of reasoning by which the Deputy Minister arrived at the conclusion. Mr. Daly then endeavoured to settle with the Winnipeg authorities, and a dispute arose as to what amount ought to have been

Mr. **SPROULE**.

expended, and the officials of the department undertook to tax the bill of expense. Mr. Daly finally offered \$5,000 as half of what he thought would be a reasonable expenditure. The city of Winnipeg refused positively to accept that, and when the matter came before me, I came to the conclusion, after looking through all the papers, that there was no basis on which the bill could be taxed down, and while I would not be prepared to say that the officers who said that the bill was too high were wrong, neither would I be prepared to say that the city was wrong. The city authorities dealt with the case to the best of their ability, with no desire to waste any money, and I decided to pay one-half of what the city of Winnipeg had paid. I may say to the hon. member for Winnipeg that so far as the department is concerned, this is final.

Mr. **JAMESON**. I may say that this is a perpetually-recurring nuisance to the city of Winnipeg. Through the negligence of the officials of the Dominion Government, disease is brought into the city by these immigrants, and we have to go to the expense of isolating the patients, and it is not fair that the whole expense should be imposed upon the city. A case of small-pox occurred in the immigration buildings under the direct care of the Government officials, and the officer in charge sent the patient to the General Hospital and put him in the measles ward, thereby spreading the disease, and rendering our children liable to contract it. When I discovered the disease last year, I took the precaution to place the patient in the isolation hospital, in order to protect the health of the city. I am glad to say that we succeeded in limiting the cases to about four, two of which were those of our own citizens, one of whom died from the disease. This was traceable to the negligence of the officials of the Dominion Government. These cases arose out of a case that developed in the steamer and was brought to the city of Winnipeg ; and this is the sort of thing to which we are liable, and which may occur over and over again. It is not at all a light matter for my constituents. It is a matter in which we have a right to claim the full expense from the Dominion Government.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and, with the object of minimizing the danger as far as possible, I have taken steps to have a temporary isolation building provided in connection with the immigration building at Winnipeg, and I have reason to believe that, under the arrangements that will be made very shortly, the danger will be minimized to such an extent that there will be no reason to apprehend any real danger in the future.

Mr. **DAVIN**. My attention was directed to this case, and I can entirely support my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson). I

consider it a hardship that the full expense that Winnipeg was put to has not been met by the Government. We had a similar case in the North-west Territories. We had two patients in the hospital at Medicine Hat, and we have never been able to get the pay from the Department of the Interior.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The same danger exists in the city of Halifax and in the city of Montreal as in Winnipeg; but in the various hospitals in these places care is taken to isolate cases of contagious disease. If a small-pox patient were let loose in a general hospital, the city would be rendered liable to some expense, and I believe, to the whole expense.

Mr. ELLIS. If the people of Winnipeg, simply because a case of small-pox occurs among the immigrants, can saddle the whole expense of dealing with it upon the country, we on the Atlantic seaboard shall be glad to do the same thing. In the seaport towns it often happens that sailors and others, acting in the interests of the commerce of the country, who come in bring disease with them, and the city or the province is put to the expense of stamping it out. What is good for one part of the country ought to be good for another part. I protest against the city of Winnipeg getting anything. These immigrants are brought in at the expense of the whole country for the particular benefit of Manitoba and the Territories, and simply because there is a little sour with the sweet, they must escape all the burdens, and place them on the entire country. I do not know anything about the management of the hospital at Winnipeg, but this would seem to be a matter of local concern. The Minister is opening the door for a considerable demand from all the ports of Canada where cases of small-pox occur.

Mr. JAMESON. The difference is this: These immigrants passed through Grosse Isle, where the medical officer was supposed to have given them a clean bill of health.

Mr. ELLIS. That makes the case all the stronger against the hon. gentleman. The immigrants were inspected, and passed the medical inspection.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the use of the inspection?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). They were inspected by the quarantine officers, and there was no disease among them: when they came into the country.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS.

### MINISTERS OF CUSTOMS AND OF INLAND REVENUE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved that the House to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue shall each receive a salary at the rate of five thousand dollars per annum.

Motion agreed to.

### EXTENSION OF THE I. C. R.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to confirm the following agreement entered into, with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company and Her Majesty in the interest of Canada, for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal.

This agreement, made this fifteenth day of May, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven.

Between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, hereinafter called "the Company," of the first part, and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented herein by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada, who is herein referred to as "the Minister," Her Majesty so represented being hereinafter called or referred to as "Her Majesty," of the second part.

Whereas Her Majesty purposes extending the Intercolonial Railway, a government railway of Canada, from Chaudière Junction, in the province of Quebec, to the city of Montreal, in said province, with termini in that city;

And whereas Her Majesty has made arrangements with the Drummond County Railway Company for the lease of all its railway now completed or hereafter to be completed between Chaudière Junction and Ste. Rosalie, in the said province of Quebec;

And whereas for the purpose of carrying out the said extension the said company is willing that, for the conducting of the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, Her Majesty shall have an undivided one-half share or leasehold interest in the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert station at the eastern end of the Victoria Bridge, together with the use of the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, the use of the Victoria Bridge across the River St. Lawrence and of

the terminals and connections hereinafter more particularly described, together with an undivided one-half interest in and use of the bridge across the Chaudière River, and of so much of the tracks and line of the said company in connection therewith as are hereinafter described, all of which right, title, property, interest and user shall be used, enjoyed and exercised to the same extent as if the said railway and property were owned by Her Majesty, in the manner and upon the terms and conditions herein contained ;

And whereas this agreement has been executed subject to confirmation by Act of Parliament as hereinafter provided and also by the shareholders of said company ;

And whereas by order of the Governor General in Council dated the twenty-fourth day of March, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, authority is given to the Minister subject to the sanction of Parliament to enter into a contract with the company for the acquisition of the above rights

Now this indenture witnesseth that the expression "Joint Section," wherever used in this indenture, shall mean the company's line and connections at Ste. Rosalie, and the whole line and branches and appurtenances hereby demised from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert and the Victoria Bridge, together with the terminals at Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, and at Point St. Charles and intermediate points between Point St. Charles and Bonaventure station, and the connections and junctions of the company's lines with other lines of railway and the Chaudière Bridge and connections, except when the meaning shall conflict with the context or otherwise plainly expressed terms of the clause in which the same is used. That the said company in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained and reserved hath given, granted, demised and leased and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns all an undivided one-half share, interest, right and title to all the company's line of railway roadbed and property from and including Ste. Rosalie station in the county of Bagot, in the province of Quebec to the Victoria Bridge, and also the undivided one-half right, share, title or interest in the company's line of railway from a point on the western side of the Chaudière Bridge at the proposed junction of the Drummond County Railway with the company's line, and including the Chaudière Bridge and to and including the switch at the eastern side of the Chaudière Junction station, being the same rights and privileges agreed to be leased to the Drummond County Railway by the company, with the full and unlimited right and privileges such as the company itself enjoys of running the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains of the said Intercolonial Railway either separately or combined and as frequently and at such times as its business and traffic may require and in both directions over any and every portion of the said company's railway between and including the said points aforesaid and the use of the Victoria Bridge across the River St. Lawrence as it at present exists or as it may at any time during the subsistence of this lease be improved, re-constructed, enlarged or extended and over the company's line and lines of railway over the said Victoria Bridge and into the Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal and the other terminal points, junctions and connections of the said company on the said Island of Montreal hereinafter more particularly described, together with the full and unlimited right and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

privilege of having the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway done in and about the stations and premises of the said company upon any portions of the company's line hereinbefore described and of the terminals and connections herein mentioned and all intermediate stations and premises of the company and in and about and upon all stations, tracks and sidings, branches or extensions belonging to or leased by the company or connected with the tracks of the company, together with the full and unlimited right in Her Majesty of constructing stations, tracks, branches and sidings, and connecting said tracks, branches and sidings, with the main branch and leased line of the company at any point or points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, on the terms and conditions hereinafter contained for the term of ninety-nine years from and after the first day of November, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, with the right of renewal as hereinafter provided. The construction of such stations, tracks, branches and sidings, with the main branch and leased lines of the company as herein provided for shall, however, be made under the supervision and subject to the approval of the chief engineer of the company, which right of approval shall be reasonably exercised.

To have and to hold said rights and privileges unto Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns from and after the first day of November, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, for the term of ninety-nine years, yielding and paying therefor to the said company, its successors and assigns, a yearly rental of one hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$140,000), and such rent to be payable in equal sums monthly, that is to say, eleven thousand six hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-six cents (\$11,666.66) on the first week day of every month in each year or a proportionate sum for any fractional part of a month, the first payment to be made on the first week day of the month next following the day on which Her Majesty goes into possession of the said leased lines and property and begins to run trains over the same :

And these presents are made upon and subject to the provisions and conditions hereinafter expressed and contained for the due performance and observance of all of which, on the part of each of them to be done and performed, Her Majesty and the company bind themselves and each of them respectively, their successors and assigns, that is to say :—

First.—That Her Majesty shall and will during the continuance of this lease or any renewal thereof pay to the company the rent hereby reserved in the manner and at the times hereinbefore mentioned without any deduction whatever, save for the reasons and on account of the happening of any or either contingency or contingencies hereinafter mentioned.

Second.—That the company shall and will keep up and maintain at all times in good repair and in a thorough efficient working condition the whole of the railway tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, buildings of all kinds, platforms, water-tanks, water supplies, telegraph lines and appliances, fences, crossings and all other appurtenances and appliances belonging to the company's railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and of the terminals and connections herein described and between the Chaudière Bridge and connections, the right and privilege of using which is included in this demise.

Third.—That Her Majesty shall and will pay to the company a share of the cost of maintenance of this railway between and including Ste.

Rosalie and Point St. Charles and Chaudière Bridge and connections, including tracks, bridges, switches, sidings, signals, appliances of all kinds, platforms, water-tanks, water supplies, fuel stations, fences, crossings and all other appurtenances and appliances it has the right and privileges of using which is included in this demise, such share of the cost of maintenance to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains running over the above mentioned sections of railway bears to the total combined engine and car mileage over the above mentioned sections of railway during each month, every engine, passenger and freight car counting each as one car, and from Point St. Charles and west to Bonaventure station, including the yards, such share of the cost of maintenance as aforesaid to be in the proportion that the combined engine and car mileage of the Intercolonial Railway trains running over the above last mentioned railway section and yards bears to the total combined engine and car mileage running over the above last mentioned section of the railway during each month; but notwithstanding anything herein mentioned, the cost of maintenance of the Victoria Bridge shall not include the cost of maintaining any part or portion thereof except that which shall be used by the Intercolonial Railway and the company, and for that class of railway purpose, which cost of maintenance shall be apportioned as aforesaid.

Fourth.—That Her Majesty shall have the right for all purposes of the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, under the reasonable rules and regulations of the company, to the full and unlimited use and the full and unlimited access thereto, as the same is or may be enjoyed by the company itself, of, to and from all engine houses, car houses and sheds, fuel sheds, water-tanks, station houses, freight and ticket offices, warehouses, freight sheds, baggage rooms, dining rooms, and all furniture and fittings appertaining thereto; all weighing scales and baggage and freight trucks; all tracks, sidings, branches or extensions either belonging to or leased by the company at Montreal, including the terminals and other connections of the company at Point St. Charles and intermediate points between Point St. Charles and Bonaventure station, and of the connections with other railways as the same now exist or as they may hereafter be built, rebuilt or improved upon terms as herein specified.

Fifth.—That if any of the said buildings or accommodations or facilities or anything appertaining thereto be destroyed by fire or other casualty, either in whole or in part, Her Majesty shall have no claim against the company for damages on account of loss of accommodation, but Her Majesty shall have, free of any other charge than the aforementioned rental, a proportionate share of such accommodation as the company may be able to provide for the use of its business and traffic and of the new accommodation as soon as the same may be provided, and reconstruction shall be proceeded with of such buildings and accommodation by the company at its own cost with all reasonable despatch.

Sixth.—In all case of collision between the trains of the parties hereto, the party whose men or trains are at fault, and are or shall be found to have been the occasion of the collision shall be held responsible to the other party for all damage done or resulting from such collision, and in case the proper officer of the two parties hereto cannot agree as to which of the parties was at fault and was the cause of the collision

or as to the amount of damage done, then the questions arising in respect thereto shall be referred to arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided for the settlement of differences and disputes as to the other questions, and each of the parties hereto who shall be found responsible under this clause or under clauses similar thereto shall indemnify the other and hold such other harmless and defend the other from and against all claims, cost and proceeding resulting from, or growing out of such default on their part and the party so adjudged liable to pay the other any damages in respect thereof shall abide by and perform the award of the arbitrators and such award shall be in all cases final and terminate the controversy between the parties.

Seventh.—In case of injury to persons or property not in transit by the trains of either party hereto or of damage by fire caused by the operation of the trains upon the said joint section or upon lands adjoining the same, the claims arising shall be adjusted and settled by the proper officers of the company and in payment thereof the party in fault shall pay the full amount of liability, provided however, that in the event of its being impossible for want of evidence to fix the liability on one of the parties hereto the amount of liability, including costs, shall be borne by the two parties in the proportion which the number of cars of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the total number of cars passing over the said joint section at the point where the injury has occurred during the current month in which the damage or injury happened. In case of injury occurring to persons or property on the trains of either party the proper officer of the party on whose train the said injury occurred shall settle the same in all cases of settlement under this clause. The release executed shall be made to include and free and discharge both the parties hereto from all and further liability to the claimant.

Any loss or damage to person or property on the trains of either of the parties hereto which may be caused in any manner whatever by the negligence or the fault of any person or persons in the joint employ of the parties hereto while in the working of said railway hereby demised or the terminals thereof, shall be paid by the party upon whose train such loss or damage occurs and such party shall save the other harmless and indemnify the other from all claims, costs, or proceedings for or in respect to such loss or damage.

Eighth.—That each of the parties hereto shall be responsible for accidents or casualties upon or to its own trains or for damages that may occur to live stock or to persons walking on the track, if there be any liability therefor and which shall result by reason of or on account of any imperfection of track or misplacement of switches or from any other cause otherwise or except collision with the trains of the other party, and any such last mentioned accident or casualty shall not give the other party a right of action or claim against the other, it being the intent hereof that each party shall be responsible for its own trains and for the conduct of its own employees and shall generally be so responsible except when the other party is in fault.

Ninth.—That the company shall and will furnish free from any other charge than the aforementioned rental at stations and sidings between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal and terminals and yards aforesaid, standing room for the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway and for other rolling stock which may be brought by the trains of the Intercolonial Railway.

Tenth.—That the parties hereto shall enjoy in all respects equal rights to the said tracks, buildings and improvements used in common unless wherein restricted in this lease, and the trains of Her Majesty shall in every respect be treated by the officers, agents and employees of the company, as trains of a similar class of the company, and the higher class trains shall have equal preference over trains of the lower class belonging to either of the parties, and Her Majesty shall have a perfect right to run all classes of trains, passenger, mixed, freight and other trains over the said joint section, subject only to the restrictions and regulations prescribed and provided for in this lease. In case of doubt between the trains of the company and Her Majesty of the same class, under the established rules the trains of the company shall have the preference. The main tracks as far as practicable to be kept unobstructed for the use of both of the parties hereto.

Eleventh.—In preparing the time tables the company shall and will, as regards the trains of the Intercolonial Railway, arrange the time of arrivals and departures from all stations between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and the speed of said trains, in accordance with the reasonable request of the Intercolonial Railway officials, made from time to time.

Twelfth.—That the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents and baggage masters of the company on the said joint section shall as far as the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned to all interests and purposes, but subject to the payment of a share of their wages as is hereinafter provided, be the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and shall from time to time in regard to such business report directly to and receive and carry out the instructions of the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway.

Thirteenth.—That the company shall and will cause the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents and other joint employees at all stations between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal to be strictly neutral as between the Intercolonial Railway and the company and to waybill freight and sell tickets by whichever of these routes may be indicated or desired by shippers or passengers.

Fourteenth.—That all business and traffic secured by agents of the Intercolonial Railway or carried in its trains shall be the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway.

Fifteenth.—That the Intercolonial Railway shall have the right to carry in and on its through trains traffic to and from and between all points on the line of railway extending from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, both inclusive, and in the conducting of its business between and including these stations shall have the right of conducting this business in as full and complete a manner as the company itself.

That the rates and fares charged between points on the joint section shall be those established by the company and to and from points on the Intercolonial Railway shall be the same by the company and the Intercolonial Railway.

Sixteenth.—That the Intercolonial Railway shall have the right to carry in and on its through trains to and from all points on their line of railway between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal all traffic coming from or intended for Montreal, or coming from or intended for any point on the Island of Montreal, or coming from or intended for any and all other points, and to enjoy the same rights and privileges in regard to such business as the company

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

itself has and enjoys in similar business from and to such above mentioned points.

Seventeenth.—That all moneys collected in the vehicles and trains of the Intercolonial Railway Company at any and all points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal shall belong to and be deemed to have been earned by Her Majesty, and the company shall not be entitled to receive any portion thereof; and that all money collected and received by the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents, baggage masters and any and all persons who may from time to time be authorized or instructed by the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway to collect and receive money between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal for Intercolonial Railway business and traffic, including among other things car rental, storage of freight in cars and storage of goods in the company's warehouses and freight sheds, or collected and received for any other business in any way connected with the Intercolonial Railway, belongs to Her Majesty and shall be deposited in bank to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, or remitted to the cashier of the Intercolonial Railway, or otherwise disposed of as the Minister may from time to time direct.

Eighteenth.—That local tickets issued by either of the parties hereto for passage between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal or any intermediate station shall be accepted on all trains of either party hereto between said points, and the party who issued the tickets shall, on presentation of the ticket so used and collected, pay to the party who carried the passengers the full amount received for the said ticket.

Nineteenth.—That Her Majesty shall pay to the company a share of the salaries and wages of the undermentioned persons at stations on the said joint section and terminals for their services in connection with Intercolonial Railway business and traffic when such services are rendered, as follows:—

Train despatchers, station masters, telegraph operators, track men, in the proportion that the number of the Intercolonial Railway trains using the premises hereby demised bears to the total number of trains using the said premises; ticket agents, baggage masters, baggage porters and policemen, in the proportion that the number of Intercolonial Railway passenger trains using the premises hereby demised bear to the total number of passenger trains using the same; freight agents, freight clerks, freight checkers, freight porters and watchmen, in the proportion that the tonnage of the Intercolonial Railway freight handled by porters bears to the total tonnage handled by all porters on said premises; also such proportionate share of the salaries of the superintendent, train master, road master and assistant engineer as the mileage of the joint section bears to the total mileage of road under jurisdiction of the officials named shall be divided between the parties hereto in the proportion that the number of cars of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the total number of cars passing over the joint section, and also a share of the cost of running, shunting and switching engines, and of the wages of yard masters, shunters, switchmen and car checkers at each station between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, and the terminals, junctions and connections aforesaid and the Chaudière section, in the proportion that the number of cars arriving and departing from the station used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway bears to the number of cars ar-

iving and departing therefrom. Her Majesty shall also have the right and privilege of having her cars loaded or empty taken by the company to the company's junctions with connecting lines, factories, warehouses and works which may be provided with standing accommodation from the tracks of the company at Montreal, including Point St. Charles, St. Henry, and intermediate points, and Bonaventure station, and the connections or junctions with the company's line, and over and upon the said joint section.

Twentieth.—That the engines, vehicles, rolling stock and trains in connection with the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway shall be manned exclusively by officials and employees of the Intercolonial, who while on the railway and premises of the company on the said joint section, shall be subject to the reasonable rules and regulations of the company and the directions of the officials of the company so far only as the movements of the engines, vehicles and trains are concerned.

That Her Majesty shall and will be responsible for any mileage on foreign cars carried over the joint sections by the Intercolonial Railway trains, which shall for the purpose of calculating the mileage charges be the cars of the Intercolonial Railway.

Twenty-first.—That the company shall and will house the engines of the Intercolonial Railway, and shall and will, if required, turn and clean them and fit them for the road, and supply them with fuel and water and small stores at all points, connections, junctions and terminals, as aforesaid, where it performs such services for any of its own engines, and Her Majesty shall pay to the company the actual cost to the company of the labour and material used therein and therefor: provided that Her Majesty may, at any point or at all points on the premises above mentioned, or at any time or times, perform the whole or any portion of the above services with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and with the supplies thereof without being liable to any charge therefor by the company.

Twenty-second.—That the company shall and will, if required to do so, at any or all stations on said joint sections, clean the passenger train cars used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and heat and supply them with water, ice, fuel and small stores, and Her Majesty shall pay to the company the cost to the company of the material, labour and stores used in such services: provided that Her Majesty may, at any point or points on the premises above mentioned of the company, and at any time or times, perform the whole or any portion of the above services with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and heat and supply said cars with water, ice, fuel and small stores at her own cost without being liable to any charge therefor by the company.

Twenty-third.—That the company shall and will, from time to time when requested to do so by the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, make temporary repairs upon the engines and other rolling stock used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, such repairs to be made promptly with all reasonable despatch, and Her Majesty shall pay the company the actual cost to the company of the labour and materials used in such repairs.

Twenty-fourth.—That the company shall and will carry passengers on through tickets, and freight on through waybills, from and to points on its railway and leased and controlled lines to and from points on the Intercolonial Railway and

its leased and connecting lines so as to avoid re-ticketing and re-waybilling.

Twenty-fifth.—That Her Majesty shall at her own cost supply all stationery, forms and tickets required for through business at all points between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal.

Twenty-sixth.—That all rates and fares shall be divided on the basis of mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by reason of one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a fair and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and, in default of agreement, by arbitration as hereinafter provided.

Twenty-seventh.—That the company shall and will at its own cost, at all times, keep on sale at all stations and agencies of its railway and of its controlled and leased lines of railway an adequate supply of tickets for all points on the Intercolonial Railway, its leased lines and its connections, reading over the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal, and the baggage of passengers using any such tickets shall be checked through to its destination over the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal.

Twenty-eighth.—That the company agrees upon the application of the general passenger agent of the Intercolonial Railway to place and keep for sale and sell at all stations and agencies on its railway, and leased and controlled lines of railway, any tickets that may be asked for leading to points on the Intercolonial Railway and its connecting lines via Montreal and to treat such business with all fairness and impartiality.

Twenty-ninth.—That Her Majesty shall have the same privilege of displaying advertisements of the Intercolonial Railway route at all stations of the company as the company itself, and the Intercolonial Railway route and its connections with the company's railway shall be shown in all the published time tables of the company.

Thirtieth.—That if the company shall at any time lease or in any way grant to any railway company, or to any person or persons whomsoever, either with or without payment, any running powers, rights or privileges, on or in any way connected with the railway premises of the company hereinbefore described, between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, the company shall pay to Her Majesty one-half of all the income it now receives or may hereafter receive for any running powers, rights or privileges, now granted or hereafter to be granted between the aforesaid points of Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. As to the other portions of the company's line herein demised the company hereby reserves to itself all revenues from any source whatever arising from the use thereof.

Thirty-first.—That Her Majesty shall have and enjoy for the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway of every kind whatsoever the same rights and facilities and in as full a manner at and within the terminal and other premises of the company at Montreal, at the terminals of Point St. Charles and intermediate points, and all the approaches and tracks thereto, as the company now has or at any time may hereafter have and enjoy for its own business and traffic.

Thirty-second.—That the company shall supply for the sole use of Her Majesty, if and when requested, a suitable ticket office in the Bonaventure station, or wherever the main depot of the company may in future be situated in Montreal, as accessible and in every way as convenient as the company's own ticket office in the said Bonaventure station or main depot at Mon-

treal, for the sale of tickets, to be provided and maintained by Her Majesty at her own expense.

Thirty-third.—That Her Majesty and the company shall each furnish to the other promptly, each and every month, all the information necessary to the ascertaining and checking of the rates, fares, charges and shares of costs and other returns to be made as under these presents, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to give the necessary facilities, including access to the books and papers to the auditors of the Intercolonial Railway and of the company respectively to enable them to verify the accounts under this agreement.

That all traffic balances, charges and shares of costs, and other returns to be made under these presents, shall be made monthly, and Her Majesty and the company mutually agree to promptly audit and pay each to the other each month the total amount chargeable against the other for the month immediately preceding.

Thirty-fourth.—That Her Majesty shall not be responsible for the acts or defaults of servants of the company, or for the deficiency or otherwise of the company's machinery or appliances, and the company shall not be responsible for the acts or defaults of the servants of Her Majesty or for the deficiency of the machinery or appliances of the Intercolonial Railway.

Thirty-fifth.—That if at any time hereafter the business or traffic shall, in the opinion of the parties hereto necessitate or warrant the laying of double tracks between and including St. Rosalie and St. Lambert, or the making of more extensive yard improvements at Point St. Charles or intermediate points between that Point and Beauport station, or the laying of additional tracks between such points, or shall warrant or necessitate any further expenditure for the proper and efficient conduct of its business, and the company shall lay the said tracks or make the said improvements or make the said expenditure, Her Majesty may have the full and unlimited use of all or any such work in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said work had been included in the premises hereby leased, the right, use or privilege in which are demised hereby, and if Her Majesty should determine to use any such works or improvements, and the Ministers should so declare, such works and improvements are hereby understood and agreed to form part of the leased premises, and Her Majesty shall pay annually for the use of any such works and improvements five per cent upon one-half of the actual cost to the company of the construction of said works and improvements; but in case of all betterments or of additional works on such joint sections which the company may be required to make under the provisions of any statute or of any order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or other competent authority, Her Majesty shall pay the interest upon one-half the cost thereof at the rate aforesaid.

Thirty-sixth.—That the company will and does hereby covenant with Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, that it has, subject to existing encumbrances, the right to demise and lease the rights and privileges hereby demised and every part thereof.

Thirty-seventh.—That if it should be found in practice that any right or interest of either party has not been fully protected for by this agreement in accordance with the true object and intent thereof, then both parties shall negotiate and agree upon in an equitable manner a new and other clause to provide for such omission, and each party shall give and execute to the other any and all further documents in

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

writing that may from time to time be required for the better securing of each of their rights and privileges under the said contract and for the better carrying out thereof.

Thirty-eighth.—That the company shall and will, if during the term of this lease Her Majesty well and faithfully performs all the covenants and agreements herein undertaken by Her Majesty to be performed, at the expiration of this lease, on request by the Minister, execute and deliver to Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, a renewal of said lease for a second term of ninety-nine years—and shall at the expiration of second term, upon like faithful performance on the part of Her Majesty, make, execute and deliver, a further renewal for a third term of ninety-nine years, and so on for ever, with the same covenants and conditions as are contained herein, subject to such limitations and modifications as may be mutually agreed upon between the parties or settled by arbitration according to the terms of this agreement.

Thirty-ninth.—That these presents are subject to the confirmation thereof by the Parliament of Canada and by the shareholders of the company.

Fortieth.—That notwithstanding anything contained in any agreement between Her Majesty and the company heretofore made and now existing, all traffic offered the company at any point on its lines west of Montreal which the shipper desires to ship via the Intercolonial at Montreal shall be billed by the company for shipment in such manner, and the company shall deliver all such traffic to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal and passenger tickets for any point on the Intercolonial Railway east of Montreal, shall be sold by the company's agents at all stations and agencies on its lines west of Montreal on request via Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway, and such ticket holder shall be entitled and shall be permitted to take the trains of the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal for such points easterly on the Intercolonial Railway.

Forty-first.—That in respect of all traffic originating throughout the company's system west of Montreal and offered for shipment for any point on the Intercolonial Railway via the Intercolonial at Montreal, the company shall not ask, impose or exact any rates or tolls from the point of shipment to Montreal which shall discriminate or tend to discriminate in favour of the company and against the Intercolonial Railway taking or receiving such business at Montreal, or which shall induce such shipment via the company's line to Lévis or Chaudière for delivery to the Intercolonial at either of such points in preference to Montreal.

Forty-second.—That in order to facilitate and develop the business of the Intercolonial Railway and the company, every effort shall be made to cause close and suitable train connections to be made at Montreal between the trains of the company west of Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

Forty-third.—That through rates and fares shall be agreed upon and made from time to time for traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, including the lines hereby demised, and all points on the company's railway, including all lines leased by them, and such rates and fares shall, as regards traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, and to and from all points on the company's lines and leased lines, be divided on the basis of mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by reason of one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in

which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a reasonable and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and in default of agreement, by arbitration as herein provided.

Forty-fourth.—That as regards traffic shipped to and from Europe and the British Isles through Halifax per Intercolonial Railway, the rates of the company for the carriage of such traffic east of Montreal shall not be higher per passenger per mile, and per ton of freight per mile than the amount per passenger per mile, and per ton of freight per mile, charged by the company on similar classes or descriptions of traffic carried by it for others to and from the same places, and intended for or coming from the same place in Europe or the British Isles. In ascertaining such rates of freight, all drawbacks or deductions allowed are to be taken off before fixing the rates.

Forty-fifth.—That the forms of all through bills of lading, also all forms of receipts for goods passing over the said lines respectively, shall be such as from time to time are agreed upon by the officials of the parties hereto, or in default of agreement, settled by arbitration.

Forty-sixth.—Her Majesty shall have the right to deduct from the rentals herein agreed to be paid to the company any sum or sums of money which may be or hereafter become due by the company to Her Majesty, and for the payment of which the company is in default.

Forty-seventh.—That should any difficulty arise between Her Majesty and the company under any clause of this agreement, or respecting the carrying out of the same according to its true intent and meaning, such differences shall from time to time, as the same may arise, be referred to the award and determination of three arbitrators, one of whom shall be nominated by the Minister, one by the company, and the third by the two so nominated; provided always, that if either party should for one month after notice that the other has nominated its arbitrator, omit or refuse to make a nomination, or if the two nominated should refuse or omit to nominate the third, then the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, or in his absence or refusal or inability to act, the Senior Puisne Judge present in Ottawa and willing to act, may on the application of either party on notice to the other nominate the required arbitrator.

Forty-eighth.—In case of the death or refusal to act of any arbitrator, or if for any other cause the office of any arbitrator becomes vacant, his successor shall be nominated in the same manner as is provided for his appointment in the first instance, unless the parties otherwise agree, and in case such successor be not nominated by the party entitled to nominate him, within one month after the happening of the vacancy, and after receiving notice requiring him to make such nomination, then the said Chief Justice, under the circumstance aforesaid, or the Senior Puisne Judge willing to act, may on the application of either party, nominate such successor.

Forty-ninth.—The arbitrators so chosen shall, within one month after the last appointment, proceed to determine the matters referred, and they, or a majority of them shall make and publish their award within one month thereafter, or within such further time as they shall in writing appoint, such extension of time to be made by a majority of the arbitrators, and the award of a majority of them shall be final.

Fiftieth.—Nothing herein contained shall in any way merge or affect the claims or rights of Her Majesty, if any such there be, as they now exist against the company or the property of the

company other than that which is the subject matter of this agreement.

In witness whereof these presents (in quadruplicate) have been signed by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, pursuant to Order in Council dated the 24th March, A. D. 1897, and the seal of the Department of Railways and Canada has been hereto affixed, and the company has hereto affixed its corporate seal, and these presents have been signed by the general manager of the company, the day and year first above written.

Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada,

By

CHAS. M. HAYS,

General Manager.

Witness to the execution by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

E. J. BEDBROOK.

ANDREW G. BLAIR,

Minister of Railways and Canals.

L. K. JONES,

Acting Secretary.

Witness to the execution by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the Secretary.

J. E. W. CURRIER.

This Lease and Agreement made and entered into the fifteenth day of May, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven :

Between the Drummond County Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company," of the first part, and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented herein by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, hereinafter referred to as "the Minister," of the second part.

Whereas Her Majesty proposes to extend the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal, with its terminal in that city, and in order to such extension it is proposed to acquire from the company its lines of railway, branches and projected lines, and other rights, interests, and property, upon the considerations and conditions hereinafter more particularly set forth.

Now this Indenture witnesseth : That the said company, in consideration of the rents, covenants, conditions and agreements hereinafter reserved and contained, hath given, granted, demised and leased, and by these presents doth give, grant, demise and lease unto Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, all its certain line of railway and branch lines extending from Ste. Rosalie, a point on the Grand Trunk Railway, in the province of Quebec, to a point on the western side of the Chaudière River, where the said line of railway connects with and joins the Grand Trunk Railway, together with the roadbed, station houses, tracks, side tracks, switches, approaches, bridges, buildings, tanks, coal sheds, cattle guards and other fixtures and appurtenances appertaining and belonging to the said line of railway, together with its branch line of railway and connections, extending from St. Leonard to Nicolet, and all and singular the property (other than the rolling stock, and equipment of every kind and description belonging to the said company and connected with its said railway), and all rights and privileges which the company may have, or may be entitled to have or enjoy, with respect to running powers over and upon the Grand Trunk Railway, across the Chaudière Bridge, and up to the present western terminus of the Intercolonial Railway, and all the right, interest, privileges and concessions, acquired by the company from the said Grand Trunk Railway Company over and upon the said last mentioned line and bridge.

To have and to hold all the said described railway and appurtenances of every kind and description, and the said rights and privileges unto Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, from and after the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, for and unto and fully ended the term of ninety-nine years from then next ensuing.

Yielding and paying therefor yearly and every year for the said term the sum of seventy thousand dollars of lawful money of Canada, in half yearly instalments of thirty-five thousand dollars each on the first days of May and November in each and every year during the term aforesaid.

And these presents are made upon and are subject to the provisos and provisions hereinafter expressed and contained, for the due performance and observance of all of which on their part to be done and performed, Her Majesty and the company bind themselves, their successors and assigns, and each of them respectively bind themselves, that is to say:—

First.—That Her Majesty shall and will, during the continuance of this lease, subject to the happening of any or other of the contingencies herein mentioned, well and truly pay to the company the rent herein reserved in the manner and at the times hereinbefore mentioned without any deduction or reservation whatsoever.

Second.—That the company for the consideration aforesaid will build and finish according to the Intercolonial Railway standard the uncompleted portion of its main line at or near Forestdale to the western side of the Chaudière River, subject to the satisfaction and approval of the Government railway engineer, on or before the first day of November, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, and will lay the roadbed of the said uncompleted portion of its line hereby agreed to be constructed with new steel rails of not less than seventy pounds weight per yard for the said distance, and as part of such construction will make all proper and necessary connections with the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway at or near the west end of the Chaudière Bridge to the like satisfaction of the engineer of Government railways, and will, in connection with the said construction, construct and finish all proper and necessary station buildings, stations, sidings, switches, tanks, buildings, coal sheds, cattle guards, crossings and other necessary appurtenances, as required by the Minister, and to the satisfaction of the Engineer of Government railways, and according to such plans as shall be furnished on the request of the company by the Department of Railways and Canals, so that the said line of railway hereby demised, or intended so to be, shall be fully completed and ready for use and occupation by Her Majesty on or before the date aforesaid.

Third.—That the company will, in the construction of the uncompleted portion of its line, construct the same to the satisfaction of the Government engineer and with a uniform grade of 52·80 per mile, and in addition on the line already constructed will reduce the grades at Carmel Hill and at the St. Francis River to a maximum grade of 52·30 per mile.

Fourth.—That it is hereby covenanted by the company with Her Majesty, that the company will and does hereby covenant and agree that Her Majesty will be put into possession of the completed railway on or before the date aforesaid free and clear of any existing encumbrance of any kind; that any trust mortgage heretofore executed upon the company's property, or bonds issued, will, before Her Majesty shall take over and enter into possession of the said line, be

wholly cancelled and extinguished, so far as such trust mortgage or issue of bonds shall affect or encumber the railway hereby demised; that any unsettled claims for right of way on the said line of railway or branches thereof shall be fully paid and satisfied; that any conveyance of such right of way upon any portion of the said line of railway or branches thereof not yet executed by the owners thereof and delivered to the company shall, previously to the acceptance of this lease, be duly executed and delivered by the persons having title to said right of way; and any unsettled claims or demands of any kind or description which may prejudice or affect the title which Her Majesty is hereby acquiring to the company's property shall be fully paid, satisfied and discharged, and further, that in the event of any claim for right of way, or in the event of any debt or demand of the company being hereinafter preferred against Her Majesty, which ought to have been paid or satisfied by the company in pursuance of this agreement, if demanded Her Majesty may, on payment thereof, deduct the amount of such claim out of any rents due and payable under this lease.

Fifth.—That at the expiration of the term hereby agreed upon, and at the termination of this lease, the said company's line of railway and branch line and all the appurtenances thereto belonging and any improvements therein and additions thereto, which shall have been made by Her Majesty during the term of this lease, and all the rights and privileges of every nature and kind whatsoever appertaining to the said railway or belonging to the said company, shall then become the absolute property of Her Majesty and is hereby declared to be then vested in Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, free and clear of any right, title or interest whatsoever of the company therein or thereto, as fully and completely as if this demise were in terms an absolute conveyance in fee simple of the roadbed and railway and property of the company to Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns as aforesaid.

Sixth.—That the company shall have no right or title to make or execute any trust conveyance of, or to issue any bonds or to create any lien upon, the line of railway hereby demised at any time after the execution of this indenture, except and only so far as it shall be necessary in order to assign, dispose of, or transfer, the rental or consideration payable to Her Majesty under this lease and agreement to the company, subject to the conditions herein set forth; and upon the issue of any bonds or the execution of any trust conveyance charging the rental payable hereby to the company for the purpose of securing principal and interest of any sum secured upon such transfer Her Majesty will pay such rental, subject as aforesaid, to the trustee named in such trust conveyance, in so far as She is liable to pay the rent hereby reserved under this indenture.

Seventh.—That Her Majesty will continuously maintain and operate the railway hereby demised during the term of this lease and agreement, and will hold the company harmless and indemnified against any and all claims arising from the operation and maintenance of the said railway during the said term.

Eighth.—That Her Majesty will purchase the rolling stock and the railway supplies of the company at a valuation to be agreed upon between the company and the Minister.

Ninth.—That Her Majesty will not be bound to take over the said railway, nor shall the rental hereby reserved begin to accrue to the company until the said line of railway and branches thereof shall be wholly completed to the satisfaction of

the Minister or the engineer of the Department of Railways, and ready for use and occupation for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway.

Tenth.—That the company will at all times, at the request of the Minister, make and execute all conveyances, assurances and writings whatsoever which Her Majesty may require for the better and further assuring of Her Majesty, Her successors and assigns, the property hereby demised and every part thereof.

Eleventh.—That in case the said line of railway is not completed and ready for occupation by the first day of November next, but shall be ready for occupation and shall be taken over by Her Majesty at a later date, the rental payable on the first semi-annual date fixed for the payment of the rent hereby reserved shall be the proportion only for such term.

Twelfth.—That it is hereby declared and agreed that these presents are subject to confirmation by Act of Parliament of Canada and by the shareholders of the company respectively.

Thirteenth.—Nothing herein contained shall in any way merge or affect the claims or rights of Her Majesty as they now exist against the company and its property, other than that which is the subject matter of this agreement.

In witness whereof these presents (in quadruplicate) have been signed by the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals, pursuant to Order in Council dated the 24th March, A.D. 1897, and the seal of the Department of Railways and Canals has been hereto affixed, and the company has hereto affixed its corporate seal, and these presents have been signed by the president of the company, the day and year first above written.

The Drummond County Railway Company.  
(Sgd.) J. N. GREENSHIELDS,  
President.

Witness to the execution by the Drummond County Railway Company.  
(Sgd.) J. E. W. CURRIER.  
(Sgd.) ANDREW G. BLAIR,  
Minister of Railways and Canals.  
(Sgd.) L. K. JONES,  
Acting Secretary.

Witness to the execution by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the Secretary.  
(Sgd.) J. E. W. CURRIER.

### TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of the House, and of the Government especially, to a very startling statement that comes across the Atlantic to us. It is a matter, I think, of the very greatest possible importance, not only to this country but to the Empire at large, and I sincerely hope that we shall be able to obtain from the Government some statement that will set at rest the very grave fear that will be entertained here when this statement becomes known and widely circulated in Canada. I will, with your permission, just read a telegram to the "Evening Post," of New York, from London, and which is reproduced in this morning's Ottawa "Citizen," and which contains statements of the gravest possible nature, and statements which, if they are true, would be, I am sure, to many of us, most distressing :

Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier, has given a new and somewhat dramatic turn to the talk of schemes of Imperial unity and agrandizement of which the air in England is very full just now. Every other colonial premier now here, while overflowing with expressions of loyalty, is assuring England of the dire consequences if she will not barter away her free trade in exchange for tariff preference in colonial markets. The Duke of Devonshire's speech at Liverpool on Saturday, following Mr. Chamberlain's lukewarm attitude towards free trade, is interpreted as indicating the readiness of the Imperial Government to make some move in the direction of Imperial customs union, when the question comes up in conference between Mr. Chamberlain and the Premiers. This may include duties on such foreign imports as wheat, flour and wheat from America, and the Argentine, as competing with Canadian and Australian products.

This was part of Mr. Chamberlain's Zollverein idea. It is at this interesting moment that Mr. Laurier steps forward and declares the Zollverein to be mere protection, and asserts that protection, which has been the curse and bane of Canada, to be the greatest possible mistake for England and the Empire. "By our tariff," says Mr. Laurier, "we in Canada give you preference as a free gift. We ask nothing in return; we do not desire you to abandon the grand principles of free trade; we desire rather to follow in your free trade lead, trading where trading is most natural. Protection must weaken you, and so hurt the Empire, and Canada as part of it."

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to do more than ask a question on calling orders of the day, he will have to take some other course.

Mr. McNEILL. If you rule so, I will conclude with a motion. You will agree that the facts are of such importance—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not object to the question, but the hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question.

Mr. McNEILL. It requires very little comment indeed, and I have very little intention of commenting upon it. I hope that we shall be able to obtain from the Government some statement, or an assurance that the Prime Minister has been in no way authorized by the Government, and that it is not the desire of the Government that the Prime Minister should do anything to discourage preferential trade within the Empire in the sense of a preference given to British colonies by the mother country and by the colonies to the mother country and to one another as against foreign nations. We have the statement here, it was unnecessary that that statement should be made, because it was very well understood that Mr. Chamberlain's great speech, his epoch marking speech, last year pointed to the fact that he was in favour of some such arrangement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman conclude with a motion?

Mr. McNEILL. I will conclude with a motion if you say so. If there ever was an

occasion when it was justifiable to do so, this is one.

Mr. SPEAKER. I only desire that the hon. member should comply with the rules.

Mr. McNEILL. That is Mr. Chamberlain's policy, that is the policy of the Colonial Secretary. It is evident from the speech of the Duke of Devonshire that that is the direction in which the present Imperial Government are moving, in the direction of a policy of that kind, and I would like to have, and I am sure this House would like to have, and I feel satisfied that the country would like to have, from the Government an assurance that on their part there is no desire to put any obstacle in the way of Canada getting a preference as against foreign nations in the British markets for her goods, nor in the way of this great policy which applies, not merely to Canada, but to the Empire as a whole. And certainly the hon. gentleman will remember, and the Government will remember, that this was the policy of the great Colonial Conference representing the whole of the Colonial Empire held here some years ago. Any movement in the direction which is pointed out in this cablegram is a movement to break up the concert of the colonies on this great question; it is not only a retrograde step, but a retrograde step of the most dreadful nature at the present moment. It is taking that step at the very moment when we had every reason to suppose that our efforts would be crowned with success; it is at this moment of all others that the Prime Minister of Canada steps forward, according to this statement, which I sincerely trust is not a true statement—steps forward and throws his weight into the scale against that concert of the colonies which was established here some few years ago. When I say concert, I do not mean to say it was an absolute concert, but I mean to say it was practically a concert of the colonies. Of course this is only a newspaper paragraph, but it will carry a certain amount of weight, and it is one that certainly contains circumstantial evidence within itself which gives it the appearance of truth. That is my excuse, therefore, for calling the attention of the Government to the matter, in order that we may have, if possible, from them a repudiation of the policy that is stated here in this paragraph to have been pursued by the Prime Minister. I hope that the statement contained in this cable message is not true. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to another statement, which is contained in this message sent to us across the ocean:

Asked as to the Duke of Devonshire's scheme of Imperial naval defence, under which the West Indies are being fortified, Mr. Laurier said: "There is only one country with whom Canada ever could be at war. That country is the United States, and war with the United States is a contingency I refuse to discuss. Such a war would be not only a folly, but a crime. That being so,

Mr. McNEILL.

what need has Canada of great schemes of naval defence? We are devoted to the British rule, and grateful for it; but we are satisfied as we are until the need arises in the course of our national development for a change."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me—if that be a statement of Mr. Laurier's—that he has surely taken a most extraordinary stand. What is the meaning of saying, that the only country with which Canada could be at war, is the United States? Surely Mr. Laurier, and surely every statesman in Canada knows, that if any other country declares war upon the United Kingdom, that is a declaration of war against Canada. If, for instance, Russia should declare war; if out of this unhappy trouble in the East there should be a declaration of war by Russia against the mother country, that is a declaration of war against Canada. Under such circumstances we would be at war with Russia, and we would be one of the very first countries to suffer. It is to me almost inconceivable that such a statement should be made by Mr. Laurier, and I sincerely hope that the Government will be able to assure this House, that so far as they are concerned, they do not entertain the sentiments and views in this cable message, which I trust is but a travesty and a misrepresentation of anything that Mr. Laurier could have said in England.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) should have thought it worth his while to occupy the time of this House with a matter of this kind. I for my part wholly and absolutely refuse to discuss any of these cable messages or cable reports. I have perfect confidence that my hon. friend the Premier will act with due care and discretion in all his utterances. I have had ample experience, as every man in this House in his own individual case has had of the utter folly and absurdity of trusting to newspaper reports as to the language that may be used by responsible statesmen in cases such as these that are now occurring in England. Until we obtain full and perfect reports of what Mr. Laurier has said, from much better sources, I for one entirely decline to be drawn into any discussion on vague hypotheses and imaginations, as to what construction may be placed on his words, conveyed to us through the medium of a cable message.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can quite understand the course pursued by the hon. the leader of the House on this occasion, because we have learned from the most conclusive evidence, how easy it is in the transmission of cable messages, to have very misleading views placed before us. The leader of the House, therefore, is quite in

a position to take the ground that there is not sufficient evidence before the House to require the Government to deal with this matter. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) based his comments on this cable message, and I am glad that the case so ably and forcibly made out by that hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has not met with any repudiation from the Government benches. I am extremely glad that no member of the Government is disposed for a single moment, to assume that the Prime Minister of Canada has adopted in England a course entirely at variance with the policy laid down by a vote of this Parliament on more than one occasion. I am glad that the members of the Government have refused to entertain the impression, that the Premier of Canada has repudiated the action of the other colonies, announced at the Colonial Conference in Ottawa, in regard to the great question of preferential trade within the Empire. I refuse to believe that the Prime Minister of Canada, having gone from hustings to hustings with the positive declaration that he was as emphatically in favour of preferential trade within the Empire as Sir Charles Tupper, and that if the people of Canada returned him to power, he pledged himself solemnly that one of the first uses he would make of that power, would be to send a commission to England to negotiate with Lord Salisbury, preferential trade within the Empire—I refuse to believe, that in view of that pledge to the people, and in view of the resolutions of the conference between Australasia and South Africa and Canada, Mr. Laurier could have made any such statement in England. I believe there has been a misconception as to what Mr. Laurier has said in England. For him to have adopted such a course as this report indicates, would not only be a breach of faith with the representatives of all the other British colonies, but it would be a declaration that he did not intend to implement the assurances which he gave to the people of Canada, and upon which he obtained power. I think my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) is quite warranted under the circumstances in assuming, that the statements in these cable messages do not warrant him bringing the matter at all under the consideration of the House. These cable reports often come from persons who hold such strong opinions of their own, that they naturally colour the information sent, and until we get more authentic news the leader of the House is justified in the statement he has made.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

#### THE EXPORT OF LOGS.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to call the attention of the leader of the House and of the Controller of Customs, to the following which appears in the Midland "Free Press" of June 10th:—

Collector of Customs Parkhill has been instructed by the Dominion Government not to give clearance papers for rafts of logs from Canada to the United States until he has received the orders of the Government.

In such connection, I would like to ask, if it is correct that such orders have been given, and secondly, if such an order has been given, under what principle of law or practice has it been given. And, what are the orders that is intended should follow this notice?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It would be a little more convenient if the hon. gentleman would allow me, during the recess, to make inquiries in reference to the matter, and I can give him the information at the afternoon session.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well.

#### THE WESTERN MILLS.

Mr. TAYLOR. As the Postmaster General is not in his place, I wish to ask the leader of the House, what arrangements have been made for carrying the mails west from Brockville, which leave Ottawa in the morning by the Canadian Pacific Railway at 11 o'clock. The Grand Trunk Railway inaugurated a new time-table yesterday, by which the mail train passes Brockville before the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway train. As I understand it now, the mail leaving here at 11 o'clock in the morning will reach Brockville in due time, but will have to remain there till three o'clock the following morning before it goes west. Surely we could have a better mail service to Gananoque and Kingston and other points, than under the present system?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have no information at all on the subject, but I quite see that if the matter is arranged in the fashion that the hon. gentleman mentions, very great inconvenience would be caused to the public. If it be in the power of the department to remedy it, I should think they will lose no time in doing so.

#### ISAAC'S HARBOUR POST OFFICE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the Postmaster General is not in town to-day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Postmaster General is absent on very special service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt. I would like to take this opportunity, as it may be the only one open to me, to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General, through his colleagues, the case of the postmaster at Isaac's Harbour, in the county of Guysborough, so that he may state before the close of the session the grounds of the dismissal of that post-

master, who for twenty-two years has held the office.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like the hon. member to observe that a question of that kind is not of sufficient public interest to be mentioned before the Orders of the Day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quite aware of that, and I was going to say, if attention were called to the matter, that I am not going to discuss it at all. I am asking the indulgence of the House to allow me to put the question, which at this period of the session I am not able to do in the regular way.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the hon. gentleman would kindly send me a memorandum of the matter, I will endeavour to obtain an answer for him as soon as the Postmaster General returns.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Instead of troubling the hon. gentleman, I will conclude the sentence I began by saying that the postmaster held the office for twenty-two years, and that seven-eighths of the electorate of the district petitioned for his retention; and my question was simply what the reason was for his dismissal.

#### THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, although I do not wish to inflict on the House too much of Tupper's "proverbial philosophy," I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when he will be able, if he has not already done so, to lay on the Table of the House the memorandum which I handed to him with reference to the Alaskan boundary, and which he said he would have printed and distributed among the members of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I referred the memorandum at once to Mr. King, the chief astronomer of my department, and in reply I received from him a memorandum in which he stated that there were certain inaccuracies in the report which the hon. gentleman had given to me, and he questioned whether it would be advisable to print it. I had intended to show Mr. King's report to the hon. gentleman, which I will do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman have both the report and the criticisms printed, and submit them both together. It is a question of great importance, involving a long strip of twenty miles of the richest territory of Canada, which perhaps may be alienated from Canada to the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is possible that the course suggested by the hon. gentleman might be followed; but I

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

have not been able, in the pressure of the business of the session, to make up my mind positively whether it would be safe to follow that course or not. The objection taken by Mr. King was that the inaccuracy referred to was such as, if confirmed in any way by the Canadian Government, might be taken as an admission, and used against them afterwards in the dispute which may arise, and it was entirely from motives of caution that I hesitated to have the document printed. The hon. gentleman will see that when a paper is printed and circulated by this Government, unless it is done with distinct limitations, it may be quoted against us, whether we will or no, at a future date, and in a matter of such importance I thought it inadvisable to act hastily or before I had time to give the matter a careful personal examination.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman either to fulfil the assurance he gave me that the paper would be printed and distributed to the House, or return the paper to me, because it is a matter that does not admit of delay. Action is being taken in the United States Senate, and a year hence this information will be useless. These criticisms, I may say, come from a source that has been recognized again and again by Her Majesty's Government as the highest authority they had in regard to the Alaskan boundary.

#### ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the leader of the House if he is in a position to answer the questions with regard to the Royal Military College?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have just received a telegram that the papers were sent last night. I presume they will be here in time to answer the questions this afternoon.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to ask in regard to a return ordered in reference to schedule "D" of the tariff, and also a return in reference to the dismissals which have taken place since the present Government have been in power. I hope no time will be lost in laying these papers upon the Table of the House.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The return asked for by the hon. gentleman from the Department of Customs is very nearly prepared. I would like to say to the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) that the return he moved for involves very much more work, and I fear that it will be impossible, so far as my department is concerned, within a short time to prepare it; but the report asked for by the late leader of the Government (Sir Charles

Tupper) will, I think, contain almost all the points which the ex-Finance Minister will particularly care about. I hope that report will be on the Table to-morrow, or at a very early day.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government if he would be kind enough to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that he proposes, as per notice given to-day, to discuss to-morrow the resolutions with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, and that there is certain information which it is absolutely necessary should be laid on the Table of the House to-day. This includes the traffic returns of the Drummond County Railway, reports as to the state and condition of the Drummond County Railway, and a statement of the rolling stock and railway supplies, as mentioned in section 8 of the agreement.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask at the same time that a report in reference to the same railway, made by the Deputy Minister of the department when I was at the head of the department, be brought down.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Do you know the date of it?

Mr. HAGGART. No. It would be a little over a year ago.

#### THE PACIFIC CABLE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As we are so near the close of the session, I am sure it would be a matter of great interest to the House, if, some time before prorogation, the hon. leader of the House took an opportunity of stating the present position of a question of great public interest, that is, the Pacific Cable, upon which action has been taken both by the late Government and by the present Government, but as to which, down to the present time, for reasons which I dare say are sufficient, no report has been laid before the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may state at once all that I am able to state in reference to that question. That is one of the matters which I understand, as soon as the ceremonial pageants are through, will engage the attention of the Colonial Premiers. Beyond that I am hardly in a position to make any statement, but it will be one of the subjects for discussion.

#### NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved second reading of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters. He said: The amendment is a very slight one made by the Senate to the Bill respecting the protection of navigable waters. It merely gives a fuller definition to the word "owner" so as to make that term include not only the

registered owner at the time of the wreck, but any subsequent purchaser, the idea being that when the owner of the wreck wishes to get rid of liability, he transfers the wreck to a person not worth a cent and so escapes liabilities for the cost of removal.

Amendment read the second time and concurred in.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 125) respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue. He said: I do not wish to go into committee until the afternoon. The resolution authorizing the payment of salaries to the officials mentioned in the Bill was passed this morning, and I cannot go into committee until the afternoon. I wish to say that when the Bill was reprinted there was a clause, which was inserted in the Bill originally, left out. That is the clause providing that the salary of the said Ministers be \$5,000 and continue at that rate until readjustment of the departments of the Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon and thereafter the salary of each Minister shall be \$7,000 per annum. When we go into committee this afternoon, I intend to move that clause which was originally in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Bill (No. 114) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

2. The paragraph lettered (c.) of section 2 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"c. The expression 'Lieutenant-Governor in Council' means the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the Territories, or in conjunction with the Executive Council of the Territories, as the case may be."

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). We are simply bringing the definition of Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the Territories into line with the definition of Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are taking away the personal action of the Lieutenant-Governor and making him act with his Council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

On section 8,

8. Subsection one of section six of chapter twenty-two of the statutes of 1891 is hereby amended by striking out the words "at any time in force in" in the fifth line thereof, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "declared to be applicable to."

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move in amendment to strike out the words "subsection 1 of" so that the clause will read "section 6 of chap. 22 of the statutes of 1891." At the time the Bill was introduced I explained that one of the provisions was we should strike out the limitation in the Act relating to the Northwest Territories, preventing the legislative assembly legislating with regard to insurance companies. The clause was accidentally omitted to have that effect, and I beg to move the amendment which will effect the intention explained at the time the Bill was introduced. The Act at present in force gives the legislative assembly authority on certain subjects, among which are the following:—The incorporation of companies with territorial objects with the following exceptions"—and among the exceptions are "insurance companies." The amendment that I move would strike out this exception of insurance companies.

Amendment agreed to, and section was amended agreed to.

On section 9,

9. Section eighteen of chapter seventeen of the statutes of 1894 is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"18. No person holding any office, commission or employment to which an annual salary from the Crown is attached, shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly, or shall sit or vote therein, during the time he holds such office, commission or employment; but nothing herein contained shall render ineligible any member of the Executive Council of the Territories, by reason of any salary, fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind or amount attaching to such membership, from being a member of the Assembly, or shall disqualify him from sitting or voting therein: Provided he is elected while holding such office, and is not otherwise disqualified."

Mr. DAVIN. I think that the old section No. 18, passed in 1894, was quite right under the circumstances of that time:

No member of the Executive Committee of the Territories shall, by reason of any salary, fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind or amount attaching to such membership, be disqualified from sitting or voting in the Legislative Assembly.

As I understand the new clause it simply provides that when a member of the Assembly accepts office he will have to go back for re-election.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, that is the usual clause; it provides that members accepting office shall go back to the people for re-election.

Mr. SIFTON.

On section 10,

Section forty-nine of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"49. The court shall sit in banc at such times and places as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appoints; the senior judge present shall preside, and three judges of the court shall constitute a quorum."

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understand that there is some objection to that section and I am prepared to move that it be struck out.

Amendment agreed to,

On section 11,

11. Subsection one of section fifty-six of the said Act, as amended by section eight of chapter twenty-two of the statutes of 1891, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

"56. For each judicial district the Governor in Council may appoint a sheriff and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint a clerk of the court and may respectively name the place at which such sheriff and clerk shall reside and keep an office; and the clerk of the district within which the seat of Government of the Territories is situate, shall be registrar of the court sitting in banc."

Mr. FOSTER. Who appoints the sheriff?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The law now is that the Governor General in Council appoints both the sheriff and the clerk of the court. Under the proposed arrangement the Governor General in Council will still appoint the sheriff while the local Government shall appoint the clerk of the court.

On section 12,

12. Subsection one of the section substituted for section sixty-four of the said Act by section seven of chapter seventeen of the statutes of 1894 is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"64. The Lieutenant-Governor may appoint justices of the peace for the Territories, who shall have jurisdiction as such throughout the same; but, until the Legislative Assembly otherwise provides, no person shall be appointed a justice of the peace for the Territories, or shall act as such, who is not the owner in fee simple for his own use and benefit of lands lying and being in the Territories of and above the value of three hundred dollars over and above what will satisfy and discharge all incumbrances affecting the same, and over and above all rents and charges payable out of or affecting the same, and who has not resided in the Territories for a period of at least three years."

Mr. FOSTER. He may not be able to read and write.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only change is that the words "until the Legislative Assembly otherwise provides," are inserted in the 12th and 13th lines. The effect is that the qualifications of justices of the peace remains as it was, so far as this Parliament is concerned, but we give the Legislative Assemblies power to

legislate in regard to the qualification of justices of the peace.

On section 14,

14. Subsection four of the section substituted for section sixty-four of the said Act by section seven of chapter seventeen of the statutes of 1894 is hereby amended by striking out all the words after "years" in the fourth line thereof.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This has to do with the qualifications of the police magistrates. The law as it is now provides that no person shall be appointed a police magistrate unless he is admitted and has practiced as an advocate, barrister, or solicitor, in one of the provinces of Canada for a period of not less than three years, or is a magistrate of not less than three years of standing in Canada. This has the effect of striking out the latter portion of that clause, because it is believed a man should not be a police magistrate unless he has been a practicing barrister for at least three years.

On section 15,

15. Subsection one of section eighty-eight of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the words "Lieutenant-Governor" in the third line thereof, and substituting the words "Legislative Assembly" in lieu thereof.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In this section I desire to move an amendment which has been suggested by Mr. Justice Wetmore, of the North-west Court, and concurred in by the Department of Justice respecting the definition of larceny. By section 66 of the North-west Territories Act, the jurisdiction of the judges of the Supreme Court of the Territories is defined, and under subsection "A" of this section authority is given to the judges to try any person charged with having committed or attempted to commit larceny, embezzlement, or obtaining money or property by false pretenses or feloniously receiving stolen property in any case in which the value of the whole property so stolen, &c., does not, in the opinion of the said judge, exceed the sum of \$200. The Criminal Act has abolished the use of the term larceny and the technical distinction formerly known to the Criminal Law by which stealing was denominated larceny and certain technical words used to describe the offence. The definition is a simple one, the act being defined as theft or stealing.

The distinction between a misdemeanour and a felony was founded on the old rules of the criminal law, and as the law exists at present, a question might arise as to whether the judges of the North-west Territories had jurisdiction to try for theft. In accordance with the suggestion of Judge Wetmore, I move in amendment that the word "larceny" in the sections I have read, be changed to "theft," and that the word "felonious" be struck out.

On section 16,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The effect of this is to abolish the office of clerk of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and put the office under the jurisdiction of the legislative assembly. We have a clerk there whom we pay \$2,000 a year, and I do not see any reason why we should have such an officer there when the legislative assembly can employ their own clerk for a much less sum.

Mr. DAVIN. I think we ought to put in something to save the officer. The present occupant of that office is a Dominion officer, and he has been a most effective officer. I can safely say that at the time he became an officer of the Government, his qualities and talents were of the greatest advantage to the North-west Territories. I may say as regards the politics of this gentleman, Mr. R. B. Gordon, that I believe his politics are of the neutral tint; however, if he had any, he never manifested them. But I think that when we have had a man there in our employ, giving him \$2,000 a year, and when we are about to amend an Act which will give another body power of either retaining that man or dismissing him, I think we ought to limit the power of appointing a clerk to the time when, either by death or by retirement, Mr. Gordon ceases to be clerk.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that is a matter that may be left safely to the parties who are to be clothed with power to deal with it. I am afraid that the suggestion of my hon. friend is not practicable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Gentlemen who have been doing official business with this officer for years past, I understand, are on perfectly good terms with him.

Mr. DAVIN. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to move:

That after the word "territory" in subsection one there be added the following words.—

"Subject to any right which may have been acquired under letters patent issued previous to such transfer."

The object of that amendment is, to avoid the Government being compelled to transfer a trail, without having regard to the fact that a patent might have been issued before for a certain part of the trail.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 20,

Mr. DAVIN. Why is it that the Minister is getting rid of subsection 2 of section 21? Is it no longer necessary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It applies to any transaction, and it is necessary, it will be there.

Mr. DAVIN. But under this section you would repeal it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There may be something in the point raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), and I will amend the section to meet his views.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the intention of this Bill is, to give the Territories autonomous government like the older provinces ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Bill will give the people of the Territories a government which shall not have the full powers of a provincial government, but in so far as they have power to deal with subjects, they shall do it in the same way as the other provinces. They will have Ministers who are responsible to the legislature, and the rules and precedents that apply to the provincial governments will apply to the government of the Territories.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the Territories will be constituted under one legislature, and I presume this Government will have to pay them the necessary expenses. Will this Bill increase the present expenses ?

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. De facto, they have this kind of government now. They have an executive committee of the assembly who are the responsible advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor. It is a practice which has grown up, but the constitution does not provide for it in the proper form.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see that there is much object in this Bill. I believe that as soon as we can, we should constitute the North-west Territories into a province, and give them responsible government in a complete form.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what we are doing.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Bill goes in that direction.

Mr. BERGERON. This Bill will make very little difference to them, except that I believe it will increase the expenses to us. Let the Territories have their own government, and pay for their own expenses, and let us get rid of them as soon as possible in that way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The objection of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is that we are not going far enough.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say a single word in qualification of what my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has stated. I am sure that no one wants to get rid of our friends in the Territories.

Mr. BERGERON. I meant in the way of getting rid of paying their expenses.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the con-  
Mr. DAVIN.

trary, we want to steadily do what I think this Act does, and the time has come when such an Act was required. It gives them power to deal with the local business of the North-west Territories to a greater extent than they were able to do before ; but I do not think it is calculated to increase the expenditure. It rather increases their legislative power in accordance with the wishes of the people.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would undoubtedly increase the efficiency of their administration.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The principle upon which I acted is this. I met the representatives of the territorial government, and they explained to me—as of course I knew before—that there has been in the Territories for some years, an agitation in favour of what they called provincial autonomy. Now, it is a subject with which it would be extremely inconvenient to deal until it takes some shape in the public mind. I fancy that any Government that undertook to form an organization there, without something more defined to go by than we have at the present time, would find very considerable difficulty. But I said that if they wanted something of a practical character which would assist them in carrying on their business, no doubt their wishes in that respect could be met. They suggested, therefore, that a Bill such as I have presented to the House would, for the present, meet the views of the people ; and I have not thought it advisable to go further at the present time, but to allow matters to develop. At a future time the House may be called on to deal with the question of the organization of a provincial constitution.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition did not understand me. I know that for some years it has been the ambition of the people of the North-west to have provincial autonomy, and I think upon that depends largely the hope of the future prosperity of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who will now enact the school ordinances ? Are they in the power of the Governor in Council or of the legislative assembly ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no change in that respect. The legislative assembly in conjunction with the Lieutenant-Governor.

Bill reported, as amended.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to say a few words which I did not say before, lest I might delay the Bill. I am exceedingly glad to see this Bill go through. In 1888, when the

Right Honourable Sir John Macdonald sat where the Minister of Trade and Commerce now sits, he brought down a Bill to amend the North-west Territories Act, and I gave notice of an amendment to that Bill that would have introduced then precisely the change which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has now happily introduced, and I congratulate him. I may, as a little piece of history, say what occurred. The leader of the then Government (Sir John Macdonald) resented my action, and withdrew his Bill, and brought down another Bill, with a clause in it which will be found in the Act of 1888, by which he introduced into our government what was called the Advisory Council. I would not then speak on the Bill, as there was no use trying to pass my amendment, and my respect for my great leader would not allow me to comment on that clause and pour on it the ridicule it deserved; but I said to a friend of mine, when he asked me why I did not comment on it, "It is a mere toy," as it turned out to be. In consequence of pressure brought by myself on the Government, we had a few years afterwards an amendment, which introduced a different state of things—which introduced a committee of four to aid the governor; but that committee of four is a very inconvenient piece of machinery, as the hon. gentleman knows, because, instead of being chosen by the Government, it was chosen by the legislative assembly. My hon. friend here (Mr. Bergeron) and, to some extent, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, are under a complete mistake in supposing that there has been any agitation amongst the people of the North-west for responsible government. There is not. In this House, whenever I advocated it, I found the members from the North-west Territories opposing me. If the debates of 1888 are looked at, it will be found that Mr. Macdowall, and others, got up in the House and said that the Territories did not want responsible government; and in Regina, at the instance of a certain individual, a meeting was held at which resolutions were passed to prevent my action in this House being successful. I can say that the most thoughtful people in the Territories have always held the views that I have held; but at the same time there has been no agitation and I have battled for this thing single-handed. I believe it would have been a good thing for the Territories if we had had this legislation in 1888; and subsequently, in 1891, when another change was made, it would have been much better for the Territories if this change had been made; so that, instead of having a nondescript government, hampered in many ways, and with more power than a government should have, more irresponsible than this Government, which we now create will be, we should have had at once a stronger and more re-

sponsible government, and my belief is that we should have made more progress than we have done. I am very glad to see this Bill launched to the third reading, and to see that we are going to have responsible government in the Territories.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, was read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it necessary to do more than call out the numbers of the clauses?

Mr. DAVIN. No; I have read them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I entirely support the motion that this Bill be read the third time. I may say that it embodies some reforms I have been contending for in this House for years. In fact I might on my own account say that while the Government have been accused of stealing many things from the Conservative party, there is no individual on this side from whom they have purloined in such a wholesale manner as from the humble individual now addressing the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I must congratulate my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) upon having at last found a Government in Canada which he can heartily support.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### REFUND OF SUPERANNUATION FEES.

The House resolved itself into committee on the following resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, in his discretion, repay to any person heretofore or hereafter dismissed from the public service the whole, or such portion as he deems advisable, of the amount contributed by such person to any civil service superannuation fund, with interest, to the date of dismissal, not exceeding... per cent per annum.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This resolution explains itself. Under the existing law, if a civil servant has served ten years, he may be retired on pension and he may be retired before ten years with a gratuity. This resolution deals with the case of a civil servant dismissed for cause, which, while in the judgment of the Government sufficient to justify his dismissal, is hardly sufficient to justify the loss of his superannuation money. We propose to pay in such cases back to the person dis-

missed the amount he has paid into the fund with interest, which otherwise he would entirely forfeit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose what my hon. friend really means is this, that when parties are dismissed from the service for being politically opposed to the Government of the day, they will not lose the amount they have paid into the superannuation fund. Of course I can only say, sympathizing deeply as I do with the unfortunate civil servants who so lose their positions, I shall be glad to see some compensation made to them, no matter how slight.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not right in presuming that persons have lost their positions for holding a different political creed from ours, but if an official has been found guilty of political misconduct to a sufficient extent to justify the Government in depriving him of his office, we think we ought not to punish him further by taking away his superannuation money. Therefore we propose to pay him that money back with interest at 4 per cent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government might well be generous as well as just and allow them the legal rate of 6 per cent, which would be about the fair rate they would get for their money if invested outside.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps we might compromise by making it 5 per cent.

Resolution, as amended, read the second time.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.05 p.m.

#### Second Sitting.

TUESDAY, 15th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the British Pacific Railway Company.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 128) relating to the Canada Investment and Agency Company, Limited.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Mr. FIELDING.

#### PROFESSIONAL STAFF, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

1. Is it one of the conditions of appointments to the professorial staff of the Royal Military College of Canada that appointees may not resign their appointments during the currency of a college session, and without the intimation of their intention to resign at least six months prior to the close of the session?

2. If there be such a condition, is its practical effect to bind the appointees to their offices for periods of twelve months?

3. Has the Government notified the following members of the staff of the college that their employment is to cease from and after the 30th of this month or at any other early date :—

Forshaw Day, Esq., Royal Canadian Academician, Professor of Freehand Drawing and Painting ;

Arthur Dupouth Duval, Esq., M.D., Professor of French ;

John Waddell, Esq., B.A., Ph. D., D. Sc., Professor of Physics, Chemistry and Geology ;

Robert Carr Harris, Esq., C.E., Professor of Civil Engineering and Architecture ;

Capt. A. G. Wurtele, Instructor in Mathematics?

4. If so, what notice has been given to these gentlemen respectively of the intended termination of their employment?

5. In the cases, if any, in which such notifications have been made by the Government to the appointees, neither accompanied nor preceded by intimation of the Government's disapproval of the appointee's conduct or of his manner of discharging his duties, what compensation is it intended by the Government to make to the several appointees in lieu of the notice which the conditions of their engagement and character of their employment implied they should be entitled to?

6. What, if any, suggestion is there in the terms of the engagements of the respective appointees which would have led to their supposing that in accepting service they became liable to summary dismissal, or at short notice, without fault assigned or other cause to disentitle them to consideration for compensation in accordance with prevailing custom?

7. Is there a condition attaching to members of civil instructional staff that after a probationary period of one year a civil professor's services may be re-engaged for five years, and successively thereafter for periods, if desired, of six years?

8. If so, does the civil appointee correctly interpret this regulation as implying that in accepting service, the Government accords him the right to the expectation of continuance of employment, uninterrupted by summary dismissal, or dismissal at short notice?

9. On the occasion of Sergeant Major Morgans being recently called to rejoin his regiment in England, was it at the solicitation of the commandant with the assent of the Militia Department that the Sergeant Major agreed to return to Canada after discharge in England to resume duty at the Royal Military College?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The following are the answers to the hon. gentleman's questions :—1. General Order 22 of the 23rd December, 1886, runs :

If a professor or instructor intends resigning his appointment, he must give six months' notice of his intention, and at such date as will allow him to continue his duty at the college to the end of the term, say 30th June.

This order was passed subsequent to the appointment of any of the professors and instructors whose names are mentioned on the above questions. I cannot find any agreement, under which these professors joined the college. 2. No, merely for six months, if the professor gave his notice at the proper time of the year. 3. Yes. From 30th June. 4. Professors Day, Duval, Waddell and Capt. Wurtele were given notice about the 1st of May. Professor Carr Harris was given notice on the 14th of June. 5. This is in the hands of the Government. 6. There is no definite suggestion, either to this effect, or to the contrary. 7. Yes. General Order of December, 1886, reads :

All first appointments to the superior civil staff will be on probation for one year, renewable, if approved, for six additional years.

However, this general order does not refer to the professors in question, as it was passed subsequent to their appointment to the college. 8. The Government reserve to themselves the right to take any action that they may deem desirable in the interests of the college, due compensation being made to individuals affected thereby. 9. Yes. I understand Sergt.-Major Morgans was re-appointed at the college, for such period, as his services proved satisfactory and efficient. This was in 1891.

#### SERGEANTS, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

1. Has the Government notified the determination of their employment from and after the 30th of this month to Staff Sergeant Leaden, Chief Clerk and Quartermaster Sergeant at the Royal Military College ; Sergeant Major Morgans, late Scots Guard, Infantry Drill Instructor, Musketry Instructor, Gymnastic Instructor, and Keeper of the Records of the Royal Military College, and holder of the championship for Canada and the United States in sword, bayonet and foil contests ; and Hospital Sergeant Brogan, Royal Military College?

2. What are their respective ages?

3. What, if any, age regulation of the Canadian Government service affects their tenure of employment?

4. How long have they been in the Imperial and Canadian services combined?

5. Was their reputation of a very high class on their entering the Canadian service?

6. Have they since retained their reputation?

7. How many years have they been in the Canadian service?

8. What notice have they received of the intention to terminate their employment?

9. What gratuity, if any, is it intended to award them respectively on the termination of their employment?

10. Are Staff Sergeant Leaden, Sergeant Major Morgans and Hospital Sergeant Brogan members of the subordinate military staff of the Royal Military College?

11. Has a recent amendment of the Royal Military College Act required that in future appointments to the subordinate military staff shall be

enlisted for service there as are members of the permanent militia for periods of three years?

12. Had Staff Sergeant Leaden, Sergeant Major Morgans and Hospital Sergeant Brogan not joined the subordinate military staff prior to the before mentioned amendments of the Royal Military College Act, would they now be liable to summary dismissal, or dismissal at short notice without military procedure under the Army Act and Queen's Regulations?

13. What, if any, reason is there for according them less consideration with regard to discontinuance of their service than will be secured to their successors under the amended College Act?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The following are the answers to the hon. gentleman's questions :—1. Yes. 2. Sergt.-Major Morgans, 47; Sergt.-Major Leaden, 61; Hospital Sergt. Brogan, 62. 3. None that I know of. 4. Sergt.-Major Morgans, 26 years; Sergt.-Major Leaden, 39 years; Hospital Sergt. Brogan, 39 years. 5. I believe so. 6. Sergt.-Major Morgans is no longer the smart man he was, and is not sufficiently up-to-date as an instructor. Sergt.-Major Leaden is still an excellent clerk, but there is no further need of his services. Hospital Sergt. Brogan maintains his reputation, but there is no further need of his services. 7. Sergt.-Major Morgans, 19 years; Sergt.-Major Leaden, 21 years; Hospital Sergt. Brogan, 16 years. 8. About 2½ months. 9. This is in the hands of the Government. 10. Yes. 11. Yes. 12. (a) Yes. (b) Yes, as they have never been enlisted in Canada and are not now soldiers. 13. None.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BENNETT. This morning when the Orders of the Day were called, I drew the attention of the Controller of Customs to a matter referring to the export duty on logs, and he said that this afternoon he hoped to be able to answer the question.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I had not forgotten it. The Commissioner is preparing an answer for me, and as soon as I receive it I will communicate it to the hon. gentleman.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue shall each receive a salary at the rate of five thousand dollars per annum.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in Committee, reported, and read the first and second times.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 125) re-

specting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I move to add this clause as part of the Bill which was omitted in the printing by mistake :

The salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$5,000 per annum, and shall continue at that rate until a readjustment of the departments of Government shall reduce the number of Ministers holding departments to thirteen or less, whereupon thereafter the salary of each of the said Ministers shall be \$7,000.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It seems to me this is the proper time to deal with the distribution of the heads of departments. I would like to ask the Minister if it is contemplated to reduce the heads of departments to the same number that it was before. I remember very distinctly that at different times since the Controllers were appointed, the hon. gentlemen opposite who were then sitting on this side of the House, objected very strongly to the increase of offices, and to the appointment of a Commissioner of Trade and Commerce. Now, so far as we have any information, it is not the intention of the Government to do away with that office to-day. Might I ask the Minister if they have it under consideration, or if they have decided to reduce the number of Ministers to the same number as before, and to do away with the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. The prevailing impression I think, on both sides of the House was that a determined effort should be made to reduce the number of Ministers, and that matter has been under the consideration of the Government, and is now engaging their very earnest consideration. The hon. gentleman sees that this Bill now introduced is merely to make the present Controllers in point of fact Ministers, and to entitle them to seats on the Cabinet Board ; and the express provision is made on the face of the Bill—not the mere statement that the Government are considering it—but that when the departments are reduced to thirteen, and not until then, their salaries should be the same as those of other Cabinet Ministers. But in the meantime, they do not receive any increase of salary whatever.

Mr. **SPROULE**. According to that, it would require another Bill to carry out the intention of the Government.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No.

Mr. **DAVIES**.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Originally it was thought that it could not be done in one Bill.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will show the hon. gentleman why it could not be done. There was only a difference of opinion as to the construction of the existing statute. The late Government thought that statute was wide enough to entitle them to call the Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue to seats in the Cabinet. The present Government thought differently, and on reference to the Minister of Justice, it was determined, in order to put the matter beyond doubt, to introduce a statute entitling them to be called to the Cabinet as Ministers of the Crown ; and then provision was inserted that calling them Ministers of the Crown should not entitle them to an increase of salary. But it is expressly provided that, if in the readjustment of departments hereafter, the number is reduced to thirteen or below, then these gentlemen who are called to the Cabinet should receive \$7,000 a year, but not until then.

Mr. **WILSON**. Why not make it ten ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It says thirteen or less, and that embraces ten. I do not think there is any difference of opinion.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. I cannot quite approve this discrimination against the Controllers. I think they ought to have \$7,000 as well as the other Ministers. I think they do as important work. I think the two present incumbents of those offices are equal to their colleagues, and I think their colleagues ought to stand up for them and see that they are as well paid as themselves. As to the number of Ministers of the Crown, I would be prepared to support in this House a proposal to reduce the number to ten, and to pay the Ministers \$10,000 each. I think that would be a long way in the right direction. But at all events, so far as I am concerned at present, I am quite prepared to let the two Controllers be paid as much as their colleagues.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not think there is the slightest difference of opinion between us at all ; we quite agree with the hon. gentleman's statement that this should be done. But the hon. gentleman sees that at present there is such a number of gentlemen holding departments that it is not thought advisable to increase the total amount paid to them in salaries ; but in the meantime, and until a readjustment takes place, they continue to receive their present salaries. But it is not intended that they shall occupy any subordinate position whatever, and as soon as the time comes they shall receive not only the same position as other Cabinet Ministers, but they will receive the same pay.

Mr. FOSTER. How many Ministers are there now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are twelve Ministers ; with these two there will be fourteen.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, when the hon. gentlemen are now under full salary, there will be fourteen titled Ministers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows well that a readjustment is contemplated by the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one good thing about this that I will mention for the comfort of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who is troubled over this, I know. We shall have a very important leverage towards reducing the number to thirteen. When an item of \$2,000 a year, in the hands of two such bright and intelligent men as the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue dangles in the distance, and that distance is to be traversed the very moment the Cabinet is reduced to thirteen there will be a very strong pressure to reduce the Cabinet to thirteen. Now, if the suggestion of my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Maclean) to make the salaries \$10,000 when the number of Ministers is reduced to ten, or nine, is adopted, that will be a still more powerful leverage, and it would work from day to day until we might probably get the Cabinet down to proportions somewhere near what it was so devoutly wished it should be by the present Postmaster General and the member for North Wellington when they were not on that side of the House. Of course, we are only going to pay for the time being, according to the work which is done. Now, the Secretary of State is a man who is hardly worked. He has a very difficult department ; lots of details in it. He ought to get \$7,000 a year, but the Controller of Customs simply walks into his office and walks out of his office, and so \$5,000 is plenty for him. That is a very wise discrimination. And the Controller of Inland Revenue ; why he cannot expect more than \$5,000 a year, and he ought to be very glad that he is going to get even that a little while, from these hardly worked colleagues of his. It is a beautiful illustration of how not to do what they promised to do and to get around a corner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad we are getting a little enlightenment on both sides of the House. If my memory serves me right, it is not long since my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) introduced a Bill apportioning this \$5,000 to the Controller of Customs. He now is getting enlightened, as some of the rest of us are, and although we might debate this from an economical standpoint, we all agree that the Controller of Customs is one of

the hardest worked officials in the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. And so should be paid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And so will be, when the readjustment takes place. The hon. gentleman sees that the Bill anticipates that in the meantime, as the hon. gentleman knows, it is quite impossible this session to overtake all the work the Government have pressing upon them. They have been obliged to submit the Bill in its present shape, and until they get time to make the readjustment which they have under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) contend that he can make the readjustment without an Act of Parliament to give him authority.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An Act of Parliament will be necessary of course to carry the readjustment out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a point in regard to this matter which has escaped attention, and I wish to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to it ; especially the attention of the hon. gentleman who is leading the House. I have already expressed my gratification at the step taken by the Government in bringing the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue into the Cabinet ; but I cannot understand why these gentlemen are brought into the Cabinet in an inferior position to that of other Cabinet Ministers. There is a very strong reason why that should not be the case. The Prime Minister when appealing to the country committed himself in the most open and public manner, to the declaration (by notifying the Controller of Customs through a letter) that it was his intention to apply to Parliament to place the Controller of Customs and Inland Revenue on the same footing as other members of the Cabinet. That public letter contained no insinuation, that when they were brought into the Cabinet there was to be a very invidious distinction made in their salaries. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has rather facetiously referred to the subject and I will do it more seriously. There is no person who knows anything of the administration of public affairs in Canada, who will not say that the duties of the Controller of Inland Revenue, and the duties of the Controller of Customs especially, are infinitely more onerous and demand a much larger amount of time and patience, and enduring attention to public business, than that of other Cabinet Ministers whom it would be invidious to name. You have arrived, at what I think a very sound conclusion, that it is desirable to have these gentlemen in the Cabinet, and you admit that they have a right to the

same salaries as other Cabinet Ministers, and therefore having decided on these two questions of public policy, what is the object of postponing the increase in their salaries? If it is not convenient to make at the present moment, a reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers which you evidently contemplate, why should you have these gentlemen in the invidious position of receiving a smaller salary. If it is not too late, I would suggest to the Ministers that they should reconsider this resolution and place the Controllers in the position which in justice to themselves and the duties they have to perform they have a right to. Under the circumstances, it would have been better to give the Controllers of the Inland Revenue and of Customs the full salaries so as to implement the promises of the Prime Minister, and then you could make your reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers afterwards.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no doubt a feeling in the country that perhaps there are too many Cabinet Ministers at the present time. However, we have them and we are entitled to deal fairly with them. I see no reason why the department which is presided over by the present Controller of Customs should not be as well remunerated as any other department. I believe it is one of the most difficult departments to manage, there is certainly a very large amount of work, and I can see no reason whatever why that gentleman should receive only \$5,000 while other Ministers are paid \$7,000 a year. My plan would be something different from anything that has yet been suggested. We have in the Senate two Cabinet Ministers. One, the Secretary of State, occupies to my mind a minor position, and one of very little public importance. There is no good reason why that gentleman should receive \$7,000 a year, while the Controller of Customs should be put off with \$5,000. Then again, in the Senate we have the Minister of Justice, and in this House we have the Solicitor General, both of whom receive together \$12,000 a year. I would reduce the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State down to \$5,000, and raise the salary of the Controllers to \$7,000 a year, and I think the money would be more equitably distributed than it is at the present time. Besides, we must bear in mind that the hon. gentlemen who have a seat in this Chamber, are called upon at times to spend money to secure their election, while in the Senate they have a life seat, and a smaller salary would remunerate them much better than it would members of this House. I hope the leader of the Government will take this matter into his consideration, and deal fairly with the case of the Controller of Customs. I am sure that the Minister of Justice, when he has in this Chamber an assistant in the Solicitor General to do half

of his work, would be very well satisfied to take the sum of \$5,000 a year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has not got sufficient respect for that august assembly which sits so near us; but I will mention his suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you report how it was received?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will consider that. The hon. the leader of the Opposition is perfectly correct in saying, that no man in the service of the Government is harder worked than the Controller of Customs, and probably than his colleague the Controller of Inland Revenue. It is also true, I admit, that the presence of these gentlemen in Council would be of very considerable service, as the hon. the leader of the Opposition admitted by his own action in summoning the Controllers to that position when he was Prime Minister; but I observe that he did not on that occasion raise their salaries. He may have intended to, but he did not do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will permit me to interrupt him for one moment, to say that I never was in a position to do so, because I could not summon them to any Government of which I was a member, having been deprived of the power. But I stood pledged, and if the party had remained in power I would have carried out the pledge, not only to make them members of the Cabinet, but to take the means which, unfortunately, I had not, of providing that they should receive the same salaries as the other Ministers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I did not know that my hon. friend intended that; but the Government do desire to have the services of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) in the Cabinet at the earliest date. The other matter, with the concurrence of these hon. gentlemen, we have decided to leave over for the present. I may remind the leader of the Opposition, however, that the mere fact of one man having a larger salary and another a smaller salary does not, by English precedent, in the slightest degree detract from the position occupied by a Cabinet Minister. Many of the English Cabinet Ministers, men of the very highest position, for example, the Duke of Devonshire, who has occupied the highest post in the councils of the Conservative party, have received, if I remember rightly, £2,000 a year, while their colleagues received £5,000, a very much wider difference than exists between the Controllers and the other members of the Cabinet. I can assure the hon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

gentleman and the House that no sort of distinction in the way of rank or position can possibly exist between the members of the Cabinet. The only difference is in the question of their present salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. Minister, when making this change, did not provide for the change all round. In all probability, they could not agree as to who should vacate his office so as to reduce the number. I presume the Government will adopt, with reference to themselves, the principle which they have adopted with reference to some of the departments, and reduce the number when one of them dies, by not filling the place. So, I presume we may live in hopes that with the first Minister who dies we shall have a reduction of the number to that extent; or else we shall be obliged to wait until we turn them out of office or until the people do so, before we get a reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. I was just going to suggest that the House would listen with a good deal of interest to a short statement from the leader of the Patrons on this auspicious occasion.

Mr. ROGERS. I was going to say a word on this subject, and I think I have very good reason for doing so. The general feeling throughout the country is that we are too much governed, too extravagantly governed, as has been pretty well acknowledged by the supporters of the Government as well as by the members of the Opposition. No doubt the Ministers feel that themselves, and therefore do not wish to increase the expense. Not only the Patrons and the supporters of the Government, but the members of the Opposition, when before the tax-payers, who have to bear the burden, took that position. I think the suggestion of the Government is very good—to reduce the number when the time comes, and not to increase the expense, and they are doing that. I know that it is in accordance with the wishes of the people.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Before the Bill is reported, I want to add a clause to provide that the Ministers of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue shall be entitled to perform such statutory duties and exercise such statutory powers as are by different statutes vested in the Controllers:

Wherever, under or by virtue of any statute, any power or duty is given to or imposed upon the Controller of Customs or the Controller of Inland Revenue respectively, such power or duty shall be exercised or carried out, as the case may require, by the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue respectively.

Amendment agreed to; Bill reported as amended, read the third time, and passed.

## COLD STORAGE TRANSPORTATION.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to ratify certain agreements between the Government and certain companies, entered into under the authority of an Order in Council, dated the 4th of May, 1897 (copies of which Order in Council and agreements have been laid before Parliament), for providing cold storage on steamships from Montreal to the United Kingdom during the season of 1897, 1898 and 1899, as follows:—

With Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. David Torrance & Co., for two steamships each, and a regular and if possible, weekly service to Liverpool; with Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. William Thomson & Sons, for three steamships each, and a weekly service to London; with Messrs. H. & A. Allan and Messrs. R. Reford & Co., for one steamship each, and a fortnightly service to Glasgow; with Messrs. Elder, Dempster & Co., for five steamships, and a weekly service to Avonmouth;

Each steamship to have cold storage capacity of about 10,000 cubic feet, (to Avonmouth, about 20,000 cubic feet,) the cost of the refrigeration plant and insulation being estimated at \$10,000 per steamship, (to Avonmouth, at \$12,325,) one-half of which is to be paid by the Government in three equal annual instalments.

2. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into contracts with any person or company, for providing cold storage accommodation at Toronto, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Charlottetown, the Government granting a dividend of 5 per cent annually for three years on a sum not exceeding \$40,000, on the cost of the cold storage premises and refrigerating plant, at Quebec, at Halifax, and at St. John; on a sum not exceeding \$50,000 at Toronto, and on a sum not exceeding \$20,000 at Charlottetown.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. Is this exactly in the line of the explanation given by the Minister last year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, three-quarters of one cent per pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I propose to make a reduction in that item to one-half cent. Without going into the complicated question of the quantity of uncleaned rice which is taken to make a definite quantity of cleaned rice, a question which is always very debatable, I may explain the position by simpler figures. Under the tariff of the late Government, the duty on cleaned rice was \$1.25 per 100 pounds,

and on uncleaned it was 30 cents, making a difference between the two of 95 cents. Under our tariff resolutions, as they now stand, the duty is \$1.25, as before, on the cleaned rice, and 75 cents on the uncleaned, being a difference apparently of 50 cents. But when we come to examine the effect of the reciprocal tariff, we find that that difference is very much reduced. The manufacturer of rice has to import his raw material from countries which are not entitled to the benefit of the reciprocal tariff, and consequently pays the full rate of duty mentioned in the general tariff, but the cleaned rice will be imported from Great Britain and therefore will get the benefit of the reciprocal tariff. Applying the  $\frac{1}{4}$  reduction to the figures, you will find that the duties, under the resolutions as they now stand, would be as follows:—\$1.25 on the cleaned rice, less  $\frac{1}{4}$ —and I am arguing on the basis of the full reduction under the reciprocal clause—makes the duty 93 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents; and on the uncleaned 75 cents, thus reducing the difference between the two to 18 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents. Our attention was drawn to the fact that the duty was thus lower than was contemplated. By the change we now propose, the duty on the cleaned rice will stand at \$1.25 less  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 31 $\frac{1}{4}$  cents, making a net duty of 93 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents. The uncleaned rice we now propose to place at 50 cents, which will leave a difference of 43 $\frac{3}{4}$  cents between the two, as against 95 cents in the old tariff. By this change we have every reason to believe the rice men will be able to continue their business.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he could see his way clear to reducing the duty to four-tenths of a cent, because although it is possible the rice mills will be able to continue under the change, it will be very hard for them to do so. The reason I make this request is because there is a rice cleaning factory in the town of Cote St. Paul, and because the municipal authorities have petitioned the Government not to cause the cessation of any further existing industries. Many industries have already been obliged to give up owing to changes in the tariff. I believe the hon. Minister is in possession of the figures. It is possible the mills will be able to go on, but only with the greatest difficulty, and as it is only a question of one-tenth of a cent I ask the hon. gentleman if he would see his way clear to reducing the duty to four-tenths of a cent instead of  $\frac{1}{2}$  a cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have given the subject very great consideration, and the judgment we have reached in imposing a duty of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent on the raw rice is as fair a conclusion as we can reach, and I regret we cannot accede to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad my hon. friend has revised his previous judgment in

Mr. FIELDING.

regard to this matter. I would like to enforce, if I thought there was any probability of my representations having weight, the request of my hon. friend to my left, but as the Government have come to their final decision, and I suppose a final decision must be reached some time or other, I do not suppose there is any use in my doing so, but I must congratulate my hon. friend on taking some little step towards protecting an industry in whose favour there is a good deal to say.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is in possession of information as to whether this rice is cleaned entirely in England, or whether a portion of it is cleaned in other countries and imported via England into this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no very special information on that point. Our information leads us to believe that the process of cleaning rice in England is substantially the same as in other countries, and there is scarcely any doubt that the rice will be cleaned in England and entitled to the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. MONK. I may inform my hon. friend that the rice is cleaned elsewhere as well as in England.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not quite answered my question. I asked if the Government was possessed of information as to whether rice imported into Canada from England was cleaned in other countries, including the countries of growth?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no information leading us to believe that that is correct. I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman any definite information as that point has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. EARLE. As a matter of fact, rice cleaned in China and Japan is imported very largely into the province of British Columbia, and it may be from some other countries. It is imported almost exclusively from China and Japan for use in our markets.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would not come under the reciprocal clause.

Mr. CLANCY. It would go to England all the same.

Mr. FOSTER. It means simply that all the cleaned rice will come from England until the foreign countries get the benefit of treaty obligations, which will not be very long.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Peaches and pears, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, one cent per pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must ask the consent of the House to go back to this item, which is No. 79. In this item, we have included pears. The old tariff item corresponding to that did not include

pears. We inserted the pears for convenience of classification. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that the effect of the change has been to make a material difference in the rate of duty, and as that is not our purpose we propose that pears shall be struck out of the item.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do pears go ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They remain under the unenumerated class at 20 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that the old duty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. If the House will consent to retrace its steps, I will propose that instead of concurrence in the article 79, the article be amended by striking out "and pears."

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Files and rasps, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CRAIG. As some items are being reconsidered, I would ask that item 278, files and rasps, be reconsidered, as I have a few remarks that I think I ought to make on the subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection, if the House consents.

Mr. CRAIG. I shall occupy very little time with what I have to say. In discussing this item the other day, I made an appeal to the Government to change the duty from 30 per cent as it is in this tariff, to 35 per cent, as it was before. I represented that this reduction would not benefit the consumer and would hurt the manufacturer and reduce the wages of the workmen. In the discussion that ensued, the House will remember, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) made some remarks about these files, and that is the only reason I have for entering upon the discussion at this time. In the town of Port Hope which I represent, there is a company called the Globe File Company, which carries on an establishment for the manufacture of files. In reply to what I said at that time, it was contended by the hon. member for Hamilton that these files were an inferior article, made out of inferior material, by inferior workmen. He also said that they were not up to the standard, because of which first class merchants would not sell them, that they might peddle a few files through the country, but that the large houses did not care to buy them. I should not have said more on this subject if it had not been for the fact that the hon. gentleman made these remarks derogatory to these files. I consider it only a matter of justice to defend the quality of these files before the House and before the country, for remarks such as were made by the hon. gentleman are very apt to injure a factory and, no doubt, they have done some injury in the present case. I was very sorry that re-

marks should be made under cover of the privilege of this House, the author of which, if they were made outside the House, could be called to account. But, as the remarks were made in this House, the company has no redress, except that I should state the exact condition of affairs, and show that these files, far from being poor files, are good files. I shall have the pleasure of reading some letters on this subject which have been received by me since these statements were made. The first letter I shall read is from Messrs. Seybold, Son & Company, of Montreal, and is as follows :—

We have been buying files from you ever since you have been in the business, and have had no complaints from our customers regarding the quality of your files.

Mr. L. H. Hebert, dealer in hardware, Montreal, writes as follows :—

Regarding your files, I beg to say that I am keeping your files in stock since a good many years, and am fully satisfied of the quality and finish, and have no complaints from any customers.

I have another letter here from Mr. Madore, wholesale hardware merchant, Montreal, who says :—

I am selling the "Globe" files since a long time, and have never had any complaints against them. All my customers are asking for the "Globe" brand, which seems to me to be very satisfactory.

Messrs. Howden, Stark & Co., importers of general hardware, Montreal, write :

We have been handling your make of files for eight years, and must say they give our numerous customers every satisfaction.

Messrs. Letang, Letang & Co., hardware merchants, Montreal, write as follows :—

We have been handling your files for several years, and we have found them very satisfactory. Messrs. Letourneau, Son & Co., Montreal, write :

In answer to your inquiry about quality of files and rasps of "Globe Manufacturing Company," which we are buying from you since many years: If customers had not been satisfied, we would have made complaint before and ceased to buy from you.

Messrs. G. T. Pendrith & Co., of Toronto, send the following letter :—

We have used your files for the last five or six years, and always found them thoroughly satisfactory. As far as our experience goes, the quality has been high and the price low. We will continue using them as long as you keep up the present high standard of quality.

The James Morrison Brass Manufacturing Co., of Toronto, a firm well known in that city, say :

We have been using files of your make for some years. We have found them satisfactory in quality and price. Our foreman says he wants no better files than what you furnish.

The following is from Messrs. H. S. Howland, Sons & Co., a firm known all over the country :—

We have sold your files to some extent, and without any complaint of quality.

Mr. C. Kloepfer, wholesale dealer in carriage hardware, Toronto, says :

I have been selling your files and rasps for some time, and find that they give perfect satisfaction to my customers. I shall continue to use them as long as their quality keeps up to the present standard.

Messrs. M. & L. Samuel, Benjamin & Co., an old and very influential firm in Toronto, write as follows :—

The files we have sold of your make have, in nearly every instance, brought us repeat orders.

The following is from Messrs. E. C. Stearns & Co., manufacturers of Stearns bicycles :—

We feel it our duty to say something in favour of the "Globe" files, which we have used the past season, and found to be more satisfactory than the majority of those manufactured in the States. We will furthermore say that we will continue using same as long as the quality is kept up to the present standard of excellence.

I have another letter from the A. R. Williams Machinery Co., of Toronto, a firm that deals very largely in machinery :

We have seen the report of remarks before the House in Ottawa in regard to your files, and we must say we are greatly astonished at such statements. We have pleasure in saying that we have handled your files for a good many years past, along with the best American files, and we have reports from a large number of users of these files, that they consider them equal to the best American or English files, without exception ; in fact, some go so far as to pronounce them better than any other file they have ever used. Our confidence has been so much strengthened in these files that we are now offering them largely to our customers and pushing their sale in preference to American-made files. We have great pleasure in making this statement, and are prepared to back it up in any way desired.

The Gurney Foundry Co., a firm well known throughout Canada, write as follows :—

We have used "Globe" files almost exclusively for some years, and our superintendent reports that he is perfectly satisfied with them.

I think these letters ought to be satisfactory as to the quality of the workmanship. But some remarks were made as to the quality of the material. It was said not only that the files were made by inferior workmen, but that they were made of poor material. I have a letter here from Messrs. Park, Brother & Co., Limited, who supply the steel, which is as follows :—

We have seen, with regret, the remarks made in the House, that your files had a poor quality of material in them. We can say, without fear of contradiction, that we are, without exception, the largest makers of file steels in the world, and have supplied the Globe File Company for some years, latterly with the whole of their supplies, and beg to state that their purchases from us are only the most expensive file steels in all their grades.

Mr. CHARLTON. Whose letter is that ?

Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. CRAIG. That is from Park, Brother & Co., Limited, Toronto. I believe they are an American firm with headquarters at Pittsburg. I am not sure of that, but they say they are the largest file steel manufacturers in the world, and furnish to the Globe File Company. I might have had more letters, but I do not want to detain the House longer on this question. I have only referred to this matter because I thought it simple justice, after what had been said, to place the facts before the House and before the country. When I spoke on the subject before I said nothing as to the quality of the files, because I knew nothing about that subject. But I am very glad to know that the files made in Canada are of such a superior quality. These letters, I think, are quite conclusive. I have made some inquiries as to the workmanship, and I find that the men who make these files are skilled workmen and include some of the best workmen in Canada, men who are as complete masters of their business as any in the United States. So, instead of being made by inferior workmen, these files are made by first-class workmen. I do not wish to detain the House except to make another appeal to the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs—

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Customs.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes, the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Finance said, when this matter was discussed before, that the argument I made was not conclusive or had not much weight. It seemed to me that I had a very strong case, and it is strengthened by these letters which prove that these files are of first-class quality. My argument is that the reduction of the duty will not reduce the price to the consumer. I feel confident of that. It will hurt the manufacturer, however, and not only that but it will have the tendency, I am informed, to reduce the wages of the workmen, a thing which none of us would desire. Now, I am sure that the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs have no intention of injuring this industry, and it seems to me that I have made out a strong reason why the duty should be placed back to 35 per cent. But I want to give another reason, and that is that other articles made in Canada to-day out of steel which is obtained on terms just as favourable as this steel, are still left at 35 per cent. I do not want this industry in my constituency treated any worse than other industries ; and I do not think that I am asking very much in asking that the duty should be placed at 35 per cent instead of 30 per cent. If I could only prevail on the Finance Minister to do so, I think I would be doing something for the workingmen for whom I am principally concerned in that matter. I notice the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) has come

in. I do not know whether he heard what I had to say, but I may inform him that I have been reading some letters in reference to this matter. I want to say to him that I have said nothing disrespectful about him, because I hope that he said what he did the other day, not knowing the true state of the case. But I want to tell him that I have been reading letters from all the leading dealers in Canada, among them Gurney & Co., Samuel, Benjamin & Co. and Pendrith & Co., of Toronto, and from hardware firms in Montreal. I read a letter from Park, Bro. & Co., Limited, of Toronto, who supply steel, and they say that they supply the most expensive file steel to the Globe File Company of Port Hope, and that they use no other. I am sure that no one will be more pleased to hear this than the member for Hamilton, and to know that this company is making a first-class quality of files. I do not know where he derives his information, or how he labours under this erroneous idea, and I am sure he will be rejoiced to know that there is no foundation for it at all, and that this company are entitled to have this justice done to them which I am now asking, namely, that the duties be made 35 per cent instead of 30.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am sorry that I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said. I have no desire to injure his friends. I do not know that I am prepared to take back a single statement I made on a former occasion. The hon. gentleman, in making his statement before, gave this House to understand that the very inferior quality of files that came into this country from the United States and England was the reason that they could not get a better price for the files they were making. I stated then, and I state now, that the files that we import from England and from the United States are of a quality superior to anything that is made in Port Hope. I have no doubt a lot of small mechanics use some of these files, but first-class mechanics who want a first-class file, will not use the Port House file to any great extent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). That is my individual opinion, and I am giving it to you for what it is worth. I think that my firm knows as much if not more about files than any other house in Canada; and I have no hesitation in saying that I am quite satisfied that if these files were as good and as well suited to the trade as the files that we import, we would certainly buy files from Port Hope. I know Mr. Grose very well, as I said before, we buy a large quantity of goods from him, and if we could buy his files and satisfy our customers as well, we would certainly buy files from him. I have no doubt that certain parties will give him certificates that his

files are suited for their purposes; but as I say, first-class machine shops throughout the length and breadth of the country, will not use those files to any great extent.

Mr. CRAIG. I am very sorry that the hon. member for Hamilton does not take back what he said. I notice he said that if these files were good, no doubt his firm would buy them. I want to say that his firm do buy them very largely, that is my information—that his firm sell as many of those files as they sell of any other files.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I presume they do of the second and third class quality of files, but not of the very best quality of files, by any means.

Mr. CRAIG. I am surprised to hear the hon. member say that some inferior firms use these files. What does he say about Stearns & Co., who make the Stearns bicycle? He would not call them an inferior firm. The hon. member says that some inferior firms might use those files.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I did not say inferior firms—I beg your pardon.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. member still sticks to what he said the other day, that these files are far inferior in quality to files that come from the United States. Now, while the hon. member may be an authority on some things, I am satisfied that he is not an authority on files, as compared with men who are engaged in active business to-day and who have been using these files. As I remarked the other day, the hon. member is an importer, and he is trying, whether intentionally or not, to ruin this industry.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CRAIG. All his remarks tended that way, because any man who wants to be convinced in the right way, would be convinced by the fact that firms such as I have quoted know a great deal more about it than he does himself. Now, what do Stearns & Co. say, speaking about these files:

We have found them to be more satisfactory than the majority of those manufactured in the States.

That is plain enough. And the A. R. Williams Company say this:

A large number of the users of these files consider them equal to the best American or English files, without exception.

Perhaps the hon. member puts himself above all these men in this country. He does not want to be convinced. This firm goes on to say:

In fact, some go so far as to pronounce them better than any other file that they have ever used. Our own confidence has been so much strengthened in these files that we are now offering them largely to our customers and pushing their sale in preference to American-made files.

The A. R. Williams Machinery Company stand as high as the firm of the hon. member for Hamilton. Then what do the Gurney Foundry Company say? The hon. member would attach importance to their opinions, I hope.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Not upon an article of that kind, I would not attach any more importance to their opinion than I would to that of a wood sawyer.

Mr. CRAIG. Then what are the facts of the case? I submit this to the House and to the country. Here we have on one side an importer who buys these files on the other side to sell, and we have large firms who are using files constantly, who testify to their excellence, and the hon. member says that these practical men do not know anything about it, that he knows all about it himself, and that he won't take their opinion at all. I will guarantee that if he was selling them he would take their opinion, and pay some respect to it. Now, what do the Gurney Foundry Company say:

We have used "Globe" files almost exclusively for some years, and our superintendent reports that he is perfectly satisfied with them.

That is from the Gurney Foundry Company of Toronto, and I would not want a better recommendation than that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They do not use first-class files at all?

Mr. CRAIG. Perhaps the hon. member for Brant knows all about it. Then I would like the hon. member for Hamilton to say what he thinks about the firm of Park, Bro. & Co.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). They are only steel makers, they do not make files.

Mr. CRAIG. I am surprised that the hon. member should make such a remark about another firm; I think I will have to stop. But I want to say that this company say that they make more file steels than any firm in the world, and that they sell to the Port Hope Company only the best quality of file steels. The proprietors of the file factory themselves told me that they do so. I will now conclude by expressing the hope that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will conclude to put the duty back to 35 per cent at it was before.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) in bringing on this discussion upon the question of files for which there was no need, has led this House to believe that the files imported into this country by importers, which seems to be a crime in his eyes, were of an inferior quality. If he had left that subject alone he would not have got himself into the trouble he is now in.

Mr. CRAIG. It is you who is in trouble.

Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) led this House to believe there was nothing but poor files brought into this country and that we importers were selling a poorer quality of file than that manufactured in Port Hope.

Mr. CRAIG. I never said so. I never made any such remark.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CRAIG. "Hansard" will show what I said.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What I was going to remark was that the hon. gentleman brought up this discussion for the purpose of getting 5 per cent extra on the files of his constituents. If these files were as good as those imported from England and the United States, I would have no hesitation in buying them. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I do know something about files; I have been buying them for forty-eight years. I have bought them, sold them and conversed with users of them who know more about them than the hon. gentleman who undertakes to champion his friends' cause here. I think that he is to blame for any injury that may be done to his friends in Port Hope, and if he had not brought up this matter I should have said nothing about it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was most ungenerous as well as most unkind for the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) to deal as he did with this firm. It must be plain to every member of this House who heard the strictures which he passed upon this firm, that, in the face of evidence to the contrary, he has treated them most unfairly. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood), without any justifiable reason, tried to represent this firm as an inferior firm, as a firm turning out an inferior article, and what he said must do them a great deal of damage in their business, without any necessity for it. When the best evidence is brought up, of individuals and of the most respectable firms in the country that these files which are manufactured at Port Hope are regarded as good in quality that the users of them acknowledge them to be first-class files, it should be accepted as having considerable weight. We have the evidence of the parties who use them. Take the Gurney Foundry Company, in Toronto. They are using them in iron and steel work which is possibly the best test of the quality of a file than can be applied. Is it possible that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) who is only a man who handles them, can be as good a judge as the men who use them, the men who know whether they will wear out rapidly or slowly, whether they are good or bad in quality and who know which are the best for them to buy. The firms and the men who use these files

ought to be the best judges. A number of respectable firms give testimonials of the quality of these files. That ought to be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man that they are of a superior quality. I think it was very ungenerous for the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) in the face of these certificates to contend that the product of that firm was inferior.

Mr. RATZ. I do not rise for the purpose of condemning this firm's files but, in my experience I have used quite a number of Globe files, as well as of English and American files, and I think that the American files are just as good as the Globe files are. I do not rise for the purpose of drawing a comparison between the two, but the English file is the best file that is made to-day. I think we must consider the consumer as well as the producer, and it appears to me that if the Globe file is protected to the extent of 30 per cent, that firm ought to be able to stand on their own ground. They should be able to manufacture a file and turn it out and that duty should be entirely satisfactory to the Globe File Company.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If hon. gentlemen will get up and talk about things they know something about, we would get through this discussion sooner. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who has just taken his seat, I suppose does not know anything about files. I have been selling files all my life, and selling them to every condition of user of the file, and yet this gentleman gets up and lectures gentlemen on this side of the House whose whole life has been spent in this business. I do think that if hon. gentlemen would confine themselves to subjects that they know something about it would be much more in the interest of getting through with the business.

Mr. CARGILL. I may say that I have been a user of files for forty years, and I have a very distinct recollection of the price that we formerly paid for them. All our files used to be imported from Great Britain or the United States. I have a very distinct recollection of the very high prices which I used to have to pay to my esteemed friend the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood).

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I gave you a good article.

Mr. CARGILL. I am satisfied, after having tested the Globe file manufactured in the town of Port Hope that it is quite as good as any American file I ever used, which was manufactured in the United States and until we had a file manufacturing establishment in Canada we never got a file at as cheap a rate as we have since. I remember distinctly the opposition that was raised to the introduction of the National Policy. It was contended by hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches to-day that it would ruin the lumber in-

dustry of this country, that it would increase the cost of every article that they use in connection with their industry, axes, saws, rubber belting, &c. What is the result to-day? We have to-day these various industries established in this country under the fostering care of the National Policy, and we are buying all these articles at a very much lower rate than what we obtained them for previous to the establishment of that policy in this country. I would, therefore, in concluding my remarks say that I have had occasion to use the Globe file manufactured in the town of Port Hope, that it has given me entire satisfaction, and that, comparing it in price and in quality with those imported from the United States, I find that it is in my interest to use the Port Hope file. I would therefore impress upon the Minister of Finance the necessity of restoring the former duty. I believe that rather than crush out an industry in this country that is to-day manufacturing an article, equal in quality, and supplying the consumer at as cheap a rate as Great Britain or the United States, the Finance Minister would be more patriotic than to take off the 5 per cent duty necessary to sustain that industry.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) seems to be wonderfully exercised because an hon. member of this House should say a word in defence of a manufacturing firm in Canada. I claim the right that any hon. member of this House has to express my opinion upon this or any other question. The hon. member (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) is pleased to say, "that the hon. member for East Grey is talking about something of which he knows nothing." The hon. member for East Grey was not exercising his judgment or speaking of his knowledge of files; he was speaking in regard to the certificates that were given from respectable firms and firms, so far as my knowledge goes, who are just as intelligent as the hon. member for Hamilton or the members of his firm, and who say most emphatically that the files manufactured by this firm are equal to those made in the United States or in England. That ought to be satisfactory. It is not my judgment, but what I refer to more particularly is that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) should, sheltered as he is, behind the privilege of Parliament which protects him in anything that he says and that he should traduce or speak as he has done of a respectable firm of manufacturers. He knows that he dare not go outside of the precincts of Parliament and make the statement that that firm are turning out a third or fourth-class article, because if he did, he would be amenable to the law. He would be at once brought into the courts and be compelled to justify his statement. But when an hon. gentleman stands up here, protected by the privilege of Parliament, and avails himself of that privilege

to say what the hon. gentleman has said regarding this firm he is very ungenerous and unfair especially in the face of the information that has been given to this House from several respectable firms, who both sell and use these files, and who give evidence to the effect that they are just as good as files imported either from the United States or from England.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in his tirade. I simply made a statement which was drawn out by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). I have his words before me from "Hansard," to the effect that the inferior quality of the files brought in from England or the United States was the cause of the factory at Port Hope being compelled to sell their files at such low rates, intimating to this House and to the country that only a common class of files were brought in by the importers of Canada. I repudiate that statement, and I say here, with some knowledge of the business—and I claim to have some knowledge of it, after spending fifty years in it—that the best quality of files sold in this country are brought from England or from the United States. When the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) talks of certificates, I could get thousands of certificates stating that the files of this factory are not to be compared to the first-class files imported from those countries. But I do not think it worth while to do so. I do not wish to injure that firm. I know Mr. Grose very well; I knew him before he was connected with this factory at all; and I have not the slightest wish to injure him. But the hon. member for East Durham has no right to state that there is no class of files brought into this country to equal the class of files made at Port Hope. The thing is absurd, and when a gentleman like the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) undertakes to lecture members of this House upon the propriety of statements made here, and says that I would not dare to say outside what I say here, I tell that hon. gentleman that outside or inside, I shall be prepared to back up the statement I have made, in his presence or in the presence of Mr. Grose himself. We have bought and sold these files, and do you suppose that if they had given as good satisfaction to our customers throughout the country, we would decline to purchase them again? I have no prejudice against any man's manufacture; but I want to sell the class of goods my customers require. If my customers required them, I would sell them.

Mr. SPROULE. They must require them, for you sell them.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We sell a hundred dozen of the better class of files to one dozen of the files we get from them. I do not know that we buy a hundred doz-

Mr. SPROULE.

ens a year from Mr. Grose, while we buy thousands of dozens from other makers, and I am quite prepared to say that if Mr. Grose made as good files as were made elsewhere, and sold them at as good a price to the purchaser, we would be quite as ready to purchase from him as from any one else. I have only to say that when the hon. member for East Grey undertakes in the future to lecture people on this side of the House, he had better talk of something that he understands, because on this subject he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MACLEAN. I just wish to express my surprise that so prominent a Liberal as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) should make such rasping remarks on the "Globe" files, and when I happen to meet the editor of that newspaper, I will direct his attention to the matter.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not want to prolong this debate; I only want to occupy two or three minutes more of the time of the House, and I thank hon. gentlemen for listening so patiently. What I wish to say is in answer to the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) that I brought all this about. I brought nothing about. I said not one word about the quality of the files made in England, in the United States or anywhere else, or about the quality of the files made in Port Hope. But I said this, and I want to repeat it to the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), that what we want the 35 per cent duty for is to keep out the poor American files. I did not say that there are not good American or English files brought into the country. The better files come in at good prices and we are not afraid of them. In fact, I said nothing about the quality of the files at all; so that the remarks made by the hon. member for Hamilton about the inferior quality of the files and about the steel used and about the workmen, were entirely gratuitous and uncalled for by anything I said; and I think the least he could do would be to rise and say he is sorry he made such a mistake, and, like a man, withdraw what he said. If I had not been able to get these certificates from gentlemen like the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill), who knows something about files, it might do a great deal of injury to this factory. It is very easy for an hon. member to get up here and in an off-hand way say that this factory makes poor articles. That question was not under discussion. If the hon. gentleman objected to the 35 per cent duty, he might have said so; but he need not have run down the goods made at this factory. I am sorry that any member should resort to an argument of that kind, when I have shown that there is no reason for it. If the hon. gentleman does not want to buy these files, I have nothing to do with that. I have nothing to do with this factory; I am not concerned

in this industry at all; but I am told that if this duty is reduced to 30 per cent, it will have the effect of reducing the wages of the men employed in the factory, and they are the people whose interests I am looking after—the manufacturers can look after themselves. I ask the Controller of Customs again to give us the 35 per cent, and I will wait a moment to see what he has to say about it, and then I am done. I would like to know what the Minister of Finance has to say about this request.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I am sorry that I cannot oblige the hon. gentleman. My view is different from his, that is all.

Mr. **KENDRY**. I may say that we use files for a special purpose. Some years ago we imported our files from the United States; but for some time we have been using the files manufactured by the Globe File Company of Port Hope, and we have found them to be superior to any we got in the United States for that purpose. I could not sit in my seat and hear the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) make statements which tended to injure any of our industries in this country. This hon. gentleman has said that he wants to run down our Canadian manufactures.

Mr. **WOOD** (Hamilton). Nothing of the kind.

Mr. **KENDRY**. He is an importer, and you will find that he has a larger profit on the imported article than he has on the Canadian article. I have no doubt that is the reason for the position he takes: the hon. gentleman's pocket makes all the difference to him. But it is not becoming in any member of this House to run down any industry which we are trying to build up in this country. I have heard this hon. gentleman make statements before which were not correct, and I hope he will have the manliness to arise and take back what he said about that manufactory.

Mr. **WOOD** (Hamilton). Will the hon. gentleman be surprised to know that I have as much interest in manufacturing in Canada as he has, and that is considerable. Therefore I do not think I am prepared to say anything against the industries of the country.

Mr. **KENDRY**. The hon. gentleman may have as much interest in rasps, but not in files.

India-rubber boots and shoes; rubber belting, rubber cement and all manufactures of India-rubber and gutta percha, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I wish to ask that rubber belting be left at the old duty. As my hon. friend knows, the rubber industry is one which has had very encouraging development in this country for the last six or

seven years, and is rapidly assuming the place of a foremost manufacture. Rubber belting is really the staple of the rubber industry in this country, and I do not see why my hon. friend should have reduced it to 25 per cent. The request is very reasonable that it should be left at 30 per cent.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. We have departed somewhat from the classification in the old tariff, which was 32½ per cent, and in making a different classification, while the duty on this belting has been reduced by 7½ per cent, on portions of their other products we have increased the duty 2½ per cent.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Rubber belting is two-thirds of the whole industry, so that you are really striking a very heavy blow at it by reducing the duty from 32½ to 25 per cent. I think my hon. friend might have left it at 30 per cent, and the industry might then be kept alive.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. We were waited upon in this matter, and considered it very carefully. If the hon. gentleman will remember, in our original resolutions we put the belting altogether, the leather and the rubber, but having gone more fully into the question, our minds were inclined somewhat in the direction of the hon. gentleman's, and we thought we had perhaps made a mistake in putting all belting at 20 per cent. Therefore, in the amended resolutions, we left rubber belting at 25 per cent. This belting is very largely used by all manufacturers, and we thought we had arrived at a pretty fair figure, which would not do any injustice to the manufacturers of belting and be a little help to some of the other manufacturers, the duties on whose products were reduced.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend will find that even in reducing the duty to only 30 per cent, he would be making quite as much and in some cases a larger cut on the rubber belting than he has made on the products of some of the manufacturers who use the belting. If he has any intention of basing the scale of duties on incidental protection, if he chooses to call it that, he should not make one industry bear the burden exclusively. It seems to me that in making a reduction of 2½ per cent, he would be giving fair compensation to those who use the belting, and on whose products the protection has also been reduced. I would press my hon. friend to make it 30 per cent. He will find, if he looks over his tariff, that in some respects that would be a larger cut for the rubber belting men than some of the manufacturers who use it have been subjected to.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The matter has already received very careful attention, as my hon. colleague the Controller

of Customs has explained; and in view of the large extent to which this belting is used by some other manufacturers, for instance, the milling industry, we thought the rate a very fair one.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has illustrated his reduction by one industry, the milling industry. He may take any other industry as well, and he will find that in reducing the rate on rubber belting to 30 per cent, he would be giving as large a cut on that as he has made on the products of the manufacturers who use the belting and would benefit by the reduction.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman loses sight of the fact that in making a different classification, while this item has been reduced, the rate has been increased on other products of this industry; for instance, on rubber hose, which is a large item, and other lines.

Item agreed to.

India-rubber clothing and clothing made waterproof with india-rubber, rubber or gutta-percha hose, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, rubber mats or matting, and rubber packing, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman would like to have that at 30 per cent, we might oblige him.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not in that business.

Item agreed to.

Buckthorn and strip fencing, of iron or steel, twenty per cent ad valorem.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was some discussion over that item, and we propose to amend it so as to make it read as follows:—

Buckthorn strip fencing, woven wire fencing, and wire fencing of iron or steel, n.e.s., fifteen per cent.

In the previous discussion the item of woven wire fencing was the subject of special mention, and my hon. colleague the Controller explained that it would come in at 25 per cent. Our attention was drawn to the fact that a considerable portion of the material used will be obtained free. They will not be all obtained free as some hon. gentlemen think, but undoubtedly a considerable portion will. We propose therefore to reduce the duty to 15 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. There is another class of fencing which is not entirely woven that is brought in in strands. Would that come in under the n.e.s.?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) here, and I am very sorry. He appeared to be very much exercised by a desire to get free fencing for the farmers, and he was strongly in

Mr. FIELDING.

favour of barbed wire fencing going on the free list. He was not so strong in having woven wire fencing, on the free list, but he wanted that, although the raw material is free, stiffly protected. He also had a very strong idea as to the bad character of barbed wire fencing, and as to the good character of this woven wire fencing, which laid him open to the imputation of wanting bad fencing for the farmers to come in free and their good fencing to be highly protected. He was also in favour of free wire, and in the course of the discussion he took great pains to point out the way in which farmers could make their own fences by using a machine which would only cost \$50, and which every farmer should have. I wanted to ask my hon. friend, if he were here, if he is a member of the firm of McGregor, Banwell & Co. of Windsor, but I am sorry he is not here. I am glad, however, to see him just now entering the House. Let me tell my hon. friend that I was just deploring his absence: It is proposed by these hard-hearted Ministers to protect woven wire fencing of which the raw material is duty free, and I wanted to hear the voice of my hon. friend raised in protest on behalf of the farmers. I was going on to contrast what was seemingly an inconsistency in his position with reference to the fencing on the one hand of barbed wire and on the other of woven wire, and to express my wonder why my hon. friend wanted bad fencing made free for the farmers and the good fencing highly protected. And then I was mentioning that my hon. friend was very strong in his ideas that the farmers could make their own fencing if this wire came in free, and there was a nice little machine by which that could be done and it only cost \$50 for the machine. And I was wondering why these things were so until I happened to take up a little paper called "Wire-fence Gem," on the heading of which I see "McGregor, Banwell & Co." and I was wondering whether the McGregor in this case was the same individual who represents the riding of North Essex in this House. If my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) would only satisfy me upon that point, I should be very much obliged to him.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Are you finished?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend would gratify me very much by giving an answer now.

Mr. MCGREGOR. When you are finished I will answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to proceed to give some of the scintillations from this "Gem," and I shall proceed on the understanding that my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) is the McGregor who is mentioned here. This is a paper published in the interest of the "fencing gem," a wonderful little machine which costs the consumer in the

neighbourhood of \$50, and by which the farmers, if they had free wire, could make their own fences. There are some gems in this "Gem." I shall trouble the House with only two or three. Here is one :

There have been numerous attempts to copy our inventions, and many imitations tried and abandoned at the appearance of legal proceedings. All quite complimentary, indeed, to the original Gem Fence Machine. They, at least, go to prove the merit and success of our device, yet we must decline to be thus infringed upon.

Years of patient thought and investigation, and of hard work by way of experiments with scores of different contrivances—often ending in more or less of a failure—were necessary to produce and perfect this modern invention.

And, therefore, we shall prosecute to the fullest extent of the law any one found in manufacturing, selling or using any infringement upon the Gem Fence Machine, automatic springs or adjustable wire-tightener, all of which are fully covered by patents issued in the Dominion of Canada and the United States.

Going on a little further, I find the following concerning fencing :—

The first to meet with general favour was barb wire. It was, however, found difficult to make a complete fence of it, as hogs, sheep, &c., would go through it easily. Then some tried various styles of smooth wire, with unsatisfactory results. Several styles of woven fence, made in factories, have been placed upon the market. These have all been high-priced.

Yet my hon. friend is in favour of a protective duty on this woven wire fencing.

They have also been unsuited to various and ever-different tastes and needs of users. The cost of material for such fences was not large, but manufacturers' profits and those of the middle dealers increased the cost to the consumer enormously.

And yet my hon. friend was in favour of keeping up the protective duty upon this woven wire fence. But he goes on to still further develop this idea, and in the course of the editorials, &c., there is this other gem, speaking of the farmer providing his fencing :

The fence manufacturers were required to go out of business. Their doubling and trebling of the actual cost of wire fencing was too much for the buyer, who felt that he could do all that himself and save 50 to 75 per cent of the cost of his farm fencing, which might amount to hundreds of dollars.

Then there is this :

Push your city. Push your town. Push your business. Push your county. Push your locality. Push for new business. Push for new enterprises. Push for new people. Push for emigration. Push. Push. Push. The way to succeed is to succeed, and "Push" is the potent word for success.

And so my hon. friend seems to have entered into a mild little kind of conspiracy by which he was to get barb wire on the free list, woven wire fencing to come in under a protective duty, while the materials

were to be free as far as possible, and then push, push, push for this little machine and success.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the advice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has just read is very good. The literature that the hon. gentleman has read says, concerning this "Gem Fencing" machine :

It will weave any sized cross-wire, large or small. Will weave them upon any kind of wire, twisted, braided or plain. Weaves cross-wires so tight that they cannot be slipped. Weaves any sized wire. It matter neither as to size or spacing of either cross-wire or running-wires of fence.

The article that is sold is a small machine with which the farmer weaves his own fence. The cost is \$5, not \$50.

An hon. MEMBER. It is \$50 for the machine.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will sell you 5,000 of them at \$5 each, if you want them. There is no use of having any nonsense about this matter. It makes no difference to the firm I am connected with whether the duty is 5 per cent or 10 per cent, because the farmer pays the duty. If we pay more for the wire and we sell him the wire, he has to pay more for it. Now, generally speaking, the farmer buys his own wire, choosing the quality that he wants to use on his farm, whether barb wire, twisted wire or plain wire, and he pays for what he gets. If he buys the machine that my hon. friend speaks of, he pays \$5 for it, and he manufactures his own fence at his own pleasure. I am not mixed up with any woven fence or any fence that affects this question at all, because whatever the duty is the farmer has to pay.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) a question? I understand him to mean that he manufactures a fence too?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, we manufacture no fence of any kind; what we have to do with is this machine for weaving fences. My hon. friend seems to want me to advertise the business a little, and so I may do a little advertising. We say to the farmers: We have an article that you can use and build your own fences, whether a hundred rods or a hundred miles, and the cost is \$5 for the machine. Instead of using woven fencing the farmer can buy the wire and make the fence. Now, the plain wire makes as good a woven fence as can be got in this country or on the other side. What we propose to the farmer is, that instead of buying woven fencing, for which he has to pay 60 cents or 70 cents a rod, we enable him to make the same thing, paying 20 cents or 25 cents for the wire, and he can do the work himself.

Mr. MACLEAN. But that is the National Policy.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Possibly it is. Now, the amount of woven wire fence brought into this country, concerning which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) makes such a fuss, is about \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. So the duty would have very little effect one way or the other. The hon. gentleman has evidently not looked into this matter. The larger portion of the woven wire fencing used in Canada is made in Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that he is not concerned in this question of duty. Now, if the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite in the past has been good the duty will mean this—that if there is a high protective duty put upon other classes of fencing, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) will sell his fencing more readily.

Mr. MCGREGOR. No, no.

Mr. CLANCY. Certainly the hon. gentleman's fencing will come into use because the other is excluded. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman has committed himself irrevocably to the National Policy after all.

Mr. QUINN. I believe it was understood that all the items respecting wire should be reserved—items 256, 257 and 258. I desire to suggest that item 257 should be 35 per cent instead of 30 per cent. I do this because of the effect of the proposed duty upon the industry of the Rubber Insulating Wire and Cable Company of Montreal, which, I understand, will be completely wiped out if the duty is reduced to 30 per cent. The raw materials which go into the manufacture of covered wire are covered by articles 258, 214 and 348.

There is another article, wax, which is raised from a 20 per cent duty to 30 per cent under the general heading; but the other articles under items 258, 214, and 248 are increased 5 per cent, and 5 per cent, and 2½ per cent. So the duty on the raw materials having been increased, it ought necessarily to follow that a protection equivalent to the increase given on the raw material, should be given to the manufactured article in this country. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to this item, and ask him if he cannot see his way clear to increase the duty from 30 to 35 per cent in order to continue the existence of this industry. I will read a letter which I have received:

Dear Sir,—The new tariff in its present form will wipe our industry out of existence.

Our raw materials are tinned copper wire, rubber sheeting, cotton yarn, ozokerite.

The duty has been lowered 5 per cent on our manufactured product, and increased on all our raw materials, with one exception.

See Article 258: Wire of all kinds, n.o.p., 20 per cent. The old rate was 15 per cent; increase, 5 per cent on the tinned copper wire.

Article 214. India rubber, n.o.p., 25 per cent—unchanged.

Article 348. Cotton yarn, 25 per cent; old rate, 22½ per cent; increase, 2½ per cent.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Ozokerite wax I do not see mentioned; it was 20 per cent. The duty on paraffine now is 30 per cent; increase, 10 per cent.

Kindly draw the attention of your confrères to the foregoing facts, who, we are sure, will do justice in the matter and classify our product 35 per cent.

Your respectfully,  
ALEX. BARRIE & CO.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the subject has been considered and reconsidered, and the item was raised from a figure lower than the duty stood at originally.

Mr. SCRIVER. I may say with reference to the matter to which attention has been called by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn), that I had a communication from this firm some time ago from which I gathered that they were satisfied with the increase which had been made in the customs duty, an increase of 5 per cent, as I understood.

Item agreed to.

Skates of all kinds, roller or other, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The specific duty which prevailed before has been abolished in this case. I do not know whether the Controller of Customs is aware how cheaply German skates can be put into the Canadian market. They can be put in, as I am informed, for about 20 cents a pair, on account of the very low scale on which labourers in Germany are paid; and it is almost impossible to compete with prices like that if you pay workmen in this country the ordinary rates. The result of the change which the hon. gentleman has made in this case, will necessarily entirely take away the occupation of between one hundred and two hundred men in my constituency. The staple product of the industry in which they are employed, is skates, and it is absolutely impossible that they should continue the manufacture unless the old duty is retained. I suppose that if the matter has been considered and reconsidered, as the hon. gentleman states, it is useless for me to say anything about it; but I cannot avoid expressing my great regret that this change has been made, because the only result in my constituency will be that between one hundred and two hundred men will be thrown out of employment, and will have to seek occupation in the United States or elsewhere.

Item agreed to.

Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders, weeders, and malleable sprocket or link belting chain for binders, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before this item is adopted I would like to urge upon the Government the desirability of reducing the duty on agricultural implements, especially. It will be remembered that when the tariff

was announced I placed before the House what I thought were very strong reasons why that duty should be, if not removed entirely, at least very materially reduced. In the west we feel that duty very keenly indeed. The people of that country, especially the settlers, were led to believe, and many of them did believe, that if there was a change of Government that duty might be entirely removed. I felt myself very keenly upon the point, and when I came to the capital I went into the question most carefully. I discovered, however, after investigating the duty upon the raw material, that it would probably be unfair to the agricultural implement industry to remove the duty entirely. But I brought myself to believe that inasmuch as the Government have reduced the duty on raw material very considerably, at least a corresponding reduction ought to be made in the duty on these agricultural implements. I may say that it has been a source of great satisfaction to the people of the west who purchase those implements, to find that a reduction of \$5 per binder has been announced by the manufacturers. It will also be a matter of gratification to the west, particularly, to know that in the agreement that has been announced between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, provision has been made for a reduction in the freight rates on agricultural implements. I may say in explanation of my position on this question, that when an amendment was introduced to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, to place agricultural implements, and I think lumber and one other article, on the free list, I voted against that amendment. I did so because the amendment as put before the House, was equivalent to a motion of want of confidence, and I explained to the House on that occasion that if a motion were made that it would be in the interest of the farmers to place these articles upon the free list, I would be prepared to vote for it. I re-assert that position at the present time. I am not prepared, as I say, to vote want of confidence in the Government and for this reason: If that vote resulted in the retirement of the present Government and the return of a Conservative Government, this duty instead of being lowered, would most likely be increased. I do not think the country or the House could have any possible hope that that duty would be in any way lowered; and for that reason I regard my position as a perfectly tenable one. I support the Government on its general policy, while I regret that this duty has not been lowered; and to bring the matter to a focus, I move that the duty be reduced to 10 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. What focus does my hon. friend wish to bring it to? He says he is

going to vote for the Government, even though they keep it on.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I propose to vote here in committee that the duty be reduced to 10 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend, to make everything certain, advertises the Government before he makes that motion, that he is not going to vote want of confidence in the Government, no matter what they do.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not apprehend that a vote in committee for a reduction of 10 per cent is a vote of want of confidence in the Government's general policy.

Mr. FOSTER. And so my hon. friend's motion is one of those motions that has nothing in it but wind. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) has let the wind out of the bag before he elevated the bag.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It comes with very bad grace for an hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who desires to be leader of the Opposition to talk about wind when we have been listening to nothing else but wind from his lips ever since the House met.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) seems a great deal wiser than when the House met.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should not be doing my duty did I not express my opinion upon this important question. I may say that the farmers of the west remember with pleasure the reduction that was made by the late Government when the duty was lowered to 20 per cent, and they still feel that there is need for a further reduction. The argument I believe that was brought to bear upon the Government against any further reduction was the fact that there had been a large reduction by the late Government and that that reduction was below the average rate of duty in the Tariff Bill. We do not wish to argue this point, but inasmuch as the duty on steel and iron has been reduced we believe that there ought to be a corresponding reduction in the duty on these agricultural implements. This is a large question; it is a larger question than many members of the House are aware of. I would call the attention of the House to this point, that in 1896 the North-west Territories paid \$1,294,435 for their agricultural implements. They paid the duty of 20 per cent that amounted to a little over \$275,400. It is one of the necessities of a farming country that they should have their agricultural implements which are really their raw materials reduced to the very lowest possible point. Now no one can plead here that the manufacturers have not reaped a generous harvest in their business during the past year. They have made money in abundance and we need not occupy the time of the House by going into a calculation to

show what they have made in their business. We ask your consideration of this point, that inasmuch as there has been a reduction in the raw material used by the manufacturers there ought to be in all justice a reduction in the duty upon these implements, especially as coming from the United States. The business from the United States is increasing year by year and it now stands in the relationship of 1 to 2½—that is 2½ coming from the Canadian manufacturers, and 1 per cent coming from the Americans. The Government has been pleased to investigate this matter, but this investigation does not lead us to hope that any substantial relief will be realized for the people by that consideration, so that we leave the matter with the House and we would ask for the consideration of the amendment that the duty be reduced to 10 per cent on these farm implements.

Mr. ROGERS. The Patrons must have something to say in regard to this matter. Speaking of the tariff as a whole my first impression upon looking over it was that it was not much of a free trade tariff. The Patrons never asked for free trade. They were, as I have said before and as I will say again, always very moderate and reasonable in their demands. They have been in the past and I think they will be in the future. They asked for a tariff for revenue. Speaking about the matter of protection in my own constituency I said that in view of the fact that we had to raise from \$38,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of revenue, there would always be incidental protection in spite of all we could do. But as far as possible we desired that the different imposts should be in the interest of revenue. This principle has been followed in most instances but not in all of them. The reduction which was made by the late Government from 35 to 20 per cent was, I am very pleased to say, brought about by the agitation raised through the country against this high tariff on agricultural implements. The Government did not dare go to the country with this enormous duty on these articles and they reduced it to 20 per cent. It had always been contended that it could not be done, that the manufacturers could not live, that it would close them up, and that is the kind of argument they are advancing to-day. It puts me in mind of a little story I heard of a boy who ran to his father and said: "Father, a badger has run up a tree." The father replied: "Oh, no, my boy, a badger could not run up a tree." Oh, yes, he did," the boy replied, "Towser was after him." And so it was with the late Government. The Government thought they could not reduce the tariff, but when Towser got after them in the shape of the agricultural vote they found they could do it, and I believe that if the present Government do not continue to reduce duties in the interest of agriculture and in accordance with their promises, Towser will be after them too. I would say as regards my

Mr. DOUGLAS.

vote that when this question was up before it was coupled with free lumber. The farmers in Ontario never asked for free lumber. I believe that if the Americans put \$2 a thousand on our lumber, that they would not favour removing the duty on their lumber coming into Canada. In regard to my vote on agricultural implements, under the present system with a duty upon the raw material used by manufacturers in the shape of coal and iron, I would not ask the manufacturers to give us free implements. Place them on the same plane as the manufacturers of barbed wire and binder twine who get their raw material free and I would ask them to give us agricultural implements free. We wish to be reasonable in all our demands. If they do not get their raw material free we do not ask them to give us agricultural implements free. We do say that we hope that the Government will give us a corresponding reduction of duty in all articles as they have done in raw material of iron, on agricultural implements, spades, shovels, axes and such things. I think they should give us a corresponding reduction in comparison to what has been given upon the raw material. In having granted a bonus to the pig iron manufacturers the Government have acted against a principle which we believe in. We do not ask for a bonus on our manufactured products in the shape of butter or anything else. We are against the principle of bonusing industries and we object to a bounty going to the iron manufacturers. I am ready to support any action that will give a corresponding reduction to what is given on raw materials.

Mr. DAVIN. What I want to point out is that here we have a supposed leader of the Patrons telling us that they did not expect agricultural implements to be placed on the free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did he say that?

Mr. DAVIN. He said so. And we have the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) telling us that the impression was given in his constituency and all over the west that we should have agricultural implements free, and though that impression was given by the hon. gentleman we have the hon. gentleman who was struggling for power as a Patron come here and saying that the Patrons did not expect that agricultural implements would be placed on the free list. Let me point out that the difficulties that he sees in the way of agricultural implements being placed on the free list are mere imaginary lions in the path. There is nothing to prevent the Government carrying out their promise to place agricultural implements on the free list and saying to the manufacturers of the imported material used in the manufacture of these implements: "We will give you a rebate on what you have paid." The hon. member for

Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) comes here to-day and apologizes for having voted with me. His constituents have taken him to task.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. My constituents did not take me to task, and I did not come here to apologize.

Mr. DAVIN. All I can say is that if it was not an apology, it was the finest piece of unconscious imitation that I ever saw in my life. The hon. member has also to apologize for himself to his constituents, because on May 5th he telegraphed to his own paper: "Fighting for the farmers." Does anybody suppose that if those men, who came here as independent members, like the Patrons and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), to represent independent constituents, had voted for my motion, the Government would not have considered the matter? That was the time to force the Government's hand, and if we had done so, we should now have implements free. But now, after the decision has been taken, and the Government have promised to do something for the implement men, they come with this bogus motion in committee. What nonsense it is talking about a vote of want of confidence. The very man who talks about it is the man who, with the pen in his hand, denounced me because I did not vote want of confidence in the late Government; and he refused to vote at a time when he knew it was important for his constituents that the vote should be taken. But here we have this gentleman and others—I do not know whether he is the head or the tail. It may be said of them as John Bright said of the cave of Adullam, that they are like the Skye terrier in "Punch,"—it is impossible to tell which is the head and which is the tail, because the tail is so like the head and the head so like the tail.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I wish to answer a question which was asked this morning by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I asked my commissioner about it, and he states that a circular was issued to the officers on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, that supervision should be exercised, and that the logs should not be towed away until the dues were paid to the Ontario Government. I am informed that that has been the practice since confederation. But the commissioner is inquiring into the whole subject.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has always been necessary to get that certificate.

Mr. DAVIN. When six o'clock was called, I was pointing out the inconsistency of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

Let me recall what was done on 5th May. The hon. gentleman telegraphed to his paper an article headed: "Fighting for the farmers," and stating:

Manitoba and North-west members, including Douglas, Oliver, Richardson, Jameson, Macdonell and a number of Ontario men—

There were fifteen anyway, and what did they do?

They bombarded Fielding and Paterson for an hour yesterday, pressing for the immediate abolition of the arbitrary valuation of American agricultural implements.

Bombarded! Fancy the ordeal through which the Controller of Customs and the Minister of Finance must have gone. There was not only the hon. member for Lisgar, but my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), and my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Macdonell), all tall men of their inches, with a cohort from Ontario; and they were bombarding those two unfortunate Ministers. No wonder that on certain occasions those two gentlemen came pale to the House, after being bombarded by these gentlemen. We know what bombarding is: it is throwing bombs. But this is only a metaphor; it is figurative language; but it illustrates the arguments, the threats, the objurgations, and the various other instances of the larger language of the earlier gods which these gentlemen must have indulged in. I know the Finance Minister must have suffered, and for various reasons the Controller of Customs must have turned pale.

Mr. Richardson, who spoke first, pointed out that with the duties on raw materials reduced, and no corresponding reduction in the duty on implements, it would be difficult for western members representing rural constituencies to defend the Government.

And why? Because of the very reason we had from him here to-day—that very many of them were led to believe that if a change of Government took place the duty on agricultural implements would be removed. That exactly was the impression. But I used to say to the people I addressed, that the argument that a revenue tariff government would make implements free was a fallacious one—that a revenue tariff government could not do it; and we find the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) as good as saying that they could not. But I said to them, a Government believing in scientific protection can do it, and I will tell you why. I will not say for the reason my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia gave, because they are a raw material of the farm. I rather put it on this ground, which is unassailable, that the farming industry is an exceptional industry, and that if the farming people are prosperous, the whole country will be prosperous. If

the farmers are not prosperous, the country cannot prosper, and therefore it is the bounden duty of Parliament to direct all its energies to making the farming community prosperous, and when we find that the amount of money invested in farming is very large and that the people interested in agriculture make up half the population of the country—

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). More.

Mr. DAVIN. I will accept what my hon. friend from Guysborough says, that they are more than half the population. Nevertheless, here is an industry on which the prosperity of the country depends and yet there is not an industry in the country that pays so badly at this moment. Therefore it is in an invidious position, and from this very desk, year after year, when the Conservative Government was in power, I used arguments, to which in the end they yielded, in favour of putting this industry on a better footing. I moved to have agricultural implements put on the free list long before the Patrons were heard of, not to speak of the period when the institution first saw the light. I held that a protectionist Government could have done what a revenue tariff Government could not do consistently with its policy. Now, with regard to the motion of my hon. friend, I propose to treat him as he would not treat me. I shall support his motion. It would please me better to have moved to put agricultural implements on the free list, but if I should do that in amendment to his motion, it might be said that my amendment would imperil it, and therefore I take the view that half a loaf is better than no bread. I shall take 10 per cent reduction as better than no reduction at all and shall support the motion of my hon. friend. But having said that, let me point once more to the peculiar position in which the hon. gentleman and his friends are placed. Here is the strong language used by my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), that it would be impossible to defend the Government if they did not put agricultural implements on the free list, and we found him stating this afternoon that very many people were under the impression that they would be placed on the free list. We find the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) also writing in his paper as follows:—

Mr. Douglas took even stronger ground, and spoke of the deep disappointment in the west on account of there being no reduction. Mr. Macdonell spoke strongly also, kicking against the arbitrary valuation which increased the duty from 20 to 30 and 40 per cent.

Having used one arm of warfare, the bombs having given out, he took to kicking, and he kicked like a steer. Now, here is the result of the bombarding and kicking, and I call the attention of the committee to it:

Mr. BLAIR.

A promise was given to take up the matter at once and investigate the price, and see if the valuation was not above the price charged by the American manufacturers to dealers who buy by the carload. This was deemed satisfactory. It may be taken for granted, that if no reduction is made in the duties in the tariff, the farmers' interests will be protected in the question of valuation. It is believed this would result in a reduction of 5 to 10 per cent.

But there is not one word about the valuation from the hon. gentleman to-day. My hon. friend says he understands that implements are selling \$5 apiece less, but if they are, it cannot be because of any reduction made by this Government in the interests of the farmers, since the hon. gentleman himself says nothing of the kind has been done. But what has happened? We have implements for sale at lower rates in consequence of the policy of the late Government, which made the great reduction from 25 to 20 per cent. Why, I remember, when in Winnipeg, you would pay nearly three times the amount for a binder which you would pay to-day, and when every agricultural implement you saw in Winnipeg had the saucy American flag flaunting from it to herald where it came from. But, in consequence of the wise and far-seeing policy of the late Administration, a policy quite consistent with placing agricultural implements, when the time came, on the free lists, their prices have declined from year to year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out, before I sit down, the curious position in which we are placed. Here we have my hon. friend from Lisgar making the motion he has just made, supported by the speech to which we have just listened. Then we have my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) also supporting that motion, and expressing his disappointment at the same time, and then we have my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), who should be the farmers' advocate, not calling to have the things that farmers use placed on the free list, but telling us he did not expect anything of the kind and that the Government were doing all they could. The Government, he said, introduced a tariff which was not much of a free trade tariff, and so on; yet in spite of that, he is content with everything, everything is lovely, and the goose hangs high so far as he is concerned. Under these circumstances, the House must admit that we are face to face with very great and curious inconsistencies. However, I intend to support the motion of my hon. friend from Lisgar, and I hope he will get sufficiently strong support to enable him to carry his motion and thus compel the Government to place these things 10 per cent lower on the tariff.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it would be rather a pity were I to allow the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to go scott free after the remarks he has just made. He accused me of inconsistency,

and spoke very loudly and enthusiastically in favour of putting agricultural implements on the free list. Now, I may say that I had occasion some four or five weeks ago to refer to the Regina "Leader," which was published by my hon. friend for many years. As I read the paper, I became so interested in it that it seemed to me almost as if I had lit upon a second edition of Boswell's "Life of Johnson." I read through the paper for some five or six hours, going through its files for nearly ten years back, I was so deeply interested in it. The only difference I could find between the Regina "Leader" and the famous "Life of Johnson," by Boswell, was that that in the case of the Regina "Leader" my hon. friend from West Assiniboia was his own Boswell. I discovered that that paper described very minutely every personal movement of the hon. member. If he had occasion to dine with Sir John Macdonald, that fact was promptly telegraphed to the Regina "Leader." If on the other hand, he had occasion to dine at Government House, that interesting news was announced in double-leaded type in the columns of the same valuable journal; and I gather from the frequency with which my hon. friend's name appeared in that organ, that he was his own correspondent while at Ottawa. Of that fact I could not possibly have any reason for doubt. I also could not help coming to the conclusion that if he did not learn in that excellent society in which he recently boasted of having been born, that champagne was at its best when cooled to a temperature of 48, he at least learned it at Rideau Hall, and I could not help thinking that during all this time when my hon. and fashionable friend from West Assiniboia was accustomed to dine with the Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne, he must have forgotten his old friend the Widow McManus who lived out on the plains of West Assiniboia, and where the practice of drinking whisky out of a tin cup or a dipper was in high favour.

Mr. FOSTER. What has this to do with agricultural implements?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman will see that very shortly. In the Regina "Leader" of 5th April, 1883, my hon. friend expressed himself as follows:—

We are not disposed to grumble at agricultural implements being still more protected.

The increased protection to which the hon. gentleman then referred was announced in the Budget of Sir Leonard Tilley, then Minister of Finance, when the duties were increased on mowing machines to \$10 specific duty and 20 per cent ad valorem, on harvesters to \$25 specific duty and 20 per cent ad valorem, and on self-binders to \$40 specific duty and 20 per cent ad valorem. So that my hon. friend was then evidently satisfied with those increases.

Mr. DAVIN. I have just said that that was the policy that enabled us to get cheaper binders, that that was a proper policy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to this policy that is to get us cheap binders, when my hon. friend advocates in his paper that this increased protection is exactly the thing wanted.

Mr. DAVIN. At that time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will leave it to the judgment of this House whether that reasoning is good. In the session of 1891, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) moved that binder twine be put on the free list, and my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia voted against it; and I understand that he excused himself on the ground that he did not know what his constituents wanted in the matter. I took the trouble to turn up the hon. gentleman's paper, and I find in an article on "binder twine" printed on the 7th April, 1892, these observations:—

In the interests of the farmers of Western Assiniboia, the "Leader" raises its voice against the duty on binder twine. We have felt for years that the National Policy bore too heavily on the North-west, and with regard to the particular item of binder twine, no one has come forward to defend a proceeding which compels the farmers to pay some \$400,000 more for the twine than the twine is actually worth.

He made a speech in Parliament supporting the reduction in the duty on binder twine, and it will be interesting to see how he voted. On Wednesday the 26th April, 1892, nearly three weeks after the above article appeared, Hon. Robert Watson, then M.P. for Marquette, moved that binder twine be placed on the free list; and the record shows that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia shirked the vote. In the session of 1893, the present Postmaster General again moved that binder twine be placed on the free list, and the record shows that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia supported the motion in a speech, but voted against it. Then, in 1893, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) moved a resolution to the following effect:—

Since the introduction of the protective system, sufficient time has elapsed for the establishment and development of such manufacturing industries as, under existing conditions, can be successfully carried on in Canada. Moreover, many manufacturers sheltered behind the rampart thus erected have formed combinations and trusts which prohibit competition and maintain monopolies.

That the existing tariff, defensible only as a protective measure, has proved in many instances oppressive and burdensome to the great mass of the consuming classes, and especially to those engaged in agricultural pursuits; is unfair and unequal in its incidence, and has been productive of discontent, verging on disloyalty, among those who suffer from its injustice.

That no sufficient reason has been adduced, or exists, requiring investigation respecting the fore-

going facts, which are notorious, nor justifying delay in the passage of remedial legislation, which is imperative.

And the hon. member for Western Assiniboia on that occasion shirked the vote. But he explained the matter in an article he sent to the Regina "Leader," that court journal to which I have already referred. If you will allow me, I will read the reasons which the hon. gentleman gave for his course. I think they will be extremely interesting to the House. I shall quote very briefly :

Any resolution impugning the existing fiscal policy is, as demonstrated on the strictly party vote on Mr. McCarthy's motion, regarded as one expressing want of confidence in the Government. It was impossible for Mr. Davin, advocating a protective tariff, to support a resolution condemning such a tariff and suggesting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but we do not exaggerate when we say that Mr. McCarthy's proposals of reduction of customs met with the private approval of many members of both parties. It is easily understood that, with party discipline—

And I would call special attention of the House to this sentence :

—with party discipline carried to the extreme to which it is in this country, individual action must be controlled by party reasons. Parliamentary procedure here leaves the private members no initiative. Expression of honest and true opinion is restricted. The individual responsibility of the people's representatives is overshadowed by the power of the Cabinet.

I think that the House will agree with me after listening to these sentences, that when it was charged recently that the hon. gentleman had crawled under the barn, the statement was warranted by the facts. The article continues :

Members of Parliament, in order to be supporters of the Government, would not require to be extreme protectionists, just as there would no longer be a necessity for a Liberal being a free trader.

Now, in order to keep up the ruse with his constituents, on Monday, February 13th, 1893, the hon. member moved as follows :—

That it is the opinion of this House that the duty on barbed wire, on agricultural implements, on coal oil and on cotton should be reduced so as to give no more than reasonable protection, and that the duty on binder twine should be abolished.

But he never pressed that motion to a vote. He conveniently took to the woods. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) had previously introduced a resolution to make binder twine free, but this the hon. member for Western Assiniboia had opposed. I will read a brief extract from his speech as reported in his own paper :

Mr. Foster had promised to make known the Government policy on the tariff, and in the face of such a request he (Davin) could not have voted for the motion. Had he done so, he would have been supporting what, coming from a mem-

Mr. RICHARDSON.

ber of the Opposition, was practically a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

Now, in the session of 1893, Mr. Cleveland had a motion for free coal oil, and respecting this, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia sent the following to his paper on 13th February, 1893 :—

A proposal was now before the House to abolish the duty on coal oil. He (Davin) could not go that far,—

—Though he was quite willing the other day that it should be placed on the free list or the duty reduced to 1 per cent—

—but that the duty should be reduced. Speaking on binder twine, he (Davin) made a strong appeal for free binding twine for the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west.

The House is already aware how the hon. gentleman voted. In the "Leader" of 14th December, 1893, I find an article from the hon. gentleman on "the tariff" :

When, last session, Mr. Davin was battling for tariff reform, a gentleman in Regina said, condemning Mr. Davin : "We have no use for any man who is not with the Government every time." With them, if they are wrong, even if they are not with the country! If Sir John Thompson and his colleagues are now in favour of tariff reform, they must have been mistaken last year in not going for it. In fact, they were. Had they yielded on four or five articles, Martin would not be member for Winnipeg to-day. The moral is surely this, that if the member representing a constituency is pressing wise reforms on the Government in a friendly manner, we should support him, not try to weaken him. And it must be said that, as a constituency, we have supported him. But there will be flies in the ointment to the end of time.

I am afraid that when the hon. gentleman goes back to his constituents, a couple of months hence, he will find himself overwhelmed with flies, and they will not be in the ointment either. Then came the visit of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and Hon. Mr. Angers to the west, when the hon. member for Western Assiniboia proclaimed that what was wanted was free lumber, coal oil, agricultural implements, barbed wire, &c. He pointed out that coal oil at Regina was 50 cents a gallon. Yet when Mr. Cleveland's motion was up to put it on the free list, the hon. gentleman voted against it. Then came the tariff revision of 1894, when agricultural implements, lumber and barbed wire were reduced; binder twine was reduced and coal oil was made 7½ cents, though, before the session closed it was reduced to 6 cents. It would be interesting to see what the hon. member for Western Assiniboia said at that time. In the "Leader" 29th March, 1894, he spoke thus :

From a commercial and political standpoint, the tariff reductions are bold throughout, and, looking at them all round, are eminently satisfactory.

Those changes meant coal oil, 6 cents a gallon, agricultural implements, 20 per cent,

vexatious restrictions in the case of coal oil continued and barbed-wire and binder twine still heavily taxed. And yet, according to the hon. gentleman, the reductions were eminently satisfactory. Now, the present Government have taken the duty off binder twine and barbed wire, reduced the duty on coal oil one cent per gallon, and have agreed to remove restrictions as to the importation, which I am credibly informed, will cut the duty almost entirely in two, and yet the hon. gentleman is not satisfied. He wants—and I am not blaming him for that, but I am pointing out his inconsistency—he wants coal oil on the free list, and he has just told you that he would like agricultural implements on the free list also. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved in amendment to the motion for Committee of Supply on 1st April, 1894, the effect of which amendment was to lower the duties on agricultural implements and the necessities of life. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia opposed that and asserted :

That, if the Opposition were in power, they dare not reduce the tariff lower than it has been reduced in the measure just brought down. The changes were too radical to suit Laurier and his friends ; it left them but little to complain of, and for that reason they were not pleased.

I looked over the correspondence sent by my hon. friend to the "Leader" and in the issue of 19th April, 1894, I find the following :—

In Mr. Davin's speech on the tariff, he dwelt on the absurdity of the suggestion made by Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Charlton and others, that the Government, if sustained at the elections on the tariff, would not carry out its promises. He (Davin) pointed out that such a thing was never known as a government propounding a policy and winning on it, and then going back on it.

But, he said, it was not uncommon for men in opposition to propound opinions and propose measures in regard to which, on getting into office, they became silent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must apologize to the committee for taking up so much time, especially as we are reaching the close of the session. I would not have done so, but that I felt it desirable, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman has been masquerading as the farmers' friend throughout that country, that his record should be thoroughly exposed in this House, in order that the House and the country, and especially his constituents, should know exactly how much weight to place upon his representations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to ask a question of the Controller of Customs as to the basis of valuation placed upon implements coming in from the United States. During the past they have been valued at \$100, which was the retail valuation. I wish to ask the Controller whether the retail price should be the basis, or the price at which implements are sold to agents by the United States

manufacturers. If the latter basis were adopted, it would materially affect the price of implements in the North-west. This is a point of some importance to the consumer, inasmuch as these implements are gradually being brought in, and we think it is only right that the valuation should be upon the wholesale price and not on the retail price.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. In answer to the hon. gentleman I would say that I am going into that question again. Rulings have been given in that way. The hon. gentleman asked me if the duty will be charged on the retail price ; I answer that it would not be charged on the retail price except when only one machine was brought in, or a case like that. The buyer purchasing wholesale here, would be entitled to enter at the price at which the wholesale buyer would purchase in the United States. I am taking steps to inquire again in reference to that matter, and will endeavour to carry out the law in the case.

Mr. SPROULE. Has not that always been the ruling in the past with regard to valuations ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is as I understand the law to be.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is no special rule for the farmers as against other importers.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be stated for the information of the House that there has been one law for the farmer in this matter and another law for other people. There has been an arbitrary valuation placed by custom-house officers in the past on these agricultural implements coming in from the States, an arbitrary value of \$100 on self-binders, which was above the wholesale price in the United States. Our contention is that there should not be such a valuation, but that agricultural implements should be placed on the same footing as any other implements or produce coming into the country, that the price at the point of production should be the basis for duty. Some of us have pressed this matter upon the Controller in the past ; certainly I think we are entitled to a somewhat more definite answer than has been given.

Amendment (Mr. Richardson) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of that clause ? When clothes wringers are not for domestic use, what will their duty be ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Large wringers used in laundries will come in at the machinery rate.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs a question with regard to the item of woodenware, item 324, although it has already been passed. Some

time ago I gave the Finance Minister a letter from the Handle Manufacturers Association of Canada, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has acceded to the request of the handle manufacturers. This letter objected to the duty being reduced to 25 per cent, and asked that it be increased to 35 per cent, on wood handles, such as rake handles, pick handles and others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend's suggestion was for an increase; we have not I think changed that item.

Mr. INGRAM. But I think the hon. gentleman changed some other items which affect that.

Item agreed to.

Watch cases, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. Could I have a chance of success if I were to press upon the Ministers the necessity of raising watch cases to the old duty of 35 per cent?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Do you think that it is necessary?

Mr. FOSTER. I think under a 30 per cent duty you will find that the Americans, suppose the duties were levelled all round, would take our market, and I do not see why that should be. But if you are going to give the quarter reduction, as you say you are, to Great Britain, which will let Swiss and German manufactures in, I think without the shadow of a doubt you will wipe out this business. Now this is a large business, although watches are not a necessary of life. The duty so far as it goes does not amount to much; but if you take off a quarter from that 25 per cent, they get no protection at all. My hon. friends know from what examination they have made, that with the low rates of wages in Switzerland and Germany, no Canadian can compete against them unless he has a vantage ground. I fear you will shut up industries which have attained a very considerable extension.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is an article which in all probability will still come chiefly from the United States. The Americans, I think, are almost beating the Europeans in the matter of watch cases, and I do not think, even with a reduced rate, there will be any large importation from England.

Mr. FOSTER. The Americans are flooding our country with these, and that is all the more reason why you should not reduce the duty which has had the effect of giving our own men the industry to a large extent. German cases are being made with cheap labour which will come in at a quarter less.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. They are not coming in.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends know that our contention is, and they have provided

Mr. INGRAM.

for it, that these other goods will come in. But suppose we take the argument that they don't come in from Germany, these goods will still come in through Great Britain. They will be brought over to Great Britain, the parts will be put together there, and then they will come into this country as English manufactures, and there is no way to keep them out.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Nine-tenths of all the imports come from the United States, and will continue to bear the duty. It is very unlikely that any very great amount will come even from Switzerland, which is the United States' greatest competitor. I would say, however, that something is due to the Canadian consumer who does not appear to have a single friend on that side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will find that it will have the effect that the American or the Swiss producer or worker will get the wages and keep his family, that the goods will be imported and that you will not find a reduction of a single cent per watch made, to the people, because of this duty you are taking off watch cases. The 5 per cent added would be sufficient to enable the Canadian manufacturers to hold their own in the market. It is an extremely small margin to the individual in the end; it is very little but, in the aggregate, it means the profit upon the manufacturer's business, and it is the one point as to whether he can keep his factory open or not.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I remember, with a tariff of 17½ per cent, they held their own.

Mr. FOSTER. These are different from the good old days when you and I were boys. The keenness of competition; the whole character of competition is changed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And Canadians have kept well up in the procession.

Mr. FOSTER. Canadians have kept well up in the procession, but not better in watchmaking in Ontario and Quebec than in coal-working in Nova Scotia. The Minister of Finance has kept the duty on coal in Nova Scotia and with a twinkle in his eye he says that he will raise it. But, in reference to this industry, I have visited these factories and gone through them carefully. They are furnishing employment to a large quantity of skilled labour. Why should we transfer all these things to another country?

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance said in his Budget speech, and afterwards, the same thing was reiterated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that they were endeavouring, as far as possible, to put the taxation of the people upon the luxuries of life. Watches may be regarded as the luxuries of life, and therefore we would naturally expect that

they would put a higher duty upon these than upon the necessaries of life.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There are a good many people who will not agree that a watch is a luxury. I think it should be classed among the necessaries of life. Articles that were once regarded as luxuries are not exactly looked upon in the same light to-day. Many things that we regarded a few years ago as luxuries are now among the necessaries of life. A watch is almost as necessary as anything else you could name, and I certainly think there is no article more universally used, no article more deserving to be admitted at a low rate.

**Mr. FOSTER.** A man would not want it for breakfast.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** No, but if he does not have one he will be likely to miss his breakfast.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I do not believe that many people will regard a watch case as a necessary of life and buy it for that purpose.

Item agreed to.

Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, pronged forks, snaths, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, and other agricultural implements, a.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would like to ask my hon. friends if they have been able to reconsider their decision upon this item?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The matter was reserved and, so far as our present information goes, I have not seen any sufficient reason for changing it. The particular complaint was in regard to the item of axes, and that is certainly an article of so universal usage that I think it ought to be placed at a moderate rate of duty. We have not been able to continue the old rate.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend has largely reduced the rate on this. What corresponding advantage is he giving so as to enable him to reduce the rate.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The manufacturer gets free steel, which is some compensation.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Well, but my hon. friend will not contend that this is very much of a compensation.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I have always found that when the manufacturer has not these things free he says they amount to a great deal, but when he wants more than that he says they do not amount to much. My own opinion is that 25 per cent is not a bad rate.

**Mr. FOSTER.** He has reduced the duty on these articles from 30 to 25 per cent. I suppose in that reduction he has gone upon the ground that he has made a compensat-

ing reduction in the raw material, and, as far as that compensating reduction goes he would be perfectly right in reducing the duty. Of course, the duty on any article has to be lowered as well as the duty on any raw material. All that has been done, so far as I can see, for the manufacturer of these tools is to give him the steel free, but in a dozen axes the quantity of steel that is used is small, comparatively. A large part of the material is iron, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has not reduced the ad valorem duty on his iron. If my hon. friend will make a calculation, from now to two or three years ago, taking the prices of iron in both periods, and taking the duties upon iron as they existed then and as they exist now, he will find that on the ad valorem basis he is charging a larger percentage of duty upon the iron of the axe-maker than was charged two, three or four years ago. The reduction on the steel is almost infinitesimal, because there is so very little steel, comparatively, used. The old rate would not be anything more than compensating the present ad valorem duties relatively placed on the raw material. My hon. friend will find that he is giving no advantage to raw material taking iron and steel both at an ad valorem comparison and he has reduced the ad valorem duty on the manufactured article. Now, my hon. friend here tells me—most atrocious pun—that I will have a good deal of assurance to stand up here and axe the Minister of Finance in regard to this matter. But I would like to axe him just one question and it is as to why he makes a difference between this class of manufacturers and others. He gives raw material and puts a 35 per cent duty upon various implements that are made. Why is it that in this case he puts a much less percentage upon the manufactured article? Take saws—you have the raw material free, but you give a duty of 35 per cent, and there are other articles which come within that same category. Why does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) reduce one to 25 per cent and keep the other up to 35 per cent? All that I would ask in this matter would be that the duty should be made 30 per cent. That is not an inordinate duty, and I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to inform the committee how it is that he has made the distinction and if it would not be wise to make the duty 35 per cent?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Axes are among the farmer's tools or implements. There is a strong prejudice in the minds of the Government favourable to the farmers' interests and that is the only object we have in bringing that duty down. We have no desire to discriminate in respect to this industry. Some things are more universally used than others, and they are taxed at a lower rate. I will think over the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) before we

take the item in concurrence, but I would say to him frankly that with an article so universally used as an axe we will be open to criticism if we impose a higher duty.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must also recollect that axes will be brought in from Germany and Belgium and from England. That competition, with the reduction of 25 per cent, will, of course, be ruinous to these manufactories, and they are not small. If I am not wrongly informed, there must be from twenty-eight to thirty of these factories in Canada, mostly in Ontario and Quebec, with a very large amount of capital; and the gentlemen connected with them assure me that it is perfectly impossible for them to keep their factories going under the stress of the competition that this rate of duty will impose upon them. With one-fourth off 25 per cent, you will have merely 17½ per cent, or thereabouts.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I hardly think that there will be European competition in the matter of axes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is wrongly informed. There most certainly will be such competition. The industry is a large one and widely disseminated. It is rather a grave matter, unless you are going to make one fell swoop, and make your tariff a free-trade tariff entirely. If you are going to do that, why in the name of goodness, do you not do it all round?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Will the hon. gentleman name the articles in this list coming from England that will be subject to the 25 per cent reduction? I do not see any articles except one or two of small import.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, my argument is that the duty is reduced below the sustentation point for American competition, and when the one-fourth reduction takes place, you are liable to have a competition from across the water in these articles, especially in axes and scythes.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Not from England.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, from England.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may be a very wise man. He may have been born a hundred years ago and may have known how things were then, and have kept himself abreast of all the wisdom of the century down to the present time; but he is altogether too dogmatic when he attempts to judge everything the wide world over. In the first place, if these axes are not made in Great Britain, they can be made in Great Britain. All the British manufacturer has to do is to adapt himself to the style.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Which he has never done.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly the answer I wanted from my hon. friend. He has based the whole of his argument upon this live-and-never-learn-anything principle that he seems to have adopted; but give the British manufacturer an advantage of 25 per cent, and in the stress of competition and the necessity for finding markets, there will be an inducement for him to study the needs of this country; and if he does so, he has just as good steel and iron, just as good machinery, and just as good skill, and consequently he can make axes which will come here at the minimum rate of duty, and enter strongly into competition with the products of our own people; and the German manufacturer can do the same. My hon. friend presumes too much upon that traditional quality of the Englishman to think that what he has done is good enough for everybody, and that he will do no better. The German has not subscribed to that principle in the last ten years but has applied an immense amount of industry, enterprise and money in finding what every country under the sun wants, in colour, texture, style and everything else, and has then gone to work to make it. And the British manufacturer, under the tuition of this competition, is not going to remain behind his German competitor. He will adapt himself to the circumstances and become a competitor; and you will find that the German manufacture, finished in England, will come in under that clause at the 25 per cent reduction, and you cannot prevent it.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) may know a great many things, and I admit that he is a well-educated man in almost any branch of industry in this country, but I can only say that for the last forty years efforts have been made by Americans and Canadians to get the American or Canadian style of axe manufactured in England, and, up to the present time, I have never seen an English axe of the American pattern sold in this country. It may have been, but I have never seen it, and I have come across a great many axes of all kinds from all countries. A few sickles and a few straw knives might come in, but certainly not hay forks nor manure forks, although they have tried to imitate them in England.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman say about scythes?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We used to get a great many scythes in the days of William Moore.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not scythes come from England now?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Very few of them.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend be surprised if I told him that since this tariff came in, thousands of dozens of scythes have come in from Great Britain?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would be surprised. For years English scythes held the market, but for a long time very few have come to this country.

Mr. FOSTER. They are coming now.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Canadians and Americans have kept the market for scythes because the articles they produce are a far better style for this country than the English scythes. Snaths certainly cannot come in from England; neither can field rollers or such things; and post hole diggers are not known in England. Out of the whole list there are only one or two articles in regard to which the manufacturers of Canada need have the slightest fear of English competition. If the door were opened to American competition, the hon. gentlemen would have a right to raise his voice; but so far as the English and Germans are concerned, I am quite sure the manufactures of this country can hold their own, even if they did come in. But I deny that English axes will ever be used in this country unless the English manufacturers change their mode of operation, which they have not done, although for many years efforts have been made again and again by Canadians and Americans to induce them to do so.

Mr. MONK. I cannot allow this item to pass without offering some protest on behalf of the manufactures of my own county. The capacity of those men to continue operations under this reduced tariff has been practically put to the test, in the town of Cote St. Paul, where there are extensive works, no later than last Saturday. That is the municipality I referred to this afternoon as having petitioned the Government, in view of the special circumstances mentioned in that petition, not to drive out of the limits of the town the manufactories in operation at the time of the coming into power of the present Government. Last Saturday over sixty workmen employed in the axe factory at Cote St. Paul were obliged to quit work, and the reason is not difficult to explain.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Not on account of English competition.

Mr. MONK. I must begin by stating that I do not wish to bring down upon these men the vituperation of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood). I am quite prepared to concede at once that the English axe or the American axe is just as good as the axe manufactured in this country; and that admission will take away from the hon. member the occasion for vilifying what is manufactured in our own country. What I was proceeding to say was that those

manufacturers, being unable to continue work under the 25 per cent tariff, were obliged to notify their workmen that they must reduce their wages 10 per cent; and so sixty skilled French Canadian workmen refused to accept that reduction—and I do not blame them, because their wages were low enough—and the works were closed. It is impossible to believe that men of business would resort to such a proceeding as that for the sole purpose of forcing the hand of the Government. The members of the Government held an inquiry throughout the country since last session, and I submit to the Minister of Finance that these men have demonstrated clearly that they are placed in such a position of disadvantage by this legislation that they are unable to continue. Why is it, I ask, that the manufacturers of axes and other articles mentioned in this item are treated so differently from the manufacturers of similar articles? There is some reason for that. When the Minister of Finance said that he did not wish to crush out the manufacturers of this country, surely he was serious, and did not wish to carry out a policy of extinction. Yet we find these men have 10 per cent stricken off their protection, which is an altogether different treatment to that meted out to other manufacturers of articles in a similar category. This is very serious matter for the portion of the constituency to which I have just referred. The hon. Finance Minister tells us that the axe is one of those articles which is in daily use and on which therefore a reduction should be made, but a hammer is of still greater daily use. For instance, I seldom wield an axe, but have frequently used a hammer, though I am a lawyer. Well, we find that hammers have a protection of 35 per cent and free steel and free handles. We find that the manufacturers of adzes have a protection of 35 per cent, and they pay \$7 a ton on their steel. The makers of shovels get a protection of 35 per cent, and they pay \$7 a ton on their steel. The manufacturers of picks, mattocks and grub hoes enjoy a protection of 30 per cent and pay \$7 per ton on the steel they use. Manufacturers of augers and auger bits get a protection of 30 per cent and free steel. Rasping knives have 30 per cent protection and free steel. Saws have the same protection. Skates have 35 per cent protection. Why is this difference made between these articles and axes. Surely there must be some reason. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that we are benefiting in respect of the steel we use, but surely he must have been informed that that is a very small protection indeed for our particular industry. In the manufacture of a dozen axes sixty pounds of iron is used and only nine pounds of steel, which reduces the protection to 2¼ cents. That is the benefit we reap, and in contradistinction to that there is a re-

duction of 50 cents per dozen on the prices of our axes. These are facts which surely ought to strike the committee.

Again, if we turn to what we pay on our raw material, I find that the manufacturers of axes, scythes, forks, hoes, rakes and sickles and hay forks, on which the duty is 25 per cent, will have to pay duty on the raw materials entering into the production of these goods as follows:—

	P. c.
On iron costing 90 cents per 100 pounds the duty is 35 cents per 100 pounds.....	39
On handles for forks, hoes, rakes and hay-knives, turned in the rough.....	25
On malleable castings, in the rough.....	25
On beeswax.....	10
On brazing wire.....	20
On oil.....	20
On glue.....	20
On bronze.....	30
On grindstones.....	15
On labels.....	35
On sheet steel.....	5
On varnish.....	40
On soft coal, costing 90 cents per ton at the pit, 60 cents per ton, or.....	75

From the above figures it will be seen that the rates of duty which these manufacturers will have to pay on what constitutes their raw materials average higher than the proposed duty on the finished goods. Yet, under these circumstances, our protection of 35 per cent is reduced to 25 per cent. And I would like to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that in view of a possible reduction in the duty, all our sales for some months have been made subject to any reduction that may take place in the tariff, so that in reality we lose 10 per cent on these past sales.

It seems to me, under these circumstances, the Government is discriminating between this industry and other industries of a similar nature, and that that discrimination is unjust; and really I am forced to the conclusion that similar industries have received protection because they have been enabled to make the Government representations through friends of the Government, which influence probably the manufacturers of axes have lacked. It is impossible not to be tempted to that conclusion when we see the immense differences made between the treatment meted out to men engaged in other similar industries.

The committee is perhaps not aware that there are over twenty-eight manufactories of axes and other articles embraced in this item of the tariff, and that a very large amount of capital has been invested in that particular industry. Not very long ago, I believe there was an axe factory started at Bedford in the province of Quebec, with a capital of \$75,000, and not started by rich men, but in which most of the people in that district are interested. That, at least, is the information which has been conveyed to me. In one of these factories there is a very considerable out-

put and a large consumption. It consumes 1,500 tons of coal, 300 tons of grindstones, 200 tons of iron, 100 tons of steel, 12,000 axe boxes, 4,000 scythe boxes, 2,000 tool boxes and 10,000 dozen handles for forks, hoes, &c. And the same factory manufactures 12,000 dozen scythes, 16,000 dozen forks, 6,000 dozen hoes, 2,500 dozen rakes, and 15,000 dozen axes. There is also this to be noticed, that there is a very considerable amount paid out in wages by these factories to skilled workmen, of whom there are over 1,500 employed by them, representing over 6,000 people who will have to suffer by the reduction, unless the Government upon reflection see fit to alter this item of the tariff on concurrence.

To give the committee some idea of the wages paid by the different factories in comparison with the raw material used, on every dollar's worth of material used they pay in wages, on scythes, \$1.53, on axes \$1.33, on two-pronged forks \$1.12, on three-pronged forks \$1.08, on four-pronged forks \$1.11, on hoes \$1.06, on rakes \$1.25.

It is with the greatest difficulty that during the past year they have been able to fight foreign competition, and I have no doubt, for my part, whatever the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) may say, what the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has stated here will be borne out, namely, that we will be flooded with axes brought from England and principally from Germany. There can be no doubt that the manufacturers in these countries will not lose sight of the opportunity now afforded them. Why, if we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, you will find that in the item of axes and these other articles, there were imported here under the old tariff as follows:—

	1894.	1895.	1896.
Chopping axes.....	\$ 4,191	\$11,696	\$32,000
Hay and manure forks...	1,374	3,697	8,400
Hoes.....	278	617	1,000
Saws.....	38,277	74,309	80,000

It is evident thus that it is with the greatest difficulty we have been able to compete against foreign manufactures. This reduction of 10 per cent is going to ruin these people. If the reduction were carrying out a uniform rule, if it were the putting into execution of a principle of policy, if it were the carrying out of a free trade tariff or a tariff for revenue only, I would not have the same ground for complaint. But what I complain of is the unjust discrimination. Where there is such a considerable discrimination as 10 per cent, it must be apparent that some explanation is needed. I say frankly and sincerely that I have no special desire to find fault with the Government, but the only explanation which can find room in my mind is that the claims of these other industries, which enjoy better protection, have been presented to the Government by people having more power with it than those connected with

this particular industry. I have been told, with what amount of truth I know not, that the people engaged in this industry, represented by item 280, have the misfortune of being connected with the Conservative party. Speaking of my own constituency, it is quite natural to suppose that during the last election, when the issue was, in that constituency, whether we should have a tariff for revenue purely and simply or a tariff which would afford protection to our industries, the people engaged in an industry which owed its very existence to the protective system should have favoured the candidate who believed that that system was absolutely necessary to the welfare of this country. But surely there was nothing wrong in that, surely you would not assimilate the case of those men to that of offensive partisanship on the part of civil servants. That issue being presented to these people, as it was in my constituency, fairly and squarely, they had every right to take part in the campaign and uphold the principle upon which their very existence depended. And they did so, probably to a great extent, but to what extent, I am unable to say. Under all these circumstances and in view of the fact that the town of Cote St. Paul is already affected by this tariff and by previous reductions, I deem it my duty to point out to the committee and to the Government the great discrepancy between the treatment meted out to the manufacturers of these articles and that meted out to the manufacturers engaged in producing similar articles; and I appeal to the Government to take these representations into consideration, and, if possible, not place the town of Cote St. Paul in the unpleasant position of seeing all its industries either diminished or completely obliterated by this new tariff. I have heard more than once—and it is another clause to which I have been inclined to ascribe the sweeping reductions referred to—statements from members representing the North-west that what they wanted was still greater reductions. I may say, for my part, I am tired of hearing these representations made by these men when I reflect upon all that we have done for the development of that country. There would be no North-west to-day at all if we had not made it for them. Do these gentlemen think, have they reflected what part in the distribution of the immense funds that we have sent there the large capital invested in industries in the eastern provinces has taken? We have spent there over \$300,000,000. Do these gentlemen imagine that of all the money that we have spent there, an immense proportion has been brought into the public coffers by the industrial people of the eastern provinces? It is a reflection which they never seem to make, and I tell you, for my own part, I am not sufficiently informed to be moving in that direction now, but expression has been given to that idea this

morning, and it is an idea which, I believe, will become a fruitful one in my mind—that it is time the North-west Territories should be organized into provinces and allowed to take upon their own shoulders the immense burdens we are bearing to-day, if they are not prepared to recognize the part which the east is entitled to have in the preparation of the tariff of this country.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I think the manufacturers have a very able advocate in the person of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) who has just taken his seat. If he was informed upon these articles as he is, perhaps, in some other things, it would be of importance to hear him in this House. He leaves out of account, in advocating the case of the manufacturers, the reduction that has taken place in the duty on raw material. He forgets that they have a reduction of \$3 a ton, or 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent on the article of iron. That amounts to something. In the article of steel also there is an important reduction. He tells us that there is 5 pounds in every axe made in this country. That shows how little he knows of the weight of axes. If the parties who loaded him up so well had been honest and had given him full particulars, they would have told him that the average box of axes weighs from 45 to 48 pounds, which is considerably different from the 60 pounds per box which he states.

Mr. MONK. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wood's) pardon. I said that 60 pounds of iron entered into the manufacture of a box of axes. That is the information I have; of course I do not pretend to know, for I never made an axe.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I understand. But there is no such weight, except in the case of a broad axe.

Mr. BRITTON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is quite right in that, because in the manufacture of an axe there must be waste.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There is very little waste.

Mr. BRITTON. There is so much waste that I can venture to say, from some knowledge of the facts, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is well within the mark in saying that 60 pounds of iron is required in making a dozen axes.

Mr. McMILLAN. In the discussion of these items, there is one class of inhabitants of this country that is entirely left out of the calculation in all the statements made—the workingmen and the farmer. The workingman in the winter has only his axe to depend upon, and his wages, in very many cases, have been reduced to a mere living pittance. The farmers of this country, also find their incomes reduced even more than any other class within the last ten

or fifteen years, and certainly some consideration should be given to them. In saying this, I know whereof I speak, having farmed in Canada for fifty years and having paid very strict attention to these matters. The prices of our implements have not been reduced in proportion to the reduction of prices on the principal exports of the farm. The mechanics in the agricultural implement manufactories can certainly stand it to have their wages reduced a little, considering that those wages have been going up steadily, while the farmers' and workmen's wages have been reduced from time to time 10, 15, 20 and 30 per cent. Last winter, in the section in which I live we could get workmen, good, able-bodied men, for \$3 and \$4 a month, and, even at that rate, many of the farmers were not sufficiently well off to be able to engage men. Certainly, in dealing with these matters the consumers are entitled to some consideration.

Item agreed to.

Embroideries, laces, braids, fringes, cords, elastic, round or flat; garter elastic, tassels and bracelets, n.o.p.; braids, chains, cords or other manufactures of hair, n.e.s.; handkerchiefs of all kinds; lace collars and all similar lace goods; lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk, or other material; shams, curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed; regalia, badges and belts of all kinds, n.o.p.; linen, silk and cotton clothing, and all other articles made up by the seamstress from linen or cotton fabrics, n.o.p.; corsets of all kinds, corset clasps, busks, blanks and steels, and corset wires, tipped or untipped, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRITTON. I hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has thought of putting in the words that have been the subject of some discussion. This item affects one industry, and, so far as I know only one. While this has been changed, as the hon. gentleman will see, very considerably from the item as it appeared in the first resolutions presented to the House and, while it is, so far, satisfactory, I think, to all the interests concerned, it may not effect the object intended unless the words are inserted "cut to lengths or in coils" after the words "tipped or untipped" in the latter part of the resolution. I would ask the Minister of Finance if he would consent to put these words in. It is important, as it seems to me, that these words should be in, because, if not, wire may be brought in under section 258, and steel might, perhaps, be brought in under item 568 of the free list. Of course, it cannot do any harm to have these words in—at least so far as I can understand the question—and, if they are not in, the section may not be of any benefit to any industry that uses these goods, but the law may be evaded by having the wires brought in coils under the items that I have mentioned. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that this whole section, No. 352, is substituted for section No. 320 of the old

Mr. McMILLAN.

tariff. That section, I suppose, the old Government carefully considered, and, because of the existence of section 320, an industry grew up and is now in existence in the constituency of my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). Of course, it is a matter of some importance to that industry, and it seems to me to be only carrying out the intention of the Government in the introduction of this item 352 that this change should be made. This is a dutiable item, and I am not asking to have any change in the rate, but only to have these words inserted, and I hope the hon. Minister will consent to that.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We are putting in "cut to lengths"; we are not putting it "in coils." We do not see our way to do that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the way the Minister suggests will cover part of the difficulty. But I think you might improve that by putting in the words "japanned" and "tempered." I know that the most expensive machinery used in the manufacture of corset wire is the wire for japanning and tempering. They may be imported with all that work done in a foreign country, in Germany, for instance, because Germany is the principal competitor now in the corset wire industry. If he will put in the tempered and the japanned, that will meet the case. Then it cannot come in either in coils or otherwise, without paying this duty.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If my hon. friend is anxious for that, we had better hold the item over until we are able to see what the effect might be.

Mr. TAYLOR. You might pass it now, and put it in on concurrence.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We will consider it on concurrence. We do not promise to put it in.

Mr. BRITTON. But so far as the hon. gentleman sees at present, there is no objection to it.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No; but it might possibly conflict with some other items. It has not been brought to our attention before.

Mr. BRITTON. If it does not conflict with any other item, then the hon. gentleman will consent to its going in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we had better hold it over. We have every desire to meet the hon. gentleman's views, but we do not care to commit ourselves to words, the effect of which we do not understand at the moment.

Item agreed to.

Shirts of any material, and ladies' or misses' blouses and shirt waists, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to this item I desire to say a few words. I have no desire to find fault with the quality

of the goods manufactured by Canadian shirt-makers in Canada. They make a good article of shirts. The white cotton shirts made in this country are well made, of good material, the linen is of sufficient quality, and they are in every respect equal to the requirements of the people of this country, with one exception. I may say, as a business man, that this exception has been brought to the attention of shirt-makers year after year, but they have not met the difficulty. I think it unfair to a great many people of this country that they should be compelled to buy, continuously, imported shirts and pay the duty when they ought to be able to secure in this country, a shirt in every respect as well suited to their wants and at a much cheaper price. The whole difficulty with Canadian shirt manufacturers is that they are too economical, they will not make a shirt that is sufficiently long for a man five feet ten inches, and upwards. I state this as a fact that is known to every business man in this country. Manufacturers have been warned that this matter would be brought to the attention of the Finance Minister if they did not change their method and make us something suitable for the requirements of our people. Take the English shirt, and you will find it four inches longer than the Canadian of the same size or number. German shirts are about one inch longer than Canadian. Until the Canadian manufacturers are prepared to do away with this miserable little economy in which they save about one and a half or two cents on a shirt, I for one, although a protectionist in principle, am prepared to vote that the protection afforded to the Canadian shirt-makers be reduced to 15 per cent. I would therefore move that the duty on white shirts be reduced to 15 per cent—unless the Finance Minister will give us some assurance that he will induce the manufacturers of white shirts in this country to do away with their miserable economy and give us a little more length.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the Finance Minister will not take that subject under his supervision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I will have to let my predecessor speak for me on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we can decide on 354 and 355 until 355a is disposed of. I would like to know what my hon. friend proposes to do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that this item in the tariff has given us much consideration and difficulty. I am sorry to say that we have not been able to reach a solution which we can regard as satisfactory to all concerned. For the present it is my intention to ask that the item 355a be struck out. It was a change in-

roduced as a special concession, with the view of assisting the shirt manufacturers. We are led to believe that it is likely to create confusion and difficulty, and we have concluded not to ask the House to concur in that item. I am sorry we have not been able to reach some arrangement which would be satisfactory at once to the cotton makers and the shirt makers, and we had hoped that they would have been able to come to some understanding which would have assisted us in the matter. Unfortunately, their views are in conflict, and, for the present, whatever we may do ultimately when we reach 355a we shall ask the House to strike it out.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend not propose then to revise the duties on 354 and 355? If, with a duty of 15 per cent on the raw material, he proposes to give them 35 per cent in each of these cases, surely if he strikes out the 15 per cent and restores these cotton fabrics to the original duties, as shown in 349 and 350, he must see that he is committing a great injustice to the collar, cuff and shirt makers, on his own basis of giving them 25 and 35 when the raw material was 15. If, now, raw material is raised from 25 to 35, what protection does he give the collar, cuff and shirt makers? The hon. gentleman has himself declared that there was a certain proportion that should exist between the two, he has distributed that proportion when he strikes out 355a. What does he propose then to do in order to restore the proportionate duty which he himself has declared by this tariff is necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I shall have to admit that in putting in that item 355a we attempted to do something for the shirt manufacturers which, on reflection, we see we cannot do successfully, and probably I may say that we should not have done. We have adopted the 35 per cent rate in regard to these manufactures as a maximum rate which we desire to apply, and if we could give the cotton manufacturer and the shirt manufacturer each a part of that 35 per cent, we should be very pleased to do so, and that is what we tried to do. We are led to believe, however, that we would do more harm by keeping that item than we would be doing good, and as the balance of convenience is that way, we have concluded to strike it out. My hon. friend asks, What protection do you give the shirtmaker in that case? As respects the coloured cotton, we give him none, except the protection which always exists on the labour, that is to say, with a duty upon coloured cottons of 25 per cent, the duty on shirts would be 35 per cent, the only protection the shirt maker would have. There would be the protection on the labour as between the Canadian and the made-up article, which it is well to remember is always considered. If you have 35 per cent upon

raw materials and 35 per cent upon the manufactured articles, that does not prove that there is no protection. There is protection, of course, to the extent of the labour involved in making up the goods from the raw material to the finished article, and the effect of striking out this item is to leave the shirt manufacturer with only that protection. I do not see any way at this moment, unless we are prepared to increase the duty on shirts, to go above 35 per cent, and we shrink from doing that. The other side of the question is that we may reduce the cotton duties. We are led to believe that if we do that there would be a larger disturbance than there would be any compensation for in the concession to the shirt people. Still, I am not quite satisfied with the result myself, I confess that I think we are making a choice of evils and doing less harm by striking that item out than by adopting it.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I will take my hon. friend on his own reasoning. In the first place he is tying himself to a pedantic rule which no business man ever does, and no business Government should ever attempt to do. This tariff ranges all the way from nothing up to more than 35 per cent, and there has been no fixed rule. Neither by a minimum provision nor by practise is it understood that a Government which is making a tariff, is to bind itself by pedantic rules. He will say for instance that he would not have less than a certain minimum duty or that he would not have more than a certain maximum duty. It would be subordinating circumstances widely differing and conditions as diverse as can be to a mere arithmetical rule for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to say: "We have a preference for 35 per cent as the highest tariff rate that we can fix. We know if we carry out that preference in that respect that we will destroy a great industry but such is our respect for preference that we would rather destroy an industry than depart from this rule." My hon. friend takes the ground that there is no going higher than that, no matter what may be the result. My hon. friend admits that he has pretty nearly equalized the duty on the raw material and the duty on the finished article, but there is the protection on the labour. My hon. friend knows that the protection of 30 per cent on the labour that is put upon a great many of these articles is no protection at all so far as the Canadian manufacturer goes because he has to compete with labour 50 or 60 per cent cheaper than Canadian labour and so my hon. friend's fancied protection of 30 per cent on the labour put upon shirts, collars and cuffs, vanishes into thin air. But he says he has to do this in order to help the cotton industry. I am very glad that he did not sacrifice the cotton industry. He would have struck a blow at the cotton industry, but it would have struck a worse blow at

Mr. FIELDING.

the interests behind the cotton industry. He has felt the force of the business and financial pressure and given way to it, and I am glad that he did give way; he has given away and restored the duties on cottons. But what is the reason that he is going to throw eight or ten thousand people in Canada out of employment as this most inevitably will. They have capital, banks and large aggregate influences behind them, but dependent upon these industries there are eight thousand people in Ontario and Quebec, 90 per cent of whom are women in the families and homes of this country who are making a living for themselves and their families out of this industry, which if you keep the duties as you propose to make them will be transferred to the continent and Great Britain and in part to the United States of America. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) whether his pedantic rule ought to stand in the way and whether for the sake of not giving more than 35 per cent on articles like collars and cuffs he is going to take the responsibility of taking the bread and butter from 8,000 people, 90 per cent of whom are women in the homes of our families in Ontario and Quebec. What purpose would be served by transferring the collar, cuff and shirt industry to foreign labour? When you have rooted out all your manufacturers you will have the same prices paid for these articles in this country that you had before. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) whether he does not think that it is most unfair to sacrifice the interests I have mentioned with the large amount of labour involved in it. Since he had to give way in the matter of the cotton duties is it fair to sacrifice an equally great and in some respects a greater industry? In the matter of distributed employment I do not think that the cotton industry is so much greater than this industry. In the total amount of wages paid the cotton industry is greater, but in the distribution of what goes to make up the difference between poverty and comfort in thousands of homes this industry is perhaps under the economical conditions of our people in Ontario and Quebec more important than the cotton mill. Does my hon. friend think that he is treating that great industry and these people fairly when at first he says: "You shall have 35 per cent on your finished product and you may get your raw material at 15 per cent. That is my fiat." Pressure comes and the 15 per cent is thrown to the winds and this rate goes to 25 per cent on plain and to 35 per cent on the coloured goods. That protection goes up and yet the disparity is allowed to exist. Surely my hon. friend, for the sake of Canadian labour and of Canadian homes and for the sake of what depends upon these will restore the duty. There has been an example in this country and the result was that Troy did the work. When a duty was put on, the Troy business was transferred to this country

and wages were paid to build up Canadian homes. It will be the same state of things if this duty is allowed to remain, and you will find that Troy will do the work and that Great Britain and the continent will do the work, and that you will have goods sent in here which will compete to the destruction of this industry. That may be all very well for the hon. gentlemen who have this wonderful respect for the 35 per cent line, but it will not do much towards keeping people when hungry and lacking employment because of the destruction of capital and labour which gave them work. I do appeal to my hon. friend to be just. He must have had the idea of being just when he brought down the tariff No. 2. He has now disturbed the equality in the heightened duty of the one; let him restore that proportion by giving an equivalent duty on the manufactured article.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's proposal is that the duty be increased on shirts to 50 per cent. I very much regret to say that that does not strike me favourably. I do not think that as a result of this duty, the industry will be seriously affected. That argument is always used when you disturb any duty and I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) using it now. My information is that while undoubtedly the industry will not have as good a time as it had before there will be fair conditions enabling it to be carried on. I think the tariff as brought down will place the shirt makers in a less favourable position than they were in before, but it will not be as disastrous to that industry as my hon. friend suggests. We will still make shirts in Canada, and these people will go on earning their living, although the profits to the manufacturers will not be so great as in the past. I wish I could see my way clear to meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion, but it seems to me that it would be leading to a higher rate of duty which would not find favour in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The result will have to be the arbiter between my hon. friend and myself. I sincerely hope that his expectation will be carried out and that these people will be able to keep employment in this work, but I very much doubt that it can be so with the competition which comes to them from cheap labour. My hon. friend knows that he is not even giving them 35 per cent, and he is going to take a quarter off that.

Mr. QUINN. It is impossible for me to allow this item to pass without expressing my sentiments against the change which has been introduced at the last moment by the Finance Minister. It is considerable of a shock to me to learn at the very last moment that the hope held out to the working people in Montreal, where there are three shirt factories, employing men, women and children, is destroyed, and that the

continuation of their employment in these factories is going to be rendered impossible by the step which is now taken. The hon. Minister thought at one time to give the shirt manufacturers a protection by reducing the duty on their raw material to 15 per cent. He could not have done this without taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case. He must have thought seriously over the matter before attempting to make such a reduction as 10 per cent in favour of the manufacturers. What argument has he put before the committee to prove that the decision which he has now come to is the proper one, and that the decision he came to when he allowed this reduction was erroneous? I cannot see it. I could not express anything like as well the mercantile view of the case as it has been expressed by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). To put it as the very least evil that will be done, there is no doubt that if the factories are not closed up, a very serious reduction will be made in the wages of the employees; and what does that mean? It means in the city of Montreal alone that the wages of 2,000 wage-earners will be reduced from 10 to 15 per cent. Their means of livelihood are limited enough at present; the remuneration they receive in this particular industry the world over is one which years ago called forth the "Song of the Shirt" from Hood; and that song is just as powerful to-day, and means as much to-day in England and other countries, not excluding Canada, as it did at the time it was written. Certainly, if this change is persisted in, there would be attached to the name of this Government the stigma of having, as the least evil that can happen, compelled the women of this country to work for wages equal only to the wages earned by the English women who brought forth the "Song of the Shirt."

Item agreed to.

Cotton duck, twenty-two and one-half per cent ad valorem.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to add, after "cotton duck" the words "gray or white, n.e.s."

Mr. BRITTON. I would like to ask that an exception be made in favour of sail manufacturers who import cotton duck for the purpose of making it into sails in their own factory. That will leave the matter as it has been for some years. The old item was 421, and the only change that was made in that item by the new item 395 was the leaving out the comma, after the word "canvas," and the collectors were instructed that the comma being left out, they were not to admit what was, by a contradiction of terms, called cotton canvass at 5 per cent. This item, 369 c., is entirely new, and it will only be bringing it to accord with what has been done in other cases, if cotton duck is allow-

ed to be brought in as before by sail manufacturers to be used in their own factories. You have allowed that to be done in the case of duck brought in for use in the manufacture of belting and hose, and canvass for bicycle tires and for other purposes in item 496, which reads in part as follows :—

Canvas or fabric, for the manufacture of bicycle tires, when imported by the manufacturers of bicycles for use exclusively in the manufacture of bicycle tires in their own factories.

I propose to extend that to the manufacture of sails when used for that purpose by a sail manufacturer in his own factory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will let the item stand, and look into the matter. It is a new suggestion.

Mr. BRITTON. It should come in under section 395, at 5 per cent ad valorem.

Item allowed to stand.

Socks and stockings of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HENDERSON. The former duty was 10 per cent per dozen pairs and 35 per cent. Now, these are articles that are surely cheap enough in this country. They are generally sold in single pairs and nobody objects to the cost, and I think it is very important for the maintenance of the industry that something more than 35 per cent should be given. The hon. Minister of Finance has been generous in some instances and retained a small specific duty with the ad valorem, and I hope in this case he will take into consideration the interests of the men who are making these articles. The factories are small and consequently more numerous, and I think he ought to restore the specific duty of 10 cents per pair along with the 35 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Yarns, woollen and worsted, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Yarns, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or like animal, costing thirty cents per pound and over, when imported on the cop, tube or in the hank by manufacturers of woollen goods for use in their products, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Could the hon. gentleman make the duty on yarns 35 per cent ad valorem? There will be a great injury done this industry if the tariff is made as low as 30 per cent. There is a large number of people employed in making these yarns, and I am almost certain their wages will be reduced unless the tariff is raised. With the 25 per cent preferential reduction, the duty will afford no protection whatever.

Mr. HEYD. I pray the indulgence of the House while I say a few words on this subject. In connection with this item, it would be well to consider items 372 and

Mr. BRITTON.

373 and 378, which are the products into which yarns ultimately go. Those familiar with the question will realize that the Government are seriously interfering with the manufacture of socks and stockings and knitted goods. The tariff on stockings and socks used to be 10 cents per dozen specific and 35 per cent. And on manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted, the duty was 5 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. The present rate is a very serious reduction, running from 40 down to 30 and in some cases 25 per cent. In this particular case the consumer is not interested, and it is therefore a matter in which the widow and orphan and working-man need not be taken into account. The cost of the manufactured article will not be influenced, whether the Government reduce this item or increase it, but the interest is divided between the spinner on the one hand and the knitting establishments and weavers, on the other. In order I presume to meet the sacrifices to which the manufacturers of the woollen goods have been submitted, the Government have felt bound to make certain concessions, and they have permitted worsted tops to be imported free of duty, so as to allow our weavers a chance to vary the classes of goods which they had been making in the past. The question comes in right at this point, what is the exact amount of duty that would best subserve the interests of the various industries engaged in making these articles? If we sacrifice the spinner for the benefit of the weaver and the knitter, there will be a direct loss to the country, and if we sacrifice the weaver and the knitter for the benefit of the spinner, there will be a similar loss, so that the difficulty for the Government was to find out how best to serve both these interests. I might inform the committee that already disastrous results have fallen upon certain manufacturers engaged in the woollen industry, which is one of the largest in the country. Owing to the introduction of free tops, the spinning industry has been seriously injured. If we take the mill of Mr. Forbes of Hespeler, whose spinning plant was estimated to be worth \$80,000, we find that owing to the importation of free tops its value has been reduced by 60 per cent, because the top-making part of his machinery has become worthless, and those men who have money invested in large spinning plants are exceedingly anxious that the duties on yarns shall not be so reduced as to make their plants equally valueless as the top-preparing plant of the spinning industry. The reduction would have this further result that it will transfer to Great Britain the labour now being done in this country. There are 1,500 men engaged in the various spinning industries of the country, preparing manufacturing yarn. I am not a protectionist, though my hon. friends to my right say that I am.

My hon. friends on the other side say I am a free trader. I am neither one nor the other; but I am prepared to take each article on its merits and do what I think it is best to do in the interests of the country. That is more important, to my mind than to be a protectionist or a free trader—these are only phrases to me and do not count for anything. I am exceedingly anxious that, in the arrangement of the tariff, when the consumers are not affected, those engaged in manufacturing should be given every facility for carrying on their industry. At present 90 per cent of the capital invested and 75 per cent of the product are to be credited to men who have spinning outfits, while the other 10 per cent of the capital and 25 per cent of the product are to be credited to men who have no spinning plants and who buy their yarn. Three-quarters of the capital in a mill is invested in the spinning department. Take a mill costing \$280,000—and we have complete mills in this country that cost that amount—they produce no more of the finished article than would a mill costing \$80,000 that buys its yarn. Therefore this item, fixing this duty at 20 per cent, is one of the utmost importance, because it strikes at the very basis of the woollen industry of our country, and, if the rate is too small, the spinning industry of our country is seriously injured, and the 1,500 men engaged in the spinning industry will probably lose their employment, and we shall transfer to Great Britain the labour now being done in our factories, and that without any benefit being conferred upon the great mass of the consumers. If I thought that I was going to interfere with the welfare of the great consuming classes of this country, I would not say a word, because I believe the consumers should be considered in this matter. But this is a question in which we can leave the consumer out of consideration, and deal with the two branches of the manufacturing trade, the spinners on one side and the knitters and weavers on the other. It must not be forgotten that we are dealing with this question on a preferential basis. On that basis we have 15 per cent on yarn, and the preferential arrangement will leave it at 11¼ per cent for the weaving and knitting interest. That does not represent the proportion that they should get of the protection. As I have said, the spinning interest is much larger than the weaving and knitting interest, and ought therefore to get a greater amount of protection, for the reason I have already suggested. I would suggest to the Government to raise the item to 25 per cent and, if not, then to 22½ per cent. That will leave the spinners at 17 per cent, and the weaver and knitter at 9¼ per cent. That would be a better balance, and I believe it would lead to the establishment of a French top making plant costing probably \$80,000 in this coun-

try in a short time. If we got an establishment of that kind to make tops in this country, we could induce the present weavers to put in spinning plants, which they could do, and thus keep the labour in this country. I believe that the Government should strain a point and do whatever they can in favour of so important an industry as our spinning industry. I do not want to move a resolution on the subject, because if the Government does not want to concede the point, it would be absurd. I may say, also, that I have no wish to embarrass the Government, but my suggestions are in accord with those that have been made by Mr. Kendry and others engaged in the trade. If the Government will make this 22½ per cent instead of 20 per cent that will leave 17 per cent for the spinner. To make it 25 per cent would leave the knitter and weaver only 6¼ per cent, which would be too little. I do not want to be too hard on any branch of the industry and I think that 22½ per cent would be about right. It would be a benefit to this industry and would not be an injury to the consumer in that line.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some parties who are interested in this line of manufacture have suggested that the wording of the clause should be amended so as to read as follows:

Yarn, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or like animal, costing thirty cents per pound and over, when imported on a cop, tube, or in the hank for manufacturers of woollen goods for their use in their products, twenty per cent ad valorem.

The reason of this suggested amendment is that some importers buy this article in very large quantities and sell it to the smaller manufacturers. It is claimed that only two or three manufacturers in the province of Quebec can buy this article in large quantities, and sell it to the other manufacturers. But with this amendment, the importers could buy and import the article, paying the duty of 20 per cent only when it would be sold to the manufacturers for their use in their products. A similar amendment to that which I now suggest has been made in other cases. The importer could be required to pledge his oath, and regulations could be made by the Controller of Customs that would prevent the benefit of the clause going to others than those for whom it is designed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the last suggestion made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) who has just sat down, I may say that it was brought to my notice only a few moments ago by another gentleman. I am willing to take the matter into our consideration, though it is fair to point out that the privilege proposed to be granted is apt to be abused. I know that it is granted under this tariff in some other cases, but I do not think

that we should extend it more than we can help, because when an article is allowed to be imported for one purpose at one rate, while if imported for another purpose it must pay a higher rate, there is a strong temptation always to enter it at the lower rate, and there is no doubt that this privilege has been abused in the past. As to the rate of duty, I may say that that subject received very careful consideration from the Ministers, and we were led to believe that, in the general interest of the woollen trade, we should be doing right in making this duty 20 per cent. Our first proposal, as hon. gentlemen will remember, was a lower rate, but after full consideration, we concluded that 20 per cent on the yarns would give a fair chance for the spinner and for the cotton mills. It was represented that a considerable number of the mills were anxious to have the yarns at a lower rate, which would enable them to open up new lines of manufacture and do a more profitable business than in making the inferior grades which have occupied so much of their attention. I would suggest that the item be allowed to pass now, and before concurrence, I propose to consider what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has said.

Item agreed to.

Fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel and ready-made clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal, n.e.s.; blankets, bed comforters or counterpanes, flannels, cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings and felt cloth, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does not the hon. Minister think it would be well to add a little to that duty? The manufacturers of ready-made clothing have always been accustomed to have a little extra protection, and, under this, it is taken away from them altogether. It would be advisable to add to this somewhat in fairness to the manufacturers of ready-made clothing, who are very large employers of labour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is very much the same question as the shirt question, which was discussed a little while ago. I must say that I see some difficulty in meeting the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond). I am afraid we cannot increase that rate.

Mr. QUINN. Would it not be well to carry out here the system adopted in some other cases and put on a specific duty in favour of the manufacturer of clothing besides retaining the 35 per cent ad valorem? I think the hon. Minister must realize that with the high rate of duty imposed on the cloth which goes into the manufacture of clothing, it would be absolutely impossible for our wholesale clothiers to go on and continue their business.

Mr. FIELDING.

Hats, caps and bonnets, n.e.s., and hat, cap and bonnet shapes, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONK. I wish to represent to the committee that there is an important factory in this line in the town of Cote St. Paul, and those interested in it anticipate that, under the operation of the preferential clause, their business will be wiped out completely. There is a very large number of farmers' families in my constituency who do a great deal of the work for the factories which have been referred to by my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), and who will be very much affected by the reduction. A great number of the wives and daughters of the farmers do work at their homes for these factories, and, I think it is but right that I should call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the fact that he will alienate, not only the farmers, but the wives and daughters of the farmers.

Item agreed to.

Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. QUINN. Would the hon. Minister add 5 per cent to that item, because when the preferential clause comes into operation, there will be 7½ per cent taken off and the duty then will be altogether insufficient.

Item agreed to.

Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal n.e.s., sixty cents per ton of 2,000 pounds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be remembered that in an earlier stage of the session I asked that the coal items be held over. Reference was several times made to a certain statement as to the views of the Government, which was made prior to the opening of the session, and in which we indicated that the policy of the Government in this matter would be to some extent influenced by what might occur in the neighbouring states in relation to the coal trade. I am glad to be able to say that what has since occurred, though it has not gone so far as we might desire, has been in the right direction. A change has been made in the American tariff, and, so far of course as it has made any progress, the change is in the direction which we should all desire to see it made. It will be remembered that in the Dingley Bill, as first proposed, the coal duty was increased to 75 cents per ton, which we regarded as a very unfavourable duty to our trade. I am glad to note that in the Tariff Bill as it stands to-day in the Senate, a change has been made, evidently for the purpose of meeting to some extent the Canadian view of the coal question; and since our

American brethren are moving in that direction, we think it is right that we should meet them, and show that we are disposed to carry out the policy which was foreshadowed some time ago. In the American Tariff Bill as it stands to-day, the general rate of duty on coal is 75 cents, but there is a proviso which appears to have been inserted for the particular purpose of meeting the Canadian trade. That proviso declares that the duty on coal shall be 60 cents per ton when imported from any country which imposes a duty of no higher rate. Sixty cents per ton is the Canadian duty to-day, with this exception, that the American duty is upon the long ton of 2,240 pounds, while the Canadian duty is upon the short ton of 2,000 pounds; so that in reality our duty is a little higher than what they propose. We propose that item 175 shall read as follows:—

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal n.e.s., 54 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of 60 cents per ton of 2,240 pounds); provided that whenever the United States Congress shall reduce the duty on bituminous coal to a sum not exceeding 40 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation, reduce the duty mentioned in this item to 40 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds.

We are not without hope that our American neighbours, having started in the right direction by coming down to our 60 cent duty, and a little below 60 cents, may be disposed to go further; and although it is a subject in which there is some difference of opinion, we do not think that a further reduction of the American duties would be to the advantage of the Canadian coal trade.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the old United States duty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To-day it is 40 cents under the Wilson Bill; it was increased by the Dingley Bill to 75 cents, and it stands to-day in the Senate Tariff Bill at 75 cents, with this proviso, that the duty shall be not more than 60 cents when imported from a country which imposes a like duty, a proviso which has clearly been put in to meet the Canadian position. We propose by this item to meet them to that extent by imposing a duty which will be equivalent to the American duty, but which will be expressed in our short term ton at 54 cents per ton. Then, in order to encourage them to go further in well doing, we put in a proviso that if they are prepared at any future time to reduce their duty still further to 40 cents, then we shall have authority, by Order in Council, to reduce our duty to a like figure. Then, with regard to slack coal we propose as follows:—

Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, twenty per cent ad valorem, but not to exceed 13 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of 15 cents per ton of 2,240 pounds).

My hon. friend, I think, is aware that in the American tariff there is a similar provision, that that duty on slack coal shall be 15 cents per long ton from any country which imposes no higher duty. We by our tariff to-day of 20 per cent ad valorem, do not impose any higher duty; but in order that we might get the benefit of their reduction, we think it well to express the duty in our tariff in terms which will show that we are meeting them. Therefore, we put in this proviso that the 20 per cent ad valorem shall not exceed 13 cents per ton, which is the equivalent of 15 cents on the long ton. I feel that this is a settlement for the moment at all events, of the coal question, which will be in the direction of the Canadian trade. Though there are, I know, some persons who regard any reduction of our coal duty as a misfortune. I think the gentlemen interested in the coal trade themselves are, the most of them, gradually coming to the conclusion that a reasonable measure of access to the American market will be beneficial to Canadian trade.

Mr. CLARKE. What about anthracite coal? Is there any duty on that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. Inasmuch as the Americans have not proceeded with their 75 cents duty as was at first proposed, we do not think it is expedient at present to raise the question of a duty on anthracite. Circumstances might arise, if our American friends were to proceed in the other direction, we might be obliged to take that view, but as they are moving in the right direction, we prefer to meet them in the same spirit.

Mr. CLARKE. There will be no duty on anthracite coal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not propose at present that there shall be any duty on anthracite coal. That is a point which may arise in the future, if our anticipations of American action are not realized.

Mr. FOSTER. On what ground does my hon. friend proceed to make the Canadian tariff? Because this is fixed, the House adjourns next week, our duty on coal is then what the hon. gentleman proposes, if the House ratifies it. But he does not know to-day, has not the least idea, what the United States duty will be when the Tariff Bill is finally passed. The House of Representatives put a certain duty upon coal, the Senate now has been doing its part of the tariff revision, and has practically made a new tariff in many respects. But that is only one branch of the legislature. When that Senate Bill is arranged, then the point comes as to whether the House of Representatives will agree with it. If it does not agree with it, as is very probable, a conference takes place between the two and the tariff is then fixed, but not

until that time. They may fix the coal duty at 75 cents, but my hon. friend does not take any power to raise it. He makes reciprocity in coal contingent upon what is the proposal in one branch of the legislature at Washington, but when that branch of the legislature is not omnipotent, and the tariff on coal in the United States is not yet made, and is just as liable to be 75 cents as it is to be 50 or 60 cents, that my hon. friend should then put Canada in a position of giving to the American coal-owners and producers access to our markets at 54 cents per ton, whilst any of our producers who want the American market for coal would have to pay 75 cents, would be manifestly jug-handled and unfair. If, however, the United States do not proceed in the way expected, the hon. gentleman puts us in a position where their products may come into our country at a cheaper rate than our products can go into their country. If the hon. gentleman wants reciprocity in coal with the United States within certain limits, he should fix a maximum limit as well as a minimum limit, so that our duty shall be within certain limits just what the United States put upon our coal, that at least would not have the element of unfairness. But to legislate fixedly in our legislature upon what is only the action of one branch of the legislature in the United States does not seem to be proceeding with prudence.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is just a possibility that what the hon. gentleman says will turn out to be correct, that the Americans might increase their duty. But all our information, and we have taken some pains to get information so far as possible on the subject, leads us to believe that the 60 cent rate which the Senate have now adopted will be adopted by the lower House; and indeed there is a possibility, though I do not dwell much upon that, of even a lower rate being made. But we do not think it is wise to say that the thing is as certain as my hon. friend seems to think it is the other way. We think in all probability, a 60 cent rate or a better one, will be maintained, because the influences which were in favour of a 75 cent rate in the lower House are largely the influences which are now controlling the Senate, and which have virtually, as I understand, agreed to support this 60 cent rate. It would be possible, however, that what the hon. gentleman suggests might occur, and that might lead towards reconsidering the matter at an early day. But I do not think that when the Americans are moving in the right direction on that point, it would be well to assume that they are going back upon it. I think, on the contrary, we have something to gain by saying to them frankly: Now, as you have begun to move in this direction and signified by the action in the Senate your willingness to reduce this rate to 60

**Mr. FOSTER**

cents, we will meet you on the same line. I think it more likely the result will be that they will adhere to their view. If they should not, then the matter will have to be reconsidered. But we think we would serve the best interests of all concerned now by assuming that the step will be adhered to by the Republican party, which now controls both houses.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I am sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend. The Government may have sources of information that possibly we have not, and there is a strong probability, I am willing to acknowledge, that the Senate will be dominant in fixing the tariff, although there is no certainty as my hon. friend will agree. But if my hon. friend wanted to deal in a square and honest way with them instead of going the whole distance, he should simply say: Yes, we are prepared for reciprocity within certain limits, but we are not prepared to give away our market at 54 cents if you put 75 cents on yours. For we are not prepared to give our market up at 54 cents, if they put 75 cents on. So you adopt the practice of grading the duty by Order in Council making the limit as between 54 cents and the higher duty on the short ton corresponding with a possible 75 cent duty on their long ton. It would be saying to the Americans what we all want to say that we are willing to trade with them on equal terms. I do not think we ought to go farther than that. I think that would be taking a fair and honest position, if we were to legislate within the limits of the 75 and the 54 cent rate, taking our short ton in comparison with their long ton.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The duty on coal in the United States has been considerably lower than ours, and I think we have something to gain by showing in the most emphatic and formal way we can on our statute-books that we are disposed to meet them if they want a lower rate than 75 cents. The question of a 75 cent rate of duty has ceased to be a practical one. The 40 cent rate under the Wilson Bill, and the 60 cent rate imposed in the Senate are before us. If our duty were made higher there would be something in the argument of the United States that they have been in a position to deal with us and that we have not been willing to meet them half way, because we have been upholding a 60 cent duty while they had a 40 cent duty.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Yes, but the political complexion has changed.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We think that in this particular matter there is something to be gained by the Canadian people meeting the United States in the right spirit, and I think there is a possibility of their meeting us in the same spirit. It is not wise to be too critical and to assume that they do not mean to do that which they seem to be willing to do.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would be very pleased indeed if I could think that the concession which the Minister of Finance proposes to make is likely to result in any substantial advantage to the Canadian coal owners and so far as my knowledge of the managers of these works goes, they do not anticipate that any advantage will be derived from any attempt to placate the authorities at Washington. So far as the duty on coal is concerned on the bulk and value coming from the United States into Canada as compared with that going from Canada into the United States our duty has been infinitely lower than theirs because the large proportion of the product of the United States coming into this country is hard coal upon which we impose no duty at all. So that it is very far from being the case that Canada is imposing a higher duty than the United States on coal. Our duty on coal is exceedingly small in comparison with theirs. Another point to be kept in mind is the fact that a good deal of coal comes not from the United States but from Scotland and England. That portion of the trade will be benefited in the future by 25 per cent under the reciprocal clause of the tariff so that coal instead of having a duty of 54 cents will only have about 40½ cents coming from Great Britain. In reference to the remarks made by the Minister of Finance as to the advantages to be derived by Canada and Canadian coal owners under concessions to be made by the United States Government, my acquaintance with the coal owners and managers leads me to believe that in so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned they do not anticipate any advantage. The fact of the matter is to the best of my knowledge the prices at which soft coal is sold and delivered in the United States to large railway corporations and others is so exceedingly low that it will be impossible for producers of coal in Nova Scotia to take advantage even of an open market in the United States. I have been informed on what I regard as good authority that contracts have been made by railway companies in the United States for the delivery of coal at \$2.16 per ton. If that is the case it is absolutely impossible for the Canadian coal producers to get any market whatever in the United States and I am very much afraid that the most that can be expected in Nova Scotia is the benefit that may result to the Dominion Coal Company in Cape Breton and to no other producers. It cannot help the coal miners in Pictou and Cumberland counties. So far as my knowledge goes it would only be of this advantage that the Dominion Coal Company might perhaps be enabled to deliver some small quantities of coal at the seaports in the extreme eastern part of the United States; it will be utterly impossible for them to reach any points inland in the United States where coal is largely consumed.

I think it was rather an unfortunate thing that the Government should have concluded to tie their hands in so far as any legislation in this matter is concerned by the action now proposed. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) should pay a considerable amount of attention to the fact which has been presented by the ex-Finance Minister who pointed out that it was not at all possible to say what duty the United States might put upon coal. They may in any case put on a duty of 75 cents per ton. In that case as this House is about to prorogue it might be impossible for the Government to take any action to remedy what would be an unfortunate change in the tariff. My hon. friend is not right that it will be better to lose a little for a few months. If the proposal is adopted it will cover a period during which all the coal contracts of the great corporations in Canada involving the purchase of a large amount of coal will be made, and great injury will result to the coal trade in Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada before it is in the power of Parliament to make the matter right. I am sure it would not be difficult to frame a clause so as to provide for that contingency. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) now provides for the contingency of the United States lowering their rate; why not provide for the other contingency of their raising their rate. I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance realizes how very little is to be gained by the Nova Scotia producers through the introduction of coal into the United States, and if the Nova Scotia producers should lose the Canadian market before Parliament should meet again, the coal interest will suffer a great disadvantage without any possibility of countervailing this whatever. I am alive to the fact that the Government is opposed to placing any duty on anthracite coal, and I may say that our miners in Nova Scotia will be disappointed at this determination of the Government, because I have heard it argued that a duty on anthracite coal would be paid not by the people of Canada but by the producers in the United States. This duty would be a great advantage to the coal producers of Nova Scotia and it seems to me that a strong case can be made out in support of the contention that the duty would not be paid by the consumer in Canada but by those great competing corporations in the United States who control the prices of anthracite and who can raise them far more than the amount of a 50 cent duty if it suits them to do so. I am sure it would not result in any injury to Canada if a duty on anthracite coal were imposed. But that would be too much to ask because it would be asking the Government to go beyond the measure of protection given by the late Government on coal. I am, however, justified in asking that the present amount of protection be retained. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows how much difficulty is ex-

perienced by the coal managers of Nova Scotia in giving employment to the men who mine the coal for a sufficient number of days in the week to enable the population of our villages to live in comfort. It is a hard thing for the coal owners to do anything at all; they have not been realizing profits and they find it impossible to give employment to the mining population to enable them to live in comfort. I would urge my hon. friend at least, in drafting his resolution, to so prepare it, as to guard against any possibility of the United States either raising their tariff or leaving it at a point as high as it is at present.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is mistaken when, in the closing words of his remarks, which are in excellent taste, coming as they do from the representative of a coal county, he assumes the probability of the Americans raising their duty above the 60 cents. He overlooks the fact that the Americans, for many years have had their duty much below ours.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). I refer to the 60-cent rate which was first suggested.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If the American duty were now and had been for some time 75 cents, there might have been some force in my hon. friend's argument; but inasmuch as it has been for some time 40 cents, considerably below ours, we have been placed at a disadvantage in the discussion of the coal duty at Washington. Where my hon. friend and I disagree is as to the value which the American market is to the coal trade. That has been a vexed question in the past. I know that many coal miners have not taken the view that the American market was of much consequence to them; but I think there is a growing feeling among them that it is of value to them. My hon. friend says that one company only would obtain any advantage from that market. That company, however, the Dominion Coal Company, is the largest in Nova Scotia. It operates a number of mines, and its operations are very extensive; and if it could obtain access to the American market, it would be a very important advantage to that company. But one thing my hon. friend has entirely overlooked, and I ask him to consider it. It is true, the owners of the mines in his own county of Pictou have not generally regarded the American market as of much value to them, and they still may maintain that view, though I think some of them are coming to the view that it is of value to them in an indirect way. He says that to-day it is hard to get employment for our coal miners. That is true. Why? Because we have been mining coal for the limited market of the Dominion of Canada. Because we have more coal output in the province of Nova Scotia than we can find a market for; and if we are to go in that way, we shall

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou).

often have hard times for our miners. We shall have short periods of prosperity, followed by periods of depression; whereas, if we could get access to the American market, through the influence of the large interest that wants our coal, not to please us, but to please themselves, we would have some hope of developing the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and affording a larger measure of employment to the people than we can hope to afford so long as we confine ourselves to the limited market of Canada. That great corporation, the Dominion Coal Company, have been reaching out for the American market, and making a struggle which a weak company could not do; and if it secured an outlet there for the product of its mines, it would be in a smaller degree a competitor of the other coal miners at home; and then the Pictou and Cumberland mines would have a better chance of competing in the home market. But if this great, powerful company has no access to the American market, it is going to compete with the other companies for the coal trade of Montreal, which is the principal market at present. The competition of this company in the only market open to them is going to be severe, and the mining companies to which my hon. friend has referred have every interest in striving to get access to the American market for our coal, because they will, to that extent, diminish the competition that occurs at the present time at Montreal, and the miners who do not expect to ship coal to the States are beginning to see that point. If we assume, then, that it is desirable to get access to the American market, look at the position which we have occupied for some years past. The Americans have brought the duty down to 40 cents, and we have had the duty at 60 cents, and whenever any one has proposed that we should be given better terms in the American market, the answer has been made, "Your duty is above ours, and you will have to meet us on even terms." I think we ought at once to bring down our coal duty to the point at which they propose to fix theirs. They do not propose to continue it at 40 per cent, and we do not propose to bring ours down to that figure. But, in the new tariff Bill it is fixed at 60 cents, and I think that we would make a mistake in the interest of the coal producers of Nova Scotia and of British Columbia, both of which have to be considered in this House, if we did not take power to fix our duty as now proposed. As long as they move in the direction of a reduction, let us meet them, and when they cease to move in that direction, then it will be time enough for us to revise our judgment.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). The Government are putting it out of their power to revise their judgment by their operations of this year. I do not think there would be any difficulty in the Finance Minister arranging his motion so as to

provide for that contingency. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says about the stress of the home competition being increased if the Dominion Coal Company are shut out of the American market; but the action of the United States is in that direction, because they are raising the duty 50 per cent, even if they adopt the lower rate of 60 cents instead of 75 cents. So that all the circumstances of the case are precisely those that will increase the competition in the Canadian market; and now is the time when that market should be carefully conserved for the Nova Scotia and British Columbia producers. But just in the face of the Dominion Coal Company being shut out of the American market, the hon. gentleman proposes to take away the protection they at present have, and therefore the whole stress of his argument tells against his own proposition.

Mr. ELLIS. Of course, we could not expect the Minister of Finance to take the duty off coal altogether, but if he had done so he would have no doubt met the public opinion of the province from which I come better than he could by many other things he has in his tariff. The province of New Brunswick wants free coal. We get some relief under the operation of the preferential clause so far as it applies to English coal; but, unfortunately, there are not now so many vessels that bring coal for ballast as formerly, steamers finding it more convenient to carry water ballast, and the relief from that direction is not so great as it might be supposed to be. In our province we find matters rather hard, between the oil tax and the flour tax for the benefit of Ontario, and the coal tax for the benefit of Nova Scotia. The one redeeming feature in the tariff which Sir Charles Tupper brought down when he proposed the iron duties was the relief he gave from the duty on anthracite coal from the United States, and it is utterly absurd for my hon. friend to say that at any time the American producer of coal pays the duty. It is undoubtedly the consumer of coal who pays the duty in the end. One of the last things I would desire to see would be a duty on anthracite coal, which goes so largely into consumption, particularly in the province from which I come, for the benefit of the coal producers of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HENDERSON. I sent the hon. Controller of Customs a memo. respecting item 497, asking him to amend it by inserting the word quebracho in the sixth line. It is a tanning extract used in the tanning of light leather and has come into use during the past two years. It would be used to a much larger extent if placed on the free list. Nearly all those extracts are already on the free list, and it would simplify the tariff by placing this one along with the rest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend handed me a memo. on the subject which unfortunately I have mislaid, but I shall look into it and bring the matter up again.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I should also like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to item 497. In the old tariff there was a provision placing "patent prepared dyes" on the free list, which I see has been omitted from this item. I would ask the hon. Minister to include that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall look it up.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman will find it in item 572 of the old tariff. There is another item to which I would like to call his attention, and that is item No. 538. In the old tariff, the corresponding clause reads: "Olive oil for manufacturing purposes," but in item 538 of this tariff it reads: "Olive oil for manufacturing soap." That would prevent its being used for other purposes in manufacturing, such as combing wool for making worsted tops. It has been on the free list up to the present, and I think it should remain on the free list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall look into it.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I would also call the hon. gentleman's attention to another item. In the old free list, acids used for medicinal, chemical or manufacturing purposes, not otherwise specially provided for, were included. I do not know whether this was omitted intentionally or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was left out intentionally because it was subject to much abuse.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I beg to lay on the Table copies of Order in Council and reports in connection with the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. The leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells me that the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) asked to have brought down a copy of a report which he said had been furnished with respect to this same subject, the taking over of the Drummond County Railway and the valuing of the road, during his administration. I have communicated with the Deputy Minister, who informs me that he made no such report whatever. The only reports that he made on the subject he made from time to time for the purpose of entitling the Government to the payment of subsidies which were being earned by it under the Subsidy Acts. Beyond that,

the Deputy Minister tells me, he furnished to the ex-Minister when the late Government were considering this same subject, an estimate of the cost or value of the Drummond County Railway, and these are the only reports or statements which were furnished by him to the late Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Were any reports made by an engineer under the instructions of the department, though not made by the Deputy Minister?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I did not ask him with regard to that, though I am almost inclined to think there were none. But I was informed that the ex-Minister of Railways stated that the report was from the Deputy Minister himself and, that being my information, my question was only directed to that point.

#### DISMISSALS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I also desire, Mr. Speaker, to lay upon the Table a copy of the telegram sent by myself to the General Manager of the Intercolonial at Moncton, asking him to furnish me with a list of those dismissed on the Intercolonial Railway. It will be remembered that I gave a statement from recollection, but I have the despatch now, and I produce it, together with the general manager's reply and the list furnished by him.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 137) respecting trials by jury in certain cases in the North-west Territories—from the Senate.—(Mr. Davies.)

Bill (No. 138) further to amend the Criminal Code of 1882—from the Senate.—(Mr. Davies.)

#### ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I had intended to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to go on a little further but, on consideration, I think we cannot, in conscience, seek to keep him longer. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. leader of the House tell us what will be taken up tomorrow?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In the morning probably the fast line service, and, perhaps, any other Bills that want a stage. Then, if, as I hope, we get through these promptly, we shall probably go on with the Supplementary Estimates. In the afternoon probably the Bill

Mr. BLAIR.

for the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal will be taken up, and any other subjects that the hon. gentleman will allow us to proceed with.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th June, 1897.

PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 139) further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Act respecting Judges of the Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Davies.)

#### RAILWAY RATES AND TOLLS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What are the general rates and tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, west bound, from the city of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, to the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, as now charged or as contained in its present freight tariff, whichever rates are now the lowest, for carloads or otherwise, upon the classes of merchandise hereinafter mentioned, whether the shipment be by all rail line or by lake and rail: Upon all green and fresh fruits; coal oil; cordage and binder twine; agricultural implements of all kinds, set up or in parts; iron, including bar, band, Canada plates, galvanized sheet, pipe, pipe-fittings, nails, spikes and horse shoes; all kinds of wire; window glass; paper for building and roofing purposes; roofing felt, box and packing; paints of all kinds and oils; live stock; wooden-ware; household furniture?

2. What are the said company's rates and tolls on grain and flour, respectively, east bound, from said city of Winnipeg to said city of Toronto by all rail line or by lake and rail?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to stipulate in any agreement with said company for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway for special or reduced rates and tolls on any other articles of merchandise than those named in questions one and two; as, for example, hides and skins, eastbound, and manufactures of leather westbound?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not in a position to explain to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) as to what the general rates and tolls on the Canadian Pacific Railway, west bound, are, but I can, as I suppose the hon. gentleman can, procure a tariff schedule and hand it to him; nor can I say what

the companies' present rates and tolls are on grain and flour, respectively, east bound from the city of Winnipeg. Question No. 3: It is not the intention of the Government to include in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway any other articles or merchandise than those named in the agreement of which notice has already been given.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to make a personal explanation. A few days ago, speaking about the Quebec bridge in the House, I said that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) in a moment of bad humour against his leader had said at Quebec, "no bridge, no vote." The hon. gentleman denied the assertion and asked me to give my authority. I said at the time that this had been reported in the public press and he also denied that, I said that I had read that somewhere and to-day I give to the House proof of my statement. I referred to a statement made in the Quebec House on the 21st March, 1890, by the Hon. L. J. Pelletier, ex-Attorney General of Quebec, in the presence of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) who was sitting as the member for Quebec County in the House.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I expect from the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) that he will conclude with a motion.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** No.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Then I object to a discussion of this kind being raised on the pretext of a personal explanation.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** I am afraid from what I gathered of his remarks that any question such as is raised by the hon. member (Mr. Choquette) would lead to a discussion and so, therefore, I think the hon. gentleman had better put himself in order by concluding with a motion.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** It was not my intention to conclude with a motion. I made an assertion here which was denied and I desire to put the proof before the House.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** We want to know before he proceeds whether he will conclude with a motion.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** It would not be fair to me if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) did not conclude with a motion, because he would be putting something before the House to which I could not reply.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The hon. member (Mr. Choquette) will conclude with a motion.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I do not wish to raise a debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair; order, order.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The hon. gentleman will understand that upon the Orders of the Day being called, there is no more parliamentary right for any speech to be made without a motion being before us than at any other time. But a practice has grown up in this House of introducing any important public question that urgently requires an answer from the Government, or a personal explanation may be in order at any time, but a personal explanation must be an explanation of what an hon. gentleman has said himself, not what anybody else has said, and therefore I think in anything of that kind which involves discussion or a reply should not be brought up in this way, but if the hon. gentleman wishes to bring it up, and wishes to move the adjournment of the House, he is at liberty to do so.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I wish to put the House in possession of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** I think the hon. member had better adopt my suggestion.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I will not make a motion.

#### FISHERY INSPECTION.

**Mr. CLANCY** asked:

Has Henry Linley, of Cedar Springs, in the county of Kent, fishery inspector, been dismissed? If so, has his successor been appointed, and what is his salary or remuneration?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). The answer to question 1 is, yes. The answer to question 2 is, yes; at a salary of \$125 per annum.

#### BUOY SERVICE AT MABOU HARBOUR.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. Were tenders invited shortly before the local general elections in Nova Scotia, in April last, for the buoy service at Mabou Harbour?

2. If so, did the lowest tenderer refuse to accept the contract?

3. Was the next tenderer asked to perform the contract, or did he express his readiness to accept it?

4. If the next tenderer signified his willingness to do the work, was his offer accepted, and if not, why not?

5. When were new tenders invited?

6. To whom were blank forms of tender distributed?

7. What was the amount finally accepted for the work, and who was the successful tenderer?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). The answer to the first question is: Post bills were sent out on the 8th April last inviting tenders up to the 25th of April for this buoy service.

No. 2. Yes. On the 4th of May the harbour master, by direction, called upon the person whose tender was the lowest to place the buoys, but he did not begin the work. The contract was sent him to sign. No. 3. Yes, but reply not received until it was decided to call for new tenders. No. 4. Answered by former question. No. 5. Bills sent out 2nd June to 12th June. No. 6. To harbour master for distribution and posting, when the first poster was sent out. No. 7. \$20 per annum. Edward Doyle.

#### FISHING ON RIVER MATANE.

Mr. Fiset asked :

1. Whether the Government has leased for rod-fishing, during the summer season, that part of the River Matane which is affected by the tide ?

2. If so, to whom has the river been leased, for how many years and on what conditions, and is it the intention of the Government to deprive the riparian proprietors, on that part of the river, of their right to fish with rod and line in front of their own land ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Walter Cassels, for nine years from 1st January, 1894, on payment of an annual rental of \$100, and to efficiently guard and protect the river at his own expense, also to build and maintain in the dam across said river (known as Price's dam) an efficient fishway. Mr. Cassels having the exclusive right of fishing under his lease, the Government is unable to grant the right of fishing to riparian proprietors.

#### ONTARIO APPEALS TO SUPREME COURT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the judges thereof.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman explain this Bill ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Bill has for its object to restrict the appeals to the Supreme Court except in certain specified cases arising in the province of Ontario. A Bill similar in terms was introduced in the Ontario legislature, but as it was beyond the power of the province of Ontario to regulate appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, this Bill is introduced to give effect to that which was done in the province of Ontario.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing in this Bill which will affect anything sub judice ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. It is a simple matter of procedure, and will therefore apply only to future cases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This Bill strikes me as one of great importance. Of course, it comes with very great authority to this House, as it affects the province of

Mr. DAVIES.

Ontario simply, and is introduced by the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat). But the effect of this Bill is to introduce a very important change into the law affecting appeals from the greatest province of the Dominion, that is, to provide that no appeal shall lie from the Court of Appeal of Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada except in certain cases. My impression is that there have been important cases—my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong—in which the Court of Appeal of Ontario has been unanimous, and the judgment of that court has been reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada. If that be the case, the House will see that it is a very serious matter to deprive, not individuals, but the whole population of Ontario, of the right of an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, which has been established and is sustained at great expense to this country. The excepted cases, in which appeals are allowed, are : where the title to real estate or some interest therein is in question ; where the validity of a patent is affected ; where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$1,000, exclusive of costs. While these large interests are protected, the Bill is certainly likely to curtail the rights now enjoyed by the people of Ontario to have a judgment of the Supreme Court in matters which may be of vital consequence to them, though not exceeding \$1,000. There is already a great protection against unnecessary and ill-founded appeals to the Supreme Court in cases involving smaller amounts than \$1,000, because the parties would necessarily have to pay a large amount of costs. I do not propose to say more, as this is a legal matter ; but it strikes me as a very radical change in the administration of justice in Canada. We have established a Supreme Court to which the humblest citizen has an equal right with the most wealthy and powerful to have the advantage of an appeal, if they so desire and have the means of carrying it on, and this Bill would seem in a large number of cases to limit the right now enjoyed by the people.

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand this Bill, in an election case, for instance, we could not appeal to the Supreme Court from the Court of Appeal of Ontario without the consent of the latter court.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is there any possibility of such a thing as that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. There is a specific tribunal appointed under the election law.

Mr. TISDALE. I apprehend that an appeal could be taken direct from the Superior Court of Ontario to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Could it get to the Court of Appeal in Ontario ?

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot say. I am merely raising the question. I am not as conversant with the practice of the courts as I formerly was, not having paid attention to the changes in the procedure; but that is one of the questions that might be raised. The Bill provides that no appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court except in four cases, namely, where the title of real estate or some interest therein is in question; where the validity of a patent is affected; where the matter in controversy exceeds the value of \$1,000 exclusive of costs; where the matter relates to the taking of an annual or other rent, customary or duty or fee, or a like demand of a general or public nature affecting future rights, and in other cases, where the special leave of the Court of Appeal for Ontario or of the Supreme Court of Canada to appeal is granted. I am not prepared to say that it is an unreasonable proposition to fix a limit in amount of money, but where there are questions of principle involved, the right to appeal should not be limited by any amount of money, as questions of principle are beyond all questions of money. There must be many questions of principles outside these four exceptions I have mentioned. It is a principle of British law and Canadian law that in matters of principle there should be no limit to the right to appeal to the highest tribunal possible, and as far as my memory goes, this is the first attempt made to put in the control of the court of appeal the right to appeal from the decision of that court in matters of principle. I do not say that there is no need of limiting appeals, but we should be careful how we run the risk, to use the mildest expression, of curtailing our federal rights by making the right of appeal to the Supreme Court, which is a federal court, dependent on the consent of the appeal court of the province. We might, thus be making our right of appeal on a question of principle arising between the province and the Dominion dependent on consent of the appeal court of the province.

Mr. McNEILL. This is unquestionably a very grave matter, and I am quite sure the gravity of it justifies the criticisms that have been passed on the measure. It seems to me that after all we need not very much fear doing what is suggested, because, as I understand it,—and if I am wrong my hon. friend the Solicitor General will correct me—the principle of the Bill had been accepted by the Ontario legislature, and is only not the law in Ontario because it was found that the Ontario legislature had not the power to give effect to the wishes of the representatives of that province.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). There was a case before the Supreme Court in which that court declared that the law passed by the Ontario legislature was ultra vires.

Mr. McNEILL. Then I understand we are simply giving effect to the desires and wishes of the representatives of the people of Ontario. Was there any substantial opposition to the measure in the provincial legislature?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I know nothing of what took place in the provincial legislature, but I had a case in which the Supreme Court declared the legislation of Ontario in this respect was ultra vires.

Mr. McNEILL. It was at all events the desire of the representatives of the people in that legislature, and we must remember that after all the public, especially those who are not very affluent members of the commonwealth, require legislation of this kind very much. It is no doubt a very serious matter to interfere with the right of appeal from one point of view, but from another point of view it is very important to protect litigants from vexatious appeals—appeals which are carried by wealthy corporations and which often make it impossible for private individuals to vindicate their rights before the courts at all. The very fact that such an appeal is hanging over a litigant often makes it impossible for him to vindicate his just rights in the courts. It is unquestionably from this point of view I judge that this legislation has been approved by the provincial legislature, and that we have been asked to do for the province what its own legislature was unable to do, that is to say, give effect to the wishes of the people of that province.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may be proper for me to state that, so far as election cases are concerned, arising out of federal elections, they naturally would be governed by our own statutes, and the courts vested with the trial of these election matters are by that fact alone federal courts. It has been laid down that provincial courts, quoad election cases are federal courts, and an appeal lies from these courts to the Supreme Court. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that in Ontario alone, of all the provinces of the Dominion, the right of appeal to the Supreme Court is unlimited. In all the other provinces, the appeals are limited according to the amount involved. In the province of Quebec, there is no appeal to the Supreme Court in any case in which the amount involved does not exceed \$2,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are there many appeals from Ontario?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand there are a great many.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not question that point and quite concur in the idea of the \$1,000 limit, but what I object to is mix-

ing all these other things in a blanket, as it were.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There will be right of appeal to the Supreme Court, under this Bill, in all cases in which the amount involved exceeds \$1,000. In all other cases involving future rights, titles to land, rights of the Crown and anything of that sort, the right of appeal will exist, independent of the amount involved, and in every case without exception an appeal may be granted by the court from whose decision the appeal is desired.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). As my hon. friend has properly said, the *raison d'être* of this measure lies in the fact that the Ontario legislature has abolished intermediate appeals. Appeals now go from the divisional court to the court of appeal, and the consequence is there is an enormous number of trivial cases brought before the Appeal Court of Ontario. This Bill does not limit the right of appeal from the divisional court, from a final judgment of any court in Ontario, but it only limits the right of appeal from the Appeal Court of Ontario.

Mr. TISDALE. I have lost track of the procedure. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) would, no doubt, be able to inform us on that point. My recollection is that, at one time, at all events, when I was not so rusty upon the procedure as I am now, an appeal had first to be taken to the Court of Appeal before you could go to the Supreme Court. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lount) may remember how that is. My impression is that we must still go to the Court of Appeal. Therefore, in many matters of principle there is danger here.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members, I trust, will remember that we are not yet in the Committee of the Whole. I would suggest that it would be better to go into Committee of the Whole and have this discussion there—it will be more regular.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before we go into Committee of the Whole, I would call the attention of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to an anomaly which exists in the law of the province of Quebec. No appeal can be taken from the Court of Queen's Bench to the Supreme Court in any case where the amount demanded does not exceed \$2,000; but by an amendment made in the law some years ago, appeals were permitted from the Court of Review of the province of Quebec, and, strangely enough, the amount in that case is not the same as when the appeal comes from the Court of Queen's Bench. I think the amendment was 54 and 55 Victoria, chapter 25. It provides that the amount in any case of appeal shall be not less than £500 sterling, when it comes from the Court of Review. I do not see any reason why this difference

Mr TISDALE.

should exist between a case coming from the Court of Review and a case coming from the Court of Queen's Bench. Probably this would be the time to bring this matter before the House so as to amend the law and make the amount the same in either case. I remember the case of *Couture versus Bouchard*, brought to the Supreme Court, on an appeal from the Court of Review, in which the amount involved was \$2,006. If the appeal had come from the Court of Queen's Bench, the amount would have been large enough to allow the appeal to the Supreme Court, but coming from the Court of Review, as it was not £500 sterling, the appeal was not allowed. This should be remedied.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That matter will be considered hereafter. The difficulty referred to arose from a misunderstanding on the part of those who drew the Bill. They evidently confused the appeal to the Privy Council with the appeal to the Supreme Court. This Bill is simply to reenact what has already been passed by the legislature of Ontario.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not propose to occupy the time of the committee at any length, but I have asked a question which I think, probably, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount), who is a member of the bar, can answer, and which, I think, is of interest to the House. I have raised the point that this proposed law would deprive the people of the province of Ontario of a right which they now enjoy, and of which, as the Solicitor General has shown, they avail themselves of to a very large extent. If this Bill passes, a large number of appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada will be shut off. The answer is that this applies to the province of Ontario, and that the legislature of Ontario have already passed a similar law which was found to be *ultra vires* and, therefore, they are obliged to come here. Now, I would not like to be bound to hold that as a satisfactory answer, because the legislature of Ontario have done a good many things that I think they ought not to have done, things to which there was grave objection. What I ask is whether there was any substantial opposition to the adoption of this law in the legislature of Ontario on the part of any considerable number of the representatives of the people. If there was not, that would go a great way with me. But if the law was carried by a majority against the protests of a number of representatives of the people, I should be disposed to give great weight to that fact.

Mr. LOUNT. In partial answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles

Tupper), I may say that this Bill is the embodiment of what might be called the best legal talent in Ontario. The benchers of the law society met and considered very carefully all matters which related to the proposals embodied in this Bill. I am not aware to what extent there was opposition to this Bill in the Ontario legislature, but I have not heard, and I do not remember seeing in the newspaper reports that there was any opposition.

Mr. BRITTON. It is necessary, apparently, that there should be some limit to the amount in which appeal can be allowed from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court. Whatever that amount may be, it must be arbitrarily fixed. It has been thought by those who have considered the matter that \$1,000, exclusive of interest, would be a fair and proper amount as a minimum in a case in which appeal was allowed to the Supreme Court. Apart from that question, I wish to point out that this Bill does not, apparently, deprive any considerable class of their right to go as far as they like, because hon. gentlemen will see that there may be an appeal to the Supreme Court :

(a.) Where the title to real estate or some interest therein is in question ;

(b.) Where the validity of a patent is affected ;

(c.) Where the matter in controversy in the appeal exceeds the sum or value of one thousand dollars, exclusive of costs ;

(d.) Where the matter in question relates to the taking of an annual or other rent, customary or other duty or fee, or a like demand of a general or public nature affecting future rights ;

(e.) In other cases where the special leave of the Court of Appeal for Ontario or of the Supreme Court of Canada to appeal to such last mentioned court is granted.

This takes in all cases of frontage taxes upon lands for local improvements in cities and towns, and also in case of drainage in townships, and all similar questions. It will be observed, also, that it allows an appeal in all cases where permission is granted by the Court of Appeal. If I understood the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) aright, he said that it was unprecedented to leave the discretion as to whether there should be an appeal to the court whose decision was appealed from. Any objection of that kind is obviated, because the Bill allows the Supreme Court also to grant permission to appeal. So, it seems to provide for almost every possible case that may arise—that is if you once determine that appeal shall not be allowed in an amount under \$1,000, and that is the only question that is debatable. I know one case in which unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal was overruled by the Supreme Court. I know one case which has been cited with a good deal of comment in which, in an Ontario matter, all the judges of the province of Ontario who pronounced upon it, and

one of the judges of the Supreme Court were on one side and judges outside of the province of Ontario on the other side. And yet that decision—of course, as it was a decision of the court of last resort—fixed the law under an Ontario statute and in a matter relating to property in Ontario. That is, of course, an anomaly, and I do not think that there can be any argument founded on the fact that in some cases the decision of the Supreme Court may overrule the unanimous decision of the Court of Appeal. Now, one other point. As the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) said, this matter was referred to the law society to get their opinion on legislation of this kind. I do not remember the precise terms of the Ontario statute. I assume that what the hon. member for Centre Toronto says is correct. I did not know that this matter was coming up and, therefore, did not look into it. Assuming, though, that the Ontario statute is exactly the same as this, that matter was considered by the benchers, and they thought that the limitation of appeals to the Supreme Court to \$1,000 and upwards was right, and, on the other point, they thought, as I now have expressed it, that it was better to limit the right of appeal as is provided in the statute.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There has been a good deal of difficulty in interpreting this clause in the Supreme Court as regards the province of Quebec, because it was a question whether the amount demanded was the amount which should decide the jurisdiction of the court, or the amount of the judgment in the lower court. For instance, where an action for \$10,000 damages is taken out, and the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench from which the appeal was brought, was only for \$100, it was in several cases decided that there was no appeal. But since then the law, I think, has been amended so as to make the amount demanded decide the jurisdiction of the court. Of course the question of interpretation may arise upon these words, but if the wording of the clause was changed to mean the amount demanded, then there could be no difficulty in the interpretation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the section of the statute originally included the amount in controversy.

Mr. BRITTON. That is an important point, because it has either been lately decided in Ontario, or it is sub judice now. A case comes up in this way : Action is brought for \$1,000 damages, an amount, say, of \$500 is recovered, and the judgment would go for \$500. But the plaintiff claims a much larger sum than that, and still the judgment goes for the \$500. As between that and the \$1,000, there is really only \$500 in controversy. So it is a question as to whether the amount actually in controversy at the time of the appeal, is to govern, or whether

the amount claimed by the plaintiff is to govern ; and that ought to be settled in some way.

Mr. TISDALE. I see great objection to changing the phraseology. In any case people would always claim damages to a large enough amount if they had a desire for litigation. I am strongly in favour of shutting off appeals where it is simply a money matter, and \$1,000 I think is quite a reasonable amount. I am glad to hear what fell from the lips of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) that this matter had been considered by the Law Society of Ontario, because if they have approved of it, that would satisfy me. No doubt that body is the most representative that could be got. I think if you do not adopt this wording, you would leave an opening for doubt and trouble.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There have been rulings of the Supreme Court holding that the amount in controversy means the amount demanded. But in order to put the point beyond dispute, so far as Quebec is concerned, I suggest that we add the following as a subsection :—

Whenever the right to appeal is dependent upon the amount in dispute, such amount should be understood to be that demanded and not that recovered, if they are different.

Mr. FRASER. I think it should be the reverse, in order to stop appeals, and that it should be the amount recovered instead of the amount demanded.

Mr. SPROULE. It is all in the hands of the lawyers now, and if they wish to continue the litigation they will advise their clients to put the amount high enough so that there may always be an appeal. I agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that it would be a much fairer thing to say the award of the court was the amount upon which the appeal should be made, instead of the amount claimed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have the greatest possible reluctance to interfere among my learned friends. My experience of the law has been that of a litigant, and I think it would be greatly for the benefit of the great majority of the people of Canada to have as few appeals as possible ; and I am in favour of limiting the power of appeals—speaking simply in my individual capacity.

Mr. SPROULE. Then if we adopted the other wording and provide that it is the judgment of the court below that regulates the amount, it would be much better, because it would shut off a great many appeals.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That would not be fair for the plaintiff. I think the amendment that was introduced here in 1891 was the

Mr. BRITTON.

result of many years' experience in litigation before the Supreme Court. It was the result of a great deal of discussion, and was passed by the House unanimously, not only by the lawyers, but also with the consent of those unfortunate people who have to come to lawyers for advice, and sometimes to pay costs.

Bill reported.

#### FAST ATLANTIC SS. SERVICE.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution, page 3976, declaring it expedient that the fast line contract be ratified and confirmed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Before this debate is proceeded with I would like to state to the House that I accidentally omitted one matter of considerable importance. Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. agreed besides the stipulation contained in the contract that they would establish a freight service of vessels of speed and capacity, and one condition of this freight service was that in the summer season they would go to Montreal and in the winter season they would go to whichever of the ports, Halifax or St. John, was not selected by the contractors for the fast service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to ask the hon. gentleman what the speed of these boats he speaks of is to be ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They will be not less than the Beaver Line of speed and probably considerably more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is an average speed of 11 knots an hour ; that is for freight service, you will understand.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair yesterday I was reading an extract from Mr. Sandford Fleming's pamphlet on this question and I ask that I may be allowed to finish that extract. As I said the other day, both the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and his friends are in favour of this and that being the case of course the Government will have the support from the other side of the House, so that nothing I can say will induce the Government to take any other course. Having expressed my objection as I have done I will content myself with concluding the extract that I was reading the other day. I may only further say that had I any encouragement that the Government would in any way deal with this matter I could have furnished them with a larger number of facts and figures to convince them of the inapplicability of

the fast line service to the St. Lawrence route, but being convinced as I am that the Government and most of their supporters are in favour of this project I shall not detain the House at this late stage of the session by continuing the debate any longer than by simply reading the balance of the extract that I commenced the other day. Mr. Fleming proceeds :

With respect to all that has appeared in the press on this subject, I can only remark that I have consulted many experienced men, the commanders of mail steamships and others, and I have read everything published which I have been able to obtain, but I have seen nothing not in accord with the facts I have submitted. I will add, that no one would more truly rejoice than myself, if the investigation of the facts led to different conclusions. I repeat the main conclusions to which I conceive these irresistibly lead :

1. That our great waterway, the St. Lawrence, will always be employed to the greatest advantage in the conveyance of staple products and all ordinary merchandise at the lowest possible rates ; and that to secure low rates the products must be carried on steamships of moderate speed. 2 That any attempt to establish on the St. Lawrence route, now followed, a line of trans-Atlantic steamships to rival those running to and from New York, must result in disappointment. 3. That if we desire to establish such a fast line successfully, the steamships must arrive at and take their departure from one of our Atlantic seaports.

I referred to the advantages and disadvantages of several ocean ports in the maritime provinces, and mentioned those which seemed to be entitled to the preference ; but the gravamen of my offence is, in having pointed out, as mildly as possible, that steamships could not run regularly at great speed with ordinary safety between Montreal or Quebec and the United Kingdom by the ordinary route followed.

These are the conclusions arrived at, Mr. Speaker, by a gentleman well qualified to judge of the feasibility of the St. Lawrence route and I am therefore fully convinced that the statement that I have already made cannot be refuted, that the St. Lawrence route is unsuitable for a 20-knot service. This matter was taken up some time ago by some parties as a pure speculation and I will simply read one extract from an article sent to the Toronto "Globe" by a correspondent on the 14th of August, 1896, when this matter was before the public before :

The agitation for a fast Atlantic service was originally started by speculators, who, for their own personal ends, asked the Government of Canada to endorse their scheme, so that they would be able to float it in Great Britain. Sir Charles Tupper, under the impression that the fast line was a drawing card in the country and would help them in the general elections, adopted this scheme as a Government measure, but the fast line was voted down, along with the other extravagant measures proposed by the Conservative party. Let our present Government learn wisdom from the past and ignore all such schemes, and let there be an end to extravagance, at least until the country has had an opportunity to re-

cover from the enormous burdens placed upon it by the lavish expenditures incurred by Sir Charles Tupper and his followers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) the date of that article ?

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Yes. August 14th, 1896.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think if the hon. gentleman will search the files of the "Globe" he will find one of the strongest articles that paper has ever published in favour of the fast line service.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If it would not be taking up the time of the House I could read an article published in the "Globe" on the following day of a column and a half in length in the strongest language denouncing the whole scheme and pointing out that we could never compete with a fast line service from Chicago by way of New York. The railway carriage necessary to carry on the business between Chicago and the Atlantic ports in Great Britain was so much greater than by New York that it was an utter impossibility to compete with that port. Therefore if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will take the trouble to go to the files of August 15th, 1896, he will find there the statement that I have outlined, and if any other hon. gentlemen have anything to say upon this question I will furnish them with the papers for the hon. gentleman's (Sir Charles Tupper's) information which will verify the statement I have already made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It recanted since.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not propose to say very much upon this question except to emphasize the opinion which I expressed last year in regard to it. I have to congratulate the Government upon the fact that it has been enabled to provide for a service at a less expense than the first amount, or rather than the amount last voted, \$750,000. But I do remember very well when the original proposition was made to vote \$500,000 to the project, that it appeared to me then that the Liberal party was as a party opposed to this very large expenditure, and I remember distinctly that the leader of the Opposition then and the Premier now introduced a resolution in the House or in the committee. I have forgotten which, expressing disapprobation of the proceeding because of the lack of information which then prevailed. I have to congratulate the Government on the other hand that they have carried out the pledge made by the preceding Government in reference to the port of St. John to give that port an opportunity to compete with Halifax as to which port for the winter terminus the contractor shall select. But even were the port of St. John selected as the winter terminus I would hesitate

as to the advisability of spending such a large sum of money for this service. In other words, I retain the opinion which I think the Liberal party itself held in 1889. I believe that the country can employ \$500,000 to better advantage than upon this line which will enter into competition with the port of New York and to great disadvantage as compared with the port of New York. However, I see that it is a hopeless case, for the now Opposition, having, when holding the reins of power, introduced the proposal will naturally support it and the Government having adopted it, it will carry so that the talk against it is useless beyond just giving expression to the opinion which one feels about it. I quite agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), and any man who has given the subject any attention must come to the conclusion that this fast line of steamers cannot be a success on the St. Lawrence route. What the Government should do, if they decide to have a fast line of steamers, is to throw aside all local influences, and devote themselves solely to the securing of the fastest possible service, with one Atlantic port both for summer and winter. I do not say whether Louisbourg, Halifax or St. John is the best port; but the attempt to bring these fast steamers by the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the summer time, over the reefs and shoals which have constantly destroyed vessels passing by that route, will prove that the scheme cannot be carried out as against lines entering the harbour of New York, with which this line must compete. Further than that, the information which we lacked in 1889, we still lack. We are adopting a class of steamers which are unknown, and I regret that it has not been stated to the House why this class of steamers is chosen in preference to steamers of a well-known type. It may be that the experiment will be very successful; but that this country should spend \$500,000 a year upon an experiment which is itself a doubtful one, and in experimenting on steamers which are practically unknown in Atlantic travel is a matter which does not commend itself to my mind. Now, I do not want to enter into discussions or quote newspaper articles here at all. I merely state my own opinion, which I feel bound to give expression to, inasmuch as I have held that opinion from the very first. I am fearful that the difficulties of the route will be so great that there will be a failure in that respect, and that we shall have the contractors coming back on the country for a larger subsidy; because there is no doubt that, having once put our hand to the plough, we shall feel it a matter of pride to carry it through, and we cannot see the end of the expense.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, you, as well as many others in this House, are aware that on three different

Mr. ELLIS.

occasions I expressed my opposition to the policy of establishing a fast steamship line.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the fourth occasion?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If the hon. gentleman will have a little patience, he will know exactly about the fourth occasion. I expressed my opinion that at the present juncture in our history we were not prepared to undertake so large a scheme. I also stated that I did not believe there was a demand on the part of the people of this country for an expenditure of money along that line. I also stated that I did not believe that a fast steamship line was in the interest of the great majority of the taxpayers of this country. I also stated that we had now on the ocean, plying between this country and England, a larger number of vessels to carry our trade than we had trade to supply them, and that we had a capacity for passenger service far beyond the necessity, with the exception of about a month or a month and a half in each year. I also stated that it was very doubtful indeed, no matter how much money we could spend for a service on the north route, whether it could compete successfully with a service on the south route, owing to the fogs and the ice. That argument is somewhat weakened by the contract which is about to be entered into by the Government with Petersen, Tate & Co., because I understand that under the contract they are to provide at their own expense, a fast tender which is to go out and meet the incoming vessels. I think my strongest argument was that in our present financial condition we could not well afford, as was then proposed, to spend \$750,000 a year for this service, in addition to the taxation the people of this country were then called upon to bear. I am bound to say, however, that that argument has been somewhat weakened and modified by the excellent bargain which our present Government are about to make, provided we accept their policy. Though I am opposed to the policy, I think that the Government, having accepted the policy, deserve credit far above their predecessors, for having made a bargain for a service equal to, if not better, than what was proposed before, for \$250,000 a year less. I must say that I think the service is better in very many ways. First, the steamers are to carry twenty-five cabin passengers more than the other; it is faster than the other; there is a fast tender provided which was not provided for in the other contract; there is to be paid \$250,000 a year less, and there is to be a reduction of about \$200,000 a year of subventions paid to other steamship lines for carrying the mails across the Atlantic, to be applied to the \$500,000, which will bring the expenditure down to \$300,000 a year. We are about to receive a fast Atlantic service for about \$300,000 a year, for which, under the

late Government, we were to pay \$750,000 a year; and even if you subtract the subventions now paid from the \$750,000, we would still have to pay \$500,000 a year. But, notwithstanding these things, which can be stated in favour of the fast line contract, I am still of the same opinion as before, that at the present time the country is not in a position to assume the responsibility of expending so much more money every year. As has been said, this is a luxury. Perhaps it is; but we had better pay for the necessaries before we involve this House in an expenditure for luxuries. The time may come when the conditions of the country may be changed, and when this may be considered a necessary investment in the interest of the country, and when my opinion on the subject may change. But, at present, I am of the same opinion that I was two years ago; I am of the same opinion that I was in the year following when I repeated the arguments I first used; and I am of the same opinion that I was last year, when I repeated them again, that, no matter how good the bargain is, this policy is premature and not in the interest of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House very long in discussing this very important question; but inasmuch as I have always regarded it as one not of local importance merely, but of Canadian and Imperial importance, I venture to trouble the House with one or two observations in a direction that has not hitherto been touched upon. I have always regarded a fast Atlantic service as a necessary commercial corollary to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was, therefore, with the greatest heartiness that I gave my support to this project when it was first brought up in this House, very shortly after I had the honour of taking a seat here. At that time, a proposition was submitted to this House by the late Finance Minister, asking for a subvention from the Parliament of Canada to a fast Atlantic service to the extent of \$500,000 a year, which was voted by Parliament. Continued conscientious and earnest efforts were put forth by the late Government to have that vote crystallized into a contract with some substantial company, but they failed. Subsequently, in 1894, the same Finance Minister submitted to this House a measure offering the sum of \$750,000 a year to any responsible company that would tender for a weekly fast Atlantic service. The idea met with the universal approval of Parliament, inasmuch as the measure passed without a division, showing how truly and accurately the proposition of the Finance Minister expressed the commercial mind of Canada. But, Sir, from that time until now even that great offer of \$750,000 a year has not resulted in our having a fast Atlantic service established.

I am delighted to find that the present Government have been more favoured than their predecessors in this respect. No member within the walls of this House feels better pleased than I am with the success which they have met; and when I say that, I am sure my feeling will be shared by all my colleagues in this House from the maritime provinces, and I am ready also to assume that it is shared by my hon. friends from the different parts of this wide Dominion. I would like to point out a weak spot in the contract, but before I come to that let me say that I was very well pleased to hear the statement as to the probable success of this steamship line that was given us the other day, on the introduction of this resolution, by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), to whom I suppose we should fairly give the credit for the success these negotiations have met with. The efforts made by the Allan people to bring about the defeat of these negotiations reflect, in my opinion, very little credit upon that great concern. Whether the Petersen, Tate Company are a responsible concern or not, I do not know, but I am willing to assume that the Government knew with whom they were dealing before entering into this transaction, and if the contractors should not be able to carry out their agreement, then, of course, the loss is theirs. If the contract be a favourable one for the contractors, it was long enough before the country, tenders were advertised for in every great and leading paper in Great Britain and on the continent, and there was ample opportunity for the Allan people to come forward and show their enterprise by taking up the scheme. But I should like to point out what I consider the weak spot in this contract. I find that there is no penalty whatever imposed on the company in the event of failure. The time between now and the completion of the contract may lapse, and then Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company may quietly turn round and say that they were unable to raise the money, and there is no remedy for the Government. We will have simply lost two years and the contractors will have suffered nothing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman fails to notice that they will lose some £20,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend behind me is mistaken with regard to the contract. The forfeiture by the contractors is £20,000—£10,000 cash and £10,000 guaranteed in case of failure on their part.

Mr. GILLIES. I am very glad indeed to find that there is such a provision in the contract. Without it we would, as I have indicated, be largely at the mercy or dependent upon the financial ability of the contractor. There is another point to which I wish to draw attention and that is the restriction put on the contractors in the selec-

tion of the port. When the proposition for a fast line service was before the House in 1894, I tabled the question which appears in "Hansard," asking the then Finance Minister if the company would have a free hand in selecting a port on this side of the Atlantic. The then Finance Minister replied that in the provisional contract two ports would be inserted, namely, the ports of Halifax and St. John, but that in the final contract the company would be at liberty to select any port they thought most suitable on this side. I find in the contract before us, that Petersen, Tate & Company are limited, for winter purposes, to the harbours of Halifax or St. John, and to the port of Quebec in the summer. That limitation, I think, should not have been imposed on the company, and I propose to bring to the notice of the House the claims of another port which the House has heard of before and which, if it had been in the minds of the Government at the time these negotiations were carried on, would, no doubt, have found prominent mention in this contract. I refer to the harbour of Louisbourg, situated on the eastern coast of Cape Breton. It is not a port that is unknown to hon. gentlemen or to history. Louisbourg, we all know, attained great importance under the French régime. The early French colonists—the superior of whom as explorers and pioneers no continent ever saw—well knew the strong strategic position of Louisbourg and its strong possibilities as a maritime port and commercial centre, and the results proved the wisdom and accuracy of their provision. During the early part of the past century it was strongly fortified by the French Government. So strongly was it fortified that it was known as the Dunkirk of America, and on its fortifications the French Government expended over £1,200,000 sterling. This at once shows the importance attached to its position by the government of France. I know that there is an impression among hon. gentlemen that the port of Louisbourg is situated on a rocky, iron-bound coast, that it is encircled by fogs, that in winter it is inaccessible on account of ice and stormy weather, and that therefore it is not suitable as a terminal port for the service that we are now establishing. I wish to remove that impression, and I think that I can give evidence to show that there is no port on this side of the Atlantic which can compare with Louisbourg as a terminal point for the trans-Atlantic service. In the year 1874, when the Intercolonial Railway was fast approaching completion and the question arose as to what was the best port on the Atlantic sea-board for the terminus of that line, a committee was appointed by this House to inquire as to the best and most expeditious route for the conveyance of mails and passengers between the Dominion of Canada and Europe and to find on the shores of the Atlantic the most suitable port accessible the year round as a terminus for

Mr. GILLIES.

the Intercolonial Railway. The words of the resolution are as follows:—

Resolved, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire as to the best and most direct route for the conveyance of mails and passengers between the Dominion of Canada and Europe, and of finding on the shores of the Dominion a harbour accessible, both in winter and summer, to be the terminus of such shortest route, with powers to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

That committee obtained evidence of the fullest character. They examined sea captains, ship masters and owners, hydrographic engineers and underwriters, and on the 23rd of May, after a long, patient and full inquiry, they reported as follows:—

1st. That there are but three harbours possessing the qualities necessary to commend them to the attention of your Honourable House, viz.: Halifax, Louisbourg and Paspebiac.

That, from the evidence given before your committee, it has been shown that Louisbourg is a first-class harbour, having the geographical advantage of being the nearest available harbour of this Dominion to Europe.

It is 230 miles nearer to Europe than Paspebiac, and 196 miles nearer to Europe than Halifax by direct route.

It should also be observed that the approaches to Louisbourg are very easy, and that the anchorage is good in the north-east portion of the harbour, which is entirely sheltered from winds, and that the harbour is capable of floating vessels of any size.

Further on they say:

Your committee recommend that a survey be made between Louisbourg and some point on the Intercolonial Railway, to ascertain the practicability of building a railway between the most suitable point of said railroad and the harbour of Louisbourg.

Now, that report was made by the committee after they had taken the fullest evidence, and it settles at once and that is for ever the question of the suitability of Louisbourg as the terminus on this side of the Atlantic for this steamship service. That report shows that the harbour of Louisbourg is accessible the year round, that it is commodious, it is large, it is well sheltered and absolutely safe, and is capable of accommodating vessels of any size or any class. The requirements of the resolution were, as will be perceived, that the harbour selected would be "accessible winter and summer. That is the greatest certificate that the harbour of Louisbourg could get from any committee inasmuch as the late Mr. Power, of Halifax, was member of that committee—a man intensely interested in the success of Halifax and strongly and unreservedly, and unreasonably, in my opinion, opposed to Louisbourg. Inasmuch as this report came from a committee largely hostile to Louisbourg and prepossessed in favour of Halifax, it is the highest and best certificate that could be given in favour of Louisbourg. The statement of this committee that Louisbourg possesses "all the necessary qualities," namely, that it is "acces-

sible winter and summer, that it is commodious and safe and capable of floating vessels of any size," is a sufficient answer to the oft repeated statements of interested persons to the contrary, and should silence for ever the voices of people who in their dread that Louisbourg should get the prominence it deserves, would lead to the exclusion of the ports in which they are specially interested.

That is all I have to say on that phase of the case, but I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that since that report was made, the advantages of Louisbourg have vastly increased, and that port is able to claim, more than ever, the right to be chosen as the terminus of the fast Atlantic service. Louisbourg has since then been connected with the great coal fields of Cape Breton, and a large pier has been built there, the largest coal pier, I am told, on the continent of America, a pier at which any vessel in the line which is now being established can ride at anchor, and with chutes from which the largest steamers can bunker. These are advantages that Louisbourg has more than she had in 1874, and more than Halifax, St. John or Quebec can offer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not more than Quebec.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, Sir, certainly, or any other port that you can mention in Canada. There is no port in the Dominion of Canada that has the advantage of having a coal pier under which the largest vessel floating can take bunker coal. What does that mean? Louisbourg coal can be put into the bunkers of a ship at Louisbourg for \$1.75 a ton. If Halifax is chosen as a port, the coal must be taken to Halifax at extra cost for freightage, and if to Quebec, the cost is still greater and then it must be loaded into the bunkers of the steamers. My hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Dobeil) is a better authority on this point that I can hope to be, because he is largely engaged in this line of business, and I am sure that he will agree with me that, if coal can be put into the bunkers of a steamer at Louisbourg at \$1.75 a ton, that same coal carried to Halifax, bulk broken, and afterwards taken out of store and lightered into the bunkers of a vessel, must cost from \$3.50 to \$4 a ton. The same reasoning applies to St. John and Quebec. Let us see what that means. Mr. Huddart, when he was here in 1894 promoting this enterprise, stated that the class of steamers required to carry out the terms of his service would consume 2,500 tons of coal on every single trip. So, if you take the coal at Louisbourg, you will save about \$5,000 on every single trip as compared with taking coal at Halifax. This leaves out of account the fact that there are 200 miles of steaming saved by selecting Louisbourg instead of Halifax, and even more if you compare Louisbourg with St. John. In the fifty-two trips that the company are obliged to make under this contract, they would save

\$260,000 in the item of coal alone, over and above what would be saved through the shorter ocean trip to Louisbourg as compared with Halifax or St. John.

I regret that my time is limited, and I know I am imposing upon the House, but I seek to convey to the minds of my hearers, the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, the idea that Louisbourg is the best port as a terminus, as compared with the three ports that are mentioned in this contract. I do not speak from any personal interest in the matter. I do not represent the county in which Louisbourg is; I do not live in Louisbourg. I speak as a Canadian interested in this measure, and in this great service which I hope will not only be a benefit to Canada, but a credit to the people who endeavoured to establish it in the first instance, and a credit to those who are carrying it out. One point more before I sit down. If Louisbourg is made the terminus of this great trans-Atlantic service, passengers landed at Louisbourg will find themselves in New York seven and a half hours sooner than if they had landed in Halifax. The distance from Liverpool to New York is 3,025 miles, which, at twenty miles an hour, means 151½ hours. From Liverpool to Halifax is 2,466 miles, which, at twenty-six miles an hour, means 123½ hours' steaming. By land from Halifax to New York, at forty miles an hour, means twenty hours. Thus the trip by water and land from Liverpool to New York by way of Halifax will take 143 hours, which, compared with 151½ hours between Liverpool and New York by steamer, would leave eight hours in favour of the Halifax route.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I must really remind my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) that it is very inconvenient to pass the regular time for adjournment, and it would be better to adjourn now and we can take this matter up again at three o'clock.

Mr. GILLIES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

WEDNESDAY, 16th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TENDERS FOR BUOY SERVICE,  
COUNTY OF INVERNESS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. What steps, if any, were taken to obtain tenders for the buoy service at Mabou, in the county of Inverness, in April last, shortly before the local general elections?

2. What offers were received, names and amounts?

3. Did the lowest tenderer refuse to enter into the contract?

4. Was the next lowest tender asked if he was ready to do the work for the amount of his tender? If so, what did he reply?

5. What is the name of the successful tenderer and contractor in each case?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). 1. Bills inviting tenders were sent out on the 8th of April. 2. Daniel D. Doyle, \$17 per annum; Angus F. Rankin, \$24 per annum; William F. Rankin, \$34 per annum; Malcolm McFadyen, \$39 per annum; John McInnis, \$39 per annum; John McEachen, \$40 per annum; Edward Doyle, \$40 per annum; Angus D. Rankin, \$45 per annum; Thomas White, \$45 per annum; Finlay Rankin, \$63 per annum. 3. Yes. 4. Yes, by letter from the department, but before the answer was received the Minister decided to invite new tenders. 5. The successful tenderer was Edward Doyle in the last case and there was only one contract.

#### ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, declaring it expedient that the fast line contract be ratified and confirmed.

Mr. **GILLIES**. I have only a few words to say to complete the argument I began at the previous sitting to show the advantages which Louisbourg offers as the terminus of the fast Atlantic service. Now, what advantage will passengers and mails have in being landed at Louisbourg instead of Halifax? From Liverpool to Louisbourg the distance is 2,270 miles. A vessel steaming 20 miles an hour would make the passage in 113½ hours. From Louisbourg to New York, at the rate of 40 miles an hour, it takes 23 hours to make the trip. That shows a time consumed of 136 hours between Liverpool and New York via Louisbourg, as compared with 143 hours via Halifax, and as compared with 151 hours going direct to New York. Well, that gives an advantage to Louisbourg over Halifax of at least from 7 to 10 hours. Therefore the traveller going to any of the western cities of Canada, Montreal, Ottawa, Hamilton, London, Toronto or Winnipeg, has this much advantage in time in landing at Louisbourg as compared with Halifax, and the British and European mails would be landed that much sooner at their western destination. This means very much for the business people of Ontario, and they are therefore directly interested in insisting upon the best port being selected as a terminus, and the most direct route to that port

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

taken in order that they may participate in the quick transit of passengers and mails from Europe to their western homes. They are consequently as much interested as I can possibly be in the selection of Louisbourg as the terminus. There is besides the saving of the ocean voyage of 196 miles by landing at Louisbourg instead of Halifax. As I said in the beginning, I have no personal interest at all to serve in bringing this to the notice of the House, I simply have the public interest at heart and nothing more. In this hope I will be joined by the majority of the members of the House. I have nothing at all against Halifax, I like Halifax. I have nothing at all against St. John; I admire the spirit and the energetic enterprise of the people of that city. I have nothing against Quebec; I have as much attachment for that grand old city as any man can have that is not a native of the place. I simply say that if Halifax is the port best adapted for the terminus—and I have shown that it is not—then by all means let us have it. If St. John is the best terminus, then let us have it; if Quebec, then let the terminus be there; but if Louisbourg be the best terminus, and the argument is decidedly in its favour, then let it be at Louisbourg. All I want is that this port be thrown into competition with other ports and that the company may have a free hand in selecting its terminus. I think I have made out a good case. With a line of railway direct from Louisbourg via St. Peters, which must and will be constructed in the interests of the country, I have shown the advantages the traveller will have in landing there as compared with either St. John, or Quebec, or Halifax. I have shown the savings the company will make in the item of coal alone. I have referred to the report of the special committee of the House of Commons made in 1874, a committee that was appointed for this very purpose, and which reported that the harbour of Louisbourg is accessible all the year round, is commodious, is sheltered, is safe, and is capable of floating any vessel in the British marine. I have nothing further to say than to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Government of which he is a prominent member to be good enough to see, before this contract is permanently ratified, that the harbour of Louisbourg and consequently the people of Cape Breton will have a fair show, and that the public interest and the success of this undertaking may not be imperilled by the interests of any one port being unduly pushed over those of another, by political influence or any other influence that I need not mention.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. I am not prepared to say that if we are to have a fast line contract at all, we are not considering the terms of an agreement which is as favourable as we could possibly hope to secure.

I believe the conditions of the agreement now before the House are of a character to warrant us in according to that agreement our support, provided we felt warranted in supporting a fast line at all. I have, however, on former occasions, voicing the sentiments of my own constituents, and the sentiments, I believe, of a very large portion of the population of the province of Ontario, I have placed myself on record here as opposed to a fast line between Canada and Great Britain so long as the condition of affairs is such as we find it. But I am bound to say that the obligations which have been incurred, or are proposed to be incurred, by the Government during this session, are somewhat startling in their extent. We have in this proposition for a fast line, an expenditure of \$500,000 per annum contemplated. That amounts to interest upon a capital sum of over \$16,000,000 at 3 per cent; and even if we are able to supplant, by the ratification of this contract, steamship agreements that are now in existence and by that means perhaps save \$200,000, we are still practically adding to our public burden the interest upon \$10,000,000. Then we have the arrangement with regard to the entry of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. It may be that this scheme will so add to the business of the Intercolonial Railway as largely to increase its earnings and to pay the rentals of \$210,000 which are contemplated. It may be on the other hand that they will not, and that there will be an addition from this source to our liabilities and our burdens as well. If the scheme does not pay the \$210,000, the charge is equivalent to an addition of \$7,000,000 to the public debt. Then we have a proposal to grant a subsidy of over \$3,600,000 to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, as heir to which will follow another scheme, probably requiring a further expenditure of public money. Now, we find in all these schemes foreshadowed by the Government, an addition to the public debt of anywhere from 18 to 27 million dollars, according as to whether the reduction in the steamship subventions is more or less, and according as to whether the Intercolonial Railway pays or does not pay, in consequence of its entry into the city of Montreal. In addition to this we have to provide for the enlargement of the canals; so that we have, all told, a formidable increase in the burdens of the country. I stand somewhat appalled at the magnitude of these increases, and I am inclined to scrutinize closely a fast line contract, not with the view of determining whether this contract, which reflects credit upon the Government that has made it, so far as its conditions are concerned, not with the view of determining whether the terms of this contract could have been made better than they are, for I am free to confess that I believe that they could not; but I confront this question with

the view of ascertaining whether a fast line contract is necessary at all. Under the condition of things that exists, under the circumstances of the country I arrive at the conclusion that at the least the entering into of this arrangement for the expenditure of half a million dollars annually by this Government is premature. This contract runs for ten years, but it will naturally merge into a continuance of that expenditure so that it will put an additional burden on the country which will not be temporary but permanent. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), a public man of great experience, a gentleman who has given this question careful consideration, tells us that in his opinion this expenditure which has been provided for will be inadequate and that we will not secure a fast line service for \$500,000. He, of course, has reason in one sense to make this assertion for it is a fact that tenders have been submitted by the Allan line and by Mr. Huddart and both of these tenders, made by responsible parties, conversant with the navigation difficulties of this route, call for a vastly larger sum than the tenders of the firm which we have under consideration to-day. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) says we are all agreed upon this question. I must assure the hon. gentleman that we are not all agreed. I have discussed this question before my constituents and I should be stultifying myself if I supported this measure, and I should be guilty of cowardice if I allowed it to go through without stating what my position is. The position I take here is the position my constituents will require me to take if they do not withdraw from me their confidence. The question is, Mr. Speaker: Do we need this fast line? In answering that question, in arriving at a conclusion as to the matter, we are bound to take into consideration the circumstances of this country. We might want that fast line; it might be a good thing to invest the money that would be required to get it if we had an abundance of means, but we are bound in answering that question to take into consideration the condition of this country. When I look around I see that the farmers of this country are poor, that the business of agriculture is depressed, that farmers who have mortgages on their farms in a great many cases are unable to pay the interest. Men holding mortgages are afraid to foreclose because it would be disastrous to them to get the farms into their hands. I find labourers are not able to get employment during the whole of the year. I find that while certain business men are prosperous, in a sense, with the aid of the law imposing protective taxes for them, the great masses of the people, the producers, the farmers, the labourers, the tax-payers are not in good circumstances and that the condition of the country is one which does not

warrant the Government in embarking in enterprises involving an expenditure of money where that expenditure can be avoided. Now, I hold that the fast line is not essential. It would be a convenience; it would benefit many business interests in this country, there is no question, but it is not absolutely essential. We have the Allan Line, the Beaver Line, the Dominion Line, the Donaldson Line, and ample provision is made in regard to cold storage. We can have all the tramp steamers that trade will warrant for the transportation of the freight we have to offer. There is no difficulty about procuring transportation and the only question is as to whether it is necessary to have a subvention granted that will procure for us a service that is a little more rapid than the service we have at present. It would be convenient to have a rapid service; it is not essential. I thought last session that the position taken by my hon. friend the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) was the position of a business man. He thoroughly understood the wants of this country and all the conditions appertaining to this matter. I agree with the position taken by him then that what we need are steamers with large freight carrying capacity, with a fair amount of speed, of say, 18 knots an hour, and that a line of this kind would serve our purposes better than a line running at a greater cost with small freight carrying capacity. Now, Sir, the only object of having this line so far as I can see is to secure the passenger trade. An 18 knot service will do just as well for our freight requirements as a 20 knot service and probably better. The slower service will do just as well for cold storage requirement as the fast line, and I think the principal object in obtaining this fast line is to have a line that will attract passenger traffic to the Canadian route. This is desirable of course, but I would like to know what interest my constituents in Norfolk can have in the question, whether passengers can be attracted from Chicago to the Canadian line rather than to the New York line. Will their interest in this matter warrant them in paying their portion of the \$500,000 to secure it? It is a question of no consequence to them at all whether passengers go by Quebec or New York. I believe my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) was quite right yesterday in assuming the probability of our being unable to command that traffic if we establish this fast line. It is an interrupted traffic; it will begin at Montreal or Quebec for six months in the year and at a maritime port, Halifax or St. John, for the balance of the year, and the natural obstacle in the way of the service securing passenger traffic will, in my opinion, not be exactly insurmountable, but so great as to throw the balance of the chances in favour of the New York route. Under any circumstances we will have failed, to a large extent, in securing control of the pas-

Mr. CHARLTON.

senger travel we hope to get. Further, I say that this expenditure is not demanded by our interests. We can get along without it. We do not need to add practically \$16,000,000 to our debt. When we come to examine the point of the scheme, there is no doubt that it is an Imperial scheme. It is a scheme the entering into of which is not forced upon the Government by any demand on the part of Canadian public opinion. The influences brought to bear upon the Government, the potent influences, that have led to the entering into of this contract are Imperial influences beyond question. It is all a part of one great scheme—fast service across the Atlantic, a transcontinental service by the Canadian Pacific Railway, Pacific steamship lines to Japan, China and Australia and the Pacific cable—all these are items in one great scheme of which this line is a part and we are entering into this scheme largely because it is desired by Imperial statesmen and demanded by Imperial influences.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish at the very outset to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) that he is entirely wrong in the view that the suggestion in reference to this fast Atlantic service came from the Imperial Government. The Government of Canada have again and again endeavoured to obtain the support of the Imperial Government. They brought it before them and pressed it upon them in every possible way. I myself in conjunction with the representatives of Australasia visited the Colonial Office, again and again, and pressed this matter in the strongest possible way and it is only after the advent of the present Government, of which the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain is a member, that I was able to get the Imperial Government to consent to the earnest entreaty of Canada and the Australian colonies. It was only then that I was able to induce the Colonial Minister to take it up and agree to bear one-third of the expense.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I suppose my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is quite able to speak for himself and his Government, but I do not think he has answered for the gentlemen who are responsible for the scheme under the consideration of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). On that point I can certainly say, on behalf of the present Government, that there has never been any attempt on the part of the Imperial Government to influence our judgment. All we have done has been done by us voluntarily as representing the people of Canada. Whether we were wise or not is a fair matter of opinion, but it would not be correct to assume that we were doing this under the influence of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very happy to hear the statement of my hon. friend the

Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). But I must say that it forces me to lose the opportunity of believing that there is a sufficient reason on the part of the Government for entering into this scheme that I would have had, had my supposition in regard to the Imperial desire to have this scheme been correct. If this is not a portion of a scheme for establishing communication from England to Australia, if it has not something to do with the development of interprovincial and intercolonial trade within the Empire, then I am entirely mistaken, and if this scheme has not to justify it the idea of the development of Imperial interests, it is a scheme which has less to justify it than if it had.

Mr. MILLS. All the more power to its elbow.

Mr. CHARLTON. The elbow to which it is proposed to put this power is, I think, rather weak. If it is not for Imperial interests, it is an elbow which had better be conservative of its powers, and attempt to pay its debts, and get out of its difficulties. If we had entered on this scheme purely of our own volition, if it were a scheme for which we did not ask the approval of the Imperial Government, if it were a scheme purely and entirely Canadian in its inception and purposes, I would have still less to say in favour of it than I say on the supposition that the Imperial Government are interested in it. We are not required to establish a fast Atlantic service to contribute largely to the laying of a Pacific cable, or to increase the efficiency of our steamship service with Australia, from the standpoint of purely colonial or domestic interests: and if this scheme of a fast Atlantic service has not to commend it the reasons which I have expressed, it has still less to commend it than I supposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I am not permitted to speak again on this subject, my hon. friend will permit me to say that he must not confound Imperial interests and Imperial pressure. I believe that we may congratulate ourselves upon having satisfied the Colonial Secretary that there were great Imperial interests in this movement; but, so far from having acted under Imperial influence or pressure in bringing this matter forward, the fact is the very reverse. It has been the colonies which have been trying to get Her Majesty's Government to regard it, as we felt they ought, as having very great Imperial importance; and I think the result shows that we succeeded in inducing Her Majesty's Government to believe that in addition to the colonial interest, there was a great Imperial interest in being able to draw Canada and the mother country so much more closely together.

Mr. CHARLTON. Let us examine, for a moment, into the position of this matter,

with reference to its bearing on Imperial interests as well as on our own domestic interests. The question may arise as to whether we have done our duty to the Empire—as to whether we are sufficiently liberal in promoting Imperial interests. As regards the establishment of a fast line of transcontinental transit and a Pacific service, let us see what we have spent. We have provided a railway across this continent. That railway, of course, serves important Canadian interests; but it is also an Imperial highway, which adds vastly to the power and the strength of the British Empire. We have spent in establishing that railway, \$70,000,000; in addition to that we have given towards it 18,000,000 acres of land; and, in addition to the money and the land, we have given to the company special privileges, some of which we are now buying back, largely at the cost of the proposed subvention to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. If we sum up the expenditures we have made for the promotion of this Imperial railway line, the aggregate would not fall short of \$100,000,000. Now, if the Imperial authorities do not ask from us this fast Atlantic service, as the hon. gentleman assures us they do not, we may consider it from the standpoint of our own interests; and if we do consider it from that standpoint, there is still less reason than when it is considered from the other standpoint, for incurring this enormous expenditure. Our attitude to the Empire should of course, be a friendly one; it is. It should be a loyal one; it is. Canada will never shrink from supporting Imperial interests. She has done her duty, and more than her duty already in that respect, and that she is prepared to do in the future. But the question which we have to examine dispassionately is whether Canada's loyalty to Imperial interests requires us to incur this enormous expenditure for a fast Atlantic service. As we are told by the hon. leader of the Opposition that Imperial interests do not require it, that point is disposed of. Then the question comes, is it our interest to do so, apart from Imperial interests? And I cannot see that it is our interest to enter into this large expenditure at the present time. The sections of the country which must pay the expenditure are not directly interested in the scheme to a large extent. At least \$300,000 of the \$500,000 will be paid by the province of Ontario, for the time at least; the provinces of the North-west must bear their proportion, and the province of British Columbia must bear its proportion. There is no part of this Dominion from and including Ontario and west of Ontario, that is specially interested in incurring this large obligation; and if that is the case, and the province of Ontario is to pay three-fifths of the expenditure, as a representative of that province, and consulting the interests of my own constituents, I believe the entering into this

obligation is premature. This country, burdened as it is with debt, with its enormous floating charges, with its meagre population, with its interests progressing slowly as they are, with the conditions of business such as exist in the country, we should refrain from embarking on any scheme involving any expenditure of money which can reasonably be avoided at the present time. That is the position I take on this matter. The present prospects of business in this country are not flattering. The conditions may change, but there is nothing in present conditions to warrant us in incurring any large expenditures which can be avoided. In conclusion, I say, as a justification for my questioning the propriety of entering into this compact at the present time, that it is equivalent to the interest on over \$16,000,000. Even after cancelling the other steamship contracts, it will be equivalent to the interest on \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000; and, in the present condition of the country, with the absolute necessity that exists of making large expenditures in other directions, I question very seriously the wisdom of embarking on this project at the present time. I have taken the liberty of expressing these opinions, not from any personal considerations, but because they are the opinions of my constituents, and because my constituents will demand that I should say on this floor what I have said before them, and what I would be bound to say at any place or at any time if I reflected their opinions on this matter.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be a matter of regret if the opinions given expression to by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Charlton) were understood by the House as being the opinions of the people of the great province of Ontario of which he is a representative. I have no doubt that, so far as he can accurately gauge the opinions of his own constituents, the hon. gentleman has given expression to them. But I repudiate, on behalf of a great many other constituencies of the province of Ontario, and on behalf of a great many gentlemen having large commercial interests in that province, the expressions to which the hon. gentleman has just given utterance. As a humble member of this House, I support this scheme, not only because it is required by Canadians, but because it is a part of an Imperial scheme in the very best sense of that term. We have had constructed across this continent the best line of railway in America; we have a canal system communicating with the ocean from the head of the great lakes unparalleled by any fresh water system in the world; we have a postal system which we are proud of; we have had established on the Pacific Ocean lines of steamships connecting with the far east and the Australian colonies, and second to none that traverse those great waters; and this fast Atlantic steamship line is needed to complete the chain of communica-

Mr. CHARLTON.

tion between the motherland and the extreme limits of our great Empire. This is not a question that has only been considered yesterday or to-day by the merchants and leading business men of the province of Ontario, and, I am surprised that a gentleman of the wide experience of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should ignore the fact that the Toronto Board of Trade, composed of at least 1,000 members, one-third of them living outside of the city of Toronto, and all of them prominent merchants, manufacturers or financiers doing business throughout the province of Ontario, has placed itself on record emphatically and unequivocally in favour of a fast Atlantic steamship line. I do not desire to take up the time of the House; but lest the remarks of the hon. gentleman should be taken as voicing the wishes and feelings of the mercantile community of the province of Ontario, I hope the House will bear with me while I read a few extracts from the annual reports and messages presented to the Toronto Board of Trade by the various presidents of that body in the last five years. In 1892, while Mr. Hugh N. Baird, one of the largest merchants in the province, the ramifications of whose business extend throughout the Dominion, occupied the position of president of that body, he had this to say in his annual address:

There is no subject of more immediate interest to business men than the improvement of our passenger and mail service across the Atlantic. It is, indeed, a matter of the first necessity to our commerce. Speaking in this room but a few days ago, a member of the board showed that on a recent trip of a great New York liner to Liverpool, one-fifth of the passengers were Canadians. Why should we, having ports on our own seaboard 400 to 600 miles nearer Liverpool than New York is, be compelled to send our buyers, our mails, our express freight through the latter city for quicker despatch? The great strides Canada has already made in railways from ocean to ocean, and in fast service on the Pacific, will largely miss their aim, unless we make the further stride of quick travel on the Atlantic as well. It is perfectly true, that this country has outgrown the present service.

I am, therefore, heartily in accord with the resolution passed at the special general meeting of the board on the 16th instant, which recited that "A first-class Canadian fast Atlantic steamship service would materially increase the value of our European exports, decrease the cost of delivery of our European imports, largely augment the volume of our passenger travel, improve our foreign and postal service, and otherwise be of great national importance." It is clear to us, besides, that the concluding portion of the resolution, urging the need of governmental arrangements necessarily required "to secure such a service and give it control of such railway service as said line of steamships must have," will meet the views of commercial men throughout the country.

These are the views presented to the board of trade by Mr. Hugh M. Baird, in delivering his annual message at the close of his term of office in 1893. Surely it cannot be asserted that this gentleman did not know what he

was talking about when he used the strongest and most emphatic language possible for a person in his position to use in advocating the immediate establishment of a fast Atlantic steamship line.

In 1893 this matter was also referred to by the retiring president of the board of trade, who in that year was Mr. R. R. Wilkie, the managing director of one of the largest financial institutions in the province of Ontario. Mr. Wilkie presented his views of the necessity for a fast Atlantic steamship service in the following words:—

This board has put itself on record more than once in favour of a high-class steam service to and from Great Britain. It is no exaggeration to say that the present service is slow and inefficient and has had the effect of driving Canadians to foreign ports and foreign lines of steamers.

It is humiliating for us, as Canadians, to consider that in a voyage to England, unless we are prepared to lose from three to five days of time, we are compelled to take ships from a foreign port and travel over a route 430 miles longer than via Quebec.

The last extract I shall read is from the report of the president of the board of trade, delivered in 1896, at the close of his term of office. Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, one of our leading merchants and importers, then president of the Toronto Board of Trade, thus referred to the fast steamship line:

The question of a fast Atlantic steamship service is one of great importance to Canada and to the Empire. The council is deeply impressed with the value and the necessity for this service. The day is past when Canada will be satisfied with anything less than a twenty-knot service. We possess great geographical advantages, being several hundred miles nearer Great Britain than either Boston or New York. Shall we lose this advantage through having slow boats, many knots per hour below the vessels that run between United States ports and England? With a fast Atlantic service, a swift through rail route from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with a further swift line of steamers from Vancouver to Japan, China and Australia, I see nothing to prevent Canada from becoming the great highway of the world between the east and the west; teas, coffees, fruits, silks and other eastern products will be carried by our railways, and Canada itself brought prominently before the world in a manner that in the past the most sanguine never conceived possible. In what better way can our country be advertised? In what better way bring to the notice of toiling millions the grand rolling prairies of the North-west, that only want the hands of men to blossom into fruitfulness and become the means of wealth and happiness to millions of the human race?

The fact that the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain has promised an Imperial subsidy of £75,000 per annum, if such an Atlantic service is organized, united to the further fact that the Dominion Government has promised a further subsidy of \$750,000 should make this important service an accomplished deed within the next two years. The Government can confidently rely upon the cordial support of the board in promoting this great Imperial project.

I think after reading the opinions of these gentlemen—gentlemen who are well and fa-

vourably known throughout the Dominion—I need not take up the time of the House at greater length. I can congratulate the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) upon what seems to be the very favourable arrangement he has made. If he has succeeded in securing vessels of the proper capacity, speed and build, and saved the country an expenditure of \$250,000 annually, I think he is entitled to the thanks of the House and the country. I cannot give an opinion as to whether these vessels will turn out to be successful, but I compliment the Government upon the fact that they are carrying out the policy which was inaugurated by their predecessors, and the adoption of which will be a permanent advantage, I believe, not only to Canada, but to every other portion of the Empire. I cordially support the resolution in favour of the subsidy proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without giving expression to the sentiments and feelings of the farmers of the eastern part of Ontario with regard to this question. I have been at several large meetings in that province, at which the fast steamship line was fully discussed, and I have yet to hear of a farmer who lifted up his voice in favour of such a large sum being expended on that service. At that time no doubt the expenditure was expected to be much greater, because it was thought that the sum of \$750,000 per year would have to be given; but let me say that the late commercial crisis through which Canada has passed was due in a great measure to the depressed condition of the agricultural industries, and when the fast steamship project was first introduced, circumstances were even then more favourable to it than to-day, because we had not then any provision for transporting our perishable products across the Atlantic in cold storage. Now, however, that we have steamers plying to Glasgow, Liverpool, Bristol and London, provided with cold storage facilities for the carrying of our perishable products and landing them in the best condition, we have not the same necessity for a fast line of steamships as we had previously. It may be said that this line will take our products across three or four days more rapidly, but what advantage would that be to the farmer? Once we have cold storage, our products cannot suffer by being two or three days longer on the ocean. I have crossed the Atlantic frequently during the last few years, and as far as my experience goes, it will be impossible to run a line of steamships at a speed of twenty or twenty-two knots an hour by the St. Lawrence route. Here is the opinion of a gentleman from the city of Quebec on that very question. I take it from an article which appeared in the "Queen's Quarterly Magazine," written by

Mr. Sandford Fleming. In that article he quotes from the work of Mr. Henry Fry, a prominent timber merchant of the city of Quebec :

Among other things stated by Mr. Fry, is, that the distressing loss of life and property were not due to any want of skill or experience on the part of owners or captains. He, however, expresses the opinion that the Government was not blameless in exacting speed, in the face of the serious obstacles which were presented to rapid steaming, and in imposing heavy penalties for non-punctuality in the delivery of the mails within the periods stipulated by contract.

Now, this is a condition imposed on the steamship company at present, which will almost compel them to run their vessels at hazardous speed after they have entered the Straits of Belle Isle and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. During the past three years, I have myself been twice nearly wrecked, when the vessel was only going at eight knots an hour. At one time I could have stepped from the side of the vessel on to an iceberg, which, by the merest chance, the captain happened to see just in time to avoid striking. Another time we were within two rods of striking an iceberg, and the vessel only going at a speed of seven knots an hour. In the month of July last, when the steamer was going at six or seven knots an hour, and the weather was very foggy, we struck an iceberg just outside the Straits of Belle Isle, and had it been a stormy night we would certainly have gone to the bottom. As it was, we had to steam back to St. Johns, Newfoundland, and lay there for two weeks. It is almost impossible for any steamship to make the speed provided in this contract. Although the company have provided for a line of torpedo boats to run ahead of the steamships, what is to become of the torpedo boats if she strikes? The loss of life will, of course, not be so great as on board the vessel, but the danger to those on the torpedo boat is just as great; and as she will have to keep half a mile ahead of the steamer, it will only be by the sound of the whistle that the steamer will be able to follow her, because you cannot see ahead any distance in the fog. I have been frequently on the river when you could not see from the rear to the front of the vessel so dense was the fog, so that there will only be the sound of the whistle from the torpedo boat to guide the steamer.

Let me repeat that the agricultural community is not going to be benefited by this fast line, because we have a sufficient number of vessels already to carry all our products to the mother country, and a sufficient amount of cold storage provided for our perishable products. All that can be said in favour of this project is that, in a measure, the honour of the Canadian Government is pledged to it. Whether that pledge was given of our own accord or through pressure I cannot say, but we are told that

it was given voluntarily by the Canadian Government, at its own instance. Well, so much the worse for the Canadian Government, if Great Britain did not require this line in the Imperial interests. In the name of the farmers of Ontario, I warn the Government fairly to-day that when they came into power it was with the idea of reducing expenditure and not increasing it, and that if they go on increasing it on the lines they are taking at present, they will have to settle with the people.

Mr. CASEY. This is a question on which, of course, everybody will have his own opinion, but I should be sorry to have it thought that the opinion of Ontario, or even of the agricultural part of Ontario, was generally hostile to the scheme proposed by the Government. I do not pretend to be as successful a farmer individually as my hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) who has just taken his seat, but I represent a farming constituency and must answer to a large and intelligent body of farmers for my vote on this question. I do not feel very much afraid to face them after supporting the proposition of the Government. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) says that the farmers do not need this fast line so much as they did before the cold storage was provided. Well, Sir, that must be admitted; but it is perfectly open to us to say, on the other hand, that the Government that has provided cold storage for the special convenience of the farmers may fairly provide a fast line more particularly intended for passenger traffic for the benefit of the rest of the community. I am not one of those farmers, or farmers' representatives, who think that all the legislation of the country should be directly for the farmers, and I do not think that my hon. friend from South Huron is one either. It is not necessary to show that all the laws we pass here are in the special interest of the farmers in order to obtain the farmers' support for them. The chief argument for this fast line, to my mind, is the advertisement it will give the country. I use the word "advertisement" in the broad sense of the word. This fast line will draw a stream of through travel across Canada; and will tend to make Canada the highway between Great Britain and the far East. There is no reason, if the parties interested somewhat improve the service on the Pacific, and if this scheme proves a success, why the stream of travel from England and from all Europe that now goes by the Suez Canal should not go through Canada. An hon. friend behind me says that this would be a costly advertisement. The sum of money involved is certainly considerable, but the price of an advertisement does not always tell the cost of it. No advertisement is costly which produces results in proportion to the price, and I believe that this advertisement will produce

results more than in proportion to the price. My hon. friend from South Huron said one thing that I fully agree with. He pointed out that the farmers were opposed to an expenditure of \$750,000 for securing this fast line, and there is all the more force in his remarks, because it was to that large expenditure that the farmers chiefly objected. But I think that when the farmers find that the fast line has been secured at a cost of \$250,000 less than the country was pledged at first to give, a feeling of thankfulness to the Government for that saving will take the place of one of opposition to the granting of the subsidy to the fast line. Now, this was practically our position—that the country was pledged to an expenditure of \$750,000 for this service. How, in honour, could the Government get out of that obligation? If they are able to secure the service for \$250,000 less than was proposed, I think that the words of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke), when he congratulated the Ministry on the arrangement made, are thoroughly appropriate to the situation.

The difficulties of navigation, of course, have to be taken into account. It is not pretended that this is the ideal fast line, that it is the fastest line possible between Great Britain and Canada; it is only contended that it is the best available line under all the present circumstances of the case. It is, of course, advantageous to bring passengers and freight as far into the country as they can be brought by ship, instead of having to transfer them to the more expensive railway. That is the reason for choosing Quebec rather than some extreme point in the east as the summer terminus of the line. The difficulties of navigation in the Straits of Belle Isle are considerable, but the fact remains that the faster the steamers we have composing our line of communication with Great Britain, the more able they will be to make up for loss of time in the Straits of Belle Isle, and to make a fast trip on the whole. I was in Montreal last autumn when the steamship "Canada," a vessel something of the type of those here proposed, arrived at that port after a passage averaging 18 knots an hour—that is, 18 knots an hour to Montreal with a long stretch of difficult river navigation included in the route. If it was possible for a steamer with no special inducements to keep up a high speed to make an average of 18 knots an hour to Montreal, it is surely possible for vessels specially constructed for the purpose and whose owners are bound by contract, to make an average of 20 miles an hour to Quebec. Of course the "Canada" did not keep up the speed of 18 knots an hour in the Straits of Belle Isle, but made up for time to be lost by going all the faster in the open water. The steamers on this line will do the same: if they are going to make an average of 20 knots, they will have to

do better than that in the open water. In view of these considerations, I think that the farmers or any other class of the community have no reason to grumble at the bargain that the Government have made, but have every reason to congratulate themselves that the country is saved one-third of the amount which it was first proposed that the service should cost.

Mr. ROGERS. My sentiments are very fully expressed by those members who have spoken from the agricultural standpoint, so it is not necessary for me to reiterate them at length. I do think that we should be guided to a great extent by the views of such an authority as Mr. Sandford Fleming. He is a man, as all know, of advanced and progressive ideas, and he has expressed a strong opinion adverse to the feasibility of this scheme. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has read us the opinion of the board of trade on this subject. We all know that business men and all those anxious to hustle forward and backward, are interested in having a fast line. But when the Board of Trade of Montreal or the Board of Trade of Toronto or the Banker's Association holds their annual gatherings, the things that are talked about are not the number of manufacturers in the country, the number of business men we have or the number of lawyers and doctors turned out of our colleges, but the number of bushels of wheat we have to export, the money we bring into the country for that and other farm products which is over \$60,000,000. It is all very well for them to talk of these matters, but these products are the result of our toil, late and early, year in and year out. Its all very fine for them to pass resolutions in favour of lavish expenditure if the same was in their own interest. As the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said, the necessity is not so much for speed as for ample facilities and cheap rates for the transport of our goods. We are already paying subsidies to 17 steamships—and three more will be added to the list—to carry the products of Canada to Europe. Even this will be a heavy load to bear, without paying so much merely to secure speed. We feel also that nine-tenths of the people going to the old country do not care even if they are detained a day or two longer on the ocean voyage. Most of them are travelling for pleasure or for their health and, with a day or two longer on the steamer, they become better acquainted and are just beginning to enjoy themselves. Those who wish to go quickly will take the New York route, which is quicker as well as safer. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) says that the scheme will not be successful because we have not granted subsidy enough; the great majority of the people, the men who make this country

what it is and keep it where it is, will not shed one tear if the scheme does fail. One great reason is that the system of ship-building is rapidly changing from year to year, and in a few years hence we may have vessels crossing the ocean at the rate of 30 knots an hour. Then where will our 20-knot service be under a 10 years contract at \$500,000? I think if this contract is put off for a few years we will not lose anything in the long run. I am aware that there are not many members of the House who hold the same opinions that I do with regard to this contract and I fear our influence will not prove very strong with the Government. I would be very glad to support any motion to postpone this contract for a time, but, as I know there are so few who hold the same opinions, I shall not take the responsibility of moving an amendment to that effect.

Mr. RATZ. I would like to say a few words on this question before a vote is taken. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) stated a few moments ago that he represented a farming constituency, and I gathered from his remarks that the farmers in his section were in favour of this fast Atlantic service. That may be the case, but if that is the case, I can say that the farmers of my constituency are not of the same opinion. The farmers of North Middlesex, the constituency which I have the honour to represent, so far as I have come in contact with them, are not at all in favour of this fast Atlantic service. They know this much about it, that they are the ones who will ultimately have to foot the great bulk of the bill, and they are the people who actually should be consulted, and their ideas should be taken into consideration. Now, as has been already stated, it makes very little difference whether a farmer's bushel of wheat or his barrel of flour gets to Great Britain a day or two earlier than it would by the ordinary Atlantic service; it is of no material consequence to him. Arrangements have already been made for cold storage for the carriage of our perishable products by the present service, so that the cold storage provided in this fast service will not benefit us to any great extent. Of course, it may be said that it will draw a certain amount of travel through the Dominion of Canada. That may be true, but will that advantage be sufficient to justify us in making this expenditure of \$500,000 yearly to pay this service? Now, a great deal has been said about the difficulties of travel through the Straits of Belle Isle; and there is no question that this proposed Atlantic service cannot travel any faster through those Straits than ordinary vessels do at the present time, and it may be that 20 knots an hour cannot be made on this account. There is another question of considerable importance, perhaps. I understand that one of our modern

Mr. ROGERS.

inventors has now under construction a new model of a ship by which he intends to cross the Atlantic in 48 hours. Now if that rate of navigation turns out to be possible, where will this service be? Why, we won't be in it at all. We would have to go back on this contract, and then no doubt hon. gentlemen who are now pressing this fast service would be dissatisfied with it, and would want to cross the Atlantic in 48 hours. For these reasons, representing the constituency I do, I feel obliged to protest against this scheme.

Mr. STUBBS. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any length; but as this is one of the questions that possess a good deal of interest for the farmers of Canada, and as I represent a rural constituency, I must say that this project is unanimously condemned by the farmers of Cardwell. If there is a vote taken on the question, I shall feel it my duty to vote against it. It appears at the present time as if this fast Atlantic service resolution was going to be carried without many dissentient voices. In that case, I congratulate the present Government on making a bargain a great deal better and more advantageous to the people of this country than the bargain that was made by the late Government. But even though the bargain may be a good one, it appears to me not to be in the interest of the country, and if the question comes to a vote, I shall feel it my duty to vote against it.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is carried I want to congratulate the Government, and specially the leader of the Government, on the most noted if not the most instant conversion which has taken place with reference to his new attitude in respect to the fast line service. It was not quite as instantaneous as that celebrated conversion we read of in the New Testament, but I am inclined to hope that it is just about as thorough. We hear no more of those outbreathings of slaughter and persecution of any such idea as this from my hon. friend. He has adopted the Imperial policy; he has by his action declared that in the years previous, not years of youth but of mature age, and not very long ago, he was either mistaken or he was criticising for opposition's sake. I congratulate the Government on being toned down by the responsibility of office, to a different view on these great matters from that which they permitted themselves to hold when they were merely in Opposition and, as they thought, irresponsible. But I want to point out to my hon. friend, so that it may be a lesson to him if he ever goes into Opposition again, that there are certain perils connected with taking a position of opposition for opposition's sake upon every great policy which is propounded by a Government. My hon. friend took the position of opposition to a

fast line service, took it very strongly; he educated some of those gentlemen who are sitting behind him to-day. But while my hon. friend has been able to turn thoroughly and quickly, the present aspect of the other side of the House shows that some of the hon. gentlemen who follow him have not been able to catch on quite so quickly, and to change quite so readily. My hon. friend from the city of Hamilton (Mr. Wood), is so far behind the times that he pins his faith upon this question of policy to an editorial in the "Globe." In simple innocence, he read what he saw was an editorial of the "Globe," and came to the conclusion that if he would plant both his feet on that, he would be on solid ground. So he planted both his feet on that editorial of the "Globe" of a few months ago, and he came before the House in all the confidence and vigorous assertion that he is capable of, and declared that he was right in opposing a fast service, and said: Here is the ground upon which I stand on, a file of the "Globe" of a few weeks ago. But my hon. friend has done poor service to the "Globe," because the "Globe" last night came out with strong and well-defined head lines and talked about the vigorous and bold policy of the present Government, saying this was a Government that was not afraid to spend a dollar if it took it into its head to spend it. that it was going to carry out a bold and vigorous policy—what of, Sir? Of a fast line service across the Atlantic; and its editorials for the last two or three weeks have been just as strongly commendatory of this fast line service as was that editorial ante-dating by a few weeks the present date upon which my hon. friend was so misled as to take his stand. Let him learn from that there is nothing stable in a "Globe" editorial, that in fact there is nothing stable in the utterance of a Liberal statesman when he is on the Opposition side of the House. Let him tone down the exuberance of utterance upon those lines of policy until he diligently listens and carefully finds out what the leaders say, and what the "Globe" itself says at this present date, in this present year of grace, 1897, and this month in which action is proposed. Now, some of my hon. friends who have expressed their opinion strongly against this measure are non-progressists, they have not been able, as I said, to catch on quickly enough. Some of them will come to it probably in this vote, as the leader of the Patrons almost intimated that he would. He thought it would carry, but he said they were only a small band, and of course principle does not count for anything. If you have got votes enough to overbear an adversary, do it; but if it is only principle that you are on don't show your colours. I commend this to the Patrons, and to the Patron leader in this House. Now, there is a point of criticism which hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the fast line, make as

a bit of solace to the Government while opposing this scheme, and that is, that they have made a better money bargain. That, my hon. friends will find out, remains to be seen. If it is of the essence of this matter that it is honestly gone into and from a conviction that an Atlantic fast service is a necessity of to-day, it is open to this criticism which I make and which I feel it is right to make, that the hon. gentleman and the Government, in asking the House to pass this resolution, are experimenting, and dangerously experimenting. They are taking all the perils of experimenting. Why, Sir, they have taken this new type, and it is admitted by hon. gentlemen from Ontario, who have taken as a basis for a decreased cost the new type upon which the vessel is to be built, this bottle-necked type. It is something new. Coal barges have been built upon this model; coal steamers also; but there was never a passenger vessel which was proceeding upon any well-defined or important route that was built upon this model, the bottle-necked pattern, so to speak. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) is in this position, that he is recommending, and his Government are taking up a vote of Parliament of \$500,000 and more, to enable an inventor, no, not an inventor, but the broker of an inventor, to experiment with an invention that has not yet been tried on the trackless waste of water anywhere in the world. Now, it may succeed, but if it does succeed that removes only one out of the list of contingencies. It is all very well for my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) to quiet the apprehensions of his followers by indulging in prophecies that this will be a great success. Mr. Knapp will do that. Go down to the town of Brockville and talk with Mr. Knapp who is now having built, a steamer that is not bottle-necked, but barrelled, and is going to roll in forty-eight hours all the way from Halifax to Liverpool on the otherside. He will tell you that he has not the slightest doubt that that will prove a great commercial and navigating success. My hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) can only prophesy. He can only hope that maybe this will turn out well, but I am informed by a pretty good authority that these gentlemen who have undertaken this business are coming to the conclusion that the new line type as applied to vessels of this size is a doubtful experiment at the best, and that they are coming very rapidly to the idea that they will have to drop the models which they have submitted and adopt vessels of the type of the "Campania," and others of that kind. If that be so, I submit that the fault that the Government has committed is in using this fast line vote in an endeavour to experiment with a new type of vessel which has not been proved by any actual experiment and they will consequently run a risk of failure which will be no slight thing for this country. The

Government had the offer of a firm who were known to be able to carry out their contracts, who had large interests in Canada, who were proceeding upon the lines of vessels which were in use on all the great steamship routes of the world, and although the cost was \$200,000 or \$250,000 more, there were the certainties on these points, that they would have a company able to carry out their contract, a company which had large interests in Canada, whose interests are bound up with those of this country and who have a great interest in a route between Canada and England. The second point of criticism that I wish to make is this: When the hon. gentleman undertook to change the line and type of vessels it was their duty to throw the matter open to tender to all steamship companies. There was a change of policy in the line and type of vessels that they proposed to take. It is very different to ask tenders from shipping firms for a type of vessels like the "Lucania" and the "Campania," which are well understood because the running powers and all the mechanism are well known. When these tenders have been received the Government says, "No, we will not have that; the cost is too great. We will alter our conditions of tender; we will alter our conditions of contract, and we will contract for a line that is built upon a totally new model and a totally new plan." Then, I say, it would only have been fair to the shipping interests of this country and the shipping interests of all countries and to the public interests of this country, as well, that new tenders should have been asked for on the new lines. I wish to make these two points of criticism and to say that if, after the lapse of a few years, during which this experiment is going on, it is proved that it is impossible for the contractors to carry out this contract or that this build of vessel is a failure, the Government will have to take the responsibility of giving a very black eye indeed to any future attempt to connect Canada with Great Britain by a fast Atlantic service. They will discredit the idea and discredit the route, as well, by any possible failure that may take place in the matter. The Government say that it is costing less than the original proposition. Granted that it is; but suppose that these steamers are built and they commence to run and they are found to be failures, that it is actually impossible to run them for the small subsidy, the alternative is in the face of the Government, as to whether the line shall be discontinued or whether, upon actual proof being given that these vessels cannot be continued without a greater subsidy, the Government shall come down and ask for a supplementary vote in order to keep the line running, basing their ground for the asking of that vote on the demonstration that the subsidy is too small. In facing that alternative they will ask Parliament to im-

Mr. FOSTER.

plement the amount and Parliament will be very likely to implement the amount if they feel that it is impossible for the service to be carried on for so small a subsidy. Is that fair to the general contracting public? If you give to a steamship company the power to get a contract under which they propose to carry on an experiment, putting it at a low figure, and finding out afterwards that they have to change the type of their vessels, the subsidy is too low and they apply for more, it will be giving to that line a step over all their competitors and enable them to get a contract really without tender to the disadvantage of reputable firms who have had an interest in Canada for many years, and whose interest would be bound up in the success of the service that they would be carrying on between Canada and the old country. That is all I have to say in the way of criticism. No one will be more heartily glad than myself if the venture of the Government proves successful, but there are great risks in attendance upon the experiment. If they gain this fast line under the conditions which were laid down and of the excellence which they demand, no one will be happier than we who sit on this side of the House, and if it shall prove that they have been unable to do that at a decreased cost to the country. The element of risk in experimenting with a new line of vessels is one that ought not to be left out of consideration, and must meet with criticism on this and that side of the House. There was no element of risk in the other scheme. The lines of vessels were well known, but there is the element of risk in this. I do not wish to take the time of the House to any greater length. My views are well known upon the general policy of a fast Atlantic service. I am in favour of it. I shall support, with these criticisms, the resolution of my hon. friend opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) for the establishment of a fast Atlantic service, and I will again hope that it will be gained for the sum they have named.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up more than a moment or two in discussing this matter. There is one thing that, at all events, I am sure we are all pleased with and it is the very fair nature of the criticism which has been used in reference to the project. Both the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster) have, I think, criticised the proposal of the Government in a most fair and straightforward manner. I should be very sorry, for my part, if I thought the view of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster) in one respect at least was a sound one. I cannot believe, and I would be sorry to believe that if what he describes as a pure experiment, the employment of a line of steamships of a kind of construction which has never been on a

passenger route before, resulted in failure, that failure would be regarded as in any degree a reproach to the possibility of our establishing a successful fast line across the Atlantic. This is, no doubt, as my hon. friend has said, to a certain extent in the nature of an experiment; and if, unhappily, it should turn out that these vessels are not so well qualified as we hope for the service which they are expected to perform, because they are of a peculiar type, that fact should not, I think, in any degree militate against the possibility of establishing a fast line with vessels of the ordinary type of construction. But as regard the course pursued by the Government, I think it only fair to say that if it is to be an experiment, it is at least, if I understood aright the interesting statements made by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), an experiment which commanded the approval of experts of the Admiralty; and the best evidence of that is that the Imperial Government are prepared to give the grant towards this line which they agreed to give, notwithstanding that vessels of this construction are being employed. If the Admiralty thought they were vessels of bad construction, or vessels not likely to perform the service required of them, certainly the Imperial grant would not be forthcoming. From that point of view, I think we may well justify the Government in entering upon this experiment, if it ought to be called an experiment. I wish, for my part, to say that I am delighted to find that in this matter the Government have taken the energetic course which they have taken, and that they have so speedily placed us in a position to believe that we shall have a first-class line of steamers plying between Canadian ports and British ports within two years. I am delighted to think that we have reached that point in this matter. To all those who have been endeavouring to promote an Imperial policy—and I venture to make use of that expression, notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—it is very gratifying to find that we have arrived at last at this position, that both the great parties in this country admit that the best and safest and surest market for the surplus products of Canada is to be found in the mother country; and that we have arrived at this other point, that both parties are prepared in as short a time as possible to provide the quickest possible communication between Canada and that market. And when hon. gentlemen representing agricultural constituencies have spoken of the farmers of this country being opposed to a policy of this kind, I wish to say that the farmers of this country have been largely misled in regard to this policy. I feel satisfied that when the matter is fairly put before the farmers of this country, they will not be opposed to such a policy. I want to call the attention

of hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this matter, especially the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), to the fact that the line which is now being established is to provide special accommodation for the products of the farmers. A very large space is to be provided for cold storage accommodation which was not the case with the fast line which was contracted for previously. That is a very great advantage to the farmers. One of the arguments that used to be urged against a fast line was that we did not want passenger vessels only, but that we wanted vessels that would carry freight. These vessels will carry from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of freight. When these facts are placed before my hon. friend's constituents, I am quite sure that there will not be the same opposition among them to such a service that there was when they were promised no such advantages. When the hon. gentleman says that it does not matter to the farmers whether their products are carried a few days more quickly or a few days more slowly across the Atlantic, he overlooks the fact that the farmers are likely to have in the mother country a market for perishable goods; and if we are to send our fruits and other perishable products to the markets of the mother country the facilities provided by this line for carrying them across the Atlantic in a few days and in good condition, will be an incalculable boon to the farmers of Canada; for by this means they will have a market for these products which otherwise they would not have had at all. For my part, I heartily congratulate the Government on the arrangement they have made, and I sincerely hope that it will turn out to be as successful as they expect.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Kaulbach,
Bain,	Kloepfer,
Bazinet,	Landerkin,
Beattie,	Lang,
Beith,	Langeller,
Belcourt,	Lavergne,
Bell (Addington),	Legris,
Bell (Pictou),	Lemieux,
Bennett,	Lewis,
Bergeron,	Lister,
Blair,	Livingston,
Blanchard,	Logan,
Boisvert,	Lount,
Borden (Halifax),	Macdonald (King's),
Bostock,	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacPherson,
Britton,	McAllister,
Brodeur,	McCleary,
Bruneau,	McClure,
Calvert,	McCormick,
Campbell,	McDougall,
Cargill,	McGregor,
Carroll,	McGugan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McHugh,

Casey,	McIsaac,
Casgrain,	McLennan (Inverness),
Champagne,	McMullen,
Chauvin,	McNeill,
Christie,	Marcotte,
Clancy,	Martin,
Clarke,	Maxwell,
Cowan,	Migneault,
Craig,	Mills,
Davies,	Monk,
Davin,	Moore,
Dechéne,	Morrison,
Desmarais,	Osler,
Dobell,	Penny,
Dugas,	Perry,
Dupont,	Pope,
Dupré,	Poupore,
Dyment,	Powell,
Earle,	Préfontaine,
Edwards,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Quinn,
Fiset,	Reid,
Fisher,	Rinfret,
Fitzpatrick,	Roddick,
Flint,	Rosamond,
Fortin,	Russell,
Foster,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Savard,
Fraser (Lambton),	Scriven,
Frost,	Scagram,
Geoffrion,	Sifton,
Gibson,	Snetsinger,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Gilmour,	Stenson,
Guay,	Talbot,
Guité,	Tarte,
Haley,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hodgins,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hurley,	Turcot,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Jamson,	Wood (Brockville), and
Joly de Lotbinière,	Yeo.—134.
(Sir Henri),	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Burnett,	Oliver,
Cameron,	Pettet,
Douglas,	Ratz,
Ellis,	Richardson,
Erb,	Robertson,
Graham,	Rogers,
Hale,	Somerville,
Macdonald (Huron),	Stubbs,
McInnes,	Tolmie,
McMillan,	Wilson, and
Meigs,	Wood (Hamilton).—22.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GUAY. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) has not voted, nor has the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette).

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am paired with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), otherwise I would have voted for the resolution.

Mr. GODBOUT. I am paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney). I would have voted in favour of the resolution.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. HEYD. I understood that my pair with the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Ferguson) commenced this evening, but I hear it began at three o'clock; therefore, I desire to withdraw the vote recorded by me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion has been declared carried, but the hon. gentleman's explanation will be taken into account by the reporters of the Debates of the House.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) respecting cold storage on steamships from Canada to the United Kingdom.—(Mr. Fisher.)

## ACT RESPECTING INTEREST.

Bill (No. 134) respecting interest was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

2. Whenever any interest is, by the terms of any written or printed contract and whether under seal or not, made payable at a rate or percentage per day, week, month, or at any rate or percentage for any period less than a year, no interest exceeding the rate or percentage of six per cent per annum shall be chargeable, payable or recoverable on any part of the principal money unless the contract contains an express statement of the yearly rate or percentage of interest to which such other rate or percentage is equivalent.

Mr. TISDALE. Suppose the document made the interest payable half-yearly, would the Act apply?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). If the interest is made payable at a certain rate or percentage for any period less than a year, it would apply, but if the interest is so much per year, payable half-yearly or otherwise, it would not apply.

Mr. TISDALE. If the note was made for a term of years, and the interest payable half-yearly, would this Bill apply?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. If the contract provides for the payment of a sum of money with an undertaking to pay interest thereon at so much per annum, the interest may be made payable monthly or quarterly or semi-annually, and this Bill would not apply. It is necessary that the rate of interest per annum should be stipulated. If, on the other hand, the interest is made payable so much per day or week or month, and not at a certain rate per year, the Bill will apply.

Mr. SPROULE. If, for instance, as is usually done, there is a foot note on the

promissory note to the effect that interest at the rate of 2 per cent shall be charged then this Bill would apply, because the rate is for a period less than a year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). Suppose the interest is not made payable by the day or week or month, but is added in a lump sum to the principal and does not appear on the face of the note as interest at all, would the Act apply? It seems to me it would not.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. It is not intended to apply to any such case as that.

Mr. **TISDALE**. I am strongly of the opinion that it would apply under the wording, if you cover up the interest with the principal. Take the ordinary banking way of doing business. There is no question of interest at all in the note, but you pay what is called a discount, and that is added to the principal: For instance, you borrow \$100 from a bank and they charge 7 per cent, and you give a note for \$107 without mention of interest at all. Would this clause make that clause bad as regards the extra 1 per cent?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. It would not. The object is to prevent people from charging so much interest for a short time, for instance a day or a week or a month, without the person who is undertaking to borrow the money and pay the interest knowing the exact nature of the obligation he has contracted. It is substantially an extension to promissory notes of the provisions already in our statutes applying to loans made with a sinking fund or mortgage attached. I understand my hon. friend to point out this case. Would it be possible for a man to borrow \$10 and give his note for \$20, and agree to pay 6 per cent per annum on that \$20, without that note coming under this proposed legislation? I think that would be an avoidance of the spirit of the Act, and would be reached by the third clause if the borrower did not know how much he was paying for interest annually.

Mr. **SPROULE**. In that case, would not the interest be considered as principal? It does not appear as interest, and in giving your note you give it for value received.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The second section seems to me to refer to a contract which has, in express terms on its face, the payment of interest at a certain rate; and if you take a note in that way, it must mention the rate of interest per annum or you cannot recover more than 6 per cent. But suppose I borrow \$100 and agree to pay \$75 interest, and in pursuance of this agreement I give my note for the \$175, would that come with-

in the terms of the section? It would be a practical evasion, but if we mean to include that kind of case, our wording should be broader.

Mr. **TISDALE**. The object, I take it, is to protect those who do not understand what they are promising, or do you mean to go further and compel people to express on the face of the note the interest they are willing to pay? I believe that in the case of money as in that of any other commodity, provided people understand what they are doing, they have a right to agree to pay any price or any rate of interest they please. Since we adopted the principle of free money with regard to interest, or the right of people to agree to pay any rate of interest they please, we have had cheaper money.

I am quite prepared to support any legislation that will prevent imposition, but I cannot understand from the Bill precisely what is meant. Now, my view of the Act is in accord with that of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and if it means what he says it does, I am in favour of it. But if it means that if a man shall not agree to pay whatever rates he pleases, why then, I think it is a step in the wrong direction. We had that matter before the House two or three sessions ago. It was referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee and was discussed in Committee of the Whole, and we finally affirmed the principle of what I call free money, in the sense of allowing bargains to be made for money the same as for any other article. I thought it meant what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said, but I presume that the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill understood what was covered by it better than I did, for I have not had the same time to consider it.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The object is to protect the borrower so that he may know exactly the nature of the contract he is entering into. A hypothetical case is put by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) in which, he says, the law can be evaded, and a man may take one of these usurious contracts. If he attempts to evade the law, and, as a result, a usurious contract is entered into, under the 3rd clause he has a right to recover.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. The object is to protect ignorant people who go to borrow money, from being charged exorbitant rates of interest. If this is the object, it seems to me that object should be stated in plain terms and the Bill should be made to cover the case. I do not think that the expressions used in section 2 cover the case which my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) alluded to. Suppose a man goes to borrow ten dollars and a note is made out for fifteen dollars, to be paid in a month. I do not think that that

case will come either under section 3 or under section 2. Section 2 says that the rate of interest is to be stated in the contract, but in the case which my hon. friend gave, there would be no arrangement concerning a rate of interest. There would simply be an agreement to pay a bulk sum at the expiration of a certain time. Then there could be no recovery under section 3, because that relates exclusively to what is said in the second section. It seems to me, therefore, that this law will be evaded every time and that the borrower will be practically left where he is.

Mr. BRITTON. This Bill, as it seems to me, is intended to meet a particular case that is said to have occurred in the province of Quebec, in which a very large judgment was recovered against a man because he had signed a note under which he agreed to pay interest at a rate of so much per day. The Bill does not provide in any way against the state of things suggested by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). Though I agree with him as to what will be done, I think it can hardly be said there will be an evasion of the law, if the law does not provide against that which is suggested. Where it is agreed that a lump sum is to be paid, there is no contravention of the second section of the Act. If the agreement does not contravene the second section, the money could not be recovered because, as has been said—and it need not more than be repeated—if it is not paid under a state of circumstances that the section provides for, it cannot be recovered under the third section of the Act. If I may be allowed to say anything against a Bill that is introduced by the Government, I do submit that this is a piece of rather useless legislation. Still, there is no doubt it provides, at all events, for one case, the case of a man being led to sign a contract that will prove a very hard one, and will make him liable for a very large sum if it is allowed to run on, through having a rate of interest specified at so much per day or per week. Such legislation has been enacted in Ontario in reference to building societies to which the principal is to be paid back on the sinking fund plan. They are prohibited from carrying on business on this plan unless the mortgage under which the instalments are paid states the rate of interest secured and being paid by the borrower. In case that is omitted, only 6 per cent can be recovered. Now, if this Bill is intended to go as far as the Solicitor General indicates, the second clause ought to be widened in some way so as to reach the class of cases to which he refers. But if the Bill is intended only to meet the particular case to which reference has been made, I think that no change is necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the Bill clearly states on the face what it intends to do—that where a man enters into a contract to pay a certain sum of money in a certain

time, after the lapse of that time, it shall not be content to charge him 2 or 3 per cent per month that such a rate cannot be collected, and if it is collected, it shall apply on the principal.

Mr. POWELL. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not understand the meaning of the clause if that is not the meaning.

Mr. POWELL. You have been reading some other Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. It provides where interest is charged "at any rate or percentage for any period less than a year," if it is in excess of 6 per cent that is collected, than the amount that is over 6 per cent shall apply on the principal. I know that there are people who lend money and who have notes drawn in that way, and I think that the innocent borrower should be protected against an extortionate rate of interest sought to be imposed upon him in this way. In a case such as that stated by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), where the interest is embodied in the principal, I do not see very well how you can legislate to reach that. I question very much if you can do so. But I think it is well we should pass a law of this kind, because there are cases within my own knowledge of people who have been robbed and almost ruined by enormous rates of interest attached to notes after the time of their maturity. We should try to protect the innocent who are forced to borrow money, so that if he gets into the clutches of a man who is unscrupulous enough virtually to rob him, the law shall step in and prevent him from extorting this 4 or 5 per cent per month.

Mr. QUINN. While I congratulate the Government upon introducing a Bill much on the lines of a Bill introduced by myself, I realize that it does not exactly cover the line I wanted to cover. As has been explained by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) the object is to protect innocent and indigent borrowers and place them in a position that an extortionate rate of interest cannot be exacted from them by usury. While I do not like to speak against the provisions of this Bill which is somewhat upon the lines of my own, I venture to offer a word or two of criticism. The Bill provides that if a man, no matter what his circumstances, agrees to pay a rate over 6 per cent—say 60 per cent—that amount can be collected from him. Now, we all know how usurers operate. It is not by disguising the rate of interest that is paid per annum or by offering a small rate of interest at the time they made the loan. They make the loan in this way: A man borrows \$100; he signs a note agreeing to pay \$150 in a month, and to the end of that note is tacked a clause to this effect: "In the event of this note not being paid at ma-

Mr. CASGRAIN.

turity, interest at the rate of \$10 or \$20 or \$50 per month shall be charged." Under this Act they would not be allowed to collect \$10, or \$20, or the amount that would be charged, and I apprehend that is the intention of the Bill, and that it is a correct construction to put upon the clause. But in order to get over this Bill, all that would be necessary by the usurer would be to say, instead of interest at the rate of \$10 per month, interest at the rate of 60 per cent per annum, and that rate could be collected. Now, while I think this is a move in the right direction, I think it does not do all that is required at the moment. As has been said by several hon. members who have already spoken, this Act originated on account of certain transactions, not only in the province of Quebec, but in other provinces. Probably we hear more about them from the province of Quebec, because public spirit is greater there, and interests itself more in protecting the poorer classes of the people. But the fact is that usury exists in different parts of this country besides the province of Quebec. It is probably brought to light in the province of Quebec more frequently than in any other province; but I know, as a matter of fact, that usury thrives all over this country, and that they exact the severest payments from people of indigent circumstances, particularly if they are ignorant persons. I am glad to see this Bill introduced, and am heartily in favour of the clause. I think it does not do all that it ought to do, but it is a step in the right direction, and I support it on that ground. When the time comes, and we find that usurers have adopted means to overcome this and evade the law, then it will be the duty of the House to interfere and bring in other legislation to operate against them. It is only by expressing the opinions of this House on this question as we are doing now, that we can notify these people that attention is being given to them, and that if they attempt to circumvent the provisions of this Bill in any way, still greater attention will be given them and the subject of usury in the future.

Mr. POWELL. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is certainly right in his construction of this section. I will take two cases. The agreement may state the amount of the loan or debt and also contain a promise to pay. That case may be provided for by this section and it may be said by a forced construction that it meets the words of the section which, in terms, require the amount of interest to be set forth. It may be argued that inasmuch as the amount of interest appears on the face of the agreement the rate of interest appears, by the terms of the written, or printed, contract. But in a case where there is no recital of the amount actually due or received, the Act does not apply. Supposing a note is for \$107 and

\$100 is the principal. By the terms of the agreement, the rate of interest in no way appears expressly or by inference. The interest is outside of the written agreement. Suppose that \$90 were the principal, the terms of the written agreement show no difference. If there was anything on the face of the agreement to show the amount received and the amount to be paid, then it is possible the language of the section might cover the case, but not otherwise.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THE COMPANIES ACT.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 135) to amend the Companies Act—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Difficulty has arisen in the construction of the words, "limitation" and "commercial paper" discounted by the company. The words "commercial paper" here apply to what is commonly known as trade paper. There is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words, and we think it proper to make it clear.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Davies.)

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

#### After Recess.

#### I.C.R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 4088) declaring it expedient to confirm an agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company and Her Majesty for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) going to make his statement on these resolutions before going into committee?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do it in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be much more in order to make the discussion on the principle of the thing before going into committee and leave the committee for the discussion of the items.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will go into committee first.

Mr. FOSTER. I as one member of the House wish to discuss this on the principle of the thing outside of the mere discussion in the committee stage. We have had no discussion upon it at all. It is not generally the practice to propose a resolution, and go into committee upon it without any explanation of the resolution at all, and I do not want to speak before I have heard the explanation of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will perceive that it will be much more convenient in this case for the Minister to make his statement in committee and then reply from time to time as occasion requires. He will have greater facilities for dealing with it in committee than he would have with you, Mr. Speaker, in the Chair and then going into committee afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. But the House may not have a disposition to go into committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it does not really make any difference. The question has been submitted to the House by the general statement of the Minister of Railways and now the resolution is formally moved. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) moves that the House should go into committee, the discussion can be taken probably with more regularity and with less loss of time. Then if the House decides to go into committee it is a mere question of discussion in reference to the various clauses.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does not propose to give the House any information in reference to the position of the Government we will have to discuss this question without that information. Are we to be forced to discuss this question before the House is given any explanation? This is the first time within my knowledge that a responsible Minister has shown such discourtesy in introducing a question by refusing to discuss the principle of it before going into the details in committee. The discussion that we had was simply upon a statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is quite true, Mr. Speaker, and yet it was a statement of the terms of the proposed arrangement between the com-

Mr. FOSTER.

pany and the Government, and although a considerable discussion took place at that time it was merely upon the statement which I then gave to the committee. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows very well that it is a mere matter of technical objection that he is now raising, and there is no want of courtesy on the part of the Government in the slightest degree. This course has been the usual course and it is a course which I thought would doubtless commend itself to the general approval of the House, because we thereby afforded every possible opportunity to hon. gentlemen on both sides to express their views on the features of these proposals. I need not say that I am quite unable to admit any discourtesy such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asserts I have committed. On the contrary I must take whatever course is the acceptable one without the slightest choice on my part. It is not a matter of any considerable moment one way or the other so far as any statement I have to make is concerned. I am willing to make it if it is insisted upon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is better.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If that is the desire I have no objection. Mr. Speaker, in endeavouring to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite the other day I made a brief statement to the House as to the terms on which the Government propose to enter into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Drummond Railway Company for the purpose of carrying out the policy and extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal. I think, Sir, that my hon. friends opposite rather got the advantage of me by reason of my having pursued that course. My purpose simply was to comply with the request which had been made by the hon. gentleman himself (Sir Charles Tupper) and in respect to which I did on the 20th May last indicate to the hon. gentleman the course that I would pursue if it met with his approval. The hon. gentleman on that day asked me whether there would be an announcement made of the arrangements which had been declared to be concluded on the opening day of the session. I replied as follows:—

I think I will be prepared, at the first opportunity which will be convenient for the purpose, to make a complete statement of the proposed arrangement. I do not know just in what form the hon. member would desire that it should be presented.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I propose is, that the promise made by the Governor General should be fulfilled and that this arrangement should be laid before this House for its approval.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question but that will be done

in the ordinary course. I thought that the hon. gentleman desired to have some explanation prior to the submission of the resolution and the Bill, so that the House might be informed as to the details. I shall take occasion, if it will answer the convenience or suit the purpose of the hon. gentleman, when the Estimates are on having reference to the Railway Department, to make a full statement with regard to these details.

Having given the hon. gentleman that assurance at his own instance and request, when the items relating to the Railway Department were reached in Supply I availed myself at once of the opportunity of presenting to the House a statement of the terms which had been agreed upon between the contracting parties and I made, I think, as the hon. members will at once acknowledge no pretense to do more than to state these terms. I presented no reasons or arguments in support of the policy which is being proposed to Parliament. I did not pretend at all to enter into the subject, or in any way to justify the course the Government were proposing to take. But the hon. gentlemen opposite took advantage, I think somewhat unfairly, of the course I was pursuing, and precipitated a discussion which appeared, and was necessarily, under the circumstances, very one-sided; because I had not contemplated for one moment that I would be expected, and did not come prepared, to present the case to the committee in support of the Government policy. Knowing, as every one knows, that there was no resolution asking the opinion of Parliament upon it, I felt that it was scarcely a convenient opportunity, to say the least of it, to present the case, as I thought it could and should be presented, when the question was fully and fairly before the House.

I do not know, Sir, that I can complain of the course which the hon. gentlemen opposite then took, although I acknowledge that they have to some extent succeeded in conveying a very erroneous and false impression with regard to the wisdom of the Government policy, and have succeeded, to some extent at all events, in creating an entire misconception of the question in the public mind. Notwithstanding that, I do not know that I much regret the course which the hon. gentlemen have taken. It very clearly indicated a determination upon their part to condemn the policy which we were outlining without being willing to take the amount of time which would reasonably be required to consider it in all its bearings, and to form a proper judgment upon it; and this also afforded me an opportunity of getting some idea of the line these gentlemen proposed to take in resisting the propositions the Government were presenting to Parliament. I observe, Mr. Speaker, that the word has gone forth to the Opposition press as to the kind of reception they are to give this proposition. I notice that it is to be characterized, and is being char-

acterized, in very strong terms. It is called a flagrant job, and I am characterized as being a bold jobber and corruptionist by reason of having made this proposition to Parliament as a member of the Administration. Well, Sir, one would almost think that the experience which some gentlemen have had in the past with regard to charges of that description, would have led them to exercise a little care, a little caution, and a little judgment, before starting out on such accusations. We all know how very easy a thing it is for people to make charges of jobbery against Governments. It does not require very much material to formulate these accusations, and it is very often done by reason of the absence of any real solid objection against the proposals which are made. It is easy enough for our friends opposite to say that a transaction is a job, and to charge members of the Government who are identified with it, and the Government as a whole who are promoting it, with being guilty of corruption. But seeing that these charges flow so glibly from some lips, I would have expected that our hon. friends opposite, with their past experience, would have paused a little, and have taken the trouble to study these proposals and to ascertain their real nature and their real merits, at least, before adopting such a method of criticism.

Well, Sir, I think that these proposals, when they come to be examined, will justify themselves. I am prepared to justify them before this Parliament; I am prepared to justify them fully before the country, and I think it will be made clear, before this discussion is over that if there ever was a proposition submitted to Parliament which had a solid foundation, which was meritorious in the extreme, which could be justified in the public interest, which was a reasonable, fair and just proposition, the one I am about to submit elaborately fulfils all these conditions. I will undertake before I sit down to show this Parliament that the utmost care and judgment have been exercised in the consideration of all the details of this arrangement from beginning to end. I am willing as a member of this Government to take upon myself, if it were necessary, the entire responsibility of having initiated this policy and of having had it pressed upon the consideration of my colleagues. There is nothing in it, I tell these hon. gentlemen, upon which they can found the suspicion of jobbery; there is nothing in it that will not stand the test of a critical examination by the business men of this country.

Now, I take it, the first question that will naturally arise for the consideration of Parliament in this connection is this: Is the general policy involved in this question one that ought to be commended? That policy is the question of an extension of the Intercolonial from its present terminus to the city of Montreal. That question I propose

to examine for a few moments before I enter into a communication of the details. That is the large question that underlies the whole matter; and if it is not possible to convince Parliament that there is an ample justification for extending the railway from its present terminus to the city of Montreal, then the whole proposition should and will fall to the ground, and be condemned by the judgment of Parliament. But I am willing to confess I thought it impossible that there would be any voice raised in this Parliament against the wisdom of the policy involved in these proposals. I thought there was scarcely any man familiar with the conditions under which the Intercolonial Railway had during all these years been operated and maintained, who would not be free to recognize the difficulties and disadvantages under which, from every business point of view, it has been managed and operated. I thought it would be conceded at once that the same conditions which apply to the operation of other railways in this and other countries, would be applicable to the case of the Intercolonial Railway, and that there was a need, a pressing and imperative need, at the earliest possible moment when an arrangement could be effected on reasonable terms, that an arrangement should be made by which the Intercolonial Railway should reach Montreal and establish a terminus in that great city. What are the reasons which made it our duty as the owners and operators of this vast property to propose this policy and to press it upon the favourable consideration of Parliament? Why, Sir, where does this railway terminate? In a little village 170 odd miles from the city of Montreal—in a little village so situated that the Intercolonial Railway is practically blocked from reaching Montreal and the country west of that city, by a piece of railway owned by a rival and competing line. What would be the feeling with which the owners of any railway would encounter such a condition of things? I said the other day, and I repeat, that there is no railway company in this or any other country which, if it found itself in a like case, would not strain every nerve and assume every reasonable responsibility in order to relieve itself of the incubus under which it laboured, the trammels under which it was operated, and to remove the blocks which prevented it reaching a point where it might fairly undertake all the business that offered, and where it might pursue under favourable conditions the object for which the railway was established. Under existing conditions, I say the Intercolonial Railway cannot be successfully operated. I venture to say that there is nothing which has given occasion for more discussion in this Parliament in times past than the fact that the Intercolonial Railway has been operated all these years at a loss. People have pointed to the annual deficit recurring from time to

Mr. BLAIR.

time, and have drawn the inference that there was something wrong in the system of owning and operating Government railways. The idea has gone abroad and has sunk deeply in people's minds, that because the Intercolonial Railway has not been a paying property—or, in other words, has scarcely in all its history been able to show a balance on the right side of its accounts—there was something inherently vicious in the Government ownership of railways, and that the less a Government had to do with them the better. That was an idea which I think I am justified in saying strongly impressed itself upon the people's minds. But I think I shall be able to show this committee that if there has been one thing more than another which has led to this state of affairs, it is that the Intercolonial Railway has been cribbed, cabined and confined. I will give this committee, before I get through, good reasons for believing that after this extension shall be concluded, and after it shall have an opportunity of getting into successful competition, the days of deficits will be over, and we shall be able—I do not say to pay interest on the capital invested—I do not think the country looks for that—but by the business arrangements which we shall be in a position to make, and by the facilities which will be secured to us in Montreal, to show a balance on the right side of the account and to reverse the record which has been exhibited in the running operations of this railway in times past. I do not desire to make any reflection upon the administration of the Intercolonial Railway in the past. I do not say that it has not been wisely handled or that it has been extravagantly handled. I am not in a position yet to express any definite opinion on that point; but I do say, as far as I have been able to exercise any little judgment I may have, that the extension of this railway to the city of Montreal will reverse the position it has had in the past by creating business which cannot fail to produce vastly improved results.

When I assumed control of the Department of Railways, I asked myself the question: Can anything be done to get us into Montreal? Though not a railway man, though not pretending to any experience in railway matters, though not versed in the details of railway management, I did feel that when we had a railway which traversed 1,200 miles of this country, which crossed through the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and a large portion of the province of Quebec, it was our bounden duty, if we could accomplish it upon reasonable terms, to lose no time in carrying out this policy of extension to Montreal. As I said the other night, and as I repeat now, I do not arrogate to myself any credit for having conceived the idea, because I know it was in the minds and intention of hon. gentlemen

opposite. I know that they looked into this matter, and I know that if they did not come to any decision, it was because it is always more convenient to put these proposals off than to take them in hand. Every Government has influences behind it urging the advisability of not taking up these large proposals, but of putting them off from day to day, and they are put off; but I felt that we could not take up this question under more favourable circumstances as a new Government, coming into a new Parliament, seeking to initiate a new policy. I felt that if there ever would be a time in the life of this Government when we could command the support and confidence of Parliament, the present was the time to take up and carry this policy to completion.

I wish to make no reflection upon the management of the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not think that the conduct of that company with respect to the Intercolonial Railway has been different in any particular from what would have been the conduct of any other railway situated in like position. Their object has always been naturally to make the best out of existing conditions, and in that view they imposed at times onerous terms upon the Intercolonial Railway which prevented our carrying any considerable proportion of the freight traffic to Montreal. And the inconsiderable portion of freight traffic which did find its way via the Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal over the Intercolonial Railway, found its way under conditions which were not as favourable. I venture to affirm, as they would have been if the Government had owned that piece of railway, or as they will be in the future if we are authorized by Parliament to become owners of that piece of railway. In all that through business, the policy of the Grand Trunk Railway has been to exact from us all they could. There have been at times undoubtedly, arrangements made which were somewhat fair, but they certainly were not as fair as we thought they should have been. No doubt the Grand Trunk Railway exacted from us a larger proportion of the mileage rate than they should have received or should have been fairly chargeable against the mileage. So that upon every ton of freight carried to and from the Intercolonial Railway via the Grand Trunk Railway system from Montreal to Lévis and Lévis to Montreal, we have been obliged to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway Company from the freight rates we received, a larger portion than was due to them, or that they would have been fairly entitled to get, if they had been simply charging us the pro rata mileage.

I said the other day, and repeat it now, in order to revive the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that we were not in a position to exercise any control in any respect over these freight charges. We could not send representatives to the conventions held for

the purpose of arranging these matters. We had no right to be represented at these conventions at all, and therefore had no say whatever in the arrangements reached. All these things pointed to the necessity, it seems to me, of the adoption of the policy we are now submitting to Parliament, and to which, I venture to hope, Parliament will give its almost unanimous support and approval.

I understand that the objection is raised to this proposition that we are not thereby able to shorten the route between Halifax and Montreal as compared with the route over the Canadian Pacific Railway. A comparison is instituted between the mileage from Halifax via the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and the mileage from Halifax via the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal, and because the mileage is greater by the Intercolonial Railway, the argument is adduced, that since we cannot absolutely annihilate distance, since we cannot overcome that difference, we are therefore not making a reasonable proposition. I for one admit frankly to-night, as I did the other night, that the question of mileage did not enter into the consideration at all in my mind, and I doubt if it entered into consideration in the minds of any of my colleagues when we were studying this question, as we did very carefully. We know that in order to be able to make the Intercolonial Railway a success, we should be able to carry our through traffic to Montreal; and that unless we could succeed in making an arrangement of the kind we now submit, we never could do it. Therefore it was not a question to my mind of greater or less mileage, but a question of getting into Montreal by the shortest way over our own road and on the most favourable terms, in order that we might work out the natural results which, as a railway, we hoped to accomplish. But if we are to consider the question of mileage between Halifax and Montreal, what is to be said with regard to the fact that we own the railway from Halifax to St. John, which forms part of the connection that the hon. gentleman includes in the Canadian Pacific Railway? I refer to the Government railway from Halifax to St. John. I presume that we are to be considered as owing some obligation to this country, and I think it is proper for us to take into account what will pay in the interests of our road, having regard, at the same time, of course, to the interests of the country. Well, the Intercolonial Railway, so far as this question is concerned, is the proprietor of all that track not only via Moncton to Lévis but from Halifax to St. John, a distance of over 270 miles of railway, which the hon. gentleman includes in his calculation.

But from another point of view, why should we consider this question of mileage at all? What becomes of the considera-

tion, that the whole distance from Moncton all the way up through the province of New Brunswick to Lévis runs through a portion of country which does produce traffic which we ought to carry to the city of Montreal? Is Halifax the only point to be considered in the calculation? I apprehend that all that traffic producing country from Moncton to the north, all the way round, making some 700 miles of the Intercolonial Railway, is a portion of the road which may fairly enter into our calculation, when we consider whether or not we should bring our road to Montreal. But the hon. gentleman does not think, in that large and broad view he takes of all these matters, that the interests of the people who live along that portion of the railway are at all worthy of consideration. The question which we therefore have to ask ourselves—but in fact there would be no question whatever to ask ourselves, if we yielded to the force of the hon. gentleman's argument. All we would have to do would be to call to mind the fact, which everybody knows, that the mileage over the Intercolonial Railway would be greater to Montreal than over the Canadian Pacific Railway; and having recalled the fact, we would at once decide that the Intercolonial Railway must remain where it is for all time, and we would have to come to that decision because forsooth we cannot annihilate distance, because we cannot reduce that 76 miles. That is the conclusion at which the hon. gentleman arrives. As I have said, I hope to be able to convince, not the hon. gentleman, but some of those behind him as well as our friends on this side, that there are reasons why it would be unwise for us to sit down in that utterly helpless fashion and allow this great undertaking to remain unfruitful, because we could not shorten the distance from Montreal to Halifax over the Intercolonial Railway, which happens to exceed that over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Again we are told that we are adding to the public debt by this proposal. So we have been reading in the newspapers which are published in the interests of our hon. friends opposite. And so we have heard from my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. They have told us that we are adding \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 to the public debt by this proposal. A little consideration will convince anybody that there is no ground at all for that statement. I entirely and absolutely repudiate the soundness of any such claim. You might just as well charge a merchant who happens to think that it would be an advantage to his business if he were to remove his store from a back street to a front street, with having added \$8,000 or \$10,000 to his liabilities because he has agreed to pay an increased rent of \$300 or \$400 a year. These gentlemen say: You are adding to the public debt I deny it. We are entering into an arrangement which, I will show you, as far as our

foresight and the judgment and experience of the men who have been operating the Intercolonial and are responsible for it, are able to assure us, will enable us to pay every dollar of rental we have engaged to pay, and have a surplus besides. Is it possible that these gentlemen can say that we cannot increase the business of the Intercolonial by getting into Montreal? Is it possible for them to make the statement, against the experience of railway operations and of business men the world over, that we cannot hope for an increase in the earnings of this road and cannot hope to pay any portion of the rental we are incurring by means of the earnings upon this additional mileage, over and above the expenses of working, and so extinguish the debt which the hon. gentleman says is being incurred under the proposal of the Government? We shall not add one dollar to the public debt, unless we fail, by the operation of the railway under the conditions agreed upon, to pay the rental we have engaged to pay upon acquiring these roads. If we fail in that, then, having engaged to pay this rental for ninety-nine years, we shall certainly be assuming what will be equivalent to an addition to the public debt. No man can say with absolute certainty what will be the result; we cannot demonstrate it with geometrical positiveness, but we can form a judgment upon it, we can take the experience of business men, we can learn from the experience of other railways, and draw a fair business conclusion. And if the conclusion that we arrive at is that these new roads acquired under the conditions proposed, will enable us to pay the rental, and that conclusion is justified by experience, we are incurring no debt, and the charge made by hon. gentlemen opposite is an assumption, and has no solid ground upon which to rest.

Now, to give to the House an idea of what our estimates are, what the opinion of the Government is, and what the judgment of those who are advising the Government in this regard is, I will call your attention for a few moments to some data that I have in my possession. I have before me an estimate which has been furnished by the chief engineer of railways as the result of consultation with the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, which shows the gross earnings of the road, and also the working expenses for the last year or two, and an estimate of what may be expected under the new arrangement with the road extended to Montreal. According to this statement, the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for 1895-96 were \$2,957,640. The working expenses were \$3,012,000, a difference against the road of about \$55,000. It is estimated that the gross earnings for the year after the extension to Montreal will be \$3,885,000, and the working expenses, \$3,363,000. In other words, the gentlemen who are responsible for the management of

the Intercolonial and who have advised me in this regard estimate that there will be a surplus of \$520,000 on the first year's operation of the Intercolonial extended to Montreal. Now, I deduct from the earnings which I have stated the rental of \$210,000, and I get a net surplus of \$310,000, or a margin of, say, three hundred thousand dollars as the result of carrying out this policy of extension.

Now, the gentlemen who give me these figures are not guessing about these matters; they are proceeding upon judgment formed after years of experience of railway operation. They know what the conditions have been, and they can form a fair judgment of what the conditions will become. They have given me an idea as to where this increased revenue is to come from. The tons of freight carried last year numbered 1,379,000. These gentlemen estimate that the amount to be carried in the first year after the extension will be 1,896,000, or about 500,000 tons additional. When you consider that the Intercolonial had only carried some three or four hundred thousand tons of through freight during the past year, when you realize that the earnings of the road, both as to freight and passenger traffic have been in the proportion of four of local against one of through business, you can realize the adverse conditions under which the people's railway has been carried on, you can realize without my pressing the facts upon you how absolutely impossible it has been to operate this road under anything like favourable conditions.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has given the receipts for 1895-96 and he gives us estimate of receipts in the future. Would he be good enough to give us, also, the estimate of receipts for the current year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has asked for the receipts for a year that is not quite ended. I have not that information in my possession. It will probably be a month or even more before I shall be in possession of that information myself. But I may tell my hon. friend that my impression is that the deficit this year will be greater than it was last year: instead of being \$55,000, I think it more likely to be \$100,000. I may not be entirely correct in that; it is an estimate based upon appearances as they were a few months ago. But the fact, as I say, that we have carried only a small proportion of through passengers and through freight in times past, shows under what disadvantages the road has been operated. We look for an entire change in this respect. Under the conditions that have existed, people scarcely think of taking the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial going to the maritime provinces. Many do, but the great majority do not. I have gone into the counting-rooms of merchants in Montreal, and have found that they did not know that the Intercol-

onial had an agent in Montreal though we have had one there for years—and there are gentlemen on this side of the House who know that that is true. How can you expect to operate a railway successfully under such circumstances? I admit that a Government railway must always operate at a disadvantage as compared with railways owned by private corporations; but no railway operated by a corporation could survive such conditions as have been imposed upon the Intercolonial. The sooner we get out of these conditions, the sooner we get alive, the sooner we wake up to the fact that we have a railway and that it is our duty to work it and give it a chance to yield us profit, the better for the road and for the country. I was amused to hear the argument put forward that in acquiring this piece of railway from Lévis to Ste. Rosalie—I am not going into the details, but I will deal with this point now—we were simply entering into competition with the Grand Trunk. We are not entering into competition with the Grand Trunk. We are getting possession of a property that is going to take us, without competition, to a connection with the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk will continue to run its road from Lévis via Richmond into Montreal, but it will not compete with us except at the point of departure, Lévis. Perhaps I ought to add the further points between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. For the rest of the road each line will have its own traffic, and I am led to believe that the traffic along the line which the Government is to secure is a very profitable traffic, and also that the traffic on the Grand Trunk from Lévis via Richmond to Montreal is a very profitable traffic. From Ste. Rosalie around by way of Richmond to Lévis we shall not compete with them; they will get their traffic and we shall get ours. We will compete with them in the trains between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, because, under the terms of the contract, we are to have the same rights that the Grand Trunk has to pick up traffic, carry passengers, and to get for ourselves the proceeds of any traffic, either freight or passenger, that we carry on that part of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman have the kindness to hand me that calculation he used?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give you the statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I noticed it was only a statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman may be able to refute it. Now, another proposition which has been put forward unhesitatingly by hon. gentlemen opposite, as if they were in possession of accurate knowledge and were justified in doing so, is that this proposition ought to be condemned because the Drummond County Railway

is comparatively worthless, and is unsuitable. Well, I observe that a statement was read by the hon. gentleman from a paper in his hand, and he seemed to be unwilling, at the time, to give us the name of his authority. But I see later that it has found its way into the Montreal "Gazette"; and I wish to make a moment's reference to this statement, because it contains some very extraordinary allegations. The statement bears the signature of F. A. Salisbury, C.E. Now, I do not know Mr. Salisbury; perhaps it is my fault that I do not know him. I have inquired about him, and I am labouring under the great disadvantage of not being able to find anybody who does know him. Possibly Mr. Salisbury may be a gentleman of some considerable reputation in his own profession; I see that he signs himself in this publication as a civil engineer. But I have reason to believe that Mr. Salisbury, in this matter, is moved and impelled in the interest of one, Mr. Armstrong, to start out in this attack upon the Government's proposal. Now, why should Mr. Armstrong interest himself so deeply in this matter? Has he a rival road? Perhaps he has. Has he any particular interest to complain of any action of the Government? I do not know. All I know is that he is connected with an enterprise which he made a very strong effort to induce us as a Government to take up, and he did not succeed. I believe that he accompanied his failure to impress the solid and valuable merits of this enterprise upon the Government with a threat that he was going to have his revenge, and I suppose he is having his revenge. Now, what does he say in this statement? He says:

This railway has been constructed in as cheap a manner as is possible. The grade of the line, to a very large extent, is a surface one, consequently having bad grades that would have been avoided in a first-class line by accepting heavier work.

He says this railway has been constructed in as cheap a manner as is possible. Now, Mr. Salisbury may be a very excellent authority, he may be a sufficient authority to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite who rely upon his statement. But I set against the statements of Mr. Salisbury, reports which have been received from time to time in the office, reports upon which our friends opposite paid a subsidy to this same company. They thought these reports were sufficient for that purpose, although the standard the Government sets up in respect to these roads is a moderately high one; these gentlemen felt that when the road reached that standard they were justified in paying, and they paid over, subsidies from time to time as they were applied for by the company, until the subsidies to the full amount authorized by law have been paid to this company. Well, as to its being constructed in a cheap manner, I affirm that this road is not constructed in a cheap manner, and I

Mr. BLAIR.

refer you to the report which has been given upon this subject by the chief engineer of railways, and to reports made by other engineers who have examined this road. They say the road is a good road, they say the road-bed is a good road-bed, they say it has been well constructed; according to their statements it is not by any means subject to the strictures which this gentleman (Mr. Salisbury) has passed upon it. This is what the chief engineer of railways says in this respect to this road:

In compliance with your request for information as to the general character of the road constructed by the Drummond County Railway Company from Ste. Rosalie Junction on the Grand Trunk Railway, via Drummondville and St. Leonard to Moose Park, a distance of 73 miles, together with a branch of 17 miles in length from St. Leonard to Nicolet, and also my views as to the standard on which the balance of the road from Moose Park to its junction with the Grand Trunk Railway near Chaudière Bridge, should be built, assuming that the line was to form a section of the Intercolonial Railway, I have to report:

That 73 miles of the road are built and in operation; that the gradients and alignments are favourable, there being only one grade exceeding 53 feet per mile, and that one is 64 feet to the mile; that, with one exception, there is no curve with a less radius than 1,433 feet, and that the one exception is a curve of 953 feet radius.

Then, the roadbed is well and substantially built, the cuttings being 20 feet, and the embankments 15 feet wide at sub-grade. Ample drainage is provided by substantial steel structures, resting on massive masonry, spanning the larger rivers, and steel-plate girders, resting on strong, well-built masonry, spanning the streams of a lesser magnitude, whereas, the general drainage throughout the smaller rivulets has been passed through culverts constructed of sound cedar timber, 10 x 10 inches square.

Then he goes on, as hon. gentlemen will have seen who have read the printed copy of this and other reports which have been placed upon the Table. You will see that he declares:

The road is well ballasted with a very fine quality of gravel; the station buildings are neat buildings, of what I consider sufficient capacity for the requirements of the road, and the water service is good. I think you will agree with me, from the description that I have given of the work, that a really good road has been secured, fully up to the general standard of railways in Canada.

Now, is not Mr. Schreiber, chief engineer of the Government, as good an authority as Mr. Salisbury? And how can any one venture to condemn this road upon the strength of a statement made by a man whose name even my hon. friend opposite was unwilling to disclose, lest, as he thought, probably, it would have militated against the value of the testimony that he was giving. Now, in addition to that, there are reports which have been received from other gentlemen who have gone over this road, and who have examined it since these statements

were made. One of them is Mr. Ridout, an official in the department, of long experience. He says :

In accordance with your instructions, I have made an inspection of the Drummond County Railway, from its junction with the Grand Trunk Railway at Ste. Rosalie to the Duchesne River, a distance of 70 miles.

I found the line in excellent condition, fully ballasted, with the exception of about three miles near the St. Francis River, the location of which is to be changed in order to reduce the grade to 53 feet per mile. The track throughout is in very good condition, the rails being 56 pounds steel and in good order ; new ties were being put in where required.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but it will save time, as he is giving Mr. Schreiber's report, to say that this report was made on the 2nd of February, and that he adds here one sentence, which the hon. gentleman did not read :

Should you finally decide to acquire the road, before the matter is absolutely closed, I suggest it would be prudent to have an examination made into its condition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not read it, not because there was anything in it which I was unwilling to read, but because I had put that same report the hon. gentleman has in his hands, in the hands of every member of this House. I entirely assent to every word therein stated. True, Mr. Schreiber says it would be well to go over the road, and the road was gone over ; before this resolution was submitted to Parliament the road was gone over, and if we had found that there was anything different from what had been represented to us and what we had been led to believe with respect to the condition of this road, it would have been a small matter to insist, and we would have insisted, upon all these conditions being fulfilled. However, what Mr. Schreiber therein referred to was the necessity of looking the ground over in the spring to see whether, in any particular, not as to the general character of the road, not as to the road-bed generally, not as to the quality of the bridge structures, not as to the alignment, not as to the ballasting, but as to any exceptional or minor particulars in which it might be well to have the road examined before the arrangement was finally concluded. Now, Mr. Ridout goes on to add :

All the bridges are of steel superstructure on very good cement masonry abutments and piers. At the St. Francis River, there is at present 60 feet of trestle-work, which is to be replaced with a permanent structure. The line is fenced throughout, with exception of about  $7\frac{1}{2}$  miles through dense woods and swamps, where fencing is not at present required. The station buildings and sidings are amply sufficient for the traffic ; some of the buildings require repairs and painting, which, I am informed, is to be done at once.

And which is being done. Still another re-

port was obtained from another engineer in the department, Mr. Johnson, who says :

Having made an inspection of the Drummond County Railway for a distance of about 70 miles from Ste. Rosalie, I beg to submit the following report :—

I found the roadbed to be firm and in very good shape throughout, and, with the exception of three miles purposely left without ballast in view of a contemplated change of alignment, well ballasted, the material being of exceptional excellent quality. The rails are all in good condition, weighing 56 pounds to the yard. The grades are not excessive, the only point at which 1.00 per 100 is exceeded being at the St. Francis River, the approaches to which, on either side, are now 1.20 per 100. I understand, the company are to reduce this grade before the road is taken over by the Government.

In that respect he is entirely right.

The percentage of curvature is exceptionally small, the curves, with one exception (one of 6°), not exceeding 4°, or a radius of 1,433 feet.

I may say, in this connection, that on my return journey, the train, consisting of an engine and combination car, made the distance of 68 miles in 90 minutes, including two stoppages, the last 28 miles being run in 30 minutes, without the least discomfort to the passengers on the train.

The principal bridges are those over the Black River, the two branches of the Nicolet and the Becancour. These are all fine substantial steel superstructures resting on massive well-built masonry abutments and piers.

And yet the statement is circulated broadcast, it is affirmed by hon. gentlemen opposite and published in their press that this is a poor worthless road that it is unsafe to use it in its present condition and that our proposition ought to be condemned. I put it to the House whether a statement made under such circumstances, emanating from interested sources, should have weight. I referred to the report of Mr. Salisbury, yet statements are made by hon. gentlemen opposite without data or information who ask the House to condemn this proposition before they have heard the whole facts and in the face of the information I am now furnishing to the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask when the examination reported upon by Mr. Ridout was made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Ridout's and Mr. Johnson's examination and reports were made since the statements were made in this House. Mr. Kingsford's report, which I might have perhaps forgotten to read, but which I think it is desirable to read, was made on the 2nd of June. Mr. Kingsford has been down on the line for some time, and his instructions were to go over the road and make his report on it, which he did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand that my hon. friend did not pay any respect to Mr. Schreiber's suggestion that before concluding any arrangement, he

should have the road properly examined at a time of the year when it could be done or did he make his examination after he had made his contract ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is not correct in what he is stating.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. It appears so from the papers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The signing of the documents between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not take place until after the date which they themselves bear and they are not dated until the 25th or 27th of May. We have abundance of evidence to satisfy us as to the character of that road. There are numbers of persons whom I had met, and with whom I and others had conversed, who had been over the road, who knew it thoroughly and who had travelled over it at a rate of speed which could not possibly have been safely attempted if the road were not in good condition. These gentlemen, some of whom are on the other side of the House and could inform hon. gentlemen there, no doubt, knew about the road before any of these surveys were made and were prepared to certify as to its character and quality. Let me read Mr. Kingsford's report. Mr. Kingsford is known to many hon. members of this House as an engineer of large experience and as a man of character and standing. He says :

In accordance with my instructions, I beg leave to report on the constructed portion of the Drummond County Line, in respect of its character and condition.

The line itself commences at St. Rosalie Junction. The intermediate two miles which connect it with the Grand Trunk system, is under the control of the St. Hyacinthe station master, and the semaphore admitting ingress upon it is under the direct control of that official.

The line is constructed for 73 miles to Moose Park. The first 27 miles to Drummondville pass through a good farming district. The land generally is in excellent cultivation. Several small villages succeed each other between Ste. Rosalie Junction and Drummondville, namely, St. Edward, St. Helene, St. Eugene, Duncan and St. Germain. Drummondville is the important place on the line. The following villages are then met :—St. Cyrille, Carmel, Mitchell and St. Leonard.

St. Leonard Junction is 19 miles from Drummondville ; at this point a branch runs 16 miles to Nicolet.

The Athabasca branch of the Grand Trunk is crossed near Maddington Falls an St. Wincelas, one mile and a half south-east of Aston station.

Proceeding east from St. Leonard Junction, the villages of St. Wincelas, Maddington Falls and Forestdale succeed, when the terminus of the present line is met at Moose Park.

I think it proper to premise my report by remarking that the season of the year in which it is made demands consideration, for it is not an act of justice in the first week of June to consider the condition of a roadbed with the spirit

Mr. BLAIR.

of exactness which might justly be exercised ten or twelve weeks later. At this date the frost has not been four weeks out of the ground, and the first attention given to maintenance of the line has been to place it in proper security by renewing the ties, where most required, by lifting and adjusting the track and straightening the steel rails where necessity exacts. This imperative duty is the first consideration, while the removal of what in themselves are blemishes affecting the appearance of the line, are left to a later date. Another duty is that of clearing out the ditches to enable them satisfactorily to fulfil the duties entailed upon them : unimpeded drainage. Consequently, in many parts of the line bunch grass has sprouted over the roadbed, which to an observer without practical experience does not suggest a favourable opinion of its character, while, in fact, it does not affect the safety and character of the roadbed.

On the condition of the roadbed it is my duty favourably to report. The ballast is of an excellent character, and there is plenty of it. It is not very neatly dressed off, as on older lines, but that is more a matter of appearance affecting the finished look of the work than in any way a detriment injurious to the safety and character of the track. I have myself been on a train which travelled forty miles an hour, and I never felt the slightest anxiety as to the propriety of this speed.

This road is said to be a bush road. It is for hauling lumber, according to the statements of the hon. gentleman.

I have reason to believe that there are occasions where specials have been run between Drummondville and St. Hyacinthe at the extreme rate of 60 miles an hour, and I do not believe that those acquainted with the condition of the track felt that any risk was being incurred during the journey. The outer portion of the track to Drummondville is cleared off generally, and the fencing in good condition. East of Drummondville, this same condition is by no means universal. There are spots where the light bush has yet to be removed. I cannot precisely give the extent of this ground where such work is necessary, but with a sufficient party, a few days would rectify it. Where the land is under cultivation, the fencing is regular and efficient. In the places where the line passes through a timbered country of light bush with a thick undergrowth, fencing has not been constructed, but no inconvenience arises to the line, for the bush itself is close and thick, and animals are not likely to stray through it.

It will thus be seen that in these 73 miles there is a good roadbed, well ballasted ; the rails in line ; the ditches freely carrying off the water, with regularity of different grades, the whole in efficient and satisfactory working order.

While what may be called the ornamental work the roadbed may require attention to obtain the neatness observable in an older line and always agreeable to the eye, I have to report the line, to the extent named, to be in excellent condition.

What warrant is there for condemning the Government for having got a road such as has been described by this gentleman ? What ever may have been the statements which have been made in respect to this proposition, we put forward this testimony to the House and we confidently rely upon it as being sufficient to satisfy the country. The

officer who is responsible for the advice he gives the Government in this matter, visited, reported upon the road before we took this matter up. His report was made in winter, at a time when it was impossible to examine it. That report was received. We had the chief engineer's assertion in regard to the general quality of this road, and now we have the additional testimony of these three gentlemen who have gone over the road, made a careful inspection of it, and who have reported that the road is in excellent shape. Mr. Kingsford directly controverts each statement which is being made by hon. gentlemen opposite in condemnation of the road. There is another thing which I think I might very properly mention in this connection, and which came to my knowledge when we had these negotiations. It was that this road when built was intended to be taken over by the Grand Trunk Railway and used by them as an extension of the Grand Trunk Railway system. They were going to acquire the road and shorten their connection. All their arrangements were concluded and they went home to London, where difficulties arose which prevented the carrying out of the arrangement. So that we have the assurance, and I give it to the House, that this road was built under the very eye and supervision of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, with the expectation that they were coming into the ownership and possession of the road as soon as it was finished, with a view of its being made a part of their system. That perhaps may not be a material fact, but it is improbable that this road could have been carelessly built, or neglected or passed over in any slipshod way, when the expectation was that it was being built so that it might become a part of the Grand Trunk Railway system. This road is attacked as being a worthless road on the ground that it is simply a lumber road, and that it is not going to furnish any traffic. We have some material on that point, which I take much pleasure in supplying to the House. I have before me the sworn returns made from time to time of the earnings of the Drummond County Railway. These earnings I will give to the House for the last three or four years as tending to show what the result of the operations of this road was during this period. In 1892-93 the net earnings, after having taken out the gross working expenses, show a result of \$12,644; in 1893-94, the surplus had increased to \$20,125; in 1894-95 it had increased still further to \$35,204; in 1895-96, it had fallen to \$29,067. This would be, of course, on the seventy-three miles. I have a certified statement here, from the books of the company, showing that for the ten months ending on the last of April of this year, the net revenue was \$28,445, not including the months of May and June, which I am sure are better than the months preceding. I am told that

the year just about to close, to the end of June, will show \$35,000 as the net earnings of this railway. Last year the result was between \$29,000 and \$30,000, the year before \$35,000, and the year before that something less. Mark you, these are the net earnings upon this piece of railway which has been pronounced worthless, and which has been operated only as a local road, without any through connections whatever. Now, extend that road, add the necessary forty-three miles and make it part of a through road, and will any person say that it is an unreasonable conclusion that it will duplicate, perhaps triplicate, the net results of its operations in the past? And even if the operation of the Drummond County Railway for the seventy-three miles, for the next year, for the year after, or for the years to come, showed nothing better than a net result of \$30,000 or \$35,000 a year, I think I would be warranted in taking that amount out of the \$64,000 a year that we would be paying in rental, and at one blow cutting away one-half of the debt which these hon. gentlemen say is being piled up in the country.

Mr. HAGGART. When dealing with that part of the matter, will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give the gross earnings of the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do so with pleasure. The gross earnings have been as follows:—

For 1892-93.....	\$60,689
1893-94.....	68,677
1894-95.....	87,519
1895-96.....	93,118

It is only fair that I should say that in the accounts, the sworn accounts which have been returned, and which are now on file in the department, there appear to have been paid during the year 1895-96, out of working expenses a sum exceeding \$10,000—I think, speaking from memory, that it is \$12,000—for bridge construction on that road, which ordinarily might fairly be charged to capital. Now, we have in 1895-96 \$93,000 of gross earnings; the working expenses were \$64,000; so that the net earnings were \$29,000. If you have a net result of \$30,000 a year only in the future—and I have in my possession facts and data which go to show that in all reason, from the prospects and promises of business, there must be a considerable increase in its earnings, even if it were continued to be run only as a local road; but if you take it as realizing only \$30,000 a year in the years to come, I am surely entitled to take that \$30,000 out of the \$64,000 which these gentlemen are charging me with, and to thereby cut in two this mountain of debt which they accuse the Government of adding to the burdens of the country by the acquisition of this railway.

Now, from all the data and information which I can obtain, I think the character

of the country through which this road runs has been very much misrepresented. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House who have been over it and who can certify to the correctness of what I am now saying, that so far from being an uninhabited country, for many miles along the completed portion of the road there is quite a thick population and a developing population. There are two magnificent water powers, one of them eight thousand or ten thousand horse-power, which I believe is inviting one of the cotton companies, which is likely to establish itself there permanently in a very short time. That is the information with which I am furnished. I do not know that the negotiations are concluded, but they are looking to that result. Why, Sir, there are at this very moment no less than from 8,000 to 10,000 car-loads of freight waiting to be carried over that road—business which has been preparing during the past winter; and a large lumber company promises to produce a great lumber freight for this road for many years to come. The country is a good agricultural and well-settled country, and if the information I have received is to be relied upon, and it has come from reliable sources, it is a slander on that country to say that there is not a reasonable expectation of this Drummond County Railway being run as a local road and paying a considerable margin over its working expenses. We are not getting it to run it as a local road; but while we are getting a shorter line, and a line just as well situated for the purpose of giving us a close connection with the city of Montreal, we are at the same time getting a piece of railway which itself furnishes more than enough business to pay its working expenses and to leave a very handsome margin of profit. So far as the future of this road and its business prospects are concerned, I do not think it can be successfully impeached; and I invite the gentlemen opposite to confer with some of their own friends who sit behind them or beside them, and who have some knowledge of this road and the country through which it passes, and its business prospects, even as a local undertaking, and they will conclude that the strictures which they have passed upon it are altogether unjustifiable, and that we have made no mistake in acquiring the Drummond County Railway.

Now, Sir, let us look for one moment at the terms upon which we have acquired this Drummond County Railway. I have stated to the committee that the chief engineer of my department gave us an estimate of the value of this road. That value was based upon what he judged would be the cost of its construction, and it was the same information exactly as had been furnished by him previously to my predecessor in office. That value was in the neighbourhood of \$1,600,000, and he had no doubt at all that

the road was worth that amount. It was especially worth that amount in view of our policy to extend the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis to Montreal or to some point on the Grand Trunk for the purpose of reaching Montreal; and he felt that if we determined in the first place, to make a connection across the country for the purpose of getting the shortest possible route from Chaudière Junction to St. Rosalie, or to St. Hyacinthe, it was infinitely better for us to acquire this road, even if we should pay more than it would cost to build a new one, because there would be removed a competitor out of the way, and we would thereby secure the business which had been worked up already by the Drummond County Railway, and which, if it were running as a competing road, it would be likely to hold for the future.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the chief engineer of his department stated that there was \$1,600,000 expended on the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I said he estimated it upon what he judged was the cost of that road. He said he had sworn statements in his possession as to what the road had cost, and he judged also as to what would be the cost of constructing a new line across that country, and his round figures were in the neighbourhood of \$1,600,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the new line. But what was the cost of the road as at present? What was his estimate as to what it did cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have the exact figures, \$1,535,000. That corresponds with the statements which were filed in the department and which are accessible to hon. gentlemen at any time they desire. Now, taking that sum of \$1,600,000 as a basis, is it possible to suggest that any fairer or more reasonable arrangement could be made than the one we have adopted?—an agreement to pay a rental of \$64,000 a year, and at the expiration of the 99 years lease to become absolute owners of the property unencumbered, so that in paying the rental, we are actually paying for the road itself. That certainly commends itself to my judgment as an arrangement which should stand criticism and meet approval. Therefore, having regard to all the circumstances, we concluded that it would be advisable that we should make that arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway and agree to pay them the rental I have stated.

It is claimed that this was an improvident arrangement, but you must not overlook the fact that there are conditions imposed with regard to the 43 miles remaining to be built, which conditions are of a stringent character. We impose upon the Drummond County the obligation of build-

ing a road more expensive than the one they have constructed, or than one of the type which they have built. We require that they should build a railway connecting the two points and covering the uncovered ground, and we insist that they should build it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway in all respects. And they have got to do that before this arrangement will be carried out. In addition we stipulate that they should lay down 70 pounds of steel per yard of rails, which of course will be a very considerable item added to the cost of construction, and taking the arrangement altogether, I believe we can confidently rely on its approval in every detail by this House. We had some fault to find with the grades at one or two points, and we stipulated that the road should be straightened. The contract shows that the grades objected to must be reduced so as to bring them down to a grade not exceeding one foot per 100 feet on any portion of the through line. They are now straightening out the line. One of these engineers has told us that they are now proceeding to reconstruct a portion of the line in order that they may escape the heavy grades which at present they have to travel over and reduce them to the figures stipulated.

But it is said that we should not have done this but should have taken over the present Grand Trunk Railway road. My objection as to that are what I stated the other day. In the first place, the distance is considerably greater. I do not know accurately what it is, some people say it is 20 miles and others that it is something less; but suppose it were only 15 or 16 miles, whatever may be the actual mileage, 15 miles is a very considerable difference, particularly when you are getting a road which is objectionable in other particulars. Let us take the question of grade. I stated the other day that on that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, the grades were heavy and were a serious objection. I was asked to state where they were, but could not say positively from memory. But I have now the information and shall give it to the House. The chief engineer reported that the grades were the objection, and that he could not recommend our acquiring that part of the road, even if it were possible for us to acquire it, on account of the grades and the distance. As to the grades, you will see, when I read his statement to you, that they are very serious objections to our taking over that road, even if it had been possible for us to arrange to acquire it and if there had been no objection on the ground of distance. The chief engineer reports that between Danby station and South Durham the grades range, rising east at one point 54.45, at another point, 55 to the mile up to as high as 61.41. Between South Durham and Lisgar, the grades still rising east, range from 55.50 to 61.40, and

then falling east, they range 53.88 up to 62 and a fraction. Between Lisgar and Richmond the grades range from 62 down to 58; from Richmond to Warwick they range from 52.80 to 54.43 and up to 55.58. From Warwick to Lévis they range from 55.58 to 72.33 at Lévis, down to 54.43 at Chaudière Curve, and up to 58.66 at Pen<sup>n</sup>sons Sidings. These are the grades upon that portion of the road, and railway men say that they are a very serious objection to that branch. But there is no use of our talking of getting that portion of the Grand Trunk, because we could not get it. As I said the other day, we did not go into any close figures, because we thought it would not be of any use, and I shall tell you why. In the first place we could not buy the road. We could buy a part of it but not the whole of it. We could buy the portion between Lévis and Richmond but when I asked Mr. Wainwright what they wanted for that piece of road, he said, "we will take \$2,500,000 for it." and so I did not talk any more about it. It would have been absurd to think of it. I dare say the Grand Trunk Railway might have taken less. It flashed through my mind that they might have taken \$2,000,000, but who would give \$2,000,000 for the ownership of 96 miles of road, when we were getting 133 miles from the Drummond County Railway for less money? But then if we got that piece of road from Richmond to Rosalie we would have to pay \$1,000 per mile rental between those points and they would own one-half of it. They would not part with that any more than they would with their right hand. They would give us one-half the same as they give us one-half from St. Rosalie to Montreal, but more they would not do, and we would be in the position of paying as much for the use of 40 miles from Richmond to Rosalie, or two-thirds as much, as over the whole road from Chaudière by the Drummond Counties Railway. Any one who considers these facts must see that no reasonable business man would enter into any other arrangements than the one we have entered into, at all events, comparing the Drummond Counties Railway proposition on the one hand and the Grand Trunk proposition on the other. I do not think that any one will say that our proposition to pay for the one undivided half interest of the road from St. Rosalie to the bridge of \$37,500 per year for those 35 miles is an unreasonable price. I think when we compare it with the sums which are paid by other railways in arrangements entered into voluntarily between themselves, you will find that we have effected an arrangement which is fairly and reasonably satisfactory. The \$37,500 was arrived at in this way. The Grand Trunk Railway claimed it would cost \$1,500,000 to build that road, and I think that any person who knows about what it costs to build roads in that section

of the country—I think the hon. leader of the Opposition who has had some little experience, would say by all means accept \$1,500,000 as a reasonable probable estimate of the cost of building 35 miles of road in that section. That was the figure they placed. They said if you are going to own half you will have to pay one-half or interest on one-half at the rate we pay, 5 per cent per year. So that dividing the \$1,500,000 by half, which makes \$750,000, and taking the interest at 5 per cent, we have the \$37,500 which we agreed to pay, not for the use of the line but for the ownership, just as fully as the Grand Trunk Railway itself has of that railway. Now, we have had some little experience in the way of railway building. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) bought 125 miles of road from the Grand Trunk Railway and paid for it \$1,500,000, and he bought it when it was in such a condition that it cost something like \$2,500,000 before he got it into working shape. And when the hon. gentleman was presenting that proposition to Parliament he did not think it necessary to enter into very minute details or to bring it down months before the end of the session so that everybody might have the opportunity of reflecting on this large transaction in all its details. Not a bit of it. Absolutely all he told Parliament at the time he introduced this proposal to buy the 125 miles from the Grand Trunk Railway, was that it was desirable to buy it. That was the reason he gave at that time. He paid \$1,500,000 for the road and spent \$1,100,000 or thereabouts in putting it in shape, so that, before he had it in proper running order it cost \$2,576,000 or \$20,115 per mile. The hon. gentleman had a further experience in his capacity of Minister of Railways in connection with the building of railways. He started to build 14 miles in order to cut the loop at St. Charles, he wanted to get into Lévis by a handier way—a very proper thing for him to do. He commenced building these 14 miles of road, and before he got through he had spent \$1,178,000—over \$60,000 per mile, and of the total about \$800,000 or \$900,000 was for land damages. If we were to undertake to build from 35 to 40 miles of road to get into Montreal from the Drummond County Railway, having the experience of the hon. gentleman before our mind, we might very well hesitate and might well conclude that it would be much better for us to take the valuation which the Grand Trunk put upon their road and the estimate they gave us of the building of a new one, and give them a fair rental for their portion of the road. If we are to get into the city of Montreal, there is no way by which we could get in with such advantage. I would not venture to propose to my colleagues nor would I dare to ask Parliament to authorize us to proceed with

Mr. BLAIR.

the construction of a railway in that locality, involving the building of a bridge, then expropriating our way into Montreal, and after that, providing terminal facilities and a station there. That would be a wholly absurd proposition to submit to Parliament. Some one has said that it would cost \$20,000,000. I do not think that that would cover it. at any rate we should have no guarantee that it would cover it. And we now make an arrangement under which we enjoy advantages ten times greater than this independent construction would give us. We have the use of the bridge and we have the use of the terminals and the stations—all the advantages that it has cost the Grand Trunk millions of money to acquire and years of experience to complete, and we get it all on reasonable terms. I stand amazed that men in this House and in this country, while approving of the policy of the Government in seeking a terminus for the Intercolonial in Montreal, will yet cavil at the terms and conditions under which we have secured that end. I say that the time will come when the men who now criticise us will acknowledge that we have made a first class arrangement, that we made a good business stroke for the benefit of the country when we completed this contract. I am as confident as I can be of anything that has not actually happened that the result will justify the course we have recommended.

Now, we have proposed to pay \$40,000 for the use of the bridge and \$62,500 for the use of the terminals. I wish to state one fact here which will give you an idea of the closeness with which this arrangement was considered and the estimates made. We asked Mr. Pottinger and Mr. Schreiber, who were here together, to go into the calculation and let us know what would be a fair rental to pay for the use of all the Grand Trunk terminal facilities at Bonaventure station, and there was not \$5,000 difference between the figures they gave us and the figures finally agreed upon between the Grand Trunk and ourselves. Assuming that we ought to get into the city of Montreal and that the general policy pursued is a wise policy, I say that no man can reasonably complain of the terms of the arrangement under which this is to be accomplished. Talk about jobbery; I want to know in what line of this transaction from beginning to end there is any justification for such a charge? Where is the detail, where is the circumstance, where are figures upon which you can hang a suspicion of jobbery about this affair? Of course some people are acute to scent job in almost any transaction—that is the natural function of some minds. But let the transaction be looked at in all its details, let reasonable estimates be made of the value of the property we are acquiring and the interest we are acquiring, and I venture

to say that there is no foundation upon which the slightest suspicion of any wrongdoing can rest.

Mr. GIBSON. No Curran Bridge there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, Sir. This is a business transaction; it has merit in itself, and when you examine the details of the contract drawn between the two companies and the Government, you will see that we have taken every means possible to safeguard the public interest. Why, Sir, when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself was buying the Grand Trunk line from Lévis to River du Loup, a line of 125 miles, what was the criticism passed upon it from the other side? His critics said to him: Under your arrangement you have no security, you have no terms and conditions which will assure the Intercolonial a safe and proper entrance into Montreal or access to the business of the west. And the reasons which suggested those criticisms are the reasons which have led to the present arrangement being concluded which we are now proposing to Parliament. We have given to this arrangement the most careful study. It is not my arrangement; it is not the arrangement of any one individual member of the Government; it is not the arrangement of the Grand Trunk or of the Drummond County Railway—it is an arrangement which the Government, as a whole, have carefully considered in all its details, and one which has been subject to careful scrutiny and examination by the Government from a business standpoint. And, as I was saying a moment ago, if you examine the details of the contract which has been entered into between the Government on one hand and these companies on the other, you will perceive very clearly that we have been solicitous and careful, that every term and every condition should be introduced which would ensure us an opportunity to gain our share of the western trade. As you will see, we have engaged with the Grand Trunk to carry the freights for us from the west to Montreal and to deliver these freights to us when they get them there, not to take them around by the Richmond line or by Lévis—not to carry them off on the Grand Trunk, but to deliver them to us. So, when we send our canvassing agents through the west, as all railway companies do and ought to do, and those agents pick up traffic and make contracts, we may be sure that the business will fall into our hands when it reaches Montreal. But we have in another respect made an unprecedented arrangement—that is with respect to running rights over a railway owned by another company. We have, under the contract, a condition under which we are entitled as between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal, to pick up for ourselves and for our own profit and advantage all the business that we can

upon that line. If we carry a passenger we can pass into our own treasury the proceed of that passenger's ticket. If we carry a ton of freight we get the full benefit of it. We do not, as in the case of the agreement of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, respecting the line between Toronto and Hamilton, pay over to the Grand Trunk 85 per cent of every dollar we earn—whatever we earn is ours. So far as this road, the bridge and the terminals are concerned, they are, for the purpose of our use, just as much the property of the Government as they are the property of the Grand Trunk itself.

Now, I submit the resolution that has been tabled with the confident expectation that it will receive the approbation of the members of the House. I know that we have been suffering under a disadvantage; I know that hon. gentlemen opposite and their press have been misrepresenting the facts and have been creating prejudice to some extent in the public mind. But I have always felt confident that when the details of the transaction came to be known, they would be generally approved. And I desire to say that I had no object, and the Government had no object, in delaying the submission of this transaction to Parliament. Everybody knows that we have been driven by the business that has been pressing upon us; everybody knows that the tariff has occupied attention almost to the exclusion of everything else, and that we have not had an opportunity to invite attention to these matters at as early a stage of the session as we desired. But we have not fallen far behind the example set us by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) when he had a similar proposition to submit to Parliament. I do not say that because he did a thing that is a justification to anybody else for doing the same thing. But I do say that I think any criticism coming from such a critic can hardly be considered valuable in view of the course which he felt himself justified in taking under similar circumstances in times past. When he had to submit to Parliament the proposition to buy a portion of the Grand Trunk, he did not hurry, the instant Parliament was opened, to lay the matter before the House and ask Parliament to deal with it. Parliament met, that session, I think early in February; but it was three months after, and it was the second day before prorogation when he took Parliament into his confidence, informed them of the arrangement he had made, and asked the House to provide the money. Now I would not have desired to do that; the Government had no object in the world in delaying this matter. We had nothing to fear from the closest examination of the facts. But I confess that I never expected there would have been any serious objection to the policy itself. I thought of course that hon. gentlemen opposite would criticise

the details, no doubt it would be their duty to do so, no doubt they would fulfil the legitimate functions of an Opposition by doing so. But I had no expectation that they would be denouncing this proposal in the violent and extreme manner in which they have been doing, and to have done so, at all events, with such a very short period in which to consider the whole matter.

Now, we have laid this matter before Parliament in all its details. The matter has been thoroughly and carefully studied out, its various aspects have been taken into account, not by my department alone but by all the members of the Government in Council. We have turned it over in its various aspects, there is no detail of it that has not undergone careful consideration. I feel, therefore, that I am in a different position, fortified by the judgment and opinion of all the members of the Government, from what I would have been had I been simply asking Parliament to accept this proposal based upon my own individual and perhaps unaided judgment. Now the House is asked to support it as a sound commercial transaction. This country has long complained, as I have said, of the deficits which have annually occurred in the working of the Intercolonial Railway. I think we are justified in expecting that the carrying out of this plan will put an end to the period of deficits, and will rapidly bring to us a period when we can announce to Parliament and to the country that the Intercolonial Railway has been run with a balance on the right side of the account. I put the proposal therefore, Mr. Speaker, before the House with the confident expectation that it will meet with approval.

Mr. FOSTER. The House has listened with steady attention and with interest to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, in explanation. I was going to say, though I think I must qualify that and end by saying in apology for the course which he has seen fit to recommend to the House. The hon. gentleman wished to go into committee without making a statement, and wished to go directly into the details of the scheme. By a little gentle pressure he yielded and made his statement to the House before going into committee, as was the proper way to do. But if the hon. gentleman, before beginning his speech, felt that he was hardly used in being forced to that method of exposition, he had not proceeded one minute in his statement until he completely justified the demand from this side of the House that he should give information with reference to his resolution before he asked us to go into committee. The hon. gentleman said that the other evening he was taken entirely at a disadvantage, he had not the information ready at hand, and he therefore was not able to give it, and he complained that it was a little unfair that the other night we sprung

Mr. BLAIR.

the discussion upon him when he was not prepared to discuss the question. That is just what we thought, that he was not prepared the other evening to discuss the question, that is, to discuss it in a business way, which is, of course, the only way that it would be proper for a Minister of Railways to put a proposition like this before the House. And it was because he was taken at a disadvantage the other evening and was not prepared for the discussion, that I thought it would be well to take the discussion now, and that he should give the information that he had not at hand a few evenings ago. Well, Sir, my hon. friend all the way through his address to-night, has not, and I leave myself in the judgment of the House, addressed himself to this House in the manner of a gentleman laying a simple business proposition before the House, endeavouring to explain it thoroughly, and reason out the grounds upon which he asked us to accept. The hon. gentleman's speech has been a declamation, in large part. The very first point that he took up and grew somewhat heated over, was that he had been charged in the newspapers with jobbery, with a flagrant job. I thought of the old French proverb, that he who begins to excuse himself overhastily brings the accusation against himself. My hon. friend would have done better, I think, if he had simply treated this in a business way instead of taking up seven-eighths of his speech in trying to defend himself from the imputation of a job, or in trying to criticise the operations and the administration of the hon. gentlemen who preceded him. On a proposition asking the House to enter into a payment of \$210,000 for 99 years, together with all the incidental yearly expenses of management and maintenance, upon a doubtful venture as to whether a sufficient amount of new business would be found to bring, according to his own judgment, revenues to offset those expenditures, it was not too much to ask that the hon. gentleman should have left aside the controversial subjects of jobbery and of previous administrations, and addressed himself simply and solely to the question in hand. Now, I ask this House, which has listened to the hon. gentleman for two hours if they have had much more from him in the way of new business for this company, except mere prophecy and contingency. The only thing of a solid nature that the hon. gentleman pretended to give us was a bald statement upon a sheet of paper, in which it is stated that the estimated traffic on the Intercolonial Railway for the first full year of operation, after being extended to Montreal, will be so and so; that the receipts will be \$900,000 greater in the gross; that its working expenses will be \$350,000 more in the gross; that its profits will be \$520,000 the first year; that the tons of freight will be increased by nearly 300,000 tons, and the number of passengers will

be increased by over 630,000. Now, I say that I am just as wise after that statement has been read in that form, as I was before; and the hon. gentleman is just as explicit as he was before, and this House is just as wise as it was before. This House does not sit here to take a set of figures and swallow them without having given to it the basis upon which those figures are totalled up. My hon. friend has said over and over again that he trusted to the verdict of business men upon this, that he had a business proposition, and that he trusted it to the business sense of the House, and to the business sense of the community. That statement contains the kernel of truth in that it is the only thing this House wants. If the proposition has anything of merit in it, it must commend itself to the business sense of the House and of the country. There is no sentiment which rules in a matter of this kind, imperial or otherwise. It is a matter of pure business, and nothing else. What the hon. gentleman has utterly failed to do, after all his declamation is excised, after all his prophecy is cut out, what he has failed to do is to lay down the basis of his anticipations as to where this immense added business will come from, and what will be its nature. This House has listened for two hours and now can a single gentleman in the House get up and do more than merely say: Well, it is stated by somebody, we do not know the basis upon which it has been stated, that there will be that increase. But as to the means which that increase is to be obtained and the grounds upon which it is based, there is no report of anybody, there is no statement of anybody, and there is no basis laid down by the Minister himself. That is where I see the cardinal defect in the presentation of this scheme, as the Minister has given it to us. Now, as a business man the hon. gentleman appeals to this House, and on the business view of it I challenge the judgment of the House, and I challenge the judgment of the country.

In the first place my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has not taken a business method of putting this matter before the House. Granted that this side of the House has no rights to information at all or anything of the kind, that it is just simply a part of the legislature which is to be driven down by the superior force of numbers, on the other side of the House the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) owed something to his own followers. He owed something to the men who sit behind him, and I ask those gentlemen who sit behind him and it is within the judgment of the House if the hon. gentleman who brought down this proposition three days before they are going to ask this House to prorogue, has treated his own followers as business men who have a right to come to a conclusion upon business reasoning and business principles. The hon. gentleman

sadly underrates the intelligence of his own followers if he thinks that he has made an appeal to them on business grounds to-night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) says that there is a suspicion abroad that he has been holding this over for some purpose of his own. What has the hon. gentleman done? He says they have been so busy with the tariff that they could not get the information down to the House before. Does my hon. friend know that there is in the report printed and laid upon the Table of the House a statement which shows that the Minister had decided the matter on the 24th of March. What is the reason that after the Order in Council, the fiat of the Government was passed that it could not have been laid on the Table of the House with the information pertinent to it and upon which members of the Council are supposed to have made up their minds. The matter was concluded before Parliament met or was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne as having been concluded. But the hon. gentleman justifies himself in his statement by saying that although the Order in Council was passed the contract was not signed. The contract was signed on the 15th of May, and on the 15th of May the hon. gentleman had that contract under hand and it is one whole month before he deigns to lay the finished contract on the Table of the House for the information of the House. Too busy with tariff matters to look after that. How much had my hon. friend to do with tariff matters? If he had to do with tariff matters I simply say that on the 15th of May the contract was completed and signed and could have been laid before the House by a simple waive of his hand and he could then have gone on with all of those disquisitions into the tariff business which was so pressing upon him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) kept that contract signed and sealed in his pocket until five days before the House is asked to be prorogued and five days before prorogation was to be asked there is still no shred of information upon the Table of the House for the hon. gentleman's supporters to make up their minds whether or not we should increase the debt of this country to an equivalent of \$7,000,000. The hon. gentleman attempted a statement in reference to this matter three or four days ago which he admitted he was unprepared to make. I call the House to witness that the only information placed before us is the Order in Council and the reports of the three engineers as to the quality and condition of the Drummond county section of 73 miles, not one shred more. Granted that the Drummond County Railway is fairly well built, that it is a substantial road; it ought to have been before he touched it at all. He should not have allowed himself to have taken one moment's time to prove that the Drummond County road was a fairly built road. The sanction of this proposal does not depend on whether the road is a fairly built road.

Granted that it was a fairly well built road, is it a business transaction which we ought to go into? If my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has proved that the road is a substantial and well built road of its class all the better; I do not want to deny it. There is no reason why I should. If it is not it is utter condemnation of the hon. gentleman. If it is it does not help him one iota in the proposition he puts before the House because that was based on the road being a fairly well built road. But the hon. gentleman has himself demanded that the standard shall be raised. The hon. gentleman made a condition that the 33 miles of road from Chaudière should be built as the rest of the Drummond County road is built? No, Sir. The hon. gentleman made a condition that it should be built on the standard of the Intercolonial Railway and he himself said to-night that that would cost them a great deal more money because he required them to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. He has pointed out that rails are to be laid on that portion of the road of 50 pounds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 56 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Of 56 pounds so that the first thing the hon. gentleman will have to do is to lay that 73 miles of road with 70-pound rails, make himself a roadbed and do everything else to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Many miles of the Intercolonial Railway are yet laid with 56-pound rails.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend say that he proposes to operate that road from Forest Vale into Ste. Rosalie in the present condition of the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the rails are good—they are new rails.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend is not going to have a first-class road equivalent to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are miles now of the Intercolonial Railway that are laid with 56-pound rails.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend is not going to the expense of providing that road with 70-pound rails?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are new rails, and good rails.

Mr. FOSTER. He is going to have a section of 33 miles with 70-pound rails. What is the reason? Is his only ground for demanding that they provide that section with the 70-pound rail, that he proposes to put that road up to the same standard as the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. Min-

Mr. FOSTER.

ister has looked for a great increase of travel, a great increase of freight; he is going to have three or four hundred thousand tons more of freight carried in the first year. Is he going to undertake that greatly increased travel with a road inferior in weight of rails and roadbed. That will be poor economy for my hon. friend because he knows as well as I do that it is the best economy to take up these 56-pound rails, sell them and put down 70-pound rails, that the easier the traffic can be carried the better the general result will be.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me to ask him a question. Is he aware of any railway in the country doing that?

Mr. FOSTER. Doing what?

Mr. GIBSON. Setting aside 56-pound rails and replacing them with 70-pound rails.

Mr. FOSTER. The Intercolonial Railway is continually taking up lighter rails selling them and putting down a heavier weight of rails. You must do that if you are going to have heavy traffic.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have heavy traffic now.

Mr. FOSTER. The only reason why it has been stipulated that that 33 miles of road should have 70-pound rails was on account of the heavy freight traffic which the hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways, expected he would have. He says that he expects a large accretion of heavy freight upon this road. Having mentioned that point, namely, that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was not showing very much faith in his present proposition in the way in which he has treated the House with reference to the information regarding it, let me go one step further. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) made his report to Council and the Order in Council was passed virtually authorizing this contract to be gone into on the terms which it contains on the 24th of March. He asked for a report from his chief engineer. The chief engineer reported very generally upon the condition of the road on 2nd February, but the chief engineer who is a cautious man declared in that report:

Should you finally decide to acquire the road, before the matter is absolutely closed I suggest it would be prudent to have an examination into its condition.

The chief authority upon which the hon. gentleman relies said: From my general knowledge and in a general way this is a fairly good road; but if you contemplate purchasing it on these terms, it would be prudent for you to have a special examination made. The hon. gentleman took the portion of the report which agreed with him, and omitted carrying out the very essence of the prudential consideration which his chief engineer urged upon him, and he went

to Council and got the order authorizing the contract. He made the contract itself without ever having asked for an examination, and without ever having sent a man down to make an examination; and it was only in June, and as the hon. gentleman himself stated here to-night, only after these charges had been made in the House—and they were not made until this explanation was made the other night—that he thought it the better part of prudence to have a report on that road from one or two of his engineers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman intends to misrepresent what I said, but he is doing so all the same.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By stating that no engineer was sent to examine the road until after these charges were made. I stated most unhesitatingly that Mr. Kingsford had been over the road in the last month, and that I had received a report from him which bears date some days prior to the time of the discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. My position is perfectly right in this respect, that no report of an engineer was made until after the contract had been authorized on the 24th day of March, and until after the contract had been signed, sealed, and delivered on the 15th day of May.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not what the hon. gentleman stated. I stated to the House, also, that the contract was not signed on the date it bears, nor was it signed until long after its date. I cannot say the exact date when it was signed, but it was prepared for the printer and was printed, and a mistake in it was corrected, and it was again printed, and it was many days after the date the contract carries on its face before it was actually signed.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not know where we are to end. These are the two reports that were laid on the Table of the House by my hon. friend; these are the only papers we have to go by; and he says that though the agreement bears date the 15th day of May, it was not signed by the parties to that agreement on the 15th day of May. But how does that help my hon. friend? Does it make a pin's difference, his crawling out of a few days in May in regard to signing the contract, when he went to the Council on the 24th day of March and got the authority to sign the contract on the terms of it, and got that authority without having any examination of the road at all? How is my hon. friend's position bettered by the latter statement, even if it be a statement of fact? And what is this House reduced to, when we have Ministers laying on the Table of the House a con-

tract signed in accordance with an Order in Council which bears date the 15th day of May, and when the hon. gentleman is cornered on it, after it has been discussed nearly five days, he states that that date is wrong, and that it was signed several days after that date? This is a new method of conducting business by this business Government. Now, Sir, I am not going very largely into the question of the nature of the reports which the hon. gentleman has got, even at this late day, and after the matter had been discussed in this House. The reports are thoroughly general. All they do, the best of them, is to give a general good character to the road, and I am quite willing to take that, and leave it at what these gentlemen say. But as for having any explicit and thorough examination of that road, and a report upon it in detail, it cannot be found within the lids of this book, and I fancy that my hon. friend has brought down all he had. Now, in order that the House may judge of this transaction has all the information which the hon. gentleman should give to the House been given yet? What knowledge has this House to-day of the condition of that road in so far as its rolling stock is concerned?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not buying that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, with his back towards his opponents, instead of his face—the attitude of a man brave in his own words—interjects in the face of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), as if he had some private spite against his colleague, something which he means to come, by way of rebound, to his opponents on this side of the House, whom he does not face; and what does he say? When this House is asked to give its sanction to a contract conferring certain powers, one of these powers authorizing the Minister to buy the rolling stock at a valuation fixed by himself and agreed upon between him and the company alone, it has not given it any information as to the rolling stock. He says he has not bought it yet, but he asks us to vote him the power to buy it. We are not given one item of information with reference to that rolling stock—as to how much it is, as to its character or its quality. We are to vote him the power blindly. He is to make whatever arrangement he chooses for the rolling stock, no matter as to its quantity, its character, its distribution, and the like of that; and he tries to shield himself by the statement that it is not bought yet. I hope it is not, because he has not the authority to buy it, and he ought not to do things which Parliament does not give him the authority to do. We have not any information yet, although the hon. gentleman promised to give it before we voted on this, as to the estimated cost of the maintenance of this road, and the estimated operating expenses. I ask hon. gen-

lemen opposite how they are going to come to a conclusion as to this matter unless they have put before them an estimate of the expenses which are necessary for this Government to put that road into a good position, the expenses which are necessary for maintaining it, and the expenses which are necessary for operating it. Some fair estimate of these expenses ought to be given. It was promised by the Minister, and it is not yet before the House.

Now, it seems to me that my hon. friend went wide of the question when he took a half hour of his time to demonstrate that the idea of getting into Montreal was a good idea, and that because the idea of getting our road into a metropolis like Montreal was a good idea, therefore we should not say anything as to the means adopted by which the idea was to be carried out. I touched upon that the other night, and I thought the hon. gentleman would not make the mistake of attempting to argue on a question like that. Does he not understand—this hon. gentleman who thinks it is the pink of courtesy to turn his back to his opponents—that this House ought to have some rights? Does he not think that he ought to give us some information on this point? I know we ought to be able to get information from the intelligence which is spread over the other side of my hon. friend's countenance, but I do not think my hon. friend should expect us to expect this information out of the back side of his countenance, which he so benignly turns to this side of the House. It has just been brought to my attention that my hon. friend is bound by the 8th section of the agreement to purchase the rolling stock and railway supplies of the company at a valuation to be agreed upon between the company and the Minister. It is not an option as to which he may do it or not. He is bound hand and foot to purchase that; and if he has bound himself hand and foot to purchase it, he must know the nature and condition of this rolling stock and these supplies, and it is his duty to lay before the members of this House that information. My hon. friend has given us not a shred of information upon it. He has not given us the report of an officer upon it. I doubt if to-day he has in his office the report of one of his engineers or officers with reference to this rolling stock and these supplies; and yet my hon. friend tried to shield himself for the lack of this information by saying that he had not bought it yet.

Now, Sir, in approaching this question from a business point of view, let us ask ourselves whether the main question is, not simply the idea that it would be a good thing to get into the city of Montreal, but the ways and means of getting in and the results you will achieve after you get in. I leave it to the House if these are not the two salient points. The idea, as a sentiment, may be excellent. We might all say

**Mr. FOSTER.**

that it would be very desirable to get that road into Montreal. But no matter how much we may like the idea sentimentally, or how strong might be our desires, as a business set of men, these two considerations are the ones which must govern us. On what terms can we get into Montreal? And what will be the business return when we do? The sentimental idea must be set aside, and these two considerations are the ones alone which we, as business men, should keep in mind and reflect upon. Now, as to the terms upon which we get in. We have pretty fully discussed them, but it will be as well to glance at them briefly again. We get into that city and enjoy such advantages as we buy for these considerations. For the use of the Grand Trunk Railway road from Ste. Rosalie to Victoria bridge, the price we pay is \$37,500 per year, which represents, at 3 per cent, a capitalization of \$1,250,000. Translated into that language, which all can understand, it simply means this, that for the privilege of getting to Victoria Bridge over the Grand Trunk line, for the right of user simply, we are to pay what is equivalent to setting aside the sum of \$1,250,000, payable to the Grand Trunk Railway.

**Mr. CHARLTON.** What is the length of that portion of the road?

**Mr. FOSTER.** It is somewhere about thirty-five miles. Then for the simple right of user of the bridge, we pay \$40,000 yearly, which, on a capitalization at 3 per cent, is equivalent to one and a third million dollars. Then, again, we give to that company for the extension of the bridge, \$300,000 out and out in cash—a sum not to exceed this. Then, with regard to the terminals, we pay simply for the right of using them, \$62,500 per year which, capitalized at 3 per cent, makes \$2,080,000. So that, translated into a language we can all understand, for the simple right of user of the Grand Trunk Railway from Ste. Rosalie into Montreal, and its terminals, we set aside the sum of \$4,963,000, capitalizing, at 3 per cent, the amount we pay. Now, we can all understand that. The hon. gentleman scouts the idea of translating the transaction in that way, but we must take this matter up as we find it, and we find \$4,963,000 to be the amount of liability we have assumed. Then, as I stated before, after we get the right of user, for which right we have to pay \$4,963,000 we have to pay our share of the cost of maintenance year in and year out for the ninety-nine years. I say that that is an immense sum which we must put upon one side of this account and hold it there when we come to ask ourselves what we are going to get. I cannot compute the cost of maintenance which we are to pay. My hon. friend would not give the information to the committee the other night, and he has not given it yet. He promised to give it, but has forgotten his promise. He promised

to give us, before this discussion went on, the cost of maintaining and operating this portion of the road, so far as an estimate could give it. If we had that estimate, we could calculate the cost. We could place it then alongside of this sum of \$4,963,000, and be able to get two parts of the account which run to our debit.

Now, when we come to the Drummond County road, what do we find? For the right of user and ultimately of possession—we ourselves, of course, maintaining the whole of the road—from the very moment we commence to work upon it on the first of November, we paid \$70,000 per year, which, capitalized at 3 per cent, makes two and one-third million dollars. Adding up all these figures, we find that this arrangement will cost us \$7,250,000 in round numbers chargeable to capital account. This has actually to be set aside and to draw interest at 3 per cent in order to make the yearly payments which we are bound to make for the mere right of user in case of the Grand Trunk Railway and ultimately the possession of the Drummond County road. We cannot brush that away; we have incurred this liability, no more and no less, and I am simply putting that on the one side of the account, and when we come to the other side I want to get all we can fairly expect as the result of any increased business.

But before I come to that, one point of this arrangement which ought to be noted is this. Her Majesty's Government binds itself to this further obligation. If the Grand Trunk Railway should come to the conclusion at any time that the traffic of their road calls for extensions and improvements in the terminals, on the bridge, on the road up to Ste. Rosalie, it can make these improvements, it may even double-track the whole of the way, and it will charge one-half the cost to the Intercolonial Railway or this Government, and this Government will have to pay another yearly sum of 5 per cent upon half the amount expended on these extensions.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Not unless we consent and use them.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Not until we consent and use them, but is the hon. gentleman going to tell us that he will not consent and will not use those extensions and improvements after his high-flown declamation as to the accretion of traffic he is going to have, how he was going to pull on all this western country, throw the freight into Grand Trunk cars and compel the Grand Trunk Railway to deliver it up when they get down to Montreal to the Intercolonial Railway? My hon. friend thinks that 5 per cent on the cost of one-half of the improvements is not too great for us to pay, no matter whether our trade is a mere fraction of the whole or not. When the Grand Trunk

Railway comes to the conclusion that its terminals in Montreal have to be enlarged, that double tracking must take place, that improvements are to be made, it will simply set to work and make them, and charge the Dominion Government with 5 per cent upon their one half share.

Now, let us look at the treatment given the Drummond County Railway and see what the fortunate owners of that road have got. The Drummond County Railway cost \$1,500,000 according to my hon. friend, but he was good enough to add another \$100,000, and to pay them at the rate of 4 per cent on a cost of \$1,600,000. But have the fortunate owners of that railway ever put \$1,600,000 into that road? Will my hon. friend say that they have put half that amount into that road? If he will look at the records in his own department, he will find that the subsidies which have been given that company and helped to build that road, which he declares cost the company \$1,500,000, amounted to \$782,000 in round numbers.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The amount of subsidy paid by the Dominion Government—I speak of that portion of the road which has been built—amounts to \$287,000.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend is wrong; it amounts I think to \$297,920. But I shall not quarrel about a little difference.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think my recollection is correct.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I cannot take the hon. gentleman's recollection against his own report which I have in my hand. But this little difference of \$10,000 is a mere bagatelle in the large amount of \$7,000,000 which is at stake. What I have said is absolutely correct. If the hon. gentleman will turn up his own report of Railways and Canals, he will find that subsidies have been given to that company for the building of the road amounting to \$782,000 in round numbers. Subtract that from their own statement of the cost \$1,500,000 and you will find that the company have spent of their own money, or money they have put into their road, the sum of \$720,000 or thereabouts. My hon. friend is, therefore, buying back \$297,000 of the Dominion's own money. He is paying those men who own the road, at the present time, and who did not put more than \$700,000 into it, \$1,600,000, which is a net 8 per cent per year, or a little over, during ninety-nine years, on all they have put into it. Now, I take that as one indication that these gentlemen at least ought to be satisfied with the bargain, and that of the three parties, if there is dissatisfaction at all, that dissatisfaction ought not to exist with the Grand Trunk Railway nor with the Drummond County Railway, but must exist with the people of this country who

have to pay and build and, in this case, to a certain extent, have to pay twice over. So that on one side of the account we have, as I have stated, what amounts to this capitalization of seven and a quarter million dollars. Now, what have we on the other side? I would ask the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) who gave us a nice disquisition in the form of a prophecy that this arrangement would, no doubt, come out all right, but forgot to give us one single fact upon which he based that prophecy. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is going to get into the city of Montreal and when he gets into the city of Montreal he will be ready for the hauling of freight and passengers. When he gets ready for the hauling of freight, he will find that that freight is divided up into two classes—into what you may call local traffic, and what you may call through traffic. He will be able to ask for business from Montreal for all points along the Intercolonial Railway for distribution in that country itself, and also freight from these places along the line to Montreal and the west for distribution. But when he is ready to carry local freight to or from Montreal, who else is ready to carry freight for the same points? The distributing points are very largely St. John, Halifax, Yarmouth, and other towns. A man who has local freight to ship to the city of St. John for distribution over the wide area which St. John serves—and it is a very wide area, taking in not only a great part of New Brunswick, but also a part of Nova Scotia—has two roads by which he may send it; he may send it by the Intercolonial to St. John, or he may send it by the competing line, the Canadian Pacific Railway, to St. John. And the Canadian Pacific Railway line to the city of St. John, even giving the hon. gentleman the saving which he says he will make, is 248 miles shorter than by the Intercolonial Railway. Now, I will ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works if he will dispute that assertion. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals declared for himself and for his colleagues that they never took mileage into account at all. Do you think that the man who has freight to ship will take mileage into account, or will he not? Do you think that the rate of freight to the city of St. John will be governed by the length of haul, or will it not? If there is anything that governs a freight rate is it not the comparative distance that the freight has to be hauled. I make the assertion, which every man sitting in this House will bear me out in making, that it is impossible that the Intercolonial Railway, starting from Montreal should compete successfully and on a paying basis with a company which carries freight to the same point of distribution and has 248 miles less of haulage than the Intercolonial itself. Now, suppose we take Halifax, the other great city of distribution.

Mr. FOSTER.

Freight from Montreal for Halifax, is being sought, but not by the Intercolonial alone.

The Canadian Pacific Railway has its line running into Halifax, and that line is just 76 miles shorter than the Intercolonial would be from Montreal to Halifax, even if you count the shortening of the line which the hon. gentleman declares he will make. The hon. gentleman does not take mileage into account. Will not the shipper of freight take mileage into account? And will my hon. friend try to maintain before business men that, in the keen competition for business to-day, the Intercolonial Railway can profitably compete for freight which goes through to Halifax for distribution, with a road that has an advantage of 76 miles, just as good a road, and with just as easy gradients in the main. Now, what local freight will the hon. gentleman get out of Montreal? He will get out of Montreal, local freight for the points along the line until he gets down to some point where the distribution can more profitably take place from St. John, and so can be taken from the other end of the line. I do not care where you fix that point. Let us fix it arbitrarily and for the sake of argument, at Moncton. The Intercolonial Railway will have the monopoly of distribution on points along the line down, say, as far as the town of Moncton in New Brunswick. I am not going to say anything as to the character of this trade more than that the amount of it over and above what will go to-day by the Intercolonial will not be appreciably greater and will not appreciably affect the result. Are there other kinds of local traffic that the hon. gentleman can get? But he says: We are going to get a chance to sit down among the railway magnates and talk over rates; we are going to send our agents into the west and they will gather freight and put it on the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it will be handed over to us at Montreal and we will carry it from there. What has your shipper in the west to say about that? What does he want to get? He wants to get the cheapest freight to St. John or to Halifax, and is it likely that he will send by a line which is 248 miles longer than another line and which is equally open to him? However, if it be over a country that is served only by the Grand Trunk Railway, what is there about this traffic that could not be arranged for with the Intercolonial terminating where it does to-day and under arrangements that have long existed between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial.

So much for the local freights. The other kind of freight that my hon. friend is setting his net for is what is called through freight, that is either freight that is seeking the old country by way of Halifax or St. John, or freight that is coming, from the old country and that is seeking this country. Now, at Montreal, when my hon. friend is there seeking to fill his cars with freight, and

when shippers are asking what are the through rates to Liverpool, the through rates to Glasgow and to other points in the old country, what is the condition which confronts them? The Grand Trunk has its through line to Portland and its steamship connection from Portland to Glasgow, Liverpool and ports on the continent, and, on shipments for Liverpool or any other point in the old country, the Grand Trunk has a distinct advantage of about 400 or 500 miles of land carriage in its line to Portland. Will my hon. friend gain anything in that case on through freight which is lying in territory which the Grand Trunk Railway is able to serve and upon the serving of which the shareholders depend for the dividends that are to be paid to them? Will the Grand Trunk, now that this arrangement has been entered into, sit idly by with the advantage in its favour and give its freight to the Intercolonial to take them by the longer route. No; then, as regards shipment to the old country, there is one competition that is not got rid of in the least degree by getting into Montreal. We are to have a line of freight steamers when this fast line is able to begin the service, both from Halifax or St. John. Suppose that your fast line is in working order, suppose that the freight line is running. We will say, for the sake of argument, that the fast line runs out of St. John and the freight line out of Halifax—and I do not wish to depress the hopes of the people of Halifax. I assume this only for argument's sake—and you are asking freight through these two ports in the winter season. The Intercolonial comes in to compete for the freight through St. John and through Halifax, the through freight which is to pass through these ports. What is the competition? If it is to go out of St. John, the Canadian Pacific Railway has its line 248 miles shorter, and has its traffic arrangements, and has that advantage in its haulage which it is impossible to overcome. If it is Halifax that is to be the port of shipment, there is yet the 76 miles, and you cannot make much of an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway for freight in the winter time in a Grand Trunk Railway country when the Grand Trunk Railway is interested in carrying it by its longest haul of land mileage down to Portland and sending it from there to the old country. So that on the matter of through freight bound for the old country either way, and vice versa, the difference between the mileage of the two is incontestably against my hon. friend. My hon. friend thought it wise to tell the House that when he went into this he did not take into account the question of mileage at all; then he was good enough to tell us afterwards that the same was true of all his colleagues, and that they threw out the question of mileage and competition on shortened mileage altogether, and that they stood as a unit in not having taken the question of

mileage into consideration. I submit to this House and to the country that the question of mileage is the whole question so far as traffic is concerned over the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal, as deriving its accretion of business and consequently of profits. But my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) had a perfectly easy way of settling that the other night. He said: Of course it is a longer haul but then if the Intercolonial Railway gets into Montreal and wants that freight it can take it, whether the freight pays for its carriage or not. Ah, that is it. No doubt the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska thought his argument good. He said that if the Intercolonial Railway is bound to get that freight it can get it, it can get it by lowering the rates. How much profit would go to the Intercolonial Railway carrying freight against a shortage of 400 miles as against the Grand Trunk Railway through Portland?

Mr. CHARLTON. And with all the disadvantages which my hon. friend depicts weighing against the Intercolonial Railway in consequence of the greater length, would he be opposed to any scheme whatever for securing entry into Montreal for that road?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that I would. I did mention this point of view when, as my hon. friend will recollect, I said that there was every difference between an idea and the way in which that idea should be carried out, and the results that might come from it. I unhesitatingly say that while sentiment, and a certain amount of business sentiment, may be to a certain extent well based, would be strongly in favour of getting that road into the metropolis, after all we must be guided by the terms upon which we can get it in, and by what we are going to find when we get there. So I say that if the Intercolonial Railway is going to take freight in competition with those lines of shorter haulage, it can only take it by carrying freight at unremunerative rates, and if it carries freight at unremunerative rates the deficit is made greater instead of being lessened. For we have in the first place certain, \$210,000 per year to put to the debit; we have certain, the cost of the maintenance and operation to put to the debit; we have also the contingent 5 per cent interest on the half cost of the very great and may be very expensive improvements that may hereafter be carried out. All that is certain to be paid, but the revenue is a contingency; and I have given my reasons for believing that for business men that contingency does not promise very much in the line of its being fulfilled successfully in the great growth of freight and of profits on the carriage of that freight. Now, Sir, this simply voices, in a rough and ready way, my views with reference to this matter. I have sought to discuss this question from

the business point of view ; and I challenge the Government now, which has able men in it, to meet these arguments and convince us if they can, and convince the country, which is of more importance, that there is any reasonable grounds for believing that under the circumstances which I have detailed, it is possible for them getting into Montreal with that large amount of expense placed directly and continuously against them, whether it is possible that any reasonable business can be hoped for or expected, or any large growth in freight tonnage and in freight receipts. That is the kernel of the whole matter. It is not a light thing to rush into an expenditure which is equivalent to an addition to capital debt of \$7,300,000. My hon. friend who sits before me to-day (Mr. Charlton), voiced his opposition largely to the fast line service on the ground that a Government which had gained its place by promises of economy, which had gained its place by continually declaring that we were adding too much to the public debt, had, in this first session of its regular work, undertaken such stupendous additions to the public debt of the country and done it seemingly with a light heart. No one would be disposed in this House to make any opposition to an expenditure of seven million dollars if it were necessary, if we could fairly show that the other side of the account so far as the Intercolonial Railway goes, would show enough increase to offset it. But there is the weak point in the whole argument. Where is this business to be got ? The Minister of Railways is a business man, he says. Let him tell us to-night, or let any other member tell us, where he proposes, under these competitive circumstances, to get this 400,000 extra tons of freight against the competition of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is just as strong, and stronger in the city of Montreal than it would be at Lévis. The Minister of Public Works gave us another idea, and I commend it to the attention of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The Minister of Public Works, when some of his followers from the city of Quebec, or interested there, began to feel that the million dollars subsidy to the bridge was fading away, my hon. friend assured them by declaring that the subsidy to the bridge would be given all the same. There is then another million or two, which after you go to the expense of getting this road into the city of Montreal, will have no *raison d'être* except simply as a local contribution to what will be a local work ; but it will be a million or two added. Now, I take this view, and I commend it to the House to be thought over, whether under these circumstances, it would not have been far better for the Government to have the connection at Lévis with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Grand Trunk Railway, and that in view of the strong competition at Montreal that they knew they

Mr. FOSTER.

must have and always will have on account of the distance, whether there would not be a decided saving and a decided advantage by making the connection there at the cost of a million dollars or so, instead of pressing this scheme with an expenditure of seven million dollars, to which we are tied irrevocably, and for ninety-nine years in one case and for perpetuity in another, to which we are tied most certainly. Now, there is one point in favour of this, and that is that if you make Quebec or Lévis the competitive point, you have the advantage of drawing on both the railways for freight which will be carried over their lines, and consequently contribute to their roads from Montreal down to Quebec and to Lévis. Quite a large amount of freight can be influenced by the combination of two roads where the determining road on the one hand has an advantage in putting freight over its line and getting the advantage of a haul for 100 or 200 miles more over its own rails. That would have been a way in which the Intercolonial Railway might have recouped itself for some of its difficulties, and certainly have done it at a very small cost. I will go further—at no cost. For the Minister of Public Works tells us we have to give the contribution to the Quebec bridge anyway, and what the Minister of Public Works says, in this present Cabinet, has to be carried out so far as expenditures go. So then the House is face to face with this, and the House could not do better than to say that it does not believe that this is an arrangement which commends itself to business men in the country. I do not believe it will. Here is an immense expenditure. Even if you get rid of a little of the deficit, suppose we get rid of \$100,000 of the deficit, you are piling up \$210,000 certain, and all the cost of maintenance, and operation, and of interest upon improvements besides. But my hon. friend the Minister of Railways gave a new version of the cause of the deficit, and it is a notable one which I call to the attention of the House. Heretofore my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and all the rest of my hon. friends on that side of the House, have been declaring up and down this country that the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway were due to the gross and corrupt mismanagement of the Tory party. To-night we are absolved entirely. The pure and lofty politician from New Brunswick, the Minister of Railways, to wit, who now turns his beaming smiles upon the Opposition, declared that that was not the cause of the deficit at all, but the deficits were due to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was cribbed, cabined and confined, and that if it could only get out of this state and get up into the glorious freedom of the city of Montreal where it would find its competitors stronger than they are at Lévis, it would do away with these deficits. One

thing then we have to thank the Minister of Railways for, and that is that he has absolved the Tory party from any charge of mismanagement as being the basis of deficits heretofore. Now, I am not going to take up the time of the House any longer in reference to this matter.

An hon. MEMBER. Go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. I know my hon. friend thinks it is all right. I will therefore go on just a moment more. There was an alternative route that has been mentioned; that was the South Shore route. There stands on the statute-books of this Parliament the sum of \$229,500 voted for the completion of that line along the south shore of the River St. Lawrence. That we will have to pay any way. I have no personal knowledge of this section, but it is conceded upon all sides that the south shore country is a country which locally would pay a road to run through and pay well. So that if that route could have been taken and that sum of \$229,500 which we have to pay out as part payment of the construction, any way, the Intercolonial Railway could have been extended to that route and have gone over the Grand Trunk Railway bridge and into the city of Montreal, and you would have had the advantage of a section of country in which that road would have been assured a local traffic which would have fairly well paid for the running of the road, and the road would have been shorter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Shorter than the Drummond County road?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend asks me if it is shorter than the Drummond County road. I cannot tell him whether it is shorter or not. I think there is not much difference between them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is quite a difference.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Over ten miles.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) does not think that mileage amounts to anything at all when it suits his argument. But he seems to think that ten miles amounts to a great deal when he is asked to take another route. Four hundred miles of advantage to the Grand Trunk Railway on a freight rate never entered into the minds of the hon. gentleman or of his colleagues as an element of competition. Two hundred and forty miles in favour of another road going to St. John, never entered into the minds of the hon. gentlemen, but when it comes to a difference of ten times one it is something stupendous.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Particularly when the hon. gen-

tleman states to this House that it is shorter; I think it is somewhat material.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if it is ten miles longer.

Mr. HAGGART. It is twenty-seven miles shorter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It cannot possibly be.

Mr. FOSTER. We are all expected on this side of the House to deal with this question mostly in the dark. The first thing you would have thought that the Minister of Railways would have given to the House would have been the exact length of the Grand Trunk Railway, of the Drummond County and of the South Shore. That was information which we should have had. But we have not got that and we have to delve and dig in the dark as best we may. If 400 miles and 248 miles and twenty-six miles are not material, no matter what the local trade is, the Minister of Railways cannot come to the conclusion that ten miles is a very great obstacle so far as the South Shore is concerned. I think I have taken up most of the points. I have simply this to mention at the last. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) said that the business men were in favour of this proposition, but my hon. friend failed to show it. He did assert that the business men favoured the idea, if kept down under proper conditions. But if this proposition has ever been favoured by business men it has not been shown yet. I have before me the Toronto "Globe," which I will not quote to the House, not only giving editorials deprecating what was then mooted, but what it thought would never materialize, but giving the opinions of business men as well. The weight of the editorial was decidedly against the proposed scheme. The Montreal "Herald" went to work early in the year and interviewed business men in the city of Montreal. Without taking the time to read these, I think I may state that the majority of the business men who were interviewed were opposed to the proposition as a business project. So that if we take the cool calm declaration of all these organs of the party and all the business men, it is a pretty good showing, prima facie, that this proposition is not favourably received by them. Of course, business men in Montreal would like to get as many railways going into Montreal as possible. No doubt, they would be to a certain extent in favour of that. But whether the project is a wise one to be carried out all depends upon the cost which it will entail and the results which may come from it. Now, I trust that this House will not look at this question in a partisan way at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) made the statement that the Opposition had tried to use the argument in such a way as to make a partisan attack upon the Government. A partisan at-

tack was not made upon the Government. This has been treated from this side of the House as a business proposition, or as one that ought to be viewed in a business light; we have endeavoured to discuss it in that way. The vote that took place this afternoon shows that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House remain firm to the policy which they had for years advocated, and will support the Government in carrying that policy out, even though the means are not the best in their opinion that might be adopted. The House this afternoon showed by this vote that though the proposition was one which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House thought might well be better, yet for the sake of a policy which had been determined upon they were willing to give an almost unanimous support to the Government upon this idea which, though not their own idea, they are endeavouring to push to success. The same thing would take place if a proposition were made to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal which commended itself to the attention and consideration of gentlemen on this side of the House in a favourable point of view. This side has just as much at stake in the Intercolonial Railway as hon. gentlemen opposite. The Intercolonial Railway has been as much their child as it has been the child of hon. gentlemen opposite. The future of the Intercolonial Railway is just as dear to us as to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I shall make this statement that if I can be shown to-night any proposition emanating from that side which would be actually in the line of carrying out the future good of the Intercolonial Railway, I would support it and so would hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We oppose it because we think the scheme is a bad one, and because we think there is no business in sight which will be of such value and of such volume as to make the venture fairly equal, in point of revenue and expenditure. On these grounds I oppose it, and not on partisan grounds. Hon. gentlemen opposite could not hope to gain very much if they were successful. They would gain, as every Government does, credit for good administration. We could hope to gain nothing by a partisan opposition to a scheme of the kind if the business features of it appeared to us as being fair. Let us just leave out the idea that this is simply a partisan attack. It is not that in any sense of the word, and this House on both sides will be doing itself an injustice if it allows itself for a single moment to be led away by the statement that partisan opposition is at the basis of the attitude we take with reference to this question.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Speaker, at 11.30 I have become convinced that the province of New Brunswick was designed on too small a scale. If it had been made larger, it would

Mr. FOSTER.

have been possible for the ambition of these two men who have addressed the House to-night to have been fully satisfied, and we would have had their speeches rolled into one, and would have been saved at least half the time of this House on this occasion. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), has told us for nearly three-quarters of an hour—

Some hon. MEMBERS. An hour and a half.

Mr. POPE. Three-quarters of an hour of the time that he spoke, that it was useless for us to try, with the Intercolonial Railway, to compete with other lines of railway going out of the city of Montreal to the maritime provinces, in carrying freight for Europe. After he had thoroughly convinced us, from his standpoint, that that was a fact, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) asked him if he would agree on any conditions to the Intercolonial Railway being extended to the city of Montreal, and he admitted that there were conditions under which he would agree to that extension. When he admitted that, he answered all the speech he had made for the first three-quarters of an hour.

I do not intend on this occasion to go into the details which hon. gentlemen opposite must have gone into in order to defend the proposition which they are responsible for placing before this House and this country. I am not here to severely criticise either them or hon. gentlemen on this side. But I have heard quite enough, not only to-night but on previous occasions, to the effect that we should not attempt to compete for traffic over the people's railway in this country, in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. We have had quoted to us different distances, the Canadian Pacific Railway in many instances being given the preference, and the Grand Trunk Railway being given the preference in other instances. But I am bound to say that with this country behind me, with the rate at which we can borrow money, without dividends to pay, with the resources which the country has as a freight agent, I would be prepared to enter into an agreement or go into a meeting where freight rates were to be settled, and I would take my chances of getting what was right in the interest of the people of Canada. It is well known that there is no railway corporation in this country that can borrow money at the rate of interest at which the Dominion of Canada can borrow it. It is well known that there is no such force behind any railway corporation as the Dominion of Canada behind her own railways; and I presume that when these hon. gentlemen took into consideration this project, they found that the people of Canada had invested large sums of money in two great highways, one the

canal system, and the other the Intercolonial Railway; they found them 150 miles or thereabouts apart; and they undertook to bring them into closer communication, and to bring them together at the commercial centre of Canada, the city of Montreal. Were they warranted in doing that? Is there any great railway in Canada or any railway reaching from the United States towards Canada that does not make every effort, be the financial cost what it may, to get to the city of Montreal? Are we to learn no lessons from these corporations? Sir, is it possible that men who are entrusted with the finances of these corporations, and shareholders who are desirous of earning dividends for the people who have put their money into these various railways, are all wrong in going to the city of Montreal, and that we are right in stopping at a little point like Lévis and handing over all our traffic to other roads? Is it right to concede that all the traffic originated in the western part of this country? For every man knows that the railway that originates the freight has the power of arbitration—that it arbitrates the rate, takes off the cream and gives you the skim milk. The Intercolonial Railway has been handling skim milk for years, as the many deficits which we have had in the operation of that railway prove.

The responsibility of the statement made by the Minister of Railways with regard to the proposed extension rests with him and with the Government to which he belongs. He has intimated, as I gather from the remarks of the ex-Minister of Finance, that it is possible by this transaction to save to this country some \$300,000 or \$400,000. Sir, I take him at his word. I hold him responsible for that statement, and this country holds him responsible for it; and I am bound to say that in my opinion, though it may be faulty, if proper administration and economy are used in the operating of that railway—even though it may not be possible for a Government to administrate a railway as economically as private corporations can do it—I say that when you look at the deficits we have had since the Intercolonial Railway was constructed, it is time for us to consider some proposition which some honourable body of men like the Government in power are willing to assume responsibility for; and I am not assuming responsibility when I say that I am prepared to support the resolution which these hon. gentlemen have introduced into this House, and to ask them to vindicate their word to this Parliament and to the people of this country.

There are three routes by which the Intercolonial Railway might possibly be extended to the city of Montreal. One is via the Grand Trunk Railway over the Richmond road; the other is the route chosen by the Government, by the Drummond County Railway; and the other is by the

road known as the South Shore Railway. There is no very great difference in the respective distance of these routes. The length of the Grand Trunk is 126 miles, that of the Drummond County is 113 miles, and that of the South Shore I have no exact figures of, but I am informed that if it came to the Victoria Bridge it would be 120 miles, and if it went to Longueuil, and the country incurred the expense of constructing another bridge across the St. Lawrence, it might be six or seven miles shorter than the other two routes. But when we face the question of the construction of another bridge across the St. Lawrence the hon. members on both sides of this House would say that under these circumstances the South Shore route would have to be abandoned, and we would have to make our choice between the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. Well, Sir, as the Minister of Railways has stated, and as I have been informed by Mr. Wainwright, it is impossible to obtain the Grand Trunk Railway at the same price at which we can get the Drummond County Railway. That brings me down to the question whether we can get the Drummond County Railway, which is a shorter route than the Grand Trunk, at less money. I know of no one who can place a better value on the Grand Trunk than the Grand Trunk people themselves, and they say we cannot get the Grand Trunk at the rate at which we can get the Drummond County road; and when we take into account the fact that the grades on that road are easy, and that there is no railway in the province of Quebec with better curvature, I say that the Government are justified in acquiring the Drummond County Railway at the best terms possible for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. Having heard in the lobbies of the House, and in various parts of this city a condemnation of the character of the Drummond County Railway, which was astonishing to me, I took the opportunity last Saturday of going over that road as far as the rails are laid, and I must say that I was agreeably surprised with its character, with the amount of new business that I saw ready to be shipped, and with the character of the country through which it passes. It was in all its parts and details satisfactory, so far as I am aware. I have heard hon. gentlemen in this House make the statement that this is but a logging road, and that statement has also been made by gentlemen who did not belong to this House at all. Sir, if it be a logging road, what was the late Government doing for the last eight or nine years? That road was built under its administration, under the direction of its officers, inspected by its engineers, and it honestly earned every dollar of the subsidy, and must have complied with all the conditions of the Subsidy Act. It has also been stated that it runs through an

unsettled country. Well, if there be nothing else against a railway except that it penetrates a forest its entire length and opens up a new country and new settlements, I for one will be prepared to assume the responsibility of supporting the claims of that railway for consideration. But it is not a fact that this road runs completely through an unsettled country. For its first thirty-five miles, it runs through the old settled country down beyond the town of Drummond. The next section runs through a new settlement and in that section we see illustrated the advantages of the policy of the late Government in encouraging railway construction by means of Government subsidies. Under that policy we found railways penetrating the forests before any settlement was made and making it possible for settlers to go in and overcome adverse circumstances and find an easy transport for their products to the foreign markets of the world, and there hold their own against the competition of foreign countries. In no part of this country will you find settlements more flourishing or conditions more promising than in that new settlement penetrated by this road, where the settlers find work during the winter in hauling, taking out lumber, carrying it to the mills or the rivers, thus being enabled to remain at home and save the expense of travelling, and developing that section of the country until it has reached a flourishing condition. And this is due to that road, which some hon. gentlemen have called a logging road. For the other part, after we pass on the Intercolonial section, we have, I believe, about forty-three miles. I do not think it is necessary to discuss the question whether that forty-three miles is good or bad road. For it is to be built on the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, and that standard is considered sufficient for this country for some years to come. The first twenty-five miles of the road is through a forest, but that forest, a portion of which is owned by the King Bros., has always been represented as one of the best forest preserves of spruce and pine timber to be found anywhere in the Dominion. The last twenty miles run down through a forest to the junction at Riviere du Loup, which is a very well settled old farming country. So that you have twenty miles on the one hand and thirty-five miles on the other, or fifty-five miles, running through an old settled country, and twenty-five miles running through a partially developed country, and twenty-five miles through forest land. That is the history of that road from the time it leaves Ste. Rosalie until it reaches the junction with the Grand Trunk Railway. I noticed in travelling over that road immense quantities of timber. It has been intimated that the timber has all been taken out by those who built that road. Gentlemen who are not in the lumber business might be prepared to accept that statement,

Mr. POPE.

but when you know that the road crosses the Nicolet River and the St. Francis and other rivers coming out of an enormous forest country that lies above, you are bound to know that what little lumber may have been taken along the actual line of that road is but a very small percentage of what is bound to be shipped over it for many years to come. I saw millions and millions of feet sawn lumber ready for shipment, and millions of feet in logs, and from inquiry I am perfectly satisfied that these mills are a permanency, representing very large investments. Some of the milling companies own thousands of acres of land, and one company, according to its own statement, will ship this year some 20,000 carloads. I was told that there were 20,000 cars of bark shipped, and I have no reason to doubt the statement.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a tan-bark road.

Mr. POPE. The hon. ex-Minister of something or other says it is a tan-bark road. If he will go down into that section and do some of his backing there, he will get tanned. Now, I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman disturbed me, because I am nervous, and these interruptions upset me. I heard some remarks made also with regard to the gentlemen who are connected with the Drummond County Railway. I heard very serious reflections cast upon them, and perhaps it is only natural, in a hot contest, as this promises to be, that such remarks should be made, but being personally acquainted with them for years, I must bear testimony to the honour and uprightness of the gentlemen associated with that road. I have known them for years, and have never known anything dishonourable against them or any institution with which they are connected. It is stated that they are going to make money. Well, suppose they do make money. I am bound to say that they would be a pack of fools if they invested their money in that road, and if they pledged their credit to the extent I know they did, notwithstanding what is said to the contrary in this House, to acquire sufficient funds to carry the road out to satisfactory completion, without expecting a fair remuneration for their enterprise. Out of this transaction I do not believe—it may be a weakness of mine not to be a believer—that the amount of money these gentlemen are going to receive will be, after everything is paid, more than a fair recompense. It has been said outside this House, if not in it, that this road has received subsidies from the two Governments. That is not the case. It receives subsidies from two Governments for a portion of the way, but for the balance—leaving out of question the forty-three miles which they will have to build, and for which they get no subsidy at all—from about St. Leonard down, they received no subsidy from the local Government. So that they have only received subsidies from the two

Governments on a portion of the road. It has been stated that the Government would be obliged to re-lay the rails over the seventy miles now constructed. I have no hesitation in saying that these rails are comparatively new and in good condition, and that so far as speed is concerned you can go just as fast over a fifty-six pound rail as over a seventy or eighty pound rail. But modern railways have found that, owing to the vibration and the wear and tear of the rolling stock and ties, it is an economy to have heavier rails. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, you will not find them tearing up the fifty-six pound rails which are in good condition in order to replace them by heavier rails.

Mr. INGRAM. That is being done on the Intercolonial Railway. They are removing fifty-six pound rails and putting on sixty-seven pound rails.

Mr. POPE. If they are only putting on sixty-seven pound rails, that is very poor policy. They ought to put on eighty or ninety pound rails. No railway man, let him be the present or an ex-Minister of Railways, will think, when he has the credit of his country behind him, of laying sixty-seven pound rails.

Mr. McCLEARY. But you have said that fifty-six pound rails are more economical for running purposes.

Mr. POPE. No; you got me wrong end to, Sir. You will have to load up the other way. I find myself under very peculiar circumstances politically about two-thirds of the time. Somebody must have been stealing, and, being a Conservative, I do not want to charge it upon this side of the House, and, consequently, I am bound to lay it to the door of hon. gentlemen opposite that they have been after our policy and after propositions that I have heard made on the other side of the House not only to-day but in days gone by. The extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal is not a new thing, it is not one that has not been heard of, it is not one that has not been proposed--and even over this same route--not accepted, though, by any Government until this Government has accepted it. I cannot say whether it has been seriously considered by any previous Government or not, but it has been considered by public men in this country, it has been considered by men who have sat in Parliament and heard the reports of the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway year after year. It would not have been unnatural, in fact it is most natural, of course for a thoughtful man to try to conceive of some idea by which to remedy, if possible, this great deficit. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) said it would make a wide difference in the far west whether you are shipping over a thousand miles or whether you are shipping over

800 miles. I say that it does make a little difference to the road that has to carry the freight, if you like, but I can tell him that if he was a shipper of lumber or other goods in this country, he would know that distance to the shipper very often does not affect him. As a shipper of goods do you suppose that I am going to stop my book-keepers and have them look up the records and see whether a thousand feet of lumber is going to travel a 100 miles for \$10 or 150 miles for \$10? That would not be practical business. We keep book-keepers for other business than that. Any man doing business extensively in this country knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk, the New York Central--all roads that have made a vast reputation and have lines of railway as good as those in any part of the world, over and over again carry freights for long distances for the same prices that other companies carry the shorter distances.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to say a few words, being a western man, and having, I believe, a few points to present that will be of value in connection with this discussion upon the proposition now laid before the House by the Government. The ex-Minister of Finance, in the able speech that he addressed to the House said that he did not seek to discuss the question from a partisan standpoint but from a business standpoint and it is from a business standpoint that I propose to say a few words about this matter. We have on hand a railway some 1,200 miles in length. I presume, considering the experience we have had in connection with that road, that were we now at the point where we had to decide whether we should build the road at all or not, we would not build it, but would apply the \$50,000,000 that it would cost to some other purpose. But the road is on our hands and must be carried on, and the question that the Government have to consider in connection with the operation of the road is whether it is possible to extricate itself from the difficulties that surround it in connection with that enterprise. It is known to us all that the road has not paid, that it has failed to pay even its running expenses, that it has been a burden upon the country; and the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), in managing its affairs naturally cast about to see if it was possible to put the road upon a basis which would overcome this difficulty and avoid the loss to the country that has hitherto characterized its management. Now, my experience with regard to railway matters would lead me to suppose that the Minister of Railways would do in reference to this matter, exactly what he has done. He has a road the western terminus of which is not an advantageous road--practically the road terminates nowhere--and if it is to be placed in a position to earn money it must have a better terminus. And casting about for a better terminus, the hon. Minister na-

turally cast his eyes upon the great commercial emporium of Canada where many lines of railways centre, where a vast amount of business can be obtained, and he has come to the conclusion that the interests of the road require that it should have a terminus in the city of Montreal. Now, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance tells us that it is not at all practicable to obtain a large addition of tonnage for conveyance over this road even with the terminus in Montreal. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in that assumption. The Intercolonial, if it enters the city of Montreal, will connect with the Grand Trunk, it will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will connect with the Parry Sound road, it will connect with the entire system of Canada, and, if it has proper facilities for carrying on the business, it will have inducements to offer and will have opportunity to draw tonnage from all these lines and an opportunity decidedly to increase its movement of through freight. I believe that the amount of business that is to be acquired by entering Montreal is very large. I asked the hon. gentleman if he took the position that it was not in the interest of the country for the Intercolonial to seek an entry into Montreal at all, and he said: No, he would not take that position; he would not assert that it was not desirable to have the Intercolonial terminate in Montreal. If that is the hon. gentleman's decision, the next question is: If it is desirable to enter into Montreal are the conditions upon which the Government are to secure an entry into Montreal favourable conditions, are they conditions that we are warranted in ratifying? That is the simple, the only question before us. Is the cost at which the entry into Montreal is to be secured, an annual payment of \$210,000 out of proportion to the advantage to be gained? Is it likely to prove a bad bargain? Are we paying an exorbitant price for entering that city. That is the business question before the House, and that is the question we have to consider in making up our minds whether we will support the policy of this Government in this matter or not.

Let us look at the matter in its details. We have other railway transactions by comparison with which we can form an opinion with regard to this rental of roads. It is only a few days ago that the Wabash road closed an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway for running powers over its line from Windsor to Suspension Bridge. And the sum it agreed to pay was \$1,000 per year per mile, with half the cost of the maintenance of the road to be charged against the Wabash. That furnishes a basis of comparison with the bargain proposed to be made for the lease of these lines, to enable the Intercolonial to run from Lévis to Montreal. And I am just reminded that under their bargain the Wabash are confined to through business; they are not allowed

Mr. CHARLTON.

to do local business. But in the case of the Intercolonial, they can do local business or any business they please. The Drummond County Railway, I think I am correct in saying, is 115 miles in length with a branch of 17 miles. That makes a total of 132 miles of road. Upon the basis of the rental paid by the Wabash, the rental for this road would be \$132,000 a year. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is getting it for \$70,000, about half the amount paid by the Wabash to the Grand Trunk for running privileges, but without power to do local business upon the great western division of the Grand Trunk. I say that so far as that part of the bargain is concerned, it is on the face of it, a good bargain. There is no sound reason for adverse criticism of it. In addition, it must be remembered, the Government own this road at the end of ninety-nine years. Then let us consider that portion of the arrangement respecting the line of the Grand Trunk from Ste. Rosalie to the Victoria Bridge. The Government virtually pays the same rental for that that the Wabash pays for the Grand Trunk—they pay \$37,000 a year for 35 miles of road, a little over \$1,000 per mile per year. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance says that \$40,000 represents a very large sum for running powers over the Victoria Bridge. But the Victoria Bridge cost a very large amount of money. It cost \$6,000,000 originally, and a very large sum, about \$2,000,000 is to be spent in putting the bridge into better condition. That represents a cost of \$8,000,000 to the road for the bridge. Now, \$40,000 a year for the privilege of using that bridge, estimating it upon the basis of \$8,000,000 cost is a very moderate charge indeed.

The Government is paying interest upon about a quarter of the cost of the bridge. There can be no reason to find fault with that portion of the bargain. Then, with regard to the terminal privileges in the city of Montreal, has anybody an idea what those terminal privileges are worth, the enormous yard room the Grand Trunk Railway has in that city, its depots, its sidings? Millions upon millions of dollars would not purchase the property that the Grand Trunk Railway uses and owns in Montreal for the prosecution of its business; and the Intercolonial Railway, for an annual rental of \$62,500, gets the use jointly with the Grand Trunk road of its terminal privileges. Now, I have looked this question over carefully. I represent a constituency up west that wants to see the affairs of this country economically managed, and I should feel disposed to criticise the Government if I thought it had made a bargain in this matter that was extravagant or injudicious. But I cannot see it in that light. I have listened to this discussion open to conviction, I have examined this pamphlet, and taken from the report of Mr. Schreiber, and other engineers visiting that road, and I believe the policy the Government is

adopting with regard to this matter, is a sound business policy. If they get into Montreal with the Intercolonial Railway, they are taking a business risk that they are warranted in taking. The condition of that road is such that something has to be done, and something has got to be risked, and the Government are bound, if they do their duty by the country, to manage the Department as the Minister of Railways and Canals is doing, with skill, with energy, with forethought. He has taken the very course that, as a prudent business man, he was bound to take; and I feel bound to say that I am disposed to sustain him in the course he has taken. Now, it is said by my hon. friend: "Oh, you may get into Montreal with the Intercolonial Railway in another way. Here you are with the Grand Trunk Railway running to the seaboard at Portland and with the Canadian Pacific Railway running to the seaboard at St. John. Both these roads have shorter lines than the Intercolonial Railway, and you cannot compete with them. My hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) has answered that argument very well, indeed. I would like to ask my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance whether the Canadian Pacific Railway finds it impossible to compete with the Grand Trunk Railway for business going to the seaboard from Montreal, though the distance to the seaboard by the Canadian Pacific Railway is much greater than by the Grand Trunk Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a successful competitor with the Grand Trunk Railroad, and the argument made by my hon. friend, that because these roads are somewhat shorter than the Intercolonial, consequently, the Intercolonial has no chance to secure business in competition with them.

Then there is another consideration, and one, perhaps, that has not occurred to any of the hon. gentlemen who have been discussing this matter, and that is that we may at some time, most unfortunately, have a condition of international relations that will result in the abrogation of the bonding privilege. The Canadian Pacific Railway passes through the northern end of Maine, the Grand Trunk Railway runs down through the state of Maine to Portland. Where would these roads be if the bonding privilege was abrogated? What would their competition with the Intercolonial amount to then? Why, the Intercolonial Railway would then become invaluable to us, it would then be the only road reaching down to the seaboard passing entirely over Canadian territory. Were we to fail to make the arrangement that it is proposed to make with the Intercolonial Railway, and if that contingency arose, we would wish that we had lost no time in doing it before. If there was no other consideration in connection with this matter, save the one I mention now, it would amply justify the

Government in taking this course to secure the entry for the Intercolonial into Montreal and an all-rail route over our railway system centering in Montreal, and to the seaboard within our own Dominion, and that railroad route passing entirely over our own soil.

My hon. friend says we might have had a Quebec connection, that we could have built a bridge across the St. Lawrence and then we would have had connection. What would we have connected with? A branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway road. We would have had no better connection with the Grand Trunk Railway, we would have had no connection whatever with the Parry Sound Railway, which will be a very important connection, indeed, to this road, and maybe more important than a connection with either of the other great lines. That would not have answered the purpose. Then he says it was not necessary to use this Drummond County road, why not build the South Shore road? Well, is my hon. friend aware that the construction of the South Shore railway, when we have got another line constructed which would answer the same purpose, would have been a waste of money? And when the road is constructed it seems it would not have answered the purpose as well. It is somewhat longer, and it would have cost more. There are expensive bridges to be built upon the line of this road, there are bridges across the St. Francis, over the Yamaska, and over the Nicolet, and these will cost an enormous amount of money. The line selected by the Government is undoubtedly the better line of the two. It is a line that will secure a greater amount of local business. The hon. member for Compton, a practical man, describes the country through which it passes; it passes through a wilderness of timber, and as long as timber reserves last, they furnish a railway line with one of the most important and profitable items of business for transport that a road can secure. So I say the policy of the Government with regard to the entry that is about to be secured into Montreal for the Intercolonial Railway is, I believe, worthy of the endorsement of this House. I believe that the cost of securing that entry is, under the circumstances, a moderate one. I believe the Minister of Railways, in the management of this matter, has shown rare good sense and good business principles, and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that, with all my regard for economy and desire to check expenditure. I shall support this scheme. I hope, although we cannot say that it will be so, I hope that this connection will result in lifting the Intercolonial Railway out of that slough of despond in which it has been for several years placed. I hope it will wipe out these deficits. I believe that this arrangement ought to pay a rental of \$210,00 a year, and leave an addition to

pay a share of the expenses of keeping that road in order, and a considerable surplus revenue. But whatever that surplus revenue may be, if we get any at all, it will be so much clear gain, and so much added to the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, and so much placed to the credit account of that road that will put it upon a firmer and a better basis as a business enterprise. I do not think that there is any justification for the severe criticism that has been engaged in as to the policy of the Government with regard to this scheme.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late hour of the night, I will try to make my remarks on this question as brief as possible. The resolutions which the hon. Minister of Railways has brought down for the consideration of the House, necessitated, as the ex-Finance Minister has shown, an expenditure which, when capitalized, would amount to over seven million dollars. The first question which this House has to consider is whether there is any necessity for building that road, and if there is such a necessity, is the expenditure in excess, or not, of what is absolutely required for the purpose. The Minister of Railways and Canals stated that when the Intercolonial Railway was making arrangements with different parties in the east for freight, it was taken by the throat at Point Lévis. He says they could not make any arrangement for carrying freight to Montreal, and therefore this connection became a necessity, and that when he came into office he perceived the necessity of getting to Montreal as a point of distribution. Well, does the hon. gentleman know that we have an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway and with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which the Intercolonial Railway can contract to deliver freight in Montreal over those roads? Does he not know perfectly well that such an arrangement extends all the way from Halifax to Montreal? He has only to account for the mileage carriage of his trains from Point Lévis to Montreal, or from St. John to Montreal, by the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. As to that part of his scheme, then, it is perfectly absurd. As chairman of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council he has the power of compelling these companies to carry his freight, and he is able to utilize their terminal facilities in the city of Montreal when he thinks it is in the interests of the country to do so. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly right in his idea of the necessity of extending the road from Quebec to Montreal. Then we have the financial question to consider, and we have to ask ourselves what amount should be properly expended for this extension. I say that the amount proposed to be expended by the Minister of Railways is enormously in excess of the requirements. When I was Minister of Railways and Canals I had occasion to consider this very matter, and I

Mr. CHARLTON.

made inquiries with regard to this same route which he proposes to follow, and I considered that I could have made arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway for a mileage rate over their road and for the use, on payment, of their terminal facilities, and for the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway, if I thought it was necessary to purchase it. But I never contemplated any such expenditure as the hon. gentleman now proposes. There was information in my department showing that the expenditure would not be in excess of \$1,700,000, let alone \$7,200,000. The hon. gentleman has at his fingers' end in his department, figures which would show the cost of traffic and the increased earnings which would accrue to the Intercolonial Railway by the extension to the city of Montreal, and the amount of freight and passengers that he would carry from Point Lévis and from St. John to Montreal. Has he furnished us with any information of that kind? Now, let me analyse his figures in which he says that the increased earning of the road would amount to \$900,000. He gives us the statement of the engineer in chief of the department. He says that the increase in tons of freight carried will be from 1,379,618 to 1,698,000. On the number of passengers, the increase will be from 1,471,863 to 2,100,000 passengers making an increased carriage of passengers to the extent of 600,000 per year. Does not the absurdity of it strike the House. I looked over the figures to see the amount that this railway of seventy-three miles carries. It carries 27,000 passengers per year. Add 10,000 in consequence of the extension of the road to Chaudière, and that would give you 30,000 a year. Double that on account of its being a through road, and that would give you 74,000 passengers per year. Where then are the 525,000 passengers with which the number is to be supplemented? You have only to draw attention to that statement, and to these figures to demonstrate the absurdity of it. It amounts to 2,000 passengers a day to be carried between Montreal and Quebec in excess of the number at present carried. How many trains would it require to carry them? These are the figures upon which the Finance Minister tries to justify the expenditure of this enormous sum for the purpose of having the road completed to Montreal—an expenditure of \$7,000,000 and some odd thousands. It may be possible that the amount that he pays for the Drummond County Road is not in excess of the absolute value of the road. The cost of that road, as furnished to the department, the hon. gentleman stated this evening to be \$1,530,000, of which that company received in bonuses from the local and Dominion Governments over \$800,000, leaving the amount that they actually expended in the building of the road at \$700,000. We all know how these returns of expenditure are made. The contractor for the building

of the road receives so much of the bonuses given by the local and the Dominion Governments, and these are supplemented by the bonds issued by the road. He includes the amount which would be absolutely required, the cash expenditure for the building of the road, and probably he takes the bonds, and he always makes an estimate of the cost of the road which is in excess of what the railway company could have it built for, if they had the cash and spent it upon the road. We have no return to the Government for the amount they have paid out in cash. Let us suppose it was \$700,000. It would make the amount paid by the Government for this road nearly \$2,300,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) said that these gentlemen had a perfect right to make a legitimate transaction, but 300 per cent is too much money to make out of an undertaking of that kind. The country might take the road for the purpose of utilizing it, and, if it did so, it would be justified in giving them a legitimate profit. Why do not the Government proceed in the manner in which they could do? If that road is absolutely necessary for the country to be utilized in the interest of the Dominion, why do the Government not exercise the right of eminent domain and take it at a fair valuation, and pay what the arbitrators award as a fair amount which should be paid for this road, instead of paying an amount which is largely in excess of what the value of the road is? The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) had no information to base his report upon which he gave to Council recommending the purchase of this road. He had the report of Mr. Schreiber, his chief engineer, who told him that a new road could be built, between the points named, for \$1,400,000, yet he gives nearly \$2,300,000 for this road, or nearly \$1,000,000 in excess of the amount which his own engineer stated was necessary for it. A remarkable thing which he states in regard to the contract which was laid on the Table of the House a few days ago was, that though the contract was dated on the 15th of May, the signatures were not made for a long time afterwards. The affairs of the Department of Railways and Canals are managed entirely different from what they were before, if this is so. The last thing to be put into a contract, after the signatures, is the date. The secretary of the department affixes his stamp, with the date of the contract, upon the day it is signed, and, when that stamp is fixed, the date is on the contract—that is, as it used to be in the department. The date was affixed at the signing of the department.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). They have no secretary now.

Mr. HAGGART. They have a secretary, because they are obliged to have one. The agreement which they have made in reference to the Drummond County Railway, pales in

comparison with the arrangement they have made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for running from Ste. Rosalie into the city of Montreal and using the terminals and the bridge. They pay their share, according to the mileage, and they help the company to pay their share of the officers employed in connection with the operation of the road, trackmen, train dispatchers and agents, and mark you, they pay one-half of the whole value going into the city of Montreal. Is it not a notorious fact that the Intercolonial Railway, doing the business that it does, will not use that road or the terminals to the extent of one-hundredth part of what the Grand Trunk Railway will? Is there an arrangement by which the Grand Trunk Railway will pay to the Government the rent of their user of the half of the road? We pay for half of the railway from St. Rosalie to Montreal, for the user of the road, according to the amount of the train mileage, but the Grand Trunk Railway Company does not pay us one cent for the part of our property which they use, and for which we have paid. That is a most extraordinary bargain. I never heard of anything like it in a contract. The Grand Trunk Railway should pay to the Dominion Government, for the user of that part of the road that belongs to the Dominion of Canada which the Intercolonial does not use, and which will be used by this company. They do not. If the Grand Trunk wanted at any time, for the purpose of enlarging their business in Montreal, to extend their tracks, they could do it, and one-half the expense would be paid by the Government, or nearly the whole of it, because the Government, for the amount which they expend, pay 4 or 5 per cent a year in perpetuity, an amount equal to nearly two-thirds of the whole amount of the extension which they make to their terminals in Montreal. As to the necessity of the extension of this road from Lévis to Montreal, it is questionable whether it will be any advantage or not. I hope it will be to the advantage of the country. In respect to that part of the road from Lévis, 125 miles, over \$1,500,000 was spent, and the hon. Minister of Railways stated that that road was in good order. Every one in this House knows as well as I do that that road is in as good order as any part of the Drummond County Railway that we are purchasing; and to complete that road up to the requirements of the Intercolonial Railway there was an expenditure of \$2,000,000. Will not history repeat itself on that section of road? Is it possible, then, that the extra earnings out of the terminals in Montreal will be so in excess of the amount at present earned by the Intercolonial Railway as to repay to this country the \$210,000, the amount we have to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway for the agents and other expenses, the amount we have to pay for keeping our portion of the road in repair, and also to pay, as the Min-

ister of Railways says in such roseate colours, the sum of \$300,000 or \$400,000? Is it an absurdity. If we can realize the \$210,000, I will venture to say that amount will be the utmost that can possibly be realized. The Minister of Railways ought to be able to come down with a calculation furnished by his officers showing the amount of the traffic that passes from one end of the Intercolonial to the other—from St. John in one direction and from Point Lévis in the other; and a calculation of the increase, within a few thousand dollars, which we ought to expect from the extension to Montreal. He does not give us a single calculation of what it will require to put that road in first-class order from the end of the 73 miles to the Chaudière Junction. We do not know what the railway company have to expend on it. He ought to have had information furnished by the officers of his department, in order to satisfy us to the fullest extent on these points; but he has left us totally in the dark in reference to them. The hon. gentleman goes to Council with a recommendation from Mr. Schreiber for the purchase of the road. But Mr. Schreiber does not speak positively as to the state of the road. He says it is the duty of the Minister to make further inquiries in order to find out whether the road is in a satisfactory condition or not. I understood the Minister to say that after Wednesday's debate he sent officers down to see what the state of the road was. He corrected himself and said that they went down a few days before. The hon. gentleman could have got from the principal officer of his department, and he ought to have furnished to this House, information as to the quantities of all kinds—the amount of earth excavation, the amount of rock excavation, the amount paid for the right of way, bridges and everything else, in detail; and there are a great many gentlemen in this House who would be capable of casting up the figures, and forming an opinion whether the amount paid for the road was in excess of what it ought to be. What kind of an inquiry did Mr. Ridout make, or could he make, with regard to the character of the road? He leaves here last Saturday, goes down to Montreal on Sunday morning, and is back here on Monday evening, and upon that examination the Minister reports to this House that he is perfectly satisfied as to the quality of the road, and recommends its purchase. It was an examination made long after he had recommended the purchase to the members of the Government and obtained an Order in Council for that purpose. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister and the Government of the day had decided to build that road from Point Lévis to Montreal, all the expenditure that would have been necessary to accomplish that would have been at the utmost \$1,700,000 for construction; and the annual payment for user, that is,

Mr. HAGGART.

for car mileage to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the use of their road from Ste. Rosalie to the bridge, and from the bridge to Montreal, would not have been more than \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year. For these expenditures everything would have been accomplished for which the Minister now proposes to saddle the country with an expenditure in excess of \$7,000,000.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on this subject, in order to state my reasons for the vote I intend to give on the question. One objection I take to this scheme is that it has been brought down here so late in the session that there is not time for us properly to consider it. The answer which the Minister of Railways has made to that objection is that the Conservative Government when in power did the same thing. To my mind that is no answer at all. I am not prepared to say that everything that was done by the Conservative Government was right, and I am not prepared to allow hon. gentlemen to use that as an argument. I hold that it is no argument. We want them to do what is right by rule of right, and not by judging what has been done by parties on this side. I say it is a very serious objection to a most important scheme, that it is brought down within a few days of the closing of the session. The matter is necessarily hurried, because there is no time for its proper consideration or discussion. Another complaint I make is of the lack of definite information. This objection has been dwelt upon by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and I think it is a very important objection to this scheme. Even as to the condition of the road the information is very general; it is not at all definite. As has been pointed out, we have no information as to the rolling stock which is to be taken over. On a great many other points the House is entitled to more information than we have received. However, these are only general objections. Now, Sir, the Minister of Railways gave as a reason for bringing this scheme down to the House and asking the endorsement of the House for it, that the Intercolonial Railway has for some years shown a deficit; and he thinks that it ought to be made a paying road, and argues that by extending it to Montreal it will be made to pay. I do not know whether that is a good argument or not. I do not consider that the Intercolonial was built in order to make money. The Intercolonial Railway was a political road, built entirely to unite the lower provinces with the upper provinces at the time of confederation. That was part of the bargain. The Government had to build this road, and if there had been no bargain, I do not think it would have been built. I do not think there is any need to make the Intercolonial Railway pay; but no argument has been offered

to show that with this extension it will pay. In fact, the argument is all the other way; it goes to show that this road will not pay. Now, I intend to read a selection from a paper, which I am sure will have a good deal of weight with members on the other side of the House. I would ask their careful attention to this short selection which I will read from the Montreal "Witness," a paper which always supports the Government when it can, but which I am bound to say is a good deal more independent than a good many of the papers which do support the Government. I intend to read a short selection from the "Witness" on this very subject, which puts the case from my point of view better than I can do it myself. The article is headed "Intercolonial Extension," and appears in the daily "Witness" of Saturday, June 12th. It begins by saying that the Intercolonial Railway is one of the political railways built by the Government as a part of the price of confederation. It goes on to say that this road has never paid, and that although economies have reduced the deficit, it has always been a drain on the treasury. Now, I shall quote the words of this article and ask the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to them:

How to at least lessen the burden, is the problem; to reduce the expenditure, or even continue the present reduced expenditure, and yet maintain the line in working order, seems impossible. The Laurier Government has decided upon the bold course, that of extending the line and attempting, by gaining business, to greatly increase its earnings. To this end the Government has secured connections which will make Montreal a terminal of the road and give it a better opportunity for securing traffic between Montreal and Halifax and intermediate points, instead of taking merely what comes to the Intercolonial through the other competing roads. To this end it has increased the capital charges of the road by two hundred and ten thousand dollars annually. It seems very doubtful, indeed, that the extension will make the road a paying one, or will even greatly reduce the deficit. The Intercolonial will have to compete with the Canadian Pacific for the Halifax business, and the line of the latter is shortest by seventy-six miles, and it will have the Grand Trunk also as a competitor. Its competition may, however, benefit both Halifax and Montreal and the whole country through which it runs, for Government competition ought at least to be real.

The arrangement entered into will certainly benefit the Grand Trunk Railway, which by it secures the urgently necessary reconstruction of the Victoria Bridge at small cost to itself. The Drummond County Railway will also be a great, a very great, gainer. That the Intercolonial will greatly benefit, seems doubtful.

But the extension of the Intercolonial is a very doubtful policy, and to create an annual charge of two hundred and ten thousand dollars for such a project at a time when economy and retrenchment were necessary, and while expenditures upon the fast Atlantic service, upon rapid deepening of canals, and upon the Kootenay Railway and other public works to which the Government was committed, had just increased the cost of public works by about a million dollars annually,

seems unwise, especially in view of the fact that there was no public demand for the extension of the Intercolonial.

My objection to this scheme is not the same as those of some hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I object to extending this road to Montreal at all. I am not going to discuss whether the Drummond County Railway is a good road or not, but I object to the Government going further into the railway business at all. I think, on the contrary, that if the Government would go out of the business altogether, it would be to our advantage. I agree with the "Daily Witness" that this extension is not likely to reduce the deficit at all, and may increase it, and, considering the enormous indebtedness to which the Government is already pledged, it is making a very great mistake by increasing that debt to the extent of \$7,000,000 more. Looking at the matter from a business point of view, without any question of party at all—and it is a matter of dollars and cents which ought to be discussed free from all party considerations—the expenditure is going to be very great. We have no guarantee that there will be an adequate return, and I believe that the people generally wish the Government to withdraw from the project and not incur such enormous expense. If the sentiment of the country were taken, I believe it would be that the Government should not go into the railway business more extensively, but get out of that business altogether if it could see its way to do so. I would be glad if the Government would make an arrangement with one of the leading companies to take over the Intercolonial Railway and relieve us of the burden. I am opposed to the Government going into the railway business any further and endeavouring to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway on unequal terms.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation). As the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway, which the Government ask us to purchase by the resolutions now under consideration, run through a portion of the county I represent here, I wish to say a few words in explanation of the vote I am about to give on the resolutions now before the House. This Drummond County Railway, when it was subsidized by the Dominion Government and the Quebec legislature, was only looked upon as a colonization road. When this road was built, the promoters did not aim so much at making it yield a large margin of profit as using it for opening up the country it passes through. The subsidies granted by the local legislature and the Dominion Government were given with a view to opening up a portion of the province of Quebec which was then without any railway communication. The Government now propose to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and as a result of carrying out this policy

of extension, have agreed to pay what I consider an exorbitant price for the rental of the Drummond County Railway. While, to my mind, the 99 years lease is also for too long a period of time. Now, it is contended that the Drummond County Railway is a first-class line, perfectly equipped, and being in need of no considerable repairs, I may say that I know perfectly well the condition of the road, as it runs through a portion of the county which I have the honour to represent in this House. I may say that I have to stand a regular storm from those of my constituents whose farms are crossed by this railway. These people are all the time complaining to me about the fencing which divides their farms from the railway and about the crossings on their farms. I may further remark that if my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) had gone over the road outside of the summer season, he would have found that the ballasting of the road is far from being a first-class ballast, as he stated.

The rental which the Government have agreed to pay, as I said a little while ago, is an exorbitant one. Notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said about the earnings of the road, and notwithstanding also the altogether fanciful estimate given by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) as to the receipts of the railway in the future, I for one, do not hesitate to say, in view of the condition of that railway and the local freight and passenger traffic which the Intercolonial may get from it, that the Government will not be able to realize on that portion of the road a sufficient sum to pay the works they have undertaken to carry out, and the yearly rental of \$210,000 which they will have to pay for running powers over their lines to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway. The late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has just shown to the House that the Government had entered into arrangements for securing an entry for the freight of the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal, also for getting the freight of the other companies which are feeders of the Intercolonial. Therefore, although we assent to the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite as to the desirability of improving the condition of the Intercolonial and increasing its movement of through traffic, still I am of opinion that the Government, in view of the exorbitant rental they have agreed to pay, together with the cost of the maintenance of the road from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, will not be able to realize sufficient earnings to pay the rental and to keep this portion of the road in repair.

The Government, I think, before many years elapse, when they realize that their policy of increasing the earnings of the Intercolonial is doomed to failure, will bring another scheme down to the House and en-

dorse the views of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig), who has just taken his seat; when he said that the interest of the country demanded that the Government should go out altogether of the railway business and get rid of the burden of the Intercolonial, seeing that railways are operated more successfully by private companies than by the Government. The idea has gone abroad and has sunk deeply into people's minds, and experience has also shown, that a Government cannot operate a railway as successfully as a private company. Therefore, I hold that the Government, instead of taking steps for extending the Intercolonial from its present terminus to Montreal, at the cost of such sacrifices to the country as they are now asking the House to endorse, ought to have made arrangements with one of the leading companies, either with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, to take over the Intercolonial, on such conditions as were calculated to secure its successful operation. But I am afraid that the Government, after making that bad bargain and paying such an exorbitant rental, will later on come down and ask the House to give its assent to the sale of the Intercolonial to one of the leading companies, so as to have it operated under the most favourable conditions to the road itself and to the trade interests of the country.

The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) tried to impress upon the House, a little while ago, that the country through which this road passes was a well-timbered country, and that owing to the fact that the road crosses rivers coming out of an enormous forest country, the lumber freight would furnish the railway line with one of the most profitable items of business for transport that a road can secure. Let my hon. friend allow me to tell him that he labours under a false impression and that the few timber reserves which are to be found along the line of the Drummond County Railway will be exhausted before many years have elapsed. That is, in fact, one of the main reasons why the shareholders and owners of the Drummond County Railway are so anxious to sell their property to the Government. These gentlemen, for several years past, have been quite alive to that fact. It is no longer a paying property, the road being unable to pay its running expenses, owing to the fact that the lumber preserves being pretty well exhausted, the lumber freight—and I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to this point—is no longer a profitable source of earnings for the road, notwithstanding all said to the contrary by my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope). And I hold that if confined merely to local traffic, the road would no longer be able to pay its running expenses. The hon. member for Compton endeavoured to create the impression that the best forest

preserves of spruce and pine timber were to be found in the Eastern Townships, so that the Drummond County Railway might safely rely, for many years to come, upon the lumber freight to feed its traffic. The rivers flowing towards the St. Lawrence which the hon. gentleman spoke of as being crossed by the railroad, are crossed by that branch of the Grand Trunk Railway running to Quebec and by that portion of the road running to the United States; so that this portion of the forest country to the east is accommodated by the Grand Trunk, and therefore, these forests shall never be cut down by the milling companies which are accommodated by the Drummond County Railway Company. Those forest preserves consist mainly of spruce timber, which is exported to the United States, under the shape of deals and pulp. Now, the Grand Trunk, through its branch line from Richmond to Quebec and its main line from Richmond to the frontier, shuts out altogether the Drummond County Railway from the benefits of that lumber traffic. The Government, therefore, unless they secure through traffic, will find it impossible to pick up enough local business to feed their line. This explains why the owners of the Drummond County Railway are in such a hurry to get rid of their road. My hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) says that the Drummond County Railway has opened up a notable portion of the lands of our province, which it is desirable to clear and settle. Our views coincide in that respect, but it may likely take twenty-five or thirty years to cut down those forests and clear the lands, so as to develop and secure sufficient local business to the road which henceforth will constitute a portion of the Intercolonial between Lévis and Ste. Rosalie, and meanwhile the Government will not get enough local business to defray their running expenses on that portion of their railway system. The settlers who will go and settle down within that territory will import very little and hardly export any products to the markets for some years to come. The history of this road will not be unlike that of the road which came before a committee of the House a few days ago. We had lately, before the Railway Committee, the Pembroke Railway Company, which has been in liquidation for a number of years, after having built a railway like the Drummond County Railway, for the purpose of opening up that portion of the province of Quebec. Not being able to make both ends meet, owing to the lumber freight having dwindled away, that railroad could not secure enough local business to pay its running expenses; and that was the reason why the committee was asked to allow the company to wind up and sell the railway to a more powerful company.

Therefore, although I approve of the scheme of providing terminal facilities for the Intercolonial in Montreal, I think the

Government are paying an exorbitant and injudicious price to the Drummond County Railway and to the Grand Trunk Railway Company; they are paying, I say, an annual rental which is out of proportion to the advantages to be gained by the Government from the operation of that portion of the road. Let the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) allow me to tell them that, contrary to their expectations, the deficit of the Intercolonial, far from being wiped out, now that Montreal is made the terminus, will be greater than it was previously. Those who say that the amount of local traffic secured by this scheme will more than suffice to pay the running expenses of the road are not familiar with that portion of the country through which the Drummond County Railway runs, and do not know how keenly this road has to compete even for local traffic.

On these several grounds, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see my way to endorse the resolutions now before us, however anxious I might be to do so. One portion of the county which I have the honour of representing here, is crossed by the Drummond County Railway and by the Grand Trunk Railway, which, in the future, will be made a part of the Government railway system. However anxious I may be to see the Intercolonial secure running powers over the Drummond County Railway, and a larger share of through traffic secured to this road, I do not think it to be in the interest of my constituents that it should cease to be a colonization road. In my opinion, the Drummond County Railway, while being operated as a local line and picking up local freight and passengers, will prove of greater advantage to the ratepayers along the line of the road than they could otherwise secure, through the Intercolonial and Government ownership of railways.

As to operating the Intercolonial as a matter of public policy, the Government, I believe, are making a mistake in purchasing the Drummond County Railway for the price agreed upon under these resolutions, because, to my mind, a 99 years' lease is equivalent to a purchase of the road. I also think that the sum paid to the Grand Trunk for running powers over its road and the use of its station buildings on the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal is too large a sum. In bringing to a close these rather lengthy remarks, I say again that, however anxious I am in principle to have this policy of Intercolonial extension to Montreal carried out, I cannot approve of the heavy expenditure which the country is being saddled with, and, therefore, from a business standpoint, I will vote against the resolutions now before us.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the question is put, I wish to say a few words on this most important matter now submitted to the House. I am sure that hon. members who

take an interest in this question regret that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not furnished to the House that full information to which we were entitled before being asked to come to a decision and vote such a large amount of money. Why, we have not to-day a map showing the location of the proposed line of railway. We have no means of ascertaining the location of the lines or the condition of the country, unless we follow the example of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) and take a trip down there and examine the road. But perhaps most of us have not such a deep interest, personally, in the matter, and may not be disposed to go to that trouble. I am reminded by the attitude of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) that when dogs go after sheep, they always have a hankering for blood, and are not safe to be trusted with sheep again. In like manner, when some men get a little taste of corruption, especially in obtaining railway funds from the Government, they are anxious to participate in another feast, if there is another haul to be made. I am not, therefore, surprised at the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) taking a trip down the road in order to have another long look at this interesting railway. I do not see the hon. gentleman here now.

An hon. MEMBER. He is barking outside.

Mr. WALLACE. He was barking up in the province of Ontario during the last Dominion election, and as the result of his barking, a constituency which formerly gave 1,600 of a Conservative majority, went 1,700 against his candidate, so that his bark was not a very effective one on that occasion. The hon. member for Compton is not in his place at present, or I would, perhaps, refer to the fact that he always takes occasion to follow the example set by the turkey which sat on the fence and first looked to the one side and then to the other, and finally dropped down on the side on which there was most corn. That looks very much like his attitude to-night. Speaking of corn, I am reminded that in 1890 the hon. member for Compton advocated the duty on that article, but some three years later, when his business operations somewhat changed and he became an importer of corn, he voted for free corn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur). The hon. gentleman has not a right to refer in such a way to the manner in which an hon. member has discharged his duties.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was referring to me, which just recall certain things in his career which—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) perhaps has the right to refer to what has been done by the hon.

Mr. WALLACE.

member, but I do not think he has the right to refer to his motives as being interested.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a ground of objection you did not refer to before, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it is not parliamentary to refer to a gentleman's motives, and, if I have referred improperly to the motives or have imputed improper motives to the hon. member for Compton, I shall regret it very much, because I would not like to impute improper motives to any one. But if his motives are improper in themselves, what am I to do? Am I to keep quiet or am I to refer to improper motives if such they should be?

I was going to settle down to the matter under discussion, just as you called my attention to the nature of my remarks. I noticed that the hon. Minister of Railways, in his strong and vehement speech was not anxious to convert this side of the House to his views. He turned his back on us, though his face is none too good for any kind of audience in this country, and he tried to convince the members behind him that the course he was taking was right. Apparently he had a very great deal of difficulty in convincing them. I noticed that he did convince the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to a very considerable extent, but there were others who were not convinced. But I was delighted to know that there was one member who applauded the hon. Minister from start to finish, who approved every word and every sentiment, every argument—if the hon. Minister can be said to have used argument—and every vehement statement that he made. The Minister could not say anything that was not applauded by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

We were delighted to see that the hon. member for Lincoln approved the construction of this road. People were asking themselves whether the hon. member had any interest on this matter. He approved and applauded every sentence uttered and it has whispered about that—

Mr. GIBSON. Go ahead; I will stand anything that you can say.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to see that I have waked the hon. gentleman up a little. It was whispered about that the hon. member for Lincoln had a very fat contract with the Grand Trunk Railway, that the money that Parliament was voting would be devoted to the enlargement of the Victoria Bridge and that the member for Lincoln had the contract on that work. It may not be violating the independence of Parliament Act in words, but it looks awfully like violating it in deeds; it looks as if the member for Lincoln, in asking this Parliament to vote money for the enlargement of Victoria Bridge by the Grand Trunk Railway was actually, by indirect means, voting money into his own pocket. So I do not wonder

that when the Minister of Railways talked, the hon. member for Lincoln applauded most heartily. What is this scheme which has been brought before the House, announced in the Speech from the Throne just about three months ago as a bargain which was completed, the papers concerning which would be laid on the Table of the House in order that members might have the information to which, of course they were entitled, and Parliament's approval which would be asked, because the contract would not be binding until Parliament had approved of it? What has happened since? We have been going along for about three months. Four or five days ago, the Minister of Railways was urged to make a statement of this bargain. Well, Sir, I think that every member of this House was humiliated to hear the Minister advocating an expenditure of \$210,000 per annum for ninety-nine years, which capitalized, amounts to about \$7,000,000—a scheme for the expenditure of an enormous amount of public money—and laying it before the House in such a halting, inconclusive way, without facts to present to the House, without the information to give to the House which alone could form a proper basis for a decision upon the matter—altogether a rambling incoherent statement. When the Minister is coming before the House, I say that it is his duty to be prepared with statements, it is his duty to be ready to give facts and figures, to answer such questions as may properly be asked, by hon. members who seek information on the subject under discussion. To-night we have another speech, but to-night, as formerly, there is a conspicuous absence of facts necessary to form conclusion. But statements are made of the most absurd and extravagant character. We are told, for instance, that 630,000 more passengers would be carried in a year if this little wheelbarrow road were constructed and these connections made. Where will they be carried to? That would mean about 2,000 passengers—or about 100 cars of passengers—per day, all to be carried by reason of the completion of this little road over and above the number carried already. Does any hon. member of this House for a moment believe such an assertion as that? Why, to-day a passenger can buy Intercolonial tickets from agents of the road in Montreal, Toronto, and every city where traffic can be secured. And if the passengers go into Halifax, St. John, Moncton or any place else on the Intercolonial, it does not change cars. He goes into a Pullman and that Pullman goes through, partly over the road of the Grand Trunk and partly over the Intercolonial. That is a matter for settlement between these two concerns, but it makes no difference whatever to the passenger who travels over the road; he buys his ticket, he travels to his destination, and whether the Intercolonial has an entrance into Montreal, or into To-

ronto, the passenger will pay neither 5 cents more nor 5 cents less for his ticket. The agents of the Intercolonial in the west are just as well able to canvass for freight and passenger business as if the road were running into Montreal to-day. But the hon. Minister of Railways tells us that the Grand Trunk takes the freight business away to Portland and will not send the freight down along the Intercolonial. It may be true that it is to their interest to take the through or ocean freight that way, but in the case of points on the Intercolonial from Quebec eastward to Halifax or St. John, the Grand Trunk has the same interest in taking passengers to these points, or in taking them from Montreal to Quebec as the Intercolonial has in taking them on eastward. They cannot take them by any other Grand Trunk route, and they are just as anxious as the Intercolonial could possibly be if they had a route to Montreal straight through, to get the passengers to go by that road. It is true that for the through traffic they may be anxious to put the business by Portland because they have a longer line, but for all the other traffic, they are working heartily in co-operation with the Intercolonial, to make that traffic larger. Then, with reference to through traffic, the Grand Trunk if it is their interest to push the trade to Portland will continue to do so, even if the Intercolonial goes to Montreal. You say that there will be another competitor for the business. To my mind, the competition is the very greatest absurdity. What does the competition mean? There is a business between Montreal and Quebec which is chiefly done by water and done more cheaply by water than these railroads could do it. There are already three railroads between these two cities, and there will be four when this road is completed, and there is not business enough for one road. It is a wilful waste of the money of the people of Canada to attempt to construct another road—we have already the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the South Shore, we are told is soon to be completed—and now there is to be a fourth line. This line the people of Canada have practically built by the bonuses they have given, and now they are to pay for it over again.

There is no excuse, to my mind, that would justify the unnecessary expenditure of this money. We are giving running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax, and we could claim as a reciprocity to have equal running powers and the same privileges on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Montreal. But the Government did not ask for that. Here is a road with not half enough to do. If the Intercolonial Railway required to run a road to Montreal—and I have not heard anything yet that will convince me that that is a necessity—they could easily make arrangements to run their cars on these through roads, especially the Canadian Pa-

cific Railway, while they are giving running powers over another section of the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But we are going to-day on a route that has very little traffic compared with other lines of railway, and it is running side by side with other lines of railway. The country through which they run does not furnish a great quantity of business because they pass through no large towns, and whatever business there may be, is divided into three or four parts. Now, take this Drummound County Railway for which these gentlemen came to the Dominion of Canada and got \$3,200. Their representatives come here and push this Government, I have no doubt, to get that money, and after they have got it one of them gets up here and reproaches the Government for being so obtuse as to vote money for such a purpose. They went to the province of Quebec, and one gentleman said that they only got a bonus from the province of Quebec for a certain portion of their road. We are told around this House that if they did not get a bonus for another portion of their road, it was not for want of trying, that they had gone down more than once, persistently pressing their claims for a bonus for this other portion of the road, but the Quebec Government of that day, wisely concluding that they were a gang of boodlers, refused to give them any further bonuses. And we hear one of them squealing to-night because that railroad was not able further to rob the treasury of Quebec.

Mr. POPE. One of whom? One of the boodlers?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) gets up to ask me a question. He is not raising a point of order, if he wants information, I can give it to him, and lots of it.

Mr. POPE. The hon. member has insinuated that I was a boodler, and connected with this railway. He says one of the gang of boodlers. I wish to know whether he insinuates that I am one of the boodlers connected with that road, or that I have one dollar or one farthing in it directly or indirectly. I have not any interest in that road one way or the other, good, bad, or indifferent. I have not anything to make out of it, whether it is built or not. When the hon. gentleman insinuates that I am a boodler he is insinuating what is not true.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has not risen to a point of order, he is making an explanation of his innocence, and I suppose we all acknowledge how innocent he is, and how lamb-like he is. He tells us that he has no interest in the road. Has he ever had any interest in the road?

Mr. POPE. Never.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. Has he ever received any consideration, directly or indirectly, from the road?

Mr. POPE. Never.

Mr. WALLACE. We are delighted to hear it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the hon. member was not referring to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) when he spoke of boodlers; otherwise I would ask him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not need to refer to him, because he was interrupting me while professing to rise to a point of order. He was interrupting me for the purpose of getting in a little speech of his own. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted by the hon. member for Compton with his bogus point of order, I was going to refer to the cost of construction of this road, or rather the price which the Government was paying for it, which I conceive to be beyond the expense of building it. Now, figures have been given to the effect that ninety and one-half miles of road are to be handed over to the Government, for which the Government pays \$35,000 half yearly, and a computation has been made that this is equivalent to \$2,200,000 in cash, and that that is the cash equivalent of \$35,000 a year paid half yearly. Now, ninety and one-half miles of railroad for which \$2,200,000 have been paid, is \$24,366 a mile. Nobody pretends to say, I venture to think the hon. member for Compton will not pretend to say, that the construction of that road cost \$24,366 a mile. Now, the Government paid, in the first instance, \$287,000 towards the construction of the road; the local government gave about \$300,000, making a total, with \$15,000 from municipalities, that the company received in cash from these sources, of more than \$600,000. Now, the company, in addition to that, from other sources, received \$141,000, and they have a debt standing against them of \$221,000, making a total of \$966,000, or, in round numbers, a million dollars. We will assume that was the cost of the construction of the road. Now, they have issued bonds to the extent of a million dollars; they have issued stock to the extent of \$400,000. Of that million dollars of bonds and \$400,000 of stock, not one dollar was paid in for the construction of the road. In making an estimate of what it was proper to pay these men, this million dollars of bonds and \$400,000 of stock should not be taken into consideration at all, but only the money actually expended on the road, and that was less than a million dollars, of which \$603,000 had been paid by the local and Dominion governments, including \$15,000 by municipalities. Therefore, less than \$360,000 have been put into that road, and yet Parliament is asked to-day to vote more than six times as much as it has cost those men,

and we are buying back our own railway, which the late Minister of Railways tells us we are entitled to get back. I find a statement that the Eastern Townships Bank is the holder of the bonds of this railway. I wonder if the hon. member for Compton is largely interested in the Eastern Townships Bank.

Mr. POPE. I am not interested to the extent of one dollar.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. POPE. Then, why do you ask the question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member has a right to put such questions.

Mr. WALLACE. Speaking to the point of order, I think I have, because I am discussing the affairs of the Drummond County Railway, and those who have, perhaps, had an unsavoury connection with it. If the cap don't fit anybody, they don't need to wear it. Now, I say that this very fact of the road costing the owners, or the company, less than \$360,000 a year, and they getting from this Government more than \$2,200,000, leaves a very large margin for somebody, a good deal of profit for the "boy." We heard to-night a very eloquent plea by a member of this House that the "boy" should have something, that there should be the greatest encouragement given to those who had sufficient enterprise to put \$360,000 into a job, and that they should be encouraged to draw \$2,200,000 out of it, and that this Dominion Parliament should present them with that money. I was struck by the innocent simplicity and virtue of the demand that these people should be paid six times as much money as they put into it, and of course the member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was not interested at all, but he was delighted to see that men who had enterprise were to receive their reward. I think the people of Canada will not view the matter quite in that light. We have a statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and which he repeated to-night, that everybody was in favour of this road. He asked, "Who is opposed to it? The city of Montreal is a unit in its favour." I read from the leading commercial journal of Montreal, and find that it is quite hostile to it. But suppose individuals went to Montreal, and said to the people there "You have two lines from Montreal to Quebec. Have you any objection to us building you another line?" Montreal would have no objection, certainly not, but if you were to go to Montreal and ask the people of that city to contribute to the cost of building a road to Montreal they would have a most decided objection to burdening themselves with the construction of a line of unnecessary rail-

way. The argument that applies to Montreal also applies to Halifax. Halifax will not object to having a through line upon the Intercolonial road to Montreal or to Toronto or to Winnipeg or to Vancouver, B.C. They would be delighted to have all these connections. The more connections a railway has with outside points the better they like it. But is that an argument that is to be given us for assuming the responsibility for \$7,000,000, that these men are not protesting and kicking at having another railway forced into their town. That is no argument. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was bound to give to this House reasons which would justify the expenditure of this money. There is no data given us by which we can conclude that this extension will add to the business of the Intercolonial. The statement which has been presented bears absurdity on the very face of it. Unless the Minister is able to give us much better reasons than that, I do not think he will succeed in convincing this House or this country that this is a wise expenditure of public money. It has been said in the "Globe" newspaper: "Just look at the enterprise of this Government; they are not afraid to do anything; they are not afraid to spend money." It is true that they have been preaching economy for eighteen years, but now that they have come into power do they practice economy? Oh, no. The leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) said: "We are not afraid to spend money. We are fellows that are not afraid." Just as flies are attracted around a molasses barrel, you see a so-called Conservative getting up and saying: "You are admirable fellows. We are flies, and we are going to attack that molasses barrel." And they will go buzzing around; they are most illustrious patriots but they will stick to the molasses as long as there is any molasses left. I said that the "Globe" newspaper had said that this Government represents a party of enterprise. Some people said that they should not go so rapidly into these enterprises, but the "Globe" newspaper says that the Government should go to these enterprises because before the end of their parliamentary term that the people will be able to judge whether these enterprises were justifiable by the results accomplished. This was a good reason, but there is another one, and it is that there are a good many men—I do not say like our hon. friend (Mr. Pope) because he has told us that he is virtuous, that if he is not virtuous he is nothing—but there are men who are not virtuous who have not these pure and incorruptible ideas that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) has and they are willing to go in and take the plunder, if there is plunder and it looks as if there was when a \$360,000 job has paid over \$2,200,000. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways was very positive on two or three occasions to-night in saying

that they are not increasing the public indebtedness of this country by this proposal before Parliament—that if they paid their way, if they made money out of this transaction instead of increasing the indebtedness it would relieve our burdens. That would be very true. If you go into an enterprise involving an expenditure of \$100 and clear \$1,000 you are not increasing your burdens, but the Minister of Railways and Canals before he forces this vote upon the House of Commons is bound to furnish us with some evidence besides the statement which has been given to-night that by the contract which he is now making the Government which are now unable to make both ends meet on the Intercolonial Railway will be able to pay their way by the addition of a poorer branch to it. It cannot be done. It takes more than 100 cents of expenditure for every 100 cents received and by the construction of this road it will take more than 100 cents to earn 100 cents and they will find that large as has been the deficit upon the Intercolonial Railway it will be \$210,000 greater on account of the undertaking which the Government proposes to ask us to carry through to-night.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Lavergne,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Beith,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Lister,
Blair,	Livingston,
Bostock,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Lount,
Bruneau,	Macdonald (Huron),
Burnett,	Mackie,
Calvert,	McClure,
Cameron,	McGregor,
Carroll,	McGugan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McHugh,
Casey,	McIsaac,
Champagne,	McLennan (Inverness),
Cowan,	McMillan,
Davies,	Madore,
Davis,	Migneault,
Dechéne,	Moore,
Desmarais,	Morrison,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Dupré,	Penny,
Dyment,	Perry,
Ellis,	Pettet,
Erb,	Pope,
Ethier,	Poupore,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fiset,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Richardson,
Flint,	Rinfret,
Fortin,	Rogers,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Russell,
Fraser (Lambton),	Rutherford,
Frost,	Savard,
Geoffrion,	Scrifer,
Guay,	Sifton,
Guité,	Snetsinger,

Mr. WALLACE.

Haley,  
Harwood,  
Hurley,  
Jameson,  
Joly de Lotbinière,  
(Sir Henri),  
Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Langelier,

Somerville,  
Stenson,  
Stubbs,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tarte,  
Tolmie,  
Turcot, and  
Yeo.—91.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Ingram,
Beattie,	Kaulbach,
Bell (Addington),	Kloepfer,
Bell (Pictou),	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McCleary,
Borden (Halifax),	McCormick,
Cargill,	McDougall,
Casgrain,	Marcotte,
Chauvin,	Martin,
Clancy,	Mills,
Cochrane,	Monet,
Craig,	Monk,
Davin,	Powell,
Dugas,	Reid,
Dupont,	Rosamond,
Earle,	Seagram,
Foster,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Tisdale,
Gilmour,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Haggart,	Wallace,
Halc,	Wilson, and
Henderson,	Wood (Brockville).—47.
Hodgins,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Parmalee,	Clarke,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Hutchison,	Klock,
Gibson,	Corby,
Choquette,	Montague,
Tucker,	Tyrwhitt,
Copp,	Bethune,
Domville,	Prior,
Macdonell,	Roche,
Heyd,	Ferguson,
Semple,	Guillet,
Brown,	Broder,
McMullen,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Christie,	Quinn,
Dobell,	Osler,
Wood (Hamilton),	Costigan,
Graham,	Roddick,
Charlton,	Ganong,
Borden (King's),	Ives,
Britton,	Maclean,
Edwards,	McNeill,
Featherston,	Sproule,
Bourbonnais,	LaRivière,
Fitzpatrick,	Boisvert,
Paterson,	Robinson,
Mulock,	Carscallen,
Gauthier,	Monk,

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the fact that we have done a tolerably good day's work, and he can hardly expect us to go any further to-night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman desires that, of course we cannot refuse his request. Still, I would be glad if he saw his way to let us get through with this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid we cannot go any further to-night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Then I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th June, 1897.

### PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

### HOGS FED ON AMERICAN CORN.

On the proposed introduction of Bill intitled: "An Act to prohibit the exportation from Canada to Great Britain of bacon and hams made from hogs fed on American corn."

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to this Bill, I desire to say that as there is yet a forlorn hope that the Finance Minister may in the interests of the farming community of this country, allow the article of Indian corn to be placed again on the dutiable list, and as the session is so near an end that there will be no possibility of reaching a Bill of such importance this session, I beg to ask that the Bill be dropped.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright.) Really this is a great disappointment. I had hoped that my hon. friend would have explained to us how, in the case of a hog fed half on Canadian corn and half on American corn, we could distinguish between the two layers of bacon.

Mr. FOSTER. That is easy enough. Take the side of the hog that is best in grain, and you may decide that that was fed on Canadian corn.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is wonderful what education will do, because I did not think it was possible that the sense of smell could be developed so keenly in the human family that a person could tell whether a piece of bacon had been fed on American corn or on Canadian corn.

Mr. HENDERSON. Education does a great deal. For example, last night we had the extraordinary spectacle of a gentleman on the other side of the House being educated to vote away millions of money after he had declared himself in favour of economy.

Bill dropped.

### DISMISSAL OF W. S. COTTINGHAM.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. Was W. S. Cottingham, formerly engaged in the Dominion Lands Office at Brandon, dismissed because of a letter supposed to have been written by him to the member for Marquette in June last? 2. If so, how came the letter into the possession of the Hon. Minister of the Interior?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton.) W. S. Cottingham, formerly engaged in the Dominion Lands Office at Brandon, was dismissed for political partisanship. The letter written by him to the member for Marquette was part of the evidence on which he was dismissed. I am not at liberty to say how the letter came into my possession or into the possession of the department.

### I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The House again resolved itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 4088) declaring it expedient to confirm an agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company and Her Majesty for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to see if I understand clearly what it is we are getting. We get an undivided one-half share between Ste. Rosalie and Lambert station, that is at the eastern end of Victoria Bridge. We get the right of user of the Grand Trunk Railway and property between St. Lambert and Bonaventure Station in the city of Montreal, including the two. That is simply the right of user and not an undivided one-half interest. We get the user only of that and one-half divided interest from Ste. Rosalie to St. Lambert, inclusive. We only get the right of user from St. Lambert to Bonaventure Sta-

tion. As to the Victoria Bridge we get the right of user only and as to the terminals we get the right of user only.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is no particular value in our having an undivided interest in the bridge or station. On the contrary there would be a disadvantage. As to the railway between Ste. Rosalie and the Victoria Bridge, our owning an undivided half entitles us, as a matter of right, to the business we get on that portion of the line.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend has taken an undivided interest in that other bridge across the Chaudière River. Why not apply the same argument to that as to the Victoria Bridge?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is a portion of the line where traffic is picked up and in respect to which we claim we should be allowed to retain all we earn. We pick up nothing on the Victoria Bridge or at the Bonaventure Station.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Do we pick up anything on the Chaudière Bridge?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We do by the connecting lines.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What I have called attention to is the seeming inconsistency between getting an undivided half interest in one bridge because it would be to the benefit of the country, and not getting it in the other because it would not be to the interest of the country. I cannot quite understand the hon. gentleman's ground on that point.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not know that I can make it clearer. I consider there would be a vast difference between including the Chaudière Bridge and the Chaudière connection in the arrangement we made with respect to the line from Ste. Rosalie to Lambert, and in including the Bonaventure Station and the line from St. Lambert to Montreal. We had no object in getting an undivided half ownership of the latter and do not know that the Grand Trunk would have been willing to give us an equal property in the Victoria Bridge and in their Bonaventure Station.

On paragraph 10,

That the parties hereto shall enjoy in all respects equal rights to said tracks, buildings and improvements used in common unless wherein restricted in this lease, and the trains of Her Majesty shall in every respect be treated by the officers, agents and employees of the company, as trains of a similar class of the company, and the higher class trains shall have equal preference over trains of the lower class belonging to either of the parties, and Her Majesty shall have a perfect right to run all classes of trains, passenger, mixed, freight and other trains over the said joint section, subject only to the restrictions and regulations prescribed and provided for in this lease. In case of doubt between the trains of the company and Her Ma-

Mr. **FOSTER**.

esty of the same class, under the established rules the trains of the company shall have the preference. The main tracks are as far as practicable to be kept unobstructed for the use of both of the parties hereto.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. In what way would the relative proportions which the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk will have to pay for the offices of the Grand Trunk, used in common by the two, be determined?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have nothing to pay for the use of the offices. As regards the officials connected with the passenger traffic, you will see later on that we pay pro rata the number of passengers we carry and the amount of business done. We pay for the freight officers also according to the amount of our business.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I suppose the Intercolonial Railway authorities will have no right to give orders or make regulations with regard to these officers, but all orders must be transmitted through the Grand Trunk Railway authorities?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is practically the case. Their officers are in charge and they direct them to carry out the arrangement in good faith and give the Intercolonial trains such precedence as they would be reasonably entitled and to such advantages as we acquire under the contract.

On paragraph 12,

That the station masters, freight agents, ticket agents and baggage masters of the company on the said joint section shall as far as the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned to all interests and purposes but subject to the payment of a share of their wages as is hereinafter provided, be the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and shall from time to time in regard to such business report directly to and receive and carry out the instructions of the proper officials of the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. That provides that we shall pay a share, but it is not defined, what is perhaps defined later, what our share will be. It will be in proportion, I suppose, to the work done for us as compared to the work done for themselves.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is quite correct. The hon. gentleman will find a later provision dealing with that point.

On paragraph 14,

That all business and traffic secured by agents of the Intercolonial Railway or carried in its trains shall be the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is that confined to sections of the road which this contract covers as to undivided interest or right of user? I sup-

pose it does not refer to the Grand Trunk system outside of these portions of the line.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Of course it does not confer any control over the Grand Trunk line, except that portion of it that we acquire. That clause was introduced for the purpose of asserting our proprietorship in the business we do. The hon. gentleman will find it covered specifically and in terms later on. This clause is inserted, perhaps, out of abundance of caution more than anything else; it covers the same ground that is covered by a later clause.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. Minister does not apprehend my point. To make it plain—this clause, I understand, has no reference to what any Intercolonial Railway agent may gather in Ontario.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. A later clause has to do with that.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This has simply to do with the lines in which we acquire the right of interest or the right of user?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, I stated that.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. Minister says that we have the use of half the bridge and terminals at Montreal. Does that preclude the Grand Trunk from making arrangements for user with any other company or road?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. We have the user of the bridge and terminals of the line in Montreal to the extent of all the business we can do, up to the capacity of the road. We have the same user as if we owned the property cut and out. But, so far as the bridge and terminals are concerned, we are in a technically different position from that we occupied with respect to the line of railway.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The half ownership, as I understand the hon. Minister, applies only to the Chaudière portion of the road, and as to the other, we have the right of user to any extent.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. So we have to the road.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Does that mean that we have any control over any arrangements of the Grand Trunk with other railways to use the road to the same extent that the Intercolonial Railway does? Have we anything to say about any such arrangements?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We are in this position: that if any other company acquires any right under any leasing agreement or traffic arrange-

ment, to use the same lines that we have acquired, whatever may be the consideration that is paid by them to the Grand Trunk is, in the first place, taken from the amount of our rental.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Proportionately?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, taken out of the amount of out rent proportionately. Then, as to amounts that may be paid by any of the other companies in the way of wheelage, the cost goes against the road, and the balance is divided between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial Railway according to the amount of wheelage of each of them. You will find a later clause that covers that.

On paragraph 15.

That the Intercolonial Railway shall have the right to carry in and on its through trains traffic to and from and between all points on the line of railway extending from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, both inclusive, and in the conducting of its business between and including these stations shall have the right of conducting this business in as full and complete a manner as the company itself.

That the rates and fares charged between points on the joint section shall be those established by the company and to and from points on the Intercolonial Railway shall be the same by the company and the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to this clause. The right of user, according to this clause, is confined to through trains. We can take no share in suburban traffic or in communication on that portion of the road except on our through trains.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. A through train would be one to or from a point off the main trunk line, beyond Ste. Rosalie.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Do I understand that this could be done—from a point five miles beyond Ste. Rosalie could you run a train service twenty times a day to or from Montreal and get the benefit of all the passenger traffic so carried?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Under a literal interpretation of the contract, that would be permissible, I think. But I do not imagine that the Grand Trunk would expect us to treat them in that way under the arrangement, and I do not think we would be justified in doing so.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I am afraid that the hon. Minister will find that the terms of this clause entirely preclude that view of the question. I think the clause will be held to cover only trains running through to the terminal portions of the Intercolonial Railway.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I hardly think so. I think that under the most liberal interpretation of this clause in favour of the Grand Trunk, we would have a right to run trains from any point at a reasonable distance—for instance, if we chose, from Lévis or Drummondville. Suppose that the business of the Drummond County branch of the line, in our view, called for the running of trains three or four or five times a day into Montreal, that would be quite within the interpretation of the clause.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. That is a very important point if the Minister is right.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think there can be no question about that. I may say frankly that one of the chief difficulties we had to encounter in our arrangements with the Grand Trunk was the point on which we strongly and peremptorily insisted when we came to prepare our detailed contract, that we should have the right to pick up traffic on all portions of the line and get the benefit of the receipts of that traffic. Of course it was contended by the Grand Trunk that no such arrangement had ever been made before, that it was not customary between railway companies and that it was an unreasonable demand on our part. We said: We have no desire or intention to interfere with what you would call your suburban traffic, but we do claim the right, on all trains that may be passing over your line, to pick up any traffic that we may and get the benefit of it. And that point was finally conceded.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Any service between Drummond and Montreal of two or three trains a day must surely be considered local, so that this section could not apply. There must be some distinction between a through train and a local train.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the latter paragraph of this section. I would like the hon. Minister to explain it. It seems clear that this provides that rates are not to be fixed by the Intercolonial or by any joint arrangement, but by the Grand Trunk itself.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is quite correct, as to the thirty-five mile section between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. We conceded that because we could not cut the rates below those that the company would be willing to have in force. I cannot think that great exception could be taken to that, because, under any other view, the Grand Trunk would be surrendering to us at our own discretion to destroy the traffic.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. What I suggested was that the rates should be jointly

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**.

arranged between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial Railway.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I understand that the question as what constitutes through trains is a very important one for all parties to this contract, and it is almost impossible that these negotiations could be brought to a close without a very complete discussion of what the term meant. It may be that the Minister is correct in saying that a train starting from a few miles from Ste. Rosalie would be a through train. But the matter must have been fully discussed. What is the hon. Minister's view of the Grand Trunk's idea as to what constitutes a through train in this respect?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have stated that when the terms of this arrangement were being discussed, it was strenuously objected to by the Grand Trunk that we should claim or be allowed to carry traffic taken up or set down on this joint section to our own profit. In other words, they insisted that we should pay to the Grand Trunk Railway 85 cents out of every dollar that we received, and this we could not agree to. I frankly acknowledge that we have expressed to the Grand Trunk Railway very clearly that we had no desire or intention of using this section for the purpose of running away with their business, but we are not subject to any limitation at all beyond what we should be upon this joint section. It would be strictly within the meaning of this clause and not at all at variance with anything that took place in the discussion or any understanding that was arrived at, that we should put on as many trains as we thought in our judgment it was desirable to do in the interest of our business, at any point on the Drummond County line.

**Mr. INGRAM**. Would the Minister explain what the words "through trains" mean.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. A through train under this section would, in strictness, mean any train which was going from a point beyond the joint section through and over this section which is covered by the agreement. It certainly does not mean a train from Halifax, it does not mean a train from Moncton or St. John, necessarily, nor a train from Miramichi. It means any train which, coming beyond this joint section, passes through that joint section.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. I hope my hon. friend will be found to be right, but I am afraid he will find that no such liberal construction will be given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to that point under this clause. I think they will hold that any train going any moderate distance over the

Drummond County Railway would be held to be a local train and not a through train.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the Minister if we have any right to alter any portion of this agreement, because if so, I think that instead of saying "through trains" we should take out the word "through" in the second line, and say that "The Intercolonial Railway should have the right to carry in and on its trains, traffic," and so forth.

Mr. FOSTER. On the Intercolonial Railway, would the Minister consider a train which ran from Sussex to St. John, a through train? We have certain terms that are well known amongst commercial men, and in train matters I suppose it is the same. We who live along the line make an easy distinction between a through train and a local. At Sussex, a through train is one that goes from Quebec to Halifax or goes from Halifax to Quebec or Lévis. But the Moncton train that starts from St. John or Sussex and returns between those points, is a local train. There must be some language peculiar to train work which defines the difference between a through train and a local train.

Mr. LOUNT. I have not heard the Minister answer the question put by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) in regard to an amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there need be no change in the agreement which has been entered into. I think the agreement will be found to be very complete. If any doubt should arise with regard to the meaning of these words, there is a provision made in the contract for resolving that doubt.

Mr. FOSTER. Would a question of that kind go to arbitration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It might possibly. The 47th section provides that if any difficulty should arise under any clause of this agreement, or respecting the carrying out of the same, such difference may be referred to arbitration. If it becomes necessary at any time fully to determine just what that phrase might mean, it could be settled under this 47th section. At all events, that is what the Grand Trunk Railway were willing to do, and those were the terms under which they were willing to give us this preference.

Mr. LOUNT. The reason I desired an answer to that question was for the purpose of discussing this clause. It appears to me that according to the language used in railway management the words "through train" perhaps have a larger meaning than is apparently given to them by the Minister. A through train is well understood in the language of railway men, and when you

have occasion to purchase tickets or to travel upon a railway, it is generally defined to be the main line between the two extreme points; and a train which is made up along that railway is called a local train. That is the definition which is apparently given in railway management. Speaking of a local definition, one can see in reading this section that the words "through train" might be intended to mean and might be read as only a train running between the two points of Ste. Rosalie and Montreal. But after all the court would probably give an interpretation to it as it generally applied in railway management, and in railway management I apprehend that the definition given to these words would mean a train between the extreme points, and that always when we speak of a local train we speak of a train that starts at some point between the two extreme points.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Even if that interpretation be correct, no change can be made in that regard. This is the language which was agreed upon after a good deal of debate between the company on the one hand and the officers representing the Government on the other. Whatever may be the ultimate determination of the meaning of these words, they will have to remain.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it is almost useless for us to consider this clause by clause, if we have nothing to do but swallow it holus bolus.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has stated the matter in a nutshell. This comes from giving us insufficient time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you had a month in which to discuss it, it would not be different.

Mr. FOSTER. But if my hon. friend had proceeded in a business way, it might have been different. We might have had the sense of the House on the undertaking, before we were all bound hand and foot to the party machine.

On paragraph 18,

That local tickets issued by either of the parties hereto for passage between and including Ste. Rosalie and Montreal or any intermediate station shall be accepted on all trains of either party hereto between said points, and the party who issued the tickets shall, on presentation of the ticket so used and collected, pay to the party who carried the passengers the full amount received for the said ticket.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the clause only allows parties who purchase tickets at any station between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal to use them on the through trains of the Intercolonial Railway as well as on the through trains of the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. LOUNT. On all trains.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that clause is only susceptible of this construction, that local tickets do not extend outside, either on the Intercolonial Railway or on the Grand Trunk Railway, but are entirely confined to this district between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have certain classes of tickets which they call local tickets.

On paragraph 23,

That the company shall and will, from time to time when requested to do so by the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, make temporary repairs upon the engines and other rolling stock used in the business and traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, such repairs to be made promptly with all reasonable despatch, and Her Majesty shall pay the company the actual cost to the company of the labour and materials used in such repairs.

Mr. INGRAM. Speaking of the charges, is there any arrangement between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in respect to charges on business handled by the Grand Trunk Railway? Is there a schedule of charges arranged between the two services?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The charges that are to be made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company will only be a proportionate amount of the expense, of the actual sum which they lay out for the purpose, dividing it according to the amount of business they do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) wants to know is whether there is any scale or schedule of charges, but I would suggest that that does not appear to be necessary, because the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company will be to make the charges as moderate as they can on their own account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), is it proposed to regulate charges by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to other railway companies for crossing the Victoria Bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that it is except in so far as the general provision of the Railway Act would apply. If other railway companies have any complaint to make they can bring it before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. WALLACE. I am told that the Montreal and Province Line Railway, operated by the Central Vermont Railway, run their trains up to the bridge and they are then charged an exorbitant price for crossing.

Mr. HAGGART.

They are charged 25 cents for each passenger crossing the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would not suggest that that is an exorbitant price.

Mr. WALLACE. They make a charge for the cars which, in itself, would be a fair charge, and then they charge for the passengers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it were the case that unfair charges were made, I think there would be a remedy.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the remedy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If a railway company desires to acquire the right of crossing the Victoria Bridge controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway, it might obtain it by an application to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. WALLACE. This company have their road right up to the bridge now, and they must cross. They have gone before the Privy Council and complaint is made that the prices charged are very exorbitant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will see that it does not bear upon the present clause.

Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps not. But when the Government are adjusting this matter it is a good time to take into consideration the general public interest.

On paragraph 24,

That the company shall and will carry passengers on through tickets, and freight on through waybills, from and to points on its railway and leased and controlled lines to and from points on the Intercolonial Railway and its leased and connecting lines so as to avoid re-ticketing and re-waybilling.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the course of traffic, both freight and passenger, is it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On paragraph 30,

That if the company shall at any time lease or in any way grant to any railway company, or to any person or persons whomsoever, either with or without payment, any running powers, rights or privileges, on or in any way connected with the railway premises of the company hereinbefore described, between and including St. Rosalie and St. Lambert, the company shall pay to Her Majesty one-half of all the income it now receives or may hereafter receive for any running powers, rights or privileges, now granted or hereafter to be granted between the aforesaid points of Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert. As to the other portions of the company's line herein demised

the company reserves to itself all revenues from any source whatever arising from the use thereof.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to this clause. I do not raise any question in reference to the latter part of the clause, but what I do want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to is the fact that the company may grant to any railway or to any number of railways the right to run over this portion of the road of which half the cost of maintenance and double-tracking is to be borne by the Government and these railways may make no payment whatever.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, that is true. They may do very much as they please with their own property.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** No, but that is your portion of the line; the Government has a joint interest in it.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We shall have the use of it. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company choose to allow any other company to use it without consideration, I apprehend they will do so at their own loss.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The point is this, that under this agreement that portion of the line between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal is the portion of the line that is jointly the property of the Government, and the company and the Government are bound to pay one-half of the cost of maintenance of that road and of the double-tracking of the road, if necessary. I do not object at all to the company permitting other companies, or any number of them, to run over the same line, but they should not be permitted to allow them to do it without paying anything, because, if they did, half the cost of the wear and tear of the road would fall upon the Government, and therefore it is most unjust. They have the right, under this clause to make any terms they choose outside of the portion of the road that is jointly used by the Government and the company. They can make one arrangement outside of that; they can make a heavier charge for the use of their line outside of this branch, and then they can allow them, in consideration of the high charge that they have made, to run over this branch for nothing, as we have to pay one-half of the cost of maintenance. I do not mean to say that this privilege would be abused, but it would permit a great injustice to be done to the Government, which is responsible for one-half the cost of maintenance.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension in regard to the meaning of one of the clauses which we have al-

ready passed. To say that the Government would be required to pay one-half the cost of the maintenance though the company may allow other companies the free use of their line is directly in conflict to the expressed words of clause 19, which provides that the Government shall only pay its proportion of the car mileage on all the cars passing over the road.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That applies to salaries, and not to the maintenance of the road.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I thought that section covered the case. I may in a moment, perhaps, be able to show the hon. gentleman the clause applying to it.

**Mr. HAGGART.** We are to have the half ownership of the line between Ste. Rosalie and the bridge. What is to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway getting a handsome price for the passage over the bridge and allowing a free passage over the section between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, in which we would have a half interest?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That would be directly contrary to the words, I think, and certainly to the spirit of the arrangement.

**Mr. HAGGART.** My hon. friend suggests that the Grand Trunk Company may give the user of the joint section for a nominal sum to a third party, provided they contribute a good sum to the bridge and the approaches.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I call attention to the third clause, which I think meets the point.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I see the force of that; but what I say is that under this arrangement, if the Grand Trunk Company receive payment from another company for running over this portion of the line, you shall share in the profits; but outside of that, they may make an arrangement with another company for a nominal consideration or for nothing.

**Mr. SPROULE.** It seems to me that a fair interpretation of this clause would not bear that construction, because the Grand Trunk Company would be obliged to pay over to the Government a proportion of the revenue from everything carried over the line.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** If the Grand Trunk Company should by any indirect arrangement receive a consideration from another company for the use of this line, it would unquestionably be liable to account to the Government for its proper proportion of the amount received. No indirect arrangement could be made by which it could fail to account to

the Government for one-half of the income it received.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This clause allows the company to give away the right for nothing if they choose.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has no right to inquire into any indirect favours which the company gets at all. That is the company's own business. Suppose the Grand Trunk Company allows another railway to run over the section, and gets a payment of \$20,000 a year for it. The Government will then get one-half of that fee, and it will get a certain amount off its maintenance in proportion to the mileage run by the third company. But under this clause you give to the Grand Trunk Company the undoubted right to allow the other company to run over the section for nothing. In that case the Government gets nothing of the \$20,000, but it has the same advantage exactly in the matter of maintenance, no more and no less. The direct loss to the Government is \$10,000. You are leaving it completely in the power of the Grand Trunk Company to roast the Intercolonial.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose the Grand Trunk should receive from another company running powers over a portion of that company's line, and in consideration thereof or in partial consideration thereof, should grant to such company power to run over this line, would the hon. Minister think that that case would be covered by this clause? It seems to me that it would not. Moreover, it would hardly seem to me that what the hon. gentleman has said is correct, namely, that the Government have joint ownership over this section of line. We have joint user in a certain sense, but not joint ownership, so long as the Grand Trunk can make arrangements. With all deference to the opinion of the hon. Minister, I have a great deal of doubt that such would be the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there would be no difficulty at all in the case the hon. gentleman suggests. Suppose the Grand Trunk Company were to receive certain rates from another company for the right to cross over this line. There would certainly be a consideration having value; and if the Grand Trunk Company and the Government failed to come to an understanding as to what the value of that concession was, it would become a subject to be referred to this board of arbitration to deal with.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It all depends upon the question whether what the Grand Trunk Company would receive would come within the meaning of the word "income." With all deference to the opinion of the hon. Minister, I would have a great deal of doubt that such would be the case.

Mr. BLAIR.

On paragraph 35,

That if at any time hereafter the business or traffic shall, in the opinion of the parties hereto necessitate or warrant the laying of double tracks between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, or the making of more extensive yard improvements at Point St. Charles or intermediate points between that Point and Bonaventure station, or the laying of additional tracks between such points, or shall warrant or necessitate any further expenditure for the proper and efficient conduct of its business, and the company shall lay the said tracks or make the said improvements or make the said expenditure, Her Majesty may have the full and unlimited use of all or any such work in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said work had been included in the premises hereby leased, the right, use or privilege in which are demised hereby, and if Her Majesty should determine to use any such works or improvements, and the Minister should so declare, such works and improvements are hereby understood and agreed to form part of the leased premises, and Her Majesty shall pay annually for the use of any such works and improvements five per cent upon one-half of the actual cost to the company of the construction of said works and improvements; but in case of all betterments or of additional works on such joint sections which the company may be required to make under the provisions of any statute or of any order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or other competent authority, Her Majesty shall pay the interest upon one-half the cost thereof at the rate aforesaid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to a very serious point which arises under this clause. This is a most onerous clause. Under it the Government may be called upon to pay 5 per cent on one-half an expenditure made by the Grand Trunk Railway, in which the Grand Trunk Railway would probably have ten times the interest that the Intercolonial would have. The Intercolonial are to have no advantage from this expenditure unless the Government pay, not a proportionate rate according to this service rendered, but the interest on half the cost. Under this clause, I have no hesitation in saying that the Grand Trunk Railway may make any expenditure they please. They may incur enormous expenditure in connection with their terminals and this line which is to be jointly used by the Government and the Intercolonial Railway, and they can do that at the entire cost to Canada. They can hypothecate this very contract in London and obtain the money at 3 per cent to do that work on half the cost of which we agree to pay them 5 per cent. When you consider this line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, the bridge and terminal station and everything connected with it, the expenditure may be immense, and almost the whole, if not the whole of that expenditure, will have to be paid by the Government, although according to the other clauses of this contract which divide the cost of maintenance according to mileage, the Government may enjoy an absolutely insignificant

portion of the advantage. I also draw attention to the last clause :

But in case of all betterments or of additional works in such joint sections which the company may be required to make under the provisions of any statute or any order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or other prominent authority, Her Majesty shall pay the interest upon one-half the cost thereof at the rate aforesaid.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Of course the hon. gentleman has not had, I can see, much opportunity of considering the matter very fully, and is starting criticisms which just occur on a superficial reading of the section, but I can assure him that this was all very fully considered and threshed out over and over again, not only by the officers of my department and myself, but by the Department of Justice. If the hon. gentleman had had occasion to think out these various phases, he would see at once that it became imperatively necessary to make some provision having regard to the future. In the first place, the question arose what should be done in case the law stepped in and ordered certain things to be done on this railway. Suppose the Privy Council decided that this railway should provide some additional protection to the public on its track or at its terminus, how should that be paid for? It did not appear reasonable that we should enjoy the usage of the track and terminus and not contribute half our proportion towards the cost of these improvements ordered. These are not works which are left to the discretion of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Why not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Because they are works which may be required by law. I am not referring to the last clause. They are works which may be imposed upon the Grand Trunk Railway by law and to the cost of which it is necessary the Government should pay its share because the Government would be using them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend does not appear to me to seize my point, even with reference to that smallest and least important part of the clause. My point is that I see no reason why the Intercolonial Railway, having the small interest which it will have in these works and terminals, should pay one-half.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am coming to that. I was pointing out that it would be our duty to bear our proportion. The hon. gentleman says we have only a small interest. That is not so. We may not use these works at the outset to the same extent as we hope to use them later, but we shall use them, and therefore, as is generally arranged between particular companies making similar

arrangements, having acquired one-half the property, we pay interest on one-half the expenditure. As to the rate of interest, the hon. gentleman talks about the Grand Trunk negotiating a loan on the basis of 3 per cent interest. I am sure they would be very much pleased to know that any such favourable terms could be secured, but the hon. gentleman must have sufficient experience to know that neither the Grand Trunk nor any other company could borrow upon an arrangement of this kind at a low rate of interest and transfer this arrangement as a security to any person making the loan. The transfer of this as security would be useless, if it should happen that the Grand Trunk Company had any existing bonds or mortgages upon these particular works, because this security would be only valuable as a means of raising money to the extent to which it would have priority over other liabilities. The Grand Trunk are paying 5 per cent yearly and are likely to have to continue paying that rate; and if they have to borrow money in order to make these improvements at 5 per cent interest, we should reasonably expect to have to bear one-half the cost at the same rate of interest. We could not make a contract upon the supposition that they could finance by a transfer of this arrangement and only pay 3 per cent. It would be absurd to entertain such a supposition. I wonder that my hon. friend could think it was at all possible for us, in making an arrangement extending over a period of one hundred years, to suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway should be able to make as favourable financial arrangements as the Government of this country, unencumbered, and having at its back the whole resources of the country.

Mr. POWELL. This is to be a permanent charge on the treasury of the country. Would it not be much better for us to borrow at 3 per cent and pay the Grand Trunk Company in cash.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I trust the hon. gentleman does not suppose that we did not consider how valuable it would be, if we could effect such an arrangement. But we could not. What would be the position of the Government if we were to ask Parliament to give us a million dollars or more to pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purchase of these rights. The first question which the hon. gentleman would ask would be: what security have you got that you are going to get a real or proper title to the property you are paying for?

I shall be bound to admit to him at once that the property of the Grand Trunk is encumbered—I assume, two or three times over. Therefore, we could not buy the property, but had to treat it as encumbered property, and so we had to resort to some such agreement as this. Does my hon. friend

suppose that I would agree to pay a rental and 5 per cent on half the cost of these extensions if, by coming to Parliament for the money, I could have bought a half interest. The hon. gentleman will see how utterly impracticable it would have been to take any other course or accomplish the arrangement in any other way. As to the rate being excessive, I venture to say that it is not. At all events, the Grand Trunk would not agree to grant us these concessions upon any other terms, and we could not ask or expect them to do so; we could not ask them to accept a less rate than they have paid and are likely to continue to pay. Now, as to the first, and, I suppose the hon. gentleman will consider, the chief objection that he has raised—I said that this clause had been very carefully considered. The question came up in this form: Suppose that the business from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie becomes so great that it is desirable to lay down another track, how will the cost of laying down that track be divided? Shall we, in the first place, reserve to ourselves the right to say whether we shall or shall not use it. It will be observed that we reserve to ourselves the right not to contribute a dollar. If the improvement is one that we think we can do without, we shall not be bound to pay. But if it became necessary in our own interest, if our traffic increased to such an extent that it would be better for us to have this improvement, is it not proper that we should have the right to do it, that, in making an agreement to cover a long term of years, we should provide for such a contingency, which the Grand Trunk have considered, and which, as has been said in the House, is regarded as imminent? Suppose that it becomes necessary to have a new track between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert, what would be the fair division of the cost? Would it not be fair that we should pay half the cost of construction? Why should we not do it? We are acquiring a half interest in this road, and if a track is to be laid down which would be in our interest equally with theirs, and if we desire to use it, why should we not pay for it on the same basis as that upon which we agree to pay in case of the original road? I do not see how it would be possible to make any other arrangement. I would like my hon. friend to suggest some form of arrangement which would be equitable and likely to agree to other than that which I have laid down—on the assumption that another track would be absolutely necessary for the purposes of the Government as well as of the Grand Trunk. I know that the officers of my department carefully considered this question in all its bearings. We had Mr. Pottinger up here and one of the traffic officers, and they and the chief engineer spent many days in going over every possible phase of the question that occurred to their minds, and none of us could hit upon

Mr. BLAIR.

any other expedient which we could commit to writing and which could be put in the form of a contract whereby the future could be provided for on any different terms or in any other way than that which is now laid down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. Minister has said that this is a locality in which there is such pressure for traffic that it may become necessary to provide for double tracking—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say, if it is necessary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that it is absolutely necessary to make provision. Any person who knows the situation of the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal knows that the pressure of traffic will absolutely compel the double-tracking of the line at no distant day. Under this clause there is a complete engagement on the part of Canada to share to the extent of the interest at 5 per cent on one-half of the cost of these improvements, which will be necessary. Under the terms that the Grand Trunk have secured at the hands of the Minister of Railways there must be an enormous expenditure of public money at an early date. And the point I make is this: The business of the Intercolonial Railway, even if it assumes the proportions that my hon. friend has intimated, would be utterly insignificant in the extent to which it would require the use of the Grand Trunk works compared with the extent to which the Grand Trunk itself must use them. Therefore, in the expenditure for extension of these works, it was unjust to Canada to compel us to pay one-half for a work in which we have a comparatively small interest—certainly not a tenth interest. Now I come to the question of the division of the cost. I say that we are going to pay practically the whole of these extensions. Under this unfortunate arrangement the hon. Minister has bound us to pay the whole, or almost the whole cost. I show that in this way: The hon. gentleman says the Grand Trunk cannot borrow money in England at 5 per cent. I grant it. I am, perhaps, saying too much in that, I think they could borrow money for less than that even situated as they are. But the hon. gentleman underrates the credit of Canada. What have the Grand Trunk to borrow money on? They have a contract with the Government binding Canada to pay them \$210,000 per annum for ninety-nine years. That contract they can hypothecate. I do not hesitate to say, from my personal knowledge of the money market of the world and of the money market of London, that the Grand Trunk Railway can take that contract and, on the strength of it, obtain any amount of money for these purposes up to the amount that will be covered by the \$140,000 per annum. I do not wish to be understood as taking

a position of the slightest hostility to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That great company has conferred upon Canada immense benefits and is entitled not only to fair but most liberal treatment in any arrangement that it may be necessary for the Government to make with them. My hon. friend has intimated that, in addition to the \$140,000 a year that he has bound the Government of Canada to pay for ninety-nine years, he proposes to ask Parliament for \$300,000 more in connection with the new bridge over the St. Lawrence. I have not a word to say against that. I have no hesitation in saying that I would give the most hearty support to my hon. friend and to the Government in making that large, handsome contribution toward the reconstruction of that important bridge for the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Therefore, I am not speaking in a spirit of hostility to the company. But I say that in making a business arrangement the interests of Canada have been sacrificed, shamefully sacrificed, and that this clause is one that will put upon the shoulders of the Canadian people an enormous expenditure for the Grand Trunk Railway Company under the guise of expenditure for extensions that we may require to use to a small extent.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I must say that I think the hon. gentleman's criticisms of these various sections would be very much more effective if they were governed by reasonable considerations. When the hon. gentleman talks about enormous obligations being put on the shoulders of the people of Canada by this 35th clause, he is simply, as the slang phrase goes, talking through his hat.

Now, what is this clause? This clause, as any person can see who reads it in a spirit of fairness is framed to enable the Grand Trunk Company, if its business calls for it, to extend its facilities; but it does not say that it may extend these facilities at the cost of Canada, it does not contain one syllable which justifies any such assertion. But is it not reasonable that in making a contract with the Grand Trunk Company we should allow them to extend their operations if they like, and in such a way that they may use them exclusively themselves and that we should be under no obligation to use them; but if we do use them, that we should pay what would be fair and reasonable as our contribution towards their construction? Why, Mr. Chairman, we could not make an arrangement that would be effective to extend over the period of even five years, unless we took into account the possibility of the need which might occur of the extension of these various ways, and taking that into account, to provide for it in some rational manner. But when the hon. gentleman says that we are piling enormous burdens upon the people of

Canada, he is simply indulging in the most exaggerated flight of imagination. Now, "if at any time hereafter the business or traffic shall, in the opinion of the parties hereto, necessitate or warrant the laying of double tracks between and including, St. Rosalie and St. Lambert," they would have actually put it into our power to say, as one of the parties to this agreement, whether it should be necessary. But if the business requires the making of more expensive yard improvements at Fort St. Charles or the laying of additional tracks between that point and Bonaventure station, why the company may go on and make provision for these improvements. Supposing no such provision as this were contained here, and after a year or two it should be found that some additional facilities were needed which had not been provided for and which Parliament desired should be made, then we have to add to the agreement in order to make it cover that case; and is it not necessary that we should at all events, seeing the possibility of such a need arising, make provision for it in our contract? Now, the hon. member says that the country is paying the whole of this cost, and that the Grand Trunk Company could take this contract into market and finance upon it. I thought I had made a very complete answer to the hon. gentleman's suggestion when he put that forward a few moments ago. I venture to say this, that if the Grand Trunk Railway's secretary or president were to take this contract and go into the office of any financier in London and offer to assign it, they would laugh at him. They would say to him: Why, I think that you are scarcely in any legal position to give us an assignment of the rental as security for that line, and if the secretary or president were to ask why, they would say: Because you have already put in one mortgage and practically several mortgages upon your property, and these mortgages cover all the rentals which you are going to receive, and your prior mortgagees have a right to ask that the rental should be paid to them and not to us. They would simply laugh at the idea of transferring the lease which had been given after the mortgage incumbrances had been placed upon the property. So that when the hon. gentleman tells us that, he, on a moment's consideration, will see that he was telling us something that is without any basis. I am free to admit this, and I will give the hon. gentleman the full benefit of it, that I think it not unlikely that the Grand Trunk Company might go into the general market and they might be benefited in floating their bonds by the statement that they had made an arrangement with the Government of Canada whereby the Government was to pay them an annual rental for the use of these facilities. It might help their position in the market, but it would not enable them to

give this as an absolute security which could be transferred for such a purpose, but it might have the effect of improving their general standing in the money market. To that extent I would be willing to concede that they would be benefited. But I do not assent to the view that it would materially reduce the rate of interest which the company would have to pay. Now, touching the other statement which the hon. gentleman made as to the congested condition of the business upon this road: The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood my previous statement. I did not say or admit that the condition of business upon the portion of the line between St. Lambert and St. Rosalie was such that a new track, in my opinion, would have to be laid down at an early date. I did not say that. I quoted the remarks made from the other side urging that that was the case. Now, I do not think that the difficulty which the Grand Trunk Railway has been experiencing from the congestion of its business, has arisen upon the track between St. Rosalie and St. Lambert. I think it has arisen altogether on the bridge. Hon. members know that there is only a single track upon this bridge, and under the regulations it is impossible for trains to follow one another except at a certain rate of speed, and at certain intervals between their passage, and that regulation limits the passage of trains to a certain extent, and a congestion does arise at certain seasons of the year. But it arises there, and there is no excuse at all for the statement that there is any congestion of business upon the main line between these points which I have named. Although I do not agree with that statement, still I say, assuming what some hon. gentlemen opposite said the other day that this congestion did exist, assuming that the possibility which the Grand Trunk Railway contemplated, would arise in the future, that is, assuming that the business should become so pressing as to render it necessary that another track should be laid, then we should desire to make provision for it, and we have made provision for it. I say we have made provision for it in the only way in which it possibly could be done, and for these two reasons: First, because you could not put it in the form of an agreement, in any other practical way; and in the next place, if you did, you would not get the Grand Trunk Railway Company to agree to it, because we have tried to get the most favourable terms and conditions which we could get in our arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company upon this point.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIR.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock p.m.

## Second Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CONDUCT OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) presented a return upon an order of the House, asked for by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in regard to the commissioners appointed to make an investigation into the conduct by public employees so far as the Marine and Fisheries Department is concerned. He said: In reference to the apparent delay, I may say that the Secretary of State's Department did not send to the Marine and Fisheries Department for this return until the 12th June, so that my department has not been to blame.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the contract for cold storage accommodation in steamships in accordance with the Bill presented to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I promised my hon. friend from Elgin that I would lay on the Table of the House the return he moved for. It has been sent over, but I find that three or four documents have been omitted. I will try to get it down to-morrow.

### THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. GIBSON. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Fraser, that the second report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that report?

Mr. GIBSON. It is the report which was presented to the House two weeks ago. It recommends the advisability of lighting the vaults underneath the departmental buildings by electricity as soon as possible, on account of the danger from fire by gas.

Motion agreed to.

### MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. Was William Beaumont, Esq., the postmaster at Maple Bay, Vancouver Island, at the time British Columbia entered confederation?
2. Has he presented a claim to this Government for arrears of salary due him by the Colonial Government of British Columbia? If so, what are the particulars of his claim?

3. Did the Dominion assume liability for such claims under the terms of union between British Columbia and the Dominion?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to investigate and settle this claim?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. The post office at Maple Bay appears to have been vacant when British Columbia entered the union. Mr. Beaumont's name appears as postmaster for the first time in the list for 1872. 2. There is no record in the department at Ottawa of a claim made by him for arrears of salary due by the colonial government of British Columbia. 3. If such were made it is probable that the Dominion would not be responsible for such a claim.

#### MAIL ROUTE CONTRACTS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked :

What is the name of each tenderer and the amount of each tender in the cases of the last contracts entered into covering the following mail routes respectively :—

- (a.) Orangedale to Margaree ;
- (b.) Margaree Harbour to Cheticamp ;
- (c.) Mabou to Margaree Harbour ;
- (d.) Mabou to Whycocomah ;
- (e.) Mabou to Port Hastings ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). In all these cases I am assuming that the question refers to the tenders that have recently been invited. My answer is, assuming that to be the case, that in each of these cases the tenders were opened on the 11th instant, in accordance with the public notices to that effect, and the contracts were awarded to the lowest tenderers. The inspector was instructed to complete the contracts, but as he has not yet reported the results to the department, it would be inadvisable to furnish the information asked for, at present.

#### POSTMASTER AT HOPEFIELD.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. Martin).asked:

1. Has the Postmaster General or any official of the department, or any member of the Government, received a petition asking for the dismissal of Angus McPhee, late postmaster at Hopefield, in Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, the names of the petitioners?

3. Was there more than one petition received ?

4. If so, the names attached to each?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The Post Office Department received a letter from the Honourable Mr. Davies, inclosing one from Mr. McKinnon to him, and also a letter from Alexander McDonald to Mr. McKinnon. Mr. McKinnon's letter stated that the late postmaster at Hopefield had not given satisfaction to the community and that a number sent and received their mail for some years at other offices, and recommending the change. Mr. McDonald's letter to Mr. McKinnon stated that

numbers of persons at the post office had petitioned the Postmaster General to have the post office changed from the place of Angus McPhee to the residence of Mr. H. Bonnell, but the petition has not reached the department, that a number of the petitioners neither sent nor received mail matter at their post office because of the dissatisfaction with the postmaster. The Honourable Mr. Davies, in his letter, quite concurs in the recommendation for a change, and expresses it as his opinion that a change would be in the public interest. Accordingly, the change was made.

#### POST OFFICE AT EAST BAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

Has the Hon. Postmaster General received a largely signed petition from East Bay, Cape Breton, protesting against removing the post office at that place to the residence of Alexander McGillivray and urging in the public interest to leave the office where it has been for many years?

If so, has the matter been considered, and will the Hon. Postmaster General act on the wish of the petitioners?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The postmastership at East Bay, south side, Cape Breton, became vacant by reason of the death of the postmaster, Hugh Macdonald, and his successor was appointed on the 26th of May, 1897. No petition against the removal of the office to the residence of Mr. McGillivray had been received up to the time of his appointment, but on the 10th of June, 1897, a petition to such effect was received, but too late, inasmuch as Mr. McGillivray had been appointed.

#### INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I would claim the indulgence of the House for a few minutes to make a personal explanation, and I hope this indulgence will be granted. A few days ago I laid on the Table of the House a return of the changes that had taken place in the personal staff of the Department of Inland Revenue. I do not wonder that at first sight, and without any further explanation, the public press on both sides should have come to the conclusion to which they have come, namely, that in this department there have been twenty-eight dismissals and forty-two appointments ; and I do not wonder that many of our friends should have expressed their disapprobation at such a state of affairs. I thought as the House was sitting that it would be more proper, more convenient and showing greater respect to the House to give the explanation to the House instead of giving it to the public press. It will only take about three or

four minutes to read the statement which I have prepared and which I am going to hand over to the "Hansard" so that it may be published officially. I hope the House will give me that privilege. Instead of there having been forty-two appointments, I have only made thirty-eight. How I deduct from these forty-two, is this: There was Mr. P. E. Richeldt, one of the officers in this department, who was appointed on the 30th June last, before I took charge of the department. Mr. Plunkett was appointed on the 7th July last, before I took charge of the department. The name of Mr. Clement, one of the officers of the department has been entered twice on the list, by mistake. Then, there was Miss Sullivan, whom we only had for five months as a copyist, and whose services were dispensed with before the reports were got out. By deducting these four from the forty-two, it leaves thirty-eight. I beg to read this statement to show the reason for these thirty-eight so-called appointments, as well as for the dismissals.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is going beyond a personal explanation, I hope he will move the adjournment of the House. The hon. gentleman will put himself in order by moving the adjournment of the House, though I am sure the House is quite anxious to hear his explanation.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, and put myself in order by moving a motion in a moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I venture to interpose the question as to whether the adjournment of the House, moved by a member of the Government, and defeated, would not cause the resignation of the Administration?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). We will take that into our most serious consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not the question of order.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will first give a list of the so-called dismissals. I may tell you, at the same time, that I think it is only fair that I should make this statement, because this question will come up sooner or later, when our Supplementary Estimates are considered. I have prepared a list which I intend to give to my hon. friend the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), who is now absent. I will hand it, also, to the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). It is as follows:—Dismissed for active partisanship, 11; customs officers collecting inland revenue on commission, removed from the customs and thereby disqualified to continue making inland revenue collections—because the law lets us employ officers in

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

the customs to make collections only as officers of the customs, and the moment they cease to be officers of the customs they become disqualified to collect our revenue, 2; temporary officers dispensed with on account of exhaustion of funds, 8; miscellaneous, failure of duty, or resignation, or economy, 10; retired with gratuities, 4; superannuations, 11; deaths, 7. Altogether this makes fifty-three vacancies created in the department since I have had the honour of being in charge of it. Now, I have filled these vacancies in the following manner. The number of appointments made to fill the fifty-three vacancies was 25, and not 42, as has been stated. I appointed these 25 officers because I considered them indispensable for the work of the department. Then I had to organize three new offices in British Columbia, which became indispensable owing to the mining development and the starting of breweries and cigar and tobacco factories in that province. These offices are at Trail, Vernon, and Nakusp. Then I commissioned two officers of the Customs Department to collect for the Inland Revenue, to replace the two customs officers who were removed, as I stated a moment ago. Instead of appointing two new officers to take their places, I commissioned two officers of the Customs Department to collect the revenue. Then I appointed one preventive officer without pay, and I promoted to permanent positions seven temporary officers who were appointed by the late Government. These are not new appointments, but the promotions of men to the permanent list who were entitled to be appointed permanently. The only new appointments I have made in order to fill these 53 vacancies are the 25 appointments I have mentioned; so that altogether there are 15 men who have not been replaced. I will not take up the time of the House any longer, and I thank the House for its indulgence. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my hon. friend what constitutes active partisanship. We know what constitutes offensive partisanship. That I think we agreed was to be a cause of dismissal; but I believe the House has never gone further. Now we have another term—active partisanship. Does it mean that if a man walks quickly to poll his vote, instead of going slowly and deliberately, or that if he happens to be, like my hon. friend here (Mr. Foster), a bicycle rider, and goes at a rapid pace, he is guilty of active partisanship? What I would like to know from my hon. friend is, first, what is active partisanship, which is now the official term agreed on by the Government, as shown by this official paper, as a cause of dismissal, and, in the next place, how he arrives at the conclusion that these 11 men were guilty of active partisanship. Was it by means of a judicial commission appointed by the Govern-

ment, for which they would of course not select active partisans of their own, to inquire in regard to active partisans, but men with a due regard to their judicial character?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The term active partisanship, if I am not mistaken, is a term which has been adopted in such books as "May" and "Todd" to describe the undue interference of public officers in election contests. If it did not take up too much of the time of the House, I could explain the case of each one of the 11 men whom I dismissed for active partisanship.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; no, no.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. If I am allowed to do that, I would like to answer the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to what I consider active partisanship.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend be good enough to favour us with the extract from "May" which defines active partisanship as a cause of dismissal?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps I have something better than that. I will give a few instances of what I consider active partisanship. In one case, Mr. Cosgrove, an officer of the department, actually took the place of a Conservative candidate, and stood on the hustings and argued with one of my hon. friends here and contested with him his right to contest the county. He did that in two instances. I have the names of the places where this happened. I then wrote to the officer and asked him if this was true, and he admitted that he had done it. I then told him that certainly I could not consider that it was allowable to a public officer to play such a part as that.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Controller give us the names of the places where this man Cosgrove acted as a partisan?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Cosgrove admitted it. I can give the names to-morrow, because I have a copy of the letter.

Mr. WALLACE. What constituency?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The constituency of Labelle. In another case, Mr. McHimm, an officer of the department, during the elections chose to bring some electors into his office, which was a Government office, and treated them there to drink and entertained them on the subject of the pending election. That may not be called offensive, but certainly it is active partisanship. Of course, I did not look out for these cases, but the accusations were brought to me, and as I had pledged

myself in the House last session to inquire into any accusations of this kind, I could not refuse to investigate this case. In another case, newspapers were brought to me showing that the name of Mr. Fiset was placed at the head of the paper as its managing editor—a paper which strongly supported the Conservative cause during the last general election. I would not have dismissed him for that only, but after the election that paper insulted and abused the Liberal party and the Administration which had been entrusted with the government of the country. I sent for Mr. Fiset and asked him if that was his name at the head of the paper, and he said it was. "Well," I said, "you are not employed by the country to edit a paper of this kind and to forget so completely what is due to the neutrality of a public officer as to attack the constituted Government." These are some cases of what I consider active partisanship.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel like congratulating the hon. Minister, who has enjoyed such a high reputation in our province up to the time of these dismissals, upon taking the earliest opportunity of vindicating that reputation before this House. But, as regards active partisanship, there was a young man employed in the department as to whom I would like to ask for some information from the hon. Controller. The one I refer to is Mr. Michael Doheny, who was employed in the Inland Revenue office in Montreal. He passed his examinations, and for some two or three years was a very efficient officer; but without any notice and without any charge being brought against him of active or offensive partisanship, and really without any cause whatever which he or anybody interested in his behalf has been able to discover, he was dismissed from his office. I would like to know what was the cause of his dismissal, and if he was replaced, by whom he was replaced, and whether the person who replaced him was either as competent to do the work or to fill the position generally as Mr. Doheny was. As a matter of fact, Mr. Doheny was an excellent officer, while the man who replaced him is utterly incapable of filling the position.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. In the case of officers appointed by the late Government, not as permanent but as temporary officers, when I found that the funds which for the payment of these temporary officers were exhausted, it became my duty to see how many of them I could dispense with. He was only a temporary officer, and I am sorry to say that I had not a good report of his conduct in the department, and I shall show my hon. friend the report.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

### GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS.

Mr. KAULBACH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention for a few moments of the hon. Minister of Marine and Finance to another article in connection with the fisheries of Nova Scotia, and the treatment they suffer at the hands of the Gloucester fishing fleet. I take it from the Montreal "Daily Star":

Halifax, June 16.—The statement of Hon. L. H. Davies in the House of Commons, discrediting the telegraphic report of the disturbance of the nets of the Nova Scotia fishermen by Gloucester fishing schooners, has awakened indignation at Prospect, where the loss of the fishermen from that cause has been particularly great. Every man in Prospect has suffered more or less from the fishing schooners sailing through their nets and tearing them.

A gentleman of unimpeachable veracity, who has just reached the city from Prospect, says Mr. Davies' statement has raised a storm of protest from the Prospect fishermen and produced considerable exasperation. The fishermen are anxious for Commander Spain to pay Prospect a visit to investigate the complaints.

The names of the Prospect men who were talked with on the subject and who have had nets damaged are: J. L. Hardiman, James Doherty, Edward Coolen, Folbert Duggan, Joseph Doherty, Joseph Martin, James Horn, Patrick Duggan, James A. Coolen, William Shea, Wm. Christian and Wm. Wagner. The last-named lost six nets.

This is a very sad state of affairs, and I feel bound to bring it to the notice of the House and the hon. Minister in particular. I appeal to him to use every effort in his power to have these poor fishermen protected and cared for in the best possible manner. As my hon. friend well knows, they have no other occupation by which to obtain a livelihood; and if their nets are to be destroyed in this way, they will certainly suffer to such an extent that the Government will have to provide them with provisions. Those fishing schooners from the neighbouring republic, sailing along our shores destroy, as is well known, the fishing industry entirely on our shores by driving the fish away. The fleets number, sometimes from sixty to eighty and one hundred sail. I have often seen sixty to eighty sail off the harbour of Lunenburg at one time, which had a deadly effect when found inside of the three mile limit. The incident referred to in the Montreal "Star" happened in the county of Halifax, and not in my county, but I have similar complaints from the fishermen in my county. They complain that it is impossible for them to prosecute their industry if the American schooners are not more carefully looked after and the offenders brought to justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It would be obviously imprudent on my part to cast any judgment upon the newspaper report to which the hon. gentleman has called my attention. When he brought this matter be-

fore the House a few days ago, I wrote immediately to Commander Spain, inclosing the cutting from the newspaper quoted, and asked for a report. I have not yet obtained a report, and until I do so the hon. gentleman cannot expect me to make any statement.

### JUBILEE DAY.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) whether Jubilee Day is a bank holiday.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Not to my knowledge.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the law that makes it a public holiday does not make it a bank holiday?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have always been under the impression that any day proclaimed a holiday is also a bank holiday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The Banking Act contains that provision.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the opinion of the Solicitor General?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not give opinions on documents I have not seen.

### USE OF GILL-NETS AND SEINES.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) whether any new regulations or orders have been given to the overseers on the St. Lawrence in the district of Montreal to allow fishing with gill-nets and seines and other instruments that destroy the fish? In Lake St. Louis, I am told, that by the use of these instruments parties have completely destroyed the fishing. Orders were given under the late Administration to prevent the use of these destructive methods, but I am aware that on the eve of the election those orders were not so stringently enforced, but were relaxed. I thought, however, that after the elections were over, whatever Government would be in power would still see that the regulations imposed for the sake of preserving the fish would be enforced. I beg to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that unless orders are given to prevent seining and netting, the fishing in the St. Lawrence will soon be completely destroyed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. The relaxation made in the order before the general elections worked a great deal of evil, and I have done my best to counteract that by giving instructions to have the law carried out everywhere. If there has been any destruction of the fish since, it is not because of

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

any relaxation in the rules, for instructions have been given to carry them out.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to hear that, but I may say that the orders have not been executed. Will my hon. friend instruct the overseers to see that they are executed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will.

#### JUBILEE DAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman leading the House to a matter I brought under his notice a few days ago, and which he said would receive his attention. I refer to the Bill which came down from the Senate and was introduced here by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue. It is a Bill providing for the observance of the Queen's birthday as a public holiday, and I draw attention to the fact that this Bill, thus introduced by a member of the Government, will have no chance of being dealt with unless the Government placed it in Government Orders. I am afraid it has escaped my hon. friend's attention.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will see to it to-morrow.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The House again resolved itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 4088) declaring it expedient to confirm an agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company and Her Majesty for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPROULE. There are two or three features of this clause that strike me as worthy of attention. One is the amount we are to pay in the event of any tracks or sidings being laid down on the Grand Trunk Railway. We are compelled to pay 5 per cent interest on one-half the cost. Now that strikes me in this way: Suppose the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and I went into partnership and agreed to invest money in a plant out of which we both expected to get a return. But if one of us was getting twice or three times the return received by the other, I think it would be hardly fair to expect the man getting the smaller amount to pay half the cost of the plant. This seems to me to be the position in this case. The Grand Trunk, I am informed, will use the stations and tracks, perhaps, eight times as much as the Intercolonial Railway, and yet the Intercolonial Railway is obliged to pay one-half of the cost of the

improvement. That appears to me to be very unfair. The same criticism, in my opinion, applies to the right we have acquired from the Grand Trunk, over the other portions of its line, because while we have acquired half the right to use the works, the use of them by the Grand Trunk will be much greater than the use of them by the Intercolonial Railway. As to the rate of interest, it seems to me very unwise to bind us for ninety-nine years to a certain rate of interest, when we know that interest is falling all the time. While money may be worth 5 per cent to-day, fifty years from now it may be worth only 2 or 2½ per cent, and we must still be paying 5 per cent for money which the Grand Trunk is getting at 2 per cent. For these reasons, I think this bargain ought to be changed. I do not know what we are going to do if we cannot make any changes. It is too bad if we are face to face with a hard and fast agreement which we must either accept altogether or reject altogether. While I admit that there are some good features in the bargain, there are some very bad ones, and we should be allowed to accept those that we think good and reject those that we do not approve.

Mr. FOSTER. I listened to the hon. Minister of Railways in the attempt he made to meet the objection so strongly presented by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and I do not think he succeeded in convincing those who were listening to him that the terms here laid down were either wise or at all fair to the country. We have here an illustration of the wrong that is done to this House and the wrong that is done to the interests of the country in having an important matter like this put off to the very end of the session. It is impossible to get the attention of the House, no matter how flagrant is the section which you are discussing, no matter how prejudicial to the interests of the country the conditions we are asked to ratify. The hon. Minister in bringing down the proposition at this late hour and in the way in which he has brought it down has most effectually shut off all free discussion in this House. But he has not cut off the discussion in the country or among business men in the country. Now I wish to make a remark or two emphasizing what has already been stated, but which cannot be stated too strongly. In the first place, the hon. Minister was face to face with these facts: The Grand Trunk has the major part of the traffic that is to come and go upon the tracks and the bridge and in the terminals and yards. He was simply getting the right of user for that proportion of the traffic which the Intercolonial Railway would do, and that is admittedly very small in comparison with that of the Grand Trunk. Probably the traffic for which the hon. Minister is asking this House to pledge itself to this bargain is not one hundredth part of the total traffic on the joint section and on the

terminals under discussion. He is to pay a round price of \$140,000 per annum for ninety-nine years to get what is sufficient trackage for the Intercolonial Railway. Now if there is to be this year or next year or later large additions to these facilities, these additions are due entirely not to any increased use of the works by the Intercolonial Railway, but it is for the accommodation and the accommodation solely of the Grand Trunk traffic, which is already large and congested and is yearly increasing. The Grand Trunk Railway is also just commencing to double-track and enlarge the Victoria Bridge, which means that it is face to face, this very hour, with a large contemplated accession to its traffic; and it is bound, whether we go into this arrangement or not, to make these enlargements so as to provide for that traffic. Another fact in point is this: That from Bonaventure station up to Ste. Rosalie the Grand Trunk has only one line, and that is the line of which we have the right of user, and this line must carry all of its traffic—that which goes to Chaudière, that which is local, and that which goes on to Portland, the great through and ocean traffic that the Grand Trunk is carrying. Just at this point the Minister of Railways, without any authority of this House, without the knowledge of any single member of his party outside of the Cabinet, steps into the breach and pledges the people of Canada for ninety-nine years to pay one-half the cost of future enlargements at the rate of 5 per cent interest—enlargements which will be rendered necessary and only rendered necessary—

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** What does the hon. gentleman mean by the statement that I pledged the country to pay 5 per cent on half the cost of these enlargements?

**MR. FOSTER.** I mean exactly what the English states, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is able to understand it.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman states that immediately after saying that the Grand Trunk are now proceeding to double-track the bridge and enlarge it. The hon. gentleman knows that we have no part whatever in the cost of the erection or construction or extension of the bridge and the laying down of the second track. That is not included either expressly or impliedly.

**MR. FOSTER.** My hon. friend could not have understood me to state that it was.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** You implied it.

**MR. FOSTER.** I did not intend to imply it; and I did not imply it so far as I could bring my language to express what I meant. I will state it so that my hon. friend will probably understand. I say he undertook this negotiation under this state of affairs:

**MR. FOSTER.**

The Grand Trunk, with a congested traffic and anticipating an accretion of business, was obliged to undertake to double-track and enlarge the bridge and to provide better facilities at its terminus for handling its business. Had not the Minister of Railways stepped into the gap, they would have been obliged to make these extensions and provide these terminal track and yard improvements no matter what they cost. It is admitted beyond doubt that if they are made, they are made solely for the accommodation of the Grand Trunk Railway traffic. Now the present facilities are sufficient for the Intercolonial Railway's traffic—sufficient for years and years to come; nobody will deny that. If then the additions are made, they are made solely to provide the conveniences necessary for the Grand Trunk itself. Now, at that point, the Minister of Railways steps in and without the authority of Parliament pledges the credit of this country, he pledges every member of his party, not one of whom knew the kind of transaction he was proposing to carry out for ninety-nine years to one-half the cost of the subsequent additions and enlargements and track-laying and yard improvements, no matter to what extent they may go, no matter what they may cost, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum. Now the hon. Minister tried to ridicule the idea that the Grand Trunk could make use of this guarantee in the financial markets of the world. He cannot delude business men and financial men on that score. I will tell him what he has done. He has done what the leader of the Opposition said he had done—put into the hands of the Grand Trunk an asset of \$140,000 a year for ninety-nine years, which this Dominion Government has to pay, which every financier on the streets of London knows that this Government will pay, and that is one of the most undoubted collaterals that the Grand Trunk could give in order to raise money with which to improve these lines for their own benefit. for the benefit of all of its shareholders and its stockholders, those to whom it is indebted, and who would be only too willing that any necessary improvements that were to take place should be made on that collateral to get the money for the road and, consequently, for their own interest, at a less rate of interest than they could otherwise get it. But he has done more than that. Interest at 5 per cent is not an interest that this Dominion should be obliged to pay, it is an insult to its credit that it should be asked to pay it. The credit of this country is such in the London market that it can get what money it wants at 3 per cent. Suppose this condition is fixed, suppose that after this contract is passed the Grand Trunk Railway comes to the conclusion that its business requirements make it necessary to undertake enlargements at its terminals, its yards, its tracks and sidings, and the section which

runs out to Ste. Rosalie, which amount to three million dollars in the aggregate, the Grand Trunk holds this Dominion liable for the interest of one-half that amount at 5 per cent. The whole amount that the Grand Trunk Railway wants to raise is, say \$3,000,000; we would pay 5 per cent on \$1,500,000 of that; that is, we pay \$75,000 per year, or we pay, in other words,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent upon the whole loan they would have to make. When Parliament consents to that, the company can go with that proposition to financial men in London and say: We want a loan of three million dollars, here is the Dominion's undertaking to pay  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent upon that three million dollars for ninety-nine years; will you give us a loan of three million dollars at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada for ninety-nine years? I do not believe you will find a financial house in London which would not take a loan of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the guarantee in this arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. The guarantee is simply this, that you, as Minister of Railways, have made a hard and fast bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway Company that when they undertake to say that their business makes it necessary that in terminals, in yard room, in double-tracking, in all these arrangements, it is necessary for them to expend three million dollars, you have to elect to say whether you will use any of these conveniences or not. How can the Minister of Railways avoid using those conveniences? Every time that he runs a train from Ste. Rosalie into Bonaventure station, he runs it under the company's rules and regulations. He may take the track that is laid there now, or he may have to take the double track which they have laid down under these conditions of improvement. His cars are to be shunted under the company's regulations; the company, in the management of its traffic, shunts these cars on to the new enlargement and the new additions in the yards. So all the way through it is practically impossible for my hon. friend to avoid using them, and if he uses them the country must pay. Now, what collateral have the Grand Trunk Railway to lay before the financial men in London? This, that the Dominion Government pays 5 per cent on half the cost, which is  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent upon the whole cost, and on that any financial man in London will give the Grand Trunk Railway a loan of three million dollars at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on the guarantee of the interest by the Dominion of Canada. And what will be the result? They will raise the whole amount of money which is necessary to build what is only necessary for their own traffic and their own convenience, and they will do it entirely at the expense of the Dominion. Why could not my hon. friend have taken a manly grasp with the Grand Trunk Railway, and

said: Whatever improvements we want, we will use, and whatever is the charge, this Dominion is able to pay you. But we don't want to pay 5 per cent per year interest when our credit stands at 3 per cent in the London market. Instead of doing that, he has opened a way for the Grand Trunk Railway to finance what is necessary of any sum that may be expended in the matter of these improvements and enlargements, and to do it with scarcely a single cent of cost to themselves. That is the agreement that my hon. friend has made, in his secret way, keeping everything to himself, not consulting his own supporters, he does not trust them, he does not think that they are able to see into the intricacies of an arrangement like this, until he has got it all matured, and three days before they want to get a check for their indemnity in their pocket, they must pass it or they must reject it, with all the consequences that it entails. That is the kind of arrangement that he has drawn Canada into. It is an improvident arrangement, and I do not think that there is another gentleman in this House who would have entered into it outside of my bold friend the Minister of Railways.

On paragraph 41,

That in respect of all traffic originating through the company's system west of Montreal and offered for shipment for any point on the Intercolonial Railway via the Intercolonial at Montreal, the company shall not ask, impose or exact any rates or tolls from the point of shipment to Montreal which shall discriminate or tend to discriminate in favour of the company and against the Intercolonial Railway taking or receiving such business at Montreal, or which shall induce such shipment via the company's line to Lévis or Chaudière for delivery to the Intercolonial at either of such points in preference to Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. What about freights west of Montreal? Suppose freight offers west of Montreal via Halifax. There is no provision in any clause that I see with reference to trade that comes west of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 44 provides for that.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of a renewal of this contract for a second or third term, would the interest run on for ever at the same rate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is optional for the Government to renew, they are free to do it or not, as they please, but they are under no compulsion.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman agree to renew it at the end of the first term?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell what will be done then.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. Minister misunderstood my question. Suppose

freight is offered in Europe to points west of Montreal, say London or Hamilton, where is the provision under this agreement that that freight might not be cornered or captured by the Grand Trunk Railway at Montreal, and an exceptional rate charged from Montreal west? Your 44th clause is intended to apply to it, but it says east of Montreal. Surely this is a mistake for west.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The matter the hon. gentleman is referring to is dealt with by the 43rd section, which declares that freight rates and fares shall be agreed upon and made, from time to time for traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway and all points on the company's railway.

**Mr. HAGGART**. That is not a reply. Where is the power under this agreement for the Intercolonial Railway to make arrangements to carry freight past its own line, which is virtually to Montreal, over the connecting line of the Grand Trunk Railway? You say that they may make arrangements, and make satisfactory arrangements, but if they do not do it, what is the result?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Well, then, there is a provision for arbitration if they do not agree in what is fair between the two roads.

On paragraph 43,

That through rates and fares shall be agreed upon and made from time to time for traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, including the lines hereby demised, and all points on the company's railway, including all lines leased by them, and such rates and fares shall, as regards traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway, and to and from all points on the company's lines and leased lines, be divided on the basis of the mileage, except where such division would act unfairly by reason of one line of railway having a largely preponderating mileage, in which case the division of rates and fares shall be settled on a reasonable and equitable basis by mutual agreement, and in default of agreement, by arbitration as herein provided.

**Mr. HAGGART**. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) says that my point is covered by clause 43. Does he not see that it only applies to freight that originates on some point on the Intercolonial Railway or Grand Trunk Railway.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Originates? No.

**Mr. HAGGART**. Certainly it does.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I cannot get at what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) desires to know. Certainly as to all freights which originate at any point on the Intercolonial Railway or any point on the Grand Trunk Railway east or west all through rates and fares shall be agreed upon. There is a covenant that these parties shall agree to adopt a

**Mr. HAGGART**.

tariff on a mileage basis, and if they cannot come to an agreement the matter is to be referred to a board of arbitration except upon traffic shipped to and from Europe to Halifax. This is a matter which we have endeavoured to cover by the 44th clause.

On paragraph 44;

That as regards traffic shipped to and from Europe and the British Isles through Halifax per Intercolonial Railway, the rates of the company for the carriage of such traffic east of Montreal shall not be higher per passenger per mile, and per ton of freight per mile than the amount per passenger per mile, and per ton of freight per mile, charged by the company on similar classes or descriptions of traffic carried by it for others to and from the same places, and intended for or coming from the same place in Europe or the British Isles. In ascertaining such rates of freight, all drawbacks or deductions allowed are to be taken off before fixing the rates.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Does my hon. friend say that a case like this is covered? Suppose that the Intercolonial Railway agents in London or Liverpool are seeking for freight, we will say, for points on the Grand Trunk Railway west of Montreal, agents of the Grand Trunk Railway are also catering for the same freight.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. At Montreal for points west.

**Mr. FOSTER**. No. What I was saying was this. There is an Intercolonial Railway agent and a Grand Trunk Railway agent in Liverpool, and they are both catering for the carriage of freight bound for western Ontario at points on the Grand Trunk Railway system. The freight might go by Halifax or St. John on the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway to that point, or it might go via Portland and the Grand Trunk Railway to that point. Is there anything in my hon. friend's sections in the agreement which prevents the Grand Trunk Railway from catering for the freight at a rate of discrimination against the Intercolonial Railway, which will be catering for the freight to go by Halifax or St. John over the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway? The agents of the Grand Trunk Railway will meet the agents of the Intercolonial Railway in Liverpool, and when these agents ask for freight to go via Halifax, the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway to a point in western Ontario, the Grand Trunk agent will step in and say: "We will take that freight at a cheaper rate by way of Portland, over the Grand Trunk Railway to this point in western Ontario." I say that this does not meet this point at all. Perhaps my hon. friend could not meet it. Evidently it is not met, and it is not a matter which my hon. friend could refer to arbitration. Does my hon. friend think that it is perfectly open for the Grand Trunk Railway to compete with this combination of the Interco-

lonial and the Grand Trunk Railway on freight to points west of Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I frankly acknowledge that I do not think it would be possible to cover the point in the express terms of a written contract. As hon. gentlemen are aware, there are two classes of arrangements between railway companies, one a leasing contract or agreement, which refers to the use of the road, and the other a traffic arrangement which refers to the interchange of traffic. Traffic arrangements are of a temporary character. They do not last more than a year and sometimes not more than for the season for which they are made. Traffic arrangements are made between companies for six months sometimes. We never proposed embodying in this agreement anything that would be the subject of an ordinary traffic arrangement, and what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) alludes to would come within that classification. I do not think it would be an easy undertaking to make an agreement covering the kind of traffic described by the hon. gentleman where the Grand Trunk Railway have a terminal of their own which would be entering into direct competition with us and where they have their own railway system beyond our terminus at Montreal.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be impossible for him to get the Grand Trunk Railway to agree not to compete.

Mr. **HAGGART**. All I was contending for was a provision in this agreement covering the case of traffic originating on either of the lines of railway. On freight originating in England for points west of Montreal there is no arrangement in this agreement, I tried to make that point plain to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but he seems not to have understood it until it was put by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). There is no arrangement in this agreement by which freight shipped from Great Britain or Europe can be sent further than Montreal. Although we have control of the whole line and built it ourselves, no arrangement has been made by which we can enter into competition with the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Now, I acknowledge that I cannot understand what the meaning of section 44 is. Will the Minister of Railways give us his view of it, an actual case, for instance?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is an error in one of the words in that clause—"east" should be "west" of Montreal. There are two or three verbal errors in the agreement in other places. That means that any arrangement which may be made by any shipper for the

shipment of his freight from any European point to Halifax, if that freight is carried through Halifax for a point beyond Montreal, then the company cannot charge any higher rate per ton for such freight per mile than the amount charged by the company on similar classes of traffic carried by it for others to and from the same places.

Mr. **HAGGART**. That is why I asked the question. I suggested that if the word "east" were "west" we could understand the clause.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is the word, but in the printer's copy it reads "east." I thought the point that the hon. gentleman wanted to get at was as to our control of the rates west from Montreal. This would be made the subject matter of competition on the other side, and I do not see how it would be possible to make any arrangement which would enable us to enter into successful competition with the Grand Trunk when they have a port of their own.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Now, we are in a very grave fix. We have the matter locked up like the laws of the Medes and Persians and it cannot be departed from; we have to swallow it all as it is or none. Here it says "east," and east it must remain for ninety-nine years.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, in the agreement which we signed I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that these corrections have been made.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). That is a mere typographical error.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This ought to be a perfect transcript of the signed document. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) ask the committee to change the word from east to west.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I ask the committee to make it conform to the agreement itself. There are two or three words which have been incorrectly printed and which I will ask the committee to correct. I have them marked.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the agreement been laid on the Table of the House?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, I think so.

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, we have had nothing but these printed documents.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The original agreement?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it should be brought down to the House. The word should be made "west," instead of "east." My hon. friend will be in a box, if it is not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How big a box? It is not very serious. Suppose it says "east" it has no meaning at all. If it reads "west," we have some power on their shipments.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the hon. gentleman is told that this is only a typographical error, what is the use of wasting time about it?

Mr. FOSTER. We were told that this contract was signed on the 15th May. When there was trouble about it, the Minister told us that it was not signed on the 15th of May, although to-day we have passed this resolution declaring that it was signed on that date. Therefore I think we ought to see the original contract. We have as much right to compare the printed document with the original contract, to see if there are any errors in it, as the Minister has. Is any demand more reasonable than that the original contract should be before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I venture to say that my hon. friend cannot recall a case in his whole parliamentary experience, in which, when an agreement was submitted in printed form to the House for ratification, the original was brought down and laid on the Table; and when a Minister of the Crown tells the hon. gentleman that a typographical error exists in the printed document, he ought to accept the statement immediately.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the House can fairly ask that we should have the original contract when there are errors in the printed document which were not discovered until they were pointed out by the members of this House, but which the Minister persisted in stating were correct until he could not longer defend them, when he said they were not in accord with the original contract. He may be speaking in good faith, but he has not the original document before him, and how is he to know when the printed document does or does not correspond with the original? I say, therefore, that in order that we may see that this document conforms to the original, we are quite within our right when we ask that the original signed agreement be brought down and be subjected to the scrutiny of the members of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. At an early part of this discussion I suggested the change of one word to the Minister, and he replied that it could not be changed. If he could not change one word in the first part of the agreement, why does he change a word in the latter part of it?

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman not see the distinction between changing a contract and changing a typographical error?

Mr. SPROULE. It may not be a typographical error, and I think it is due to this House that we should be in a position to verify the corrections, and see whether the original document contains the same words as the printed document. The hon. Minister must have the original document in his department, and it would not take much time or trouble to have it brought here, so that we could make a comparison of the two.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are three or four typographical errors which it will be necessary to correct, and which I will call attention to later on, and I presume the committee will correct these so that this document will conform to the original agreement which has been executed.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries wants to know if I have ever heard of original documents being brought into this House by Ministers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say anything of the kind. I asked whether the hon. gentleman ever knew of a case in which when a Minister of Railways laid an agreement before the House, the original was brought down attached to the printed document.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has raised a point which I did not raise. I did not ask that the original document be attached to the printed document.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say you did. I said that no original contract was brought down when a Minister placed a printed duplicate of that document before the House. I challenge the hon. gentleman to name an instance.

Mr. FOSTER. My opinion is certainly the reverse. I myself, when I was a Minister, brought down contract after contract, and had them in my desk, so that when a matter came up the contract was there for any hon. member to inspect it who wanted to do so. This House certainly has as much right to inspect original documents as a committee of this House; and the hon. gentleman knows that the Committee of Public Accounts has had original papers brought before it in stacks for the perusal of any member of that committee. If that is so in that committee, why should it not be so in this House? Besides, if I am not misinformed, in the case of the fast Atlantic contract this very year, the original document as signed by Sir Richard Cartwright on behalf of the Government was brought down to the House. Now, if any member of this House wants to see the

original document as signed by the parties to it, I think we have a right to ask that the Minister shall bring it down and give us that opportunity. If this is a constitutional doctrine which the Minister is introducing, it is a new constitutional doctrine, and I protest against it. It is not particularly that the Minister's veracity is in question; but his fallibility may be established, and we are not going to take any Minister as infallible. I ask the leader of the House, who is an old constitutional member, whether or not we have a right to see this original contract?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that we are in this position. The hon. Minister has acknowledged that there are several typographical errors. How do we know what is correct and what is not correct? He has not drawn attention to these typographical errors as we went along, and we have accepted them all as correct, and passed them. The Minister ought to have drawn the attention of the Chairman to them, at least, and asked him to change them before we passed each section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not passing these sections. There is only one section in the resolution, and that section includes both agreements, and it is my purpose to ask the committee to make the necessary corrections in the three or four cases where corrections are necessary, so that the agreements as they are approved by the House shall be positively at one with the agreements as executed. In the fourth clause, for instance, instead of the word "belong" we should have the word "belonging."

Mr. INGRAM. I think we are entitled to that original document. I remember very distinctly the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) drawing the attention of the hon. Minister several times to the word "east," and the hon. gentleman persisted in saying that the word was "east."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Surely the hon. gentleman is mistaken. My attention was not called to the word "east."

Mr. INGRAM. I am most positive that it was called to the word two or three times, and the hon. gentleman persisted in saying it was "east." But, after the argument, persisted in by my hon. friend to my right that it was not in the interests of the Government to have the word "east" in there instead of "west," we find the hon. gentleman saying it was a typographical error, and that we should accept it as such. For that reason, I hold we ought to see the original contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the Government take the ground that the House

has no right, when called upon to ratify a contract, to see the original document.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The position which the Government takes is that we have set forth in printed form the agreement entered into, and which we ask this House to ratify. If there be no such agreement, then the whole legislation on the subject will be absolutely nugatory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, all the members of the House are interested in seeing that any legislation we pass is not nugatory. I must say that I thoroughly understood the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) to have directed the attention of the hon. gentleman to this word "east," as printed in section 44. It may be that the hon. Minister did not understand my hon. friend, but I certainly did, and it seems to me that, under the circumstances, as it is apparent that there are several typographical errors in the document as printed and laid before the House, it is not unreasonable that we should insist on having the original laid on the Table for the purposes of comparison.

Mr. BRITTON. Is not this the position fairly stated: An agreement has been entered into between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway. That agreement is not valid or binding until ratified by the House. The majority of hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to have it ratified. The hon. Minister of Railways tells us that the change he suggests is intended to make the printed document agree with the original. If that be the case, we know what we are doing, the original agreement will be ratified, and no harm done; but if, on the other hand, the amendments suggested by the hon. Minister, and which he says are intended to make the printed document conform with the original, in reality are at variance with the original document, then the result will be just what hon. gentlemen opposite want. There will be no real valid agreement and all we have done must go to nought, unless the Grand Trunk Railway see fit to accept the agreement as passed by the House. With regard to the difference in date about which so much has been said, all of us who have had anything to do with documents of this kind must know that very often the date is filled in as part of the agreement, although the agreement may not be signed or executed until some time later, and I must confess that I do not see any legal objection to a course of that kind. The agreement is actually signed as bearing the date mentioned in it, although the time of actual signing may be different.

Mr. CLANCY. Does not the hon. gentleman think that the House is entitled to have before it, not what purports to be a copy of the agreement, and which is shown to contain many errors, but the original

agreement itself. I would like the hon. gentleman to say to the House, as a lawyer, whether or not this committee is entitled to the original agreement, to every word and line of which we are asked to give our assent? If the copy of a document were produced in court, the hon. gentleman would not accept it, but would insist on having the original. But the hon. gentleman says that we on this side do not want the agreement to pass, and therefore we ought to be the better pleased if the agreement we do ratify should not really be the one passed between the parties. That is a most extraordinary argument, especially coming from an hon. gentleman of the legal standing of the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. BRITTON. I am not an old parliamentarian, and therefore my opinion as to parliamentary practice perhaps may not be worth very much, but I say that in a case of this kind we ought to accept the word of the Minister when he tells us that the original agreement is in a certain way, and suggests an amendment to the printed copy to make it agree with the original. If I were to answer the question asked me, I certainly would say, whatever my opinion be worth, that I think the original agreement ought to be here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have been assisting in this House at the passage of scores of agreements, and very often opposing their passage, and, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, I have never seen the House insist on any occasion on the production of the original. Nevertheless, if hon. gentlemen cannot possibly proceed with the discussion without seeing the original, I have no doubt my hon. friend will produce it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite sure that the statement made by the hon. leader of the House will command universal approval. While it is not always regarded as necessary to submit the original agreements to the Government, no one who has been a member of Parliament for any length of time would venture to deny that the Government have constantly brought down original agreements. There never has been an instance in the history of this Parliament when an original agreement of such importance as the one now asked for, was not produced when called for. The House will see the absolute necessity of the hon. Minister doing this when he admits that there are errors in the printed copy. Suppose that through clerical errors, or otherwise, the document we are asked to ratify does not conform to the original, in what position will we be in? The Grand Trunk Railway have not bound themselves to any agreement except the original, and therefore our confirming a document which they have not signed, and which is at variance with the one they have signed, will

Mr. CLANCY.

have no binding effect on them, and this legislation will be useless. I cannot understand the hon. Minister's hesitation in complying with the appeal of his leader, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to lay the document before the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am really surprised at the hon. gentleman. In the first place the assumption that it is the usual or ordinary thing to lay original papers on the Table is an extremely violent one, and one which has not heretofore been insisted upon—at all events that is the information I have, and I think it is reliable. Now, I entirely dissent from the proposition that any clerical error, any patent and plain mistake which there might be typographically in the document which was signed, which would not concur with the agreement as confirmed here by Act of Parliament would necessarily or at all invalidate the contract in which Parliament did concur. If there was any substantial difference between the two, if the Act which Parliament passed confirmed a contract which was substantially different from that which is actually entered into, the Grand Trunk might well say: The contract which we entered into with you has not been ratified, and therefore we are not bound by it. I have no objection to produce the agreement. But the committee might go on with the discussion, and if it was found that the agreement which was signed contains the word "east" in place of the word "west," the error is so patent and clear to any one who will read the clause that it could not affect the validity of the agreement between the Grand Trunk and ourselves. I say that it is a clerical error, and while I do not say that it was not in the written draft as it was prepared, as it was agreed upon—in careful reading by the officials of the Government the error would probably have been noticed. I have no doubt that if an error, it slipped in in the course of printing. And it is not expected, I presume, that the Minister of each department shall sit down and read the printer's proof of each document to ascertain whether it conforms strictly to the document as drawn. So I am not able to guarantee that the printed document signed by the company does not contain the word "east." But I am absolutely sure that the agreement as it was entered into was "west" that it could not mean anything but "west," that there is really no sense in the clause unless with that word, because the Grand Trunk has no line east of this point. Now, if hon. gentlemen are prepared to go on and deal with the remaining sections, we can save the final disposition of the matter until the written contract is procured.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad that the hon. Minister has finally given consent which, had he given it an hour ago, would have saved a great deal of time. We

do not insist that the document shall be technically laid on the Table, but we ask that it shall be available so that questions asked by hon. members may be answered authoritatively, and thus we may be able to do our business correctly. I think that the suggestion that we should go on and finish this reading of the contract, leaving it open to make such amendments as we find, on comparison with the original, are necessary, is one that we might well accept.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that if the word "east" is contained in the original, it is clearly an error and it ought to be "west." I would have no hesitation, for one, in advising the committee to make the change in the printed form, because it would then unquestionably be in accordance with what was intended.

Mr. FOSTER. We will leave it then, and the original paper will be here in the evening, say.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Not to be laid on the Table, it will be understood.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, we do not expect that, but it will be before us for purposes of comparison.

Mr. WALLACE. The document need not be laid on the Table, because then it would be the property of the House. There is another serious defect in the copy that is now before us, which purports to be a copy of the agreement. I see that it is signed here at the end "Chas. M. Hays, General Manager," and "Andrew G. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals." But though this is, I suppose, a sealed document, there are no seals in the copy. Some may think that this is not a very important matter, but I think it is. For instance, we have presented to the House not many days ago a document dated the 14th June, a contract between the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Petersen, Tate & Company, ship-builders. If you will look at page 400 of the "Votes and Proceedings," you will find that that is a completed document, that the seal is there, or the "L.S." which stands instead of the seal. In the agreement we are now considering there is no proper completion of the document before us; it is presented to the House in defective form. I think the Minister of Railway's attention should be called to the fact that he has not presented to the House a proper copy of the original document.

On agreement with the Drummond County Railway Company

On paragraph 3,

That the company will, in the construction of the uncompleted portion of its line, construct the same to the satisfaction of the Government Engineer, and with a uniform grade of 52·80 per mile, and in addition on the line already constructed will reduce the grades at Carmel Hill

and at the St. Francis River to a maximum grade of 52·80 per mile.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to assume that the two places mentioned are the only places on the road where this change would be required. If there are other places where the grade is more than 52·80, that should be provided for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As a matter of fact, there are no other grades than the two mentioned that are greater than 52·80. We know that as an absolute certainty.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. Minister mean that the road shall be completed with a uniform grade of 52·80 per mile or does he mean that that is the maximum grade?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I mean that that shall be the maximum grade. The word "uniform" grade is a clerical error, and the clause should be amended in that respect.

On paragraph 4,

That it is hereby covenanted by the company with Her Majesty, that the company will and does hereby covenant and agree that Her Majesty will be put into possession of the completed railway on or before the date aforesaid free and clear of any existing encumbrance of any kind; that any trust mortgage heretofore executed upon the company's property, or bonds issued, will, before Her Majesty, shall take over and enter into possession of the said line, be wholly cancelled and extinguished, so far as such trust mortgage or issue of bonds shall affect or encumber the railway hereby demised; that any unsettled claims for right of way on the said line or railway or branches thereof shall be fully paid and satisfied; that any conveyance of such right of way upon any portion of the said line of railway or branches thereof not yet executed by the owners thereof and delivered to the company shall, previously to the acceptance of this lease, be duly executed and delivered by the persons having title to said right of way; and any unsettled claims or demands of any kind or description which may prejudice or affect the title which Her Majesty is hereby acquiring to the company's property shall be fully paid, satisfied and discharged, and further, that in the event of any claim for right of way, or in the event of any debt or demand of the company being hereinafter preferred against Her Majesty, which ought to have been paid or satisfied by the company in pursuance of this agreement, if demanded, Her Majesty may, on payment thereof, deduct the amount of such claim out of any rents due and payable under this lease.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this section is read, we might as well ask the Minister for a little information. This relates to the indebtedness, bonded or otherwise, of the company. Will the Minister kindly inform the House what is the present condition of the company in that respect, who are its stockholders, what bonds have been issued, what are the amount of bonds per mile, and as to the interest rate upon these bonds?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that I am not able to furnish the hon. gentleman with the in-

formation that he asks for. It is made a condition of this agreement that the company shall satisfy the Government that their property is absolutely unencumbered at the time the Government takes the road over. We have stipulated that we shall have the right to assign the rental which is payable under this lease as a security for bonds which shall issue subsequent to the execution of the lease, and which shall not take effect, and which shall only be a charge or lien upon the rental itself. The property is to be wholly unencumbered. As to the amount of existing bonds, I am not in a position to say, but I understand they are something in the neighbourhood of a million dollars. They are hypothecated, I think, with some one or more of the banks. But my information has not been very minute upon that point, nor did I think it necessary to make particular inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. Are any of these bonds in the hands of the public, or are they held as collateral security by banks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am inclined to the opinion, though I cannot speak with certainty, that the bonds are in such a position that the company can take them and surrender them to the Government or otherwise, if the Government, or the solicitors who may be representing the Government when the matter comes to be arranged, are satisfied that they are absolutely extinguished, and that the property is clear of any encumbrance whatever. I do not know in whose hands they are now held, or whether they are scattered, but I rather judge that they are not scattered.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend understand that the clause in this section with reference to claims unsettled for right of way, would take in all right of way claims? or is it understood that all claims for right of way have either been paid or preferred? What I want to point out is this. Is the hon. gentleman satisfied that after the arrangement is gone into the Government will not be called upon to satisfy claims for damages which may not have been preferred, but yet may be valid; or is it understood that all the claims have either been settled or have gone so far before the Drummond County Railway that they are covered by this clause?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand that the claims, in the main, have been settled, but not altogether. I believe there are some which still remain unadjusted. But as to those, whether they have been preferred or not, we propose to take power, as we think we have done, to pay claims when properly presented, and if they should be presented at any period hereafter, we shall have a right to reserve out of the rental which

Mr. BLAIR.

will be payable, an amount sufficient to pay any such claims.

Mr. FOSTER. You have taken that power?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so, in the latter lines of this clause:

On paragraph 8,

That Her Majesty will purchase the rolling stock and the railway supplies of the company at a valuation to be agreed upon between the company and the Minister.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some information about this rolling stock before we give the right to purchase, because it is an important consideration. What is the amount of the rolling stock on this road, and what is its valuation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have not the slightest idea whether the rolling stock is of much or little value. I am told that it is in fairly good condition, but I have no knowledge of it, and would not act upon any such belief. The Crown has no authority to reserve to itself the right to take the rolling stock if it can get it at such a valuation as it believes it could properly take it at.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend will find that he is mistaken. He has no option to take it if he pleases, he is bound to take it, but he is not bound to take it except at a valuation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is another way of stating what I said. I think they are fairly bound to sell to us, and if we can agree upon reasonable terms, we are fairly bound to take their rolling stock, that is, if they are willing to sell it to us at what we believe to be a reasonable price. If they ask too much we are under no compulsion to take the property. We must get it at what we believe to be a fair value, or else we will not take it all.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of disagreement, who is to determine the value?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question of determining it in the event of disagreement. It is for the department to take it or not, as they please.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose you do not agree on the valuation as mentioned in the section, is there not some means of determining what shall be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, and I will explain why. I felt that in a matter of that kind, which was not an essential condition of the contract, we ought to be under no compulsion to buy, especially at a price which might be demanded of us by some third party. If we could not agree, then I was unwilling for one to bind the Government to sub-

mit to a figure which might be fixed by a third party. If we cannot agree upon a price, then we will not take the article at all, we have a free hand. I would only consider that we were under an obligation of treating the parties fairly, and of taking the property from them if they were willing to sell it to us at a price which was fair.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the Minister wanted to give them a great deal too much for it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I suppose Parliament would turn us out.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not a little singular that my hon. friend goes to work and purchases a road, and in purchasing the road is so slow that he does not get an engineer's report upon it and act according to the advice of his engineer until after he has signed the contract? Then he goes to work and binds himself to purchase that rolling stock at a valuation, and he actually tells us that he has no statement from one of his officers as to the amount of rolling stock that is upon the road, or its quality, or anything of the kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a fact.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am sorry that my hon. friend has to admit that.

On paragraph 9,

That Her Majesty will not be bound to take over the said railway, nor shall the rental hereby reserved begin to accrue to the company until the said line of railway and branches thereof shall be wholly completed to the satisfaction of the Minister or the Engineer of the Department of Railways, and ready for use and occupation for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. That word "or" is not a clerical error, between the Minister and the engineer, is it? Should it be "and"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it should be "or." I have a memorandum from the Deputy Minister which shows that the word "east" in clause 44, ought to be "west." I have sent for the agreement. I think the word ought unquestionably to be "west" to make the sense of the clause.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend expressed a doubt as to whether the word was "east" or "west" in the original.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no question about it that the word "east" must be "west" to have any reasonable meaning. As to the sealing of the document I am told that the document bears the seal and that it is only an error on the part of those who made the copies that the letters L.S. were not placed opposite the name. I would sug-

gest that the amendment be now made in both cases. If the hon. gentleman would consent to the committee rising, there can be no final stage taken and I will get the agreement and show it to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). I suppose that will answer.

Mr. FOSTER. That will answer.

Mr. TISDALE. I would suggest to the Minister that if you are changing the word "east" to "west" we will have to put a substantive clause in.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not if the error is a patent one. Have you any doubt as to its being patent?

Mr. TISDALE. I have no doubt as to its being patent, but it is material. Unless the instrument is re-executed and we confirm it, it might create an awkward question.

Mr. LOUNT. The court would read "west" in there beyond doubt.

Mr. FOSTER. If it read "east" in the document.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly; it is a patent error.

Mr. FOSTER. Which court?

Mr. LOUNT. The court of law.

Mr. FOSTER. That is bad law, I am afraid.

Resolution to be reported.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) if he proposes to sit on Saturday.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will be able probably to tell to-night when I see what progress has been made.

Mr. BERGERON. You will have to move to-day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, there are two days in which to move.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whatever is the more convenient will be readily assented to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The matter is in my hon. friend's own hands. If his thirst for information can be assuaged in short gulps we can get through, but if he desires to have it in long draughts I do not know what will be the result.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) propose to make any change in this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). No, we do not propose to make any change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) if he has any information as to the effect of these sugar duties as now arranged on the West India sugar trade at Halifax? There is a very strong feeling there that a very serious injury will be occasioned by that duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is somewhat mistaken as to the position of the matter. The item in which the West India trade is more particularly interested is the first item in the schedule. Upon that item we have made no change. The item stands exactly as it was before. I am prepared to say that it is represented by the West Indian trade that the specific or fiat duty of one-half a cent a pound on all grades of sugar does not encourage that trade; and that is well worthy of consideration. We have found some difficulties, however, at the present stage of the session in the way of reopening the question, and we are inclined to think that it is better that the matter should stand for a few months longer, during which we will consider the question of changing the form of the duty when Parliament meets again. The particular product in which the West India trade are interested is raw sugar, and on that we have not made any change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But still the alteration made in the duties has struck a severe blow at the West India trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think that is hardly correct. It is not the alteration of the duty which they object to; but it is the fiat duty, which my hon. friend inserted in his tariff, and which like all specific duties bears somewhat hardly on the lower grades. The sugar question is always a very difficult and complicated one; and after full consideration we have come to the conclusion that it is better to allow the matter to rest for the present than to attempt to make a change now which might meet the views of the West India trade, but might not on the whole satisfy all parties concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite evident that the hon. gentlemen are literally unable to  
Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

make up their minds what to do, and they propose to take six or seven months more to consider the question. If that is the case, it is well to move cautiously with regard to a question affecting such an immense industry, and involving not only the labour of our people, but the outside trade to a large degree. As this state of indecision as to what it is best to do ultimately is frankly acknowledged by my hon. friend, does he not think it better to leave the duties as they were before, until they can take plenty of time to look into the matter and come to a final decision as to what will appear to be the wisest course to pursue? My hon. friend is cutting off the real results of his own caution by making the change he has made. Under the old tariff sugar interests were fairly successful, and the business was going along well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To leave the duties exactly as they were before would not be regarded as satisfactory to all concerned. It would be no advantage to the West India trade, because the raw sugar, in which they are chiefly interested, is left exactly as it was before. We have made a change in the duty on the refined article, and except as to the relation that always exists between the importer and the purchaser of sugar, there is no connection between the two. The refiner undoubtedly complains of the reduction we have made in the duty on refined sugar; but it is also fair to state that the continuance of the old duty on raw sugar is criticised by the West India trade. They complain of the fiat duty which my hon. friend adopted three years ago; and there is fair reason to doubt that that is the best form of duty. If we left the duties exactly as my hon. friend suggests on both lines, he is mistaken in assuming that that would be satisfactory to the sugar trade. The West India trade would still complain, as they complain now, of the fiat duty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend seems to think that the West India trade is alone affected by the duty on raw sugar, and that inasmuch as he has not changed that duty, he has not done anything to interfere with the West India trade. The hon. gentleman could wipe out the West India trade completely, and still leave the duty on raw sugar just as it is. What is to be done with the sugar after it is brought in is the question on which the subject turns; and, therefore, it is a mere evasion, in my opinion, to say that the West India trade is not seriously affected because the duty remains on raw sugar as it was before. I do not question the statement of the hon. gentleman that the West India trade may not have been satisfied with matters as they stood. My information is that since the change of tariff made by hon. gentlemen opposite the merchants of Halifax have sent to 140 parties with whom they were trading in the

West Indies, directing them not to forward any sugar. In fact, they regard the change made in the sugar duty by the hon. gentleman as having struck not only a severe but a fatal blow at the West India trade; and I do think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) that, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman admits that after all the consideration they have given to this subject they have not yet made up their minds whether the policy they have adopted is one that it will be wise to continue to maintain, it would be reasonable to leave the question open, as it stood before, for consideration a little longer, and not thus, by a change which they themselves are not at all satisfied will be permanent, disarrange more thoroughly than before so important a trade as that between Canada and the West Indies. I really think that my hon. friend would be consulting the interests of the Government, and I am sure he would be consulting the interests of the country, if, until he is able to give this question such consideration as to leave no doubt in his mind as to what course should be pursued, he leaves matters as they were before. I submit to my hon. friend that it is not too late to adopt that course, and it would be a course perfectly consistent with the statement he has made to-day.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The hon. gentleman is slightly mistaken in saying that we have not made up our minds as to the wisdom of the course we are pursuing. We have made up our minds to this extent, that we believe the change we have made is a wise change, though of course we may be mistaken. The only question is whether we might not go further and make a change in the duty on raw sugar, or in the method of levying the duty on raw sugar. That is a point as to which there is room for debate. It is on that point that I expressed some doubt, whether the flat duty or a duty based on the polariscopic test is the better. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that the West India trade are hostile to the change we have made. All they are complaining of, if they are complaining at all, is that we have not made a greater change, and changed the method of levying the duty on raw sugar. Of course, I understand that there is that connection between the West India trade and the refiner to which the hon. gentleman refers, in that the West India man must have a market for his sugar.

**MR. FOSTER.** You cannot disjoin these two interests, because if there is no refining done in the country, the West India trade must go to smash, because no one will import raw sugar in if there is no one here to refine it. When my hon. friend has lowered the duty on refined sugar, he has struck a blow at the refining industry of the country which will react directly on the raw sugar

trade with the West Indies, as well as on the trade in beet root sugar from Europe. So that my hon. friend may be assured of this, that if he can keep the duties just as they were, there might be some dissatisfaction as to whether the duty should be imposed as a specific duty simply and absolutely on sugar at so much per pound, or whether other tests should be used. My hon. friend, however, would conserve the refining industry in this country and the raw sugar trade as well. If the Government admit that they cannot see their way clear as to what is really the best for the whole business all round, I think the argument is almost irresistible that they should not imperil, even for six months, the great business of refining and the dependent business of importing raw sugar. It would be thoroughly consistent and just what business men ought to do, if they cannot see their way to a betterment which actually satisfies them, to leave the thing just as it was when they are sure that in doing so they will not imperil either the one industry or the other.

**MR. SPROULE.** Looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, if the duty affects the British West Indies, it must affect other countries as well. Last year we imported from British Guiana 6,000,000 pounds, from the British West Indies 90,000,000 pounds, from Belgium 16,000,000 pounds, from the East Indies 14,000,000 pounds, from Germany 8,500,000 pounds, and a large quantity from the Phillipine Islands and Spanish West Indies.

Sugar candy, brown and white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, candied peel and popcorn, one-half of one cent per pound and thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

**MR. FOSTER.** This is a change from the first tariff as brought down.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Yes.

**MR. FOSTER.** Consisting in adding the specific duty.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** In the tariff of 1894, the duty on sugar candy was 35 per cent. Then in the tariff of 1895, a duty of ½ cent per pound was added on sugar and was also added to the sugar candy. Our first draft of the resolutions made a change in that, but we have concluded to restore the original duty for this reason. The preferential rate will apply to the sugar candy but not to the sugar imported from countries which do not get the benefit of the reciprocal rate. Therefore, the manufacturer of candy will not get his sugar any cheaper except to the extent of the reduction on the refined? We know that England is the largest sugar market in the world and uses large quantities of it in making sugar candy, so that there will be considerable quantities of confectionery brought from the mother country under the reciprocal rate. So that really by leaving

this rate, as it stood in the old tariff, we are making, so far as the old country is concerned, a very substantial reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. At what rate will chewing gum come in ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 20 per cent.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, seven and one-half cents per bushel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will be a discussion on that item.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Better take the discussion on the free item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). We understand that the discussion may cover both items, as they are related, and we can take up the free item at once.

Free List—Indian corn, n.e.s.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I wish to say a few words on this item which affects the whole country, but affects very specially the province from which I come. I regret very much that the Government has seen fit to take the duty off corn. A duty of 7½ cents a bushel has been left on corn for distilling purposes, but corn coming in for other purposes is free. I think the Government will find it a very difficult matter to collect the duty on corn brought in for distilling purposes. There is nothing to prevent a farmer selling his corn to a distiller and replacing it with imported corn. I believe the Controller of Customs will not be able to follow that corn so far as to prevent the farmer from selling the imported corn to the distiller. As the Finance Minister pointed out last night, it is a very difficult matter to collect duty on articles which are free for one purpose and dutiable for another. I am sure it will be found so in the case of Indian corn. A large quantity of the coarse grains are grown in this country, not only enough for home consumption but enough to give us a large quantity to export. So far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, for some years past we have found that the home market was sufficient to consume all our coarse grains except, perhaps, a small percentage, which may have been sent to Newfoundland or to the West Indies. The great bulk of our coarse grains were used by the local markets in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Last year there was a very large crop of oats in every part of the country and especially in the maritime provinces.

Mr. FIELDING.

The result was that we had more than was required to stock the market that we have heretofore had, and the surplus had to be shipped to England. The consequence was that the price went down so that the farmers did not realize what would pay them for growing the article. Prices will be further reduced by the importation of a large quantity of corn when the duty on corn is removed. We find that in 1878 we imported \$3,335,619 worth of corn ; in 1894, we imported only \$683,877 worth. That means that the place of \$2,851,742 worth of corn was supplied by the coarse grains grown in our own country. My contention is that the admission of free corn into this country will have the effect of still further depreciating the price we have had for the large quantity of coarse grains grown in our country. While free corn may be of some advantage to the farmers who are large stock feeders and are able to take advantage of it, the great majority of the poorer farmers of this country cannot afford to grow oats, which they must grow and sell them for 20 cents or 22 cents a bushel and then import corn from the United States, where 2,151,000,000 of bushels of corn is grown. It may be of some small advantage to the large feeders, but the general farmers and the poorer classes of people who really have more need of legislation in their favour than the large and wealthy farmers do, will not be able to take advantage of it in any sense. I know sufficiently of my own country to say that, and I know what I am talking about. Now, Sir, there is much more corn grown in this country, many times over, as I understand it, than would supply what is required by the distillers of this country. As I said before, there is nothing to prevent our farmers selling the corn that they would use for their own feeding purposes, to the distillers, and importing American corn to replace what they sold to the distillers ; so that really, so far as I can see, it will not be possible to collect any duty from the corn that is required for distilling purposes. It was stated here the other night that the farmers do not require free corn. For my part, I do not believe that anything like the majority of the farmers are asking for or require free corn. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), I think it was, said the other night that the farmers "are getting on a little too fast for their own good." Now, I must say I think this item of free corn is going to prevent them from progressing ; I believe myself it will be a retrograde movement rather than otherwise. It is well known that corn is not a good article for making pork. I know that pork made from corn is not as good as pork made from barley, oats and peas ; and the effect of bringing in corn free means the depreciation of the value of the pork that is made in this country. To substantiate that, I will read an extract from a letter written by one of the heads of one

of the large pork-packing establishments in Canada, in which he says :

With respect to free corn, we are very much pleased that this matter is receiving the attention of a good many members of Parliament at present. The fact of corn being admitted free is a serious matter to the pork-packing industries of Canada, as, if imported largely into this country and fed liberally to hogs, it will seriously interfere with the quality. We may say, we have not bought any hogs in the counties of Essex and Kent during the past two or three years, the reason being that the quality of the hogs is not suitable to make fancy export bacon, and, therefore, we have refused to buy them, and the quality, as we understand it, is caused by the farmers feeding corn instead of mixed grain, as is followed in all other districts in Canada, and, therefore, if other districts would import corn largely and commence feeding it liberally, the results would be serious, not only to the packers, but to the farmers generally in Canada. In this connection, a large Chicago packing house writes, under date of January 14, 1897, as follows :—

“It has been suggested that the Canadian farmer feed his hogs corn. This is the most fatal step he can take. It would not alone undo the work that has been done during the past ten or fifteen years in educating him how to raise hogs fit for export, but it would reduce the value of the hogs fully one-third. As we understand it, you raise too many hogs now that are unsuitable for export, to supply your own domestic trade. If you introduce corn as the staple article of hog feed, you do not increase your domestic outlet any, but you decrease the percentage of your product which can be exported by putting yourself on the same basis as the States; in other words, you are giving up a good market, where your goods bring a premium, to compete in a market where you have not a ghost of a chance. At present your bacon compares favourably with both the Irish and Danish product, and you have established a reputation for quality which you must maintain at any cost. This cannot be done by substituting corn or other grains. As a citizen of the United States, of course, I should like to see Canada opened up to receive our products, but, looking at it from the standpoint that you must look at it from, I cannot see one feature in it to benefit either the Canadian packer or farmer.”

Now, if this is the case, and I have no reason to doubt it, I think it would be very detrimental to the pork-packing business of Canada, which is, you may say, in its infancy, is only fairly getting under way, but is going to grow to large proportions if it is properly fostered. Our province of Prince Edward Island, although a small one, can grow an immense quantity of pork, and I dare say more, proportionately, than any other part of Canada. We can grow coarse grains necessary to make the best pork that can possibly be made anywhere in the world. Our people are giving their attention largely to the growth of pork and are very successful in it. A large packing establishment is being built there now on the most modern system. I think that it would be a retrograde step if we were to allow the quality of our home-grown pork to be deteriorated by allowing

free corn to be imported into this country to feed hogs, and to take the place of the coarser grains that make much better pork than corn would make. I may say further that we have a large local demand in the lower provinces for our pork which, I am sorry to say, has been greatly interfered with by some of the changes that have been made in the tariff. The coal and iron industries have been growing up in the maritime provinces, and these consume large quantities of our pork. The people of New Glasgow, Londonderry, and the surrounding towns are large consumers of the products of our farms, and afford some of the best markets for our pork, beef, and such like products. Now, Sir, I regret indeed to find that, owing to the changes made in the tariff, a circular has been sent to the employees in these different industries notifying them that 10 per cent of their wages is to be deducted in consequence of the reduction in the protection that has hitherto been given to the manufacture of iron, particularly in the county of Pictou. Now, fault has always been found with us that we did not give under the National Policy a home market to our farmers for the stuff they grow on their farms. We did furnish them with a home market, and those who did not believe it before will soon be made painfully aware of it when they find that the home market they had for the past two years and which was steadily growing, is to a large extent taken away from them in consequence of the reduction in the tariff which has already begun to result in the lowering of the wages of the labouring men in the localities that I have mentioned. I regret that the Government has not seen fit to continue the duty on corn. If we did not grow enough of these coarse grains in our own country, I could readily see that there might be a necessity for it, particularly in those portions of Canada where it is used as food. But with us it is not used as food to any extent. Thank goodness, our people can eat something better. But I think it is a great mistake on the part of the Government to have allowed this duty, to be taken off corn. I believe they will be able to raise very little revenue from that imported for distillers, as I have already explained. It will be very difficult indeed for the Government to collect any revenue from that source. Under these circumstances, I must say that I regret very much, in the interest of our people, and in the interest of the whole country, that the Government has seen fit to admit corn free.

Mr. SPROULE. To my mind this is one of the most important items in the tariff, because it affects one of the largest classes of the Dominion, and it affects them in a way that must seriously injure them if it is continued. In the year 1877-78, before the National Policy was introduced,

the farmers of Canada knew very well what it meant to have the injurious competition of the United States farmer. In some lines out of which the Canadian farmer was making money, in cattle, grain, meats and all those kinds of produce, the competition from the United States was growing more and more serious, and when the National Policy was introduced they found very soon the benefits of that policy. Let us take the line that is represented by the article now under consideration. As I said, the serious competition from the United States was so great that the farmers of Canada felt it very much, they were driven out of their own market, they were obliged to find a market abroad for the produce of their farms to a greater extent than would have been the case had they not been subjected to competition from the American farmer. In the year 1878, before the National Policy was introduced, we imported into Canada 7,387,507 bushels of corn. I think my hon. friend did not give the figures correctly. Some will say that this is brought in for the distilleries. I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that during that year there were only 1,677,445 bushels brought in for the distilleries; so that the great bulk of this corn was brought in for feeding cattle and hogs and grinding into food. Now, the farmers felt that seriously. It was injuring the prices of their coarse grains, their pease, their oats, their barley, their buckwheat, and all those grains of that kind. After the National Policy was introduced the beneficial effects of it were felt very rapidly because the next year we find that instead of 7,000,000 bushels of corn being brought into Canada there were only 2,763,999 bushels, so that there were kept out 5,000,000 bushels in round figures by the National Policy. Will any one tell me that the keeping out of Canada of nearly six millions of bushels of corn intended for home consumption would not give the farmers a better market? Will any one contend that the National Policy did not give the farmer better prices for his other grains and for his corn? It seems to me that there is no person who has given any thought to the subject but who will admit that that competition was injurious to the Canadian farmer and detrimental to his best interests. What do we fear in all lines of life? It is competition. What is it that the farmer does not want from abroad? It is competition. He does not want competition from abroad any more than the manufacturer wants it. You have not only reduced the duty upon some of the industries directly interested, but in this one line you have taken the duty off entirely. The duty is of the same importance to the farmer as it is to the manufacturer of cloths, and to the manufacturer of agricultural implements. When you take the duty off the products of their industries you leave them open to the free and injurious competition

Mr. SPROULE

of United States manufacturers in their lines. So it is with the Canadian farmer. The last census that we have taken tell us that there are 647,000 people engaged in farming in Canada. These 647,000 farmers are quite able to supply the wants of Canadians in this particular line, and yet they have much less of protection on this product than the United States farmers, and when you took this duty off you brought them into direct competition with eight millions of farmers on the other side of the line. In my judgment, they do not want that nor are they asking for it to-day. Is there any person who will contend that it will not affect them injuriously if competition brings down the prices of manufactured lines. It must equally bring down the prices of farmers' products, and the more men there are engaged in farming and the more products there are in the same market, the more it must bring down prices. It is held by some that we require this corn because it will enable us to make more money out of some other pursuits of life. It is held that it will be an advantage to the feeder if he can bring in corn because he can feed his stock cheaper and make more money out of his beef and his hogs. It will be an advantage to some, but only to a very few. To ascertain how far it would or would not affect the farmers if corn were brought in for that purpose we have only to think for a moment that a fair proportion would be about two out of ten of the farmers of Canada who are fattening stock. The percentage in Canada to-day is about two out of ten. While it might benefit those two who, like my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), who fattens 100 head of cattle in a year, to the other eight it would be a disadvantage. There is no doubt about it, because eight out of every ten depend upon the coarse grains that they raise and the coarse grains that they sell largely for their return in the agricultural pursuits of life. They are not prepared to go into the feeding of stock, and there are two reasons for this. The first one is that they are not provided with suitable buildings, and the other is that they cannot lie out of their money long enough while waiting for the return which the feeding of stock would bring them in. As soon as their grain is grown and threshed it must be marketed to get the money required for the various demands of their homes, paying store bills, taxes and notes for agricultural implements. They require this money at the beginning of the winter and they are obliged to sell their grain to obtain it. But if they have to wait for the return from the feeding of stock it means that they must wait till spring and even beyond that till the summer season. Besides which, as I have said, they are not provided with buildings suitable for the feeding of cattle. Therefore, the majority of farmers depend upon another line of

life, and that line is the raising of coarse grains that are produced in such plentiful quantities in Canada. It may be said that we require this corn because we need it for feed. That is not the case. With our coarse grains which are quite as good for feed and very nearly as cheap, and of which we raise enough to supply all our wants, there is no reason why we should displace them by bringing in other grain. What was the result when we brought in seven million bushels of corn? The result was to displace the coarse grains of the Canadian farmer. There is only so much consumed and you cannot make the consumption very much more, and if what we raise at home is not consumed, and if what is raised abroad is consumed here a market must be found for the surplus of the production over the consumption. In the Trade and Navigation Returns I find that we have had an importation of corn to the extent of seven million bushels, which displaced the oats, pease and barley of the Canadian farmer. We had the same injurious competition in the line of meat. We found that the Americans were supplying the Canadian consumption of meats. In 1890 over thirty-three million pounds of meat came in. We raised the duty to shut that meat out. We raised it a little over half a cent a pound on fresh meat, and we shut the American product out. Was that any benefit to the Canadian farmer? The Canadian farmer got that market at home; he did not have to send his product abroad, and he had the additional profit which he saved on the transport, and which he would have lost if he had been obliged to send it out of the country to sell. It may be said that we are bringing in this corn for the distilleries, and that they are obliged to pay the duty upon it. But as long as we raise more than will supply the distilleries it is not likely that the distilleries are going to bring in corn and pay 7½ cents per bushel when they can buy it at home. But it is not about the distillers that I am concerned; I am concerned for the Canadian farmer who will be so injuriously affected by bringing in this corn. In the summer season in our part of the country, when freight rates are slack on the lake, steamboat owners will contract to bring corn from Chicago to Owen Sound or Collingwood for 1 cent a bushel. They usually bring it over at from 1 to 2 cents a bushel, but in the fall when freights are slow they will bring it in for 1 cent a bushel. If there is any margin over 1 cent a bushel between the price of corn in Chicago and the price in Canada there is no doubt that it will be brought here in large quantities and sold. If an American holding corn is not finding a ready sale for it in his own country and the price in Canada is 3 cents higher than in the United States, he will bring it into this country and make a profit of 2 cents a

bushel on it. It will be dumped down in Collingwood and Owen Sound as it was many years ago. Men who handle it there will run it down the railways, sell it to grain buyers along the line and the grain buyers will sell it to the feeders of stock. Now, when this is done, bushel after bushel of it will displace so many bushels of the Canadian farmer's coarse grains, and it will therefore affect our farmers injuriously to that extent. Of late years the price of coarse grains has been very low. It is said that it does not pay the Canadian farmers to raise such grain, and this condition of things will be greatly accentuated, if you allow thousands of bushels of a commodity that comes in from abroad, which can be utilized instead of our Canadian coarse grain. The consumption of coarse grains in Canada is limited to a certain quantity, and if you import from abroad the home product cannot be consumed. If we had a fair expression of the views of the Canadian farmers, I believe that seven-tenths, yes, eight-tenths of the farmers of Canada would be found not to want free corn. There are a few who do want free corn, but I believe I am perfectly safe in saying that eight-tenths of our farmers do not want it. It is an entirely mistaken idea to say that the farmers of Canada are in favour of this proposal. Let me ask: Who had the ear of the Government in regard to this? It was a few of their friends who are large cattle feeders and large stock feeders to whom it would be an advantage to have free corn, and who have been constantly pressing the matter on the attention of the Government. The great mass of the agricultural community of this country who make their living from raising coarse grains, have not been able to make their wants known to the Government as directly as these stock feeders and the result is, that the interests of the many have been sacrificed to the requirements of the few who will be benefited by this proposal. I am quite sure, that after a few years of free corn, it will be plain to every farmer and to every politician in Canada, that we will suffer from the competition of eight million farmers in the United States, who are direct producers in the line that half a million farmers in Canada are interested in. There are four or five manufacturers in the United States to every one in Canada, and if you abolish the duties on manufactured goods, tell me that it will not injure the manufacturers of this country. There is no one so insane as to deny such a proposition. And, if it will injure the manufacturer to make his products duty free, so it will injure the farmer, because while the one is a manufacturer of cottons and woollens, the other is the manufacturer, in a certain sense, of coarse grain, out of the sale of which he expects to make a livelihood. Now, let me ask, how many lines of products raised by the farmer do

you strike by abolishing the duty on corn. You strike at his article of oats, his articles of pease, his article of barley, and his article of corn. You strike him in four different directions, and in each one of these you injure him by allowing corn in duty free. Why should we do that injustice to the most deserving class in this country? I sincerely hope that the Government may reconsider this matter, and see that it would be in their interest, and in the interest of the Canadian farmers, to put the same duty on corn as was on it before. If the Government does not do this, they will find in a short time that the Canadian farmer is very seriously injured.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a representative of one of the ridings in the corn belt of Ontario, I feel called upon to say a few words in reference to the removal of the duty upon corn. There are fifteen ridings, I believe, in the province of Ontario that are interested in this question to a large extent, from the standpoint of being producers of corn, and the farmers of these fifteen ridings are naturally adverse to the admission of American corn free of duty, unless some compensating advantages accrue to them. So far as the question stands upon its own abstract merits, I do not know that I could take very strong ground against the free admission of corn. Of course, if we import large quantities of corn, that corn displaces a corresponding amount of coarse grains, but the corn will not be imported and the coarse grains displaced by the importation of corn, unless there is a profit in the exchange in the shape of the ability of the farmer, or the cattle feeder, to buy the corn at a less rate than he secures for the sale of his coarse grain. There is no question that there is a class of farmers who buy grain for feeding stock and hogs, and who would naturally be benefited by the admission of corn free of duty, from the United States. In my own experience, I bought corn last spring from twelve or fifteen different farmers for the purpose of feeding stock and hogs, and my operations as a farmer would have been benefited by the free admission of corn. I am not prepared, however, to say, that the twelve or fifteen farmers who sold corn to me would be benefited by the removal of the duty, and they would clearly be averse to the removal of that duty. It is a pretty nice question to decide, where the balance of profit and loss, so far as the entire agricultural community is concerned, will come in. The farmers of these fifteen ridings where corn is raised, and who have a surplus of corn to sell, naturally are opposed to the removal of the duty, and it is not in their interest to have that duty removed.

A good many arguments have been advanced here with regard to the use of American corn, which I deem to be quite fall-

Mr. SPROULE.

acious. For instance, the argument that it is calculated to deteriorate the quality of our pork is without foundation. Now, in these ridings where corn is produced, the pork is fattened upon corn, and no question is ever raised on the part of the buyers as to the quality of that pork. The great difference between the quality of Canadian and American pork rests, not so much upon the quality of the feed given to hogs, as it does upon the manner in which these hogs are handled, and the way in which these hogs are sold. The western farmer usually keeps his hogs until they are over a year old. His object is to sell to the purchaser, a drove of hogs that will weigh 300 pounds each.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, the object is to raise heavy hogs. The western farmer believes, when he gets his hogs at a certain age, that he can convert his corn into money by putting it into pork more profitably than in any other way. The mode of feeding these hogs is altogether different; they wallow in the prairie mud, and I myself have seen hogs in Iowa and in Illinois, fishing corn out of mud where I wondered how they could discover it at all. Now, the Canadian hogs are sold at a medium weight; they are sold when they are suitable for bacon. That is the prime consideration in the sale of Canadian hogs, and I repeat, that the hogs in these ridings where corn is raised are fed largely upon corn. The farmers there seldom think of feeding anything else except corn to their hogs, when fattening them. Therefore, that objection raised to the use of corn, is an objection which I do not think is of a very serious character.

Although coming from a corn raising riding, I have no special objection to placing corn upon the free list, so far as the interest of the farmers of Canada at large are concerned; and the objection that I do have to placing corn upon the free list, rests upon another basis altogether. I think that we are putting this grain upon the free list at an inopportune time. I think there is a consideration in connection with this matter, aside from the interest of the agriculturist. That matter that connects itself with this question is: The effect that this placing of corn upon the free list may have upon future negotiations between this country and the United States, for the remission or lowering of some of their agricultural restrictions. In giving to the Americans free corn, we are giving them something that is, in their estimation, an important concession, and we are giving them that concession without a quid pro quo. That is the particular objection, and the only objection, I have to the admission of American corn free of duty. In this connection it would not be far-fetched, nor foreign to the subject, to

refer very briefly to the condition of our trade relations with the United States, in order to illustrate the point I wish to make, that we ought not to give to those people a single concession which they might deem of value without receiving something in return. We imported from the United States last year, \$58,500,000 of products of various kinds; that is to say, 53 per cent of our total import trade. We gave to the Americans last year a free list of \$29,500,000, in round numbers. Upon this free list there was \$5,000,000 of manufactures. We paid to the United States last year, in addition to our export of coin and bullion, amounting to \$4,699,000, the sum of \$14,250,000. As a compensation for that free list of \$29,500,000 which we gave to them, we had last year free entry into the American market for about \$17,500,000 of our products. The Bill now under consideration in Congress strikes from that list forest products, hides, wool, and various other articles, reducing it to about \$5,000,000, while we give them a free list of about \$30,000,000. In other words, we give them six times the advantage which they give to us. In addition to the \$5,000,000 of manufactures which come into Canada from the United States, we buy from them \$22,000,000 worth of goods on which we pay duty, or \$27,000,000 in all. There is this large balance of trade against us. When we come to ask the Americans to permit us to pay for the products of their labour in the shape of manufactures which we purchase from them, with the products of our labour in the form of natural products which we wish to sell to them, how are we met? We are met by this new tariff, with its schedule of duties upon the products of our labour which we desire to exchange with the United States for the manufactures we purchase from them. We are required to pay on cattle valued at \$10 per head and upwards, \$6 per head; on hogs, \$1.50 per head; on horses and mules valued at \$150 or less, \$30 per head; on sheep, \$1.50 per head; barley, 30 cents a bushel, which is 125 per cent ad valorem on the present value of barley in our markets; on barley malt, 45 cents a bushel; on buckwheat, 15 cents a bushel; on corn, 15 cents a bushel; on corn meal, 20 cents a bushel; on oats, 15 cents a bushel; on rye, 10 cents a bushel; on wheat, 25 cents a bushel; on butter, 6 cents a pound; on beans, 40 cents a bushel; on cabbage, 3 cents a head; on hay, \$4 a ton; on potatoes, 25 cents a bushel; and this whole range of duties is calculated to be prohibitory. This refusal on the part of the United States, with our liberal trade arrangements towards them, to receive on terms of neighbourly comity the products of our labour, creates a condition of things in the highest degree unsatisfactory; and in view of these circumstances, I hold that to give the Americans free admission for their corn is granting to them a concession to

which they are not entitled. I hold that we ought to retain corn on the dutiable list until we can secure some consideration from the United States in return. That is a position which impresses me as being one of very great importance; and for that reason, while I reaffirm that the duty on corn, so far as the question stands upon its own merits, is not, in my opinion, a serious matter, or even detrimental to the country, yet I would not remove that duty, under the existing trade relations of these two countries, until the United States give us some consideration for the concession. Now, I know by experience that in the western states—in Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and in the other great corn states which are the centre of opposition to reciprocity in agricultural products between these two countries—the free admission of corn into the Canadian market is considered a matter of very great importance; and I know that the hostility of these western farmers to concessions which will admit, free of duty, the products of our soil into the American market, can be very largely reduced and to a great extent removed, by placing before those farmers the important consideration we have to give of permitting their corn to enter our markets free of duty. I know this from experience, from hundreds of instances in which I have discussed this question with American farmers. I know that in the great majority of cases these men say: "We will not object to give you free admission of hay, free admission of potatoes, and free admission of barley, in some cases, if you will give us the free admission of corn." Under these circumstances, it would be the part of thrift for us to hold this concession back until we can secure some quid pro quo for granting it, and I urge these considerations upon the Government. Not that I intend to oppose the policy of removing the duty on corn; but I intend to impress upon them the desirability of waiting before this step is taken until they can secure from that people some consideration. They are not a people who are in the habit of giving something for nothing; they are not specially liberal in their treatment of us; and I am not disposed to do anything which can result to their advantage unless we get something in return. I confess, though it may not be a Christian feeling, that I would rather suffer a little myself than to give them an advantage which they do not pay for. Consequently, I do not believe in putting corn on the free list just now.

Mr. MOORE. Before this clause in the tariff resolutions is disposed of, I wish to give expression to some views which I hold on this important question, and to state some reasons why I think we should not consent to take off the duty upon corn imported into this country from the United States. If I had

reason to believe that the farmers of Canada were in favour of free corn I would certainly not oppose it, but would vote for this resolution. I believe, however, that while there are some wealthy farmers who are feeding stock and may find it to their personal advantage to have the duty removed, the large majority are positively opposed to its renewal and to allowing corn to come in free, unless the United States will make an adequate concession for the favour we thus give their farmers. There are those who believe, and I presume they are correct, because they are practical farmers, that corn mixed with other grains would be a better feed, and therefore those who are fattening stock would prefer to have the privilege of importing their corn free of duty. I presume they are correct in holding that a mixed feed is better, but what is there to prevent their using Canadian corn? Why cannot we have corn raised in the Dominion instead of sending for it to the United States and bringing it in free of duty to compete with the home grown corn of the Canadian farmers? They reply that we cannot get sufficient corn in Canada, but it seems to me, with a country as large as ours, with a population of five million people, with a land area of 3,500,000 square miles, with a good climate and a fertile soil, we ought to be able to raise sufficient for our own use, and to hold the contrary is to discredit the intelligence and enterprise of the people of this country. I am convinced that with proper protection, even in Ontario alone, we could raise all the corn required and at moderate prices. I know something about the importations of corn from Ontario into the province of Quebec, where we do not raise as much as we desire to have. Corn has been laid down in the eastern townships of the province of Quebec, and not at competitive railway points either, at 28½ cents per bushel free of freight, and the wealthy farmer who will complain because he has to pay 28½ cents for corn laid down at his door is not the patriotic citizen that a good and wealthy farmer ought to be. It has been said, with greater force of expression than I am capable of, that free corn would interfere very largely with the price of home-grown grain, and I shall not try to lend my force to that argument because it is too apparent to be denied. There is another item in the resolutions applying to the grain which the distillers use, and on which they are called upon to pay a duty of 7½ cents per bushel on corn imported for their use, but they will have every opportunity of evading payment of this duty. What is there to prevent their going round the province of Ontario and buying up all the Canadian corn and then letting the dealers import from the United States. In that way the Government would lose the duty, and the distillers would receive great benefit from a Government

Mr. MOORE.

which is supposed to be in favour of temperance and prohibition. Another objection to free corn is that it is calculated to strike a fatal blow at the National Policy. It is calculated to strike a heavy blow at the protective system of this country, which has been of such incalculable benefit to the people in building up our various industries and placing us in an advantageous position amongst the peoples of the world. By protection we have been enabled to advance more rapidly than any other nation in the last eighteen years, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may say against the National Policy. Previous to 1878 many petitions went into Parliament from the farmers asking for protection upon breadstuffs, including corn. Their prayer was refused by the Government of that day, but the Government which succeeded under the leadership of the late Sir John Macdonald granted their request, and since then breadstuffs have borne a duty. Now, let me give the House a few figures, which will show the effect that the National Policy has had upon the importation of American breadstuffs. In 1878, when these breadstuffs were imported free of duty, barley, oats, pease, beans, corn, cornmeal, wheat, wheat flour rye and rye flour came into this country from the United States to the amount of \$13,446,960. In 1894 that amount was reduced to \$1,000,862, showing a difference in favour of the Canadian farmer of \$12,446,000. At that rate per year, our protective tariff furnished our farmers in the past eighteen years with a market of over \$200,000,000. Let me ask if it was not an advantage to our farming community to have a protective tariff on breadstuffs, when that protection gave them a market to the extent of over \$200,000,000 during the time it was in force. Take the article of corn alone. We imported into Canada in 1878 \$3,535,619 worth of corn. But after the duty was imposed upon American corn, that importation was reduced to \$683,677 in one year, leaving \$2,851,742 as the value of the market which our farmers supplied instead of foreign producers. At that rate, this market in eighteen years amounted to about \$50,000,000. Was that an advantage to this country? Were not our people better off in having this market for their own home-grown grain than if it were controlled and supplied by a foreign country? Then, take for a moment the article of pork. Up to 1890 we had a tariff for revenue on that article, but in that year our farmers asked for protection and the Government increased the duty upon pork, with this result, that while under the tariff of 1890 we imported \$1,458,286 worth, in 1891, after the imposition of the protective duty, the imports were reduced to \$309,436, being a reduction in one year of \$1,148,850, and at the same time our exports of pork were increased by \$3,943,000, making a difference of over \$5,000,000 in favour of our farmers owing to

the increased trade stimulated by a protective tariff as compared with a tariff for revenue.

One word more in regard to these petitions. These petitions are circulated through the country, they were presented to the Government, and, in 1878, they had the desired effect, and the Government granted the prayer of the farmers. And since that time until the present, there has never been a petition presented to Parliament asking that the duties be taken off breadstuffs; and I think it would be the height of impropriety for the people's representatives to remove the duty in the interest of the farmers, who are not asking for it and who did ask for protection and allow the admission of corn grown in the United States free of duty, where it can be grown so cheaply that they use it to burn. They raised last year about 2,100,000,000 bushels of corn, and it is of the greatest importance to them that they should get a market for their surplus. After the people of Canada have been treated as they have been by the Government of the United States we are asked to concede to the United States a privilege which is of the utmost importance to them and that will be injurious to this country. While I am opposed on general grounds and as a practical question to corn being admitted free of duty, because it comes into competition with the home grown grain of the farmers, and discourage them in an industry in which they ought to be encouraged, there are other important considerations that would induce me to vote against corn being admitted free into this country from the United States. That reason is the attitude of the American people and the American Government in connection with the commercial relations that exist between the two countries. They are not entitled to any consideration of this kind after the unfair treatment we have received at their hands. Since 1847 over a score of applications have been made by the leading men of this country to the Government of the United States for reciprocal trade regulations between us, but in no case except one have the natural products of Canadian soil been admitted into the United States free of duty, and in that exceptional case they repealed the duty as soon as they could legally do it. Why did they do this? They can tell their own story. It was not so much because they cared for the favour that they thought they were doing to the people of Canada that they withheld commercial treaties from Canada. But they prevented the people of Canada from sending into that country the produce of their soil, they denied us free access to their markets thinking that they could thereby force us into annexation, thinking that they could thereby compel Canada to renounce its allegiance to the British Crown and become part and parcel of the American union. As proof of this I will take a few moments of the time of this House to read

some of the expressions of sentiment by the leading men of the United States. In 1891, James G. Blaine, who was then Secretary of State for the United States, in answer to a letter which was written to him, made this statement:

There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government.

Speaking at Calais, Maine, in August, 1888, Mr. Blaine said:

Beyond the frontier, across that river, our neighbours choose another Government, another allegiance. They are subjects of Queen Victoria; they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to give to the Canadian the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come with us, they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens, that millions of men who hold the United States no allegiance, who have no part nor lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us—it is an absolute wrong for a Democratic Congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have.

And here is a statement made by President Lane, of the Boston Merchant's Association, a few years ago:

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

The whole region of Canada will, when this commercial union is established, become as if she were so many vast territories added to our domain, and up and down a continent the world will see the result of an unrestricted trade in all that continent produces, natural or manufactured.

There was an answer given to that by an hon. gentleman who is in this House tonight, who said:

Briefly, Sir, if this project can be carried out, it will mean for you the addition of half a continent for commercial purposes and the creation of a complete new tier of northern states, with an enormous area of unoccupied fertile land, with very great mineral resources, with a present population of some 5,000,000, but with a capacity of maintaining fully 50,000,000 and the certainty (in such a contingency) of a very rapid increase, which population—and I hold this is no small matter—is essentially in character the same as your own, with much the same habits, customs, and prejudices even.

An hon. MEMBER. Who said that?

Mr. MOORE. I think it is set down to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce

(Sir Richard Cartwright). I have not much fault to find with the sentiment.

Mr. Blaine said again :

If Canadians want to get the advantage of the American markets, it must be by becoming American citizens.

And General Benjamin F. Butler said :

Canada is blubbering for a reciprocity treaty. Let her blubber until she is willing to join the union.

Senator Carlisle said :

I am in favour of commercial union, because it will bring Canada under our flag.

Senator Depew said :

I am in favour of it because it will advance the stars and stripes from Niagara Falls to the North Pole.

Mr. Bullock, the President of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, said :

The ready road to reciprocity with our neighbours—to accept Sir Richard Cartwright as senator from the state of Ontario.

But we do not want to spare him from this country. The leader of the present Government, Mr. Laurier, said at the Liberal banquet in Montreal :

The policy of the Liberal party can be expressed in two words—unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

And he said also “he hoped to be able to conciliate the United States if there was a change of Government.”

Now, it takes all that Canada has to give, if it takes all these concessions to conciliate the United States and make them friendly to this country. I think we had better try to get along without the United States and depend more upon our own resources and upon our own energy. We have the carrying out of that policy in the Alien Labour Bill, and in yesterday's “Witness” I find a despatch from Washington, that Senator Tillman, a man of great prominence in the United States, has given notice of an amendment that he will offer to the tariff Bill providing for a head tax of \$100 on all immigrants to the United States. The amendment also makes it a misdemeanour punishable by a fine and imprisonment for a person to enter the United States to labour without intending to become a citizen.

Why, Sir, should such become law, it would take a hundred dollars to get a man from Canada into the United States. I believe that, according to their laws, they admit hogs into the United States very much cheaper than they do one of the citizens of this country. We find that they are not commercially friendly to this country, and I hope the time is past when we shall get down upon our knees and supplicate them for commercial favours that they have refused us for the last fifty years, with only one exception. In passing this Alien Labour Bill which would exclude Canadians from

Mr. MOORE.

that country, they take them by the shoulders and turn them around and thrust them back across the line unless they will renounce their allegiance to their queen and country. They have forgotten that less than two years ago when they were trying to raise a large amount of gold, they borrowed from this country, from our banking institutions, \$25,000,000. They have forgotten more than that, they have forgotten that in the valuation of the United States which amounted to \$65,000,000,000 according to the census of 1890, 10 per cent and more of that value was supplied by English capitalists. Notwithstanding that, they will take a subject of the British Crown who wants to enter that country, by the collar and thrust him back across the line, unless he is willing to forswear his allegiance and become a citizen of the United States. More than that, they have forgotten that during their civil war, 40,000 brave Canadian sons enlisted in the American army to help preserve the union, when it was attacked by the enemies of the stars and stripes. They have forgotten that 20,000 of Canada's brave sons perished upon the battlefield or in their hospitals, while in the service of the United States government; and still they will take Canadians by the collar and thrust them back when they attempt to enter that country. I believe, Sir, it is time for us to wake up and to show them that the people of Canada are a self-reliant people. Let us prove to them that though the United States may raise their tariff from nadir to zenith, so high that the birds cannot fly over it, still we can exist, and Canada prosper without any commercial favours from the people of that country. We have, Sir, another reason, we have a country as great as the United States, we have a country whose climate is as good and soil as fertile. We have greater wealth in our forests, we have greater wealth in our fisheries, and when the mines of this country are more developed, I think it will not take very long to convince the people of the United States, aye, and of the whole world, that we have as great a quantity of the precious metals as any country under the sun. But we have more than that, we have five millions of Canadians, an enterprising people, who will compare more than favourably with the same number of inhabitants of the United States. It is time for us to assert our commercial independence and to show the people of the United States that we are made of stuff that cannot be brow-beaten. More than that, we can tell them that we belong to the grandest Empire under the sun, without parallel amongst the nations of the world, an Empire that rules over one-sixth of the earth's surface, and controls one-third of its commerce. More than that, we are soon to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of a Queen who stands at the head of all earthly sovereigns, and reigns over the greatest and grandest Empire that the world has ever known.

Mr. STENSON. I had not intended to take any part in this discussion, thinking that it should be left to the old and experienced members, and particularly to practical farmers. But since my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Moore) has given us his idea with regard to free corn, I must say that my first feeling was one of immense surprise. I think my hon. friend from Stanstead is the only representative from that section of the country who is against free corn. Now, Mr. Chairman, during my election, the question of free corn was discussed, and the hon. member for Stanstead will perhaps be surprised to hear that it was my adversary, the National Policy man, who brought up the question and declared that he was in favour of free corn. In 1894, I think it was, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), who represents a fine farming constituency, was in favour of free corn, and pressed it upon the Conservative Government, and believed that he had some chance of success. But his opinion, and the opinions of all the other members from my section of the country, with the exception of the hon. member for Stanstead, are certainly in favour of free corn, because we are a dairying community, and a dairying community wants free corn. But I can easily understand now why the hon. member from Stanstead is against free corn; he has given us the secret which impels him to oppose anything free. In the first place, it would be a shame to admit that, in our immense country, we cannot raise corn enough.

An hon. MEMBER. We do not raise cotton, either.

Mr. STENSON. Well, I will just mark that down, that if it is a shame not to be able to raise corn, it is perhaps just as big a shame not to be able to raise cotton.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. STENSON. Why not, what is the difference? Is it not the climate that makes the difference? I think that you will admit that it is the climate, and if that is the cause, then it is no shame for us not to have a climate suitable for raising corn, particularly as our friends to the south of us are raising corn for us, and raise it very cheaply, if we only will give up this National Policy and not make it dear by our own fault. More than that, Mr. Chairman, the Government, it is said, will raise less duty if we allow this corn in free, because our farmers will furnish their corn to the distillers. Well, let our farmers furnish corn to the distillers and get all the benefit that they can out of it; but if the Controller of Customs is not clever enough to prevent them from cheating him out of the duty, then we will call upon him to be more attentive to his business the next time. But the great trouble with the member for Stanstead is that it will be a blow at the

National Policy. Now, I have no sympathy with him in that feeling, that is no reason why I should be against the admission of free corn. On the contrary, if it proves to be a blow against the National Policy, that is one of the reasons why I should be glad to see corn admitted free. It will be a mortal stroke to the National Policy, which will die in the due course of time. On the other hand, I do not mean to say that we want to kill it outright at present, but the time will come when this protective tariff must be done away with.

Mr. CLANCY. Do you want oats free?

Mr. STENSON. We are on corn just now, we will be satisfied if corn is admitted free. Now, what is the reason of all this patriotic display of eloquence on the part of my hon. friend from Stanstead about the attitude of the Americans? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman appears to think that it is just to please our friends across the line that we want corn to come in free. We have not the slightest desire to please them at our expense; on the contrary, we want that corn free. Who is it that wants the corn? The farmers want the corn; they want to use the corn; they are the ones who use the corn. I will treat the question in a moment in a more serious manner, after we get through with the patriotic part of it. Not only has this corn brought us into a discussion of annexation and of what all the presidents and all the would-be presidents of the United States said, but we have been reminded that 40,000 of our brave Canadian lads went over there and fought for those Americans. And we have been asked to believe by the hon. member that if these 40,000 had not gone over the stars and stripes would have been swept off the face of the earth. At all events, these 40,000 were brave men. After we get a little more numerous, and after we are allowed to bring in their corn free, we will send them enough to bring them over and annex them to us. We will send 400,000 or 500,000 of our boys to annex them instead of them annexing us. An hon. member made the assertion that there were 7,000,000 bushels of corn imported into Canada in a certain year. If that were so, what became of the statement that only one-fifth of the farmers of Canada wanted this corn? It has been said that only two out of ten farmers wanted corn for fattening purposes. It struck me that this was a most remarkable statement to make that only one-fifth of the farmers wanted free corn. One-fifth out of 7,000 would give us 1,400 farmers for 7,000,000 bushels of corn, or to each farmer 5,000 bushels. This is a little too much and there must be a mistake in the hon. gentleman's calculation. It may be that there are only two out of ten who fatten cattle, but that is no reason for believing that there are not a great many other farmers who use corn,

not to fatten cattle but in dairying, and who require that corn to fatten their pork and to raise their young cattle. When we could send our young cattle to England, when there was no embargo on them, it was not so necessary as it is now to have them fattened. But at present we cannot go on with that business, as it is necessary that they should be slaughtered upon their arrival in Great Britain. Therefore, we must fatten them in this country. In my part of the country there is not one farmer out of ten who will not say that he wants free corn as cheap as he can get it to fatten their cattle and raise their young stock. I am going to be brief because I expect that there will be some more experienced and older members to take this question up. But I will just mention this fact that our exports in grain are not increasing, and our exports in beef are increasing. What we want to increase more than this is our exports of butter and cheese and to succeed in dairying we want to be permitted to get that corn in free. Some hon. gentlemen are afraid that this is going to spoil the quality of our pork. For the information of these hon. gentlemen I will say that there is not a farmer in my section who would pretend to fatten his pork wholly upon corn. It is merely an accessory to the mixed feed of the cattle and hogs. There is not one farmer in my section who would pretend to fatten hogs wholly on corn and there is not one out of one hundred who would not be in favour of getting free corn.

Mr. TISDALE. So far I have not found any part of the tariff brought before the House but what has been fully discussed by gentlemen upon both sides of the House to give the House and the country every view that might possibly be expressed. Upon this occasion I apprehend the discussion has been somewhat full, but, at the same time, there are some circumstances connected with this question of free corn that, representing, as I do, an agricultural constituency, I would feel that I was somewhat short in my duty even at this late hour of the session if I did not give expression to the sentiments that I believe affect my constituents. In doing so, and before I enter upon this particular question I desire to say this, that, so far as this Government, composed as it is of gentlemen opposed to me in politics, and opposed to the Government and the party that I have during the time I have been in the House supported, have risen above any question of party or have displayed the courage necessary to a renunciation of principles whatever hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may have said—whenever they do so for the benefit of this country. I want to congratulate them. It takes a great deal of courage for hon. gentlemen belonging to any party or leading any party, to take a course different, perhaps, on any occasion,

Mr. STENSON.

to that which they advocated before, and I am one of those though identified with party and though believing that party government in this country is the best government, on the whole, that we can get, commend the courage of those who rise above any question of party when they have responsibility upon their shoulders and when they believe that their course is the best in the interest of the country. Now, I want to say, on this point, that, notwithstanding that I am opposed to them, notwithstanding that I am identified with a party opposed to them; insofar as they do this they shall have my support whether my party agree with me or not. With that short introduction, I will proceed to the question. I might have made it more lengthened if it were not that I do not want, for one moment, to detain the committee or to prolong the session of this House which I think, with opportunities all proper criticism should be closed as soon as possible, in the interest, not only of the members of this House, but of the country. I want to draw attention for a few moments to this important question, and in doing it I want to say that I am against this proposal of free corn, and that I agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I will even go with my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) in saying, that in return for a proper consideration we should admit corn free of duty from the United States, though I might differ with him as to what would be a proper consideration, and I am entirely in accord with him, that this policy is unjustifiable when we get no reciprocal return for it. In view of the fact that the hon. member for the north riding of Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in asserting his duty as the representative of the people, joins issue with his party on this question, I would be derelict in my duty, if I, elected as a Conservative, did not express my opinion. I take issue with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stenson) who has just spoken, and who represents an agricultural constituency, when he says, that 100 to one of the farmers of the country are in favour of free corn, and I tell him that, on the contrary, there is not one in a hundred who approve of this proposal of the Government. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have always shown that I was prepared to go against the individual interests of my riding, if the interests of South Norfolk were antagonistic to the interests of the Dominion as a whole. In the present instance, Sir, I contend that the interests of my constituents and the interests of the farming population of Canada generally, are identical, and these interests are opposed to free corn. Since these gentlemen opposite got into power I am more hopeful of the future of Canada, than I was before, judging from their tactics when in Opposition. According to our light, and honest convictions, as proved yesterday, nearly all

the members of the Conservative party stood up to support a proposition made by the Government, while 20 or 30 of their own supporters opposed them. That, Sir, is a proof that the Conservative party in Opposition are willing to advocate any measures, no matter from what party they come, that we believe to be in the best interests of Canada. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to live up to the spirit evinced by the Conservative members of this House. This policy proposed by the Government does not hit at Indian corn alone, but it means an injury to all the coarse grains grown by the farmers of this Dominion. Our oats, our inferior grades of barley, our pease, and other such grains will be struck at by free corn. In my opinion it means the loss of millions of dollars to the farmers of Canada, and in all sincerity I ask the Government to reconsider their position and to retrace their steps. If this should come to a vote, I appeal to the Liberal members of this House, who represent constituencies more largely interested in this question than the people of North Norfolk; I ask them to emulate the example of my hon. confrère (Mr. Charlton), and to oppose free corn, if they believe it to be for the benefit of Canada they should do so. We see here to-night, the hon. member (Mr. Charlton), who always stands by his party in season, and sometimes, as we on this side of the House think, out of season; we see him fearlessly express his opinions on this question. As far back as 1891 I said, that if the Liberal party could only get over their platform speeches, if they could only agree to endorse the principle of protection to Canadian industries, and protection of Canadian farmers, they would then have a chance to attain power, and to remain in power after they did attain it. I state here to-night with all the responsibility that attaches to the statement, that I am more interested in the progress and development of Canada than I am in the welfare of the Conservative party. I am a protectionist, a moderate protectionist, and representing an agricultural constituency, I have never made any secret of it. I believe that the farmers of Canada should be protected, and I am glad to say that with the exception of the matter of free corn, the present Government are protecting the farmers upon their products. I shall not charge hon. gentlemen opposite with adopting the Conservative policy. I do not care whether it is ours or theirs, so long as it is a policy that will tend to make Canada, in this Jubilee year, the right arm of the British Empire as she undoubtedly is, I will support that policy. I will not charge hon. gentlemen opposite with stealing our clothes, but so long as they protect our farming and manufacturing industries I will support them in that. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they wish to pursue a policy which will be beneficial to the farmers of this country, they will strike this item out of

the tariff and restore the duty on corn to what it was before. I make this appeal to them in very good company, from a Liberal standpoint, when my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) makes the same appeal. Between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) and myself many sharp passages have occurred in the past, but I compliment him on the stand he has taken in this matter. I shall express publicly, as I have privately, the opinion that hon. gentlemen opposite are in a position to convince the people of the United States on certain questions which we on this side of the House, probably, could not convince them on. I am not going to say any unpleasant things in regard to what they have done in the past or in regard to what we claim we are doing. They have had the courage to show the American people the position in which we stand. I agree with them that it would be a calamity to have any disturbance with the people of that great republic. As we have always said on this side of the House, and as I have always strongly felt, it is in the best interest of this country and in the best interest of the Empire, that we should live on the best relations we can with our neighbours to the south, but at the same time we should let them understand that they cannot, by unfriendly legislation or unfriendly talk or threats, intimidate a free people like the people of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had an opportunity—and I congratulate them upon taking advantage of that opportunity—for showing the American people that the people of Canada, Reformers and Conservatives alike, though we are only 5,000,000 to 65,000,000, are a people who, with the blood of two courageous races, the Norman and the Anglo-Saxon, in their veins, will not be intimidated or driven. I congratulate them, and I wish to say to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that I am glad to stand side by side with him in this matter, and I will follow in the footsteps of the proposition he makes, which I believe to be for the best interests of this country. I say the time is opportune for letting the American people know that unless we get a good consideration in return, we are not going to open our doors to free corn. This question is a business question; and I wish to say to the hon. member for North Norfolk that as a Conservative I am prepared, against every man on this side of the House if necessary—though I do not think it would be necessary—to join with him in saying that when the American people will give us a fair equivalent, we shall be willing to make concessions to them. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite—and I am giving them this advice against the interests of my party—that the best politics they can adopt for keeping themselves in power is to join in the sentiments the hon. member for North Norfolk has expressed. I know

these Americans ; I have had associations with them ; and if they find that you truckle to them, or that you are not alive to your own interests, they will treat you as they think you ought to be treated ; but if you show them that you are ready, in a commercial sense, to deal blows to them if they deal blows to you, they will respect you. I am glad to oppose this motion. In this crisis of our history, I say the Liberal party should join with us, and with the hon. member for North Norfolk in saying to the United States : " We do not wish to get anything from you for which we do not give you a fair equivalent ; if you want your people to come into our country to labour, as all free people should, we want our people to have the same right in your country ; we are a great, broadminded British people, who do not want any compulsion, and if you attempt to put compulsion upon us, you will find that the spirit of the French as well as the English will revolt against it, and that you cannot compel us by that sort of conduct." I say I am very glad to see the hon. member for North Norfolk take the position he has taken to-night, Liberal as he is ; and many of my party have thought him extremely Liberal. But I am glad to see that modern Liberalism, Liberalism in power, Liberalism under the responsibilities which this side of the House had for eighteen years, is prepared to say to the United States : " Unless you consider us, we must in our own self-defence consider ourselves." One word as to the largeness of this issue. I do not want to quote statistics. Hon. members of this House on both sides are well posted on this matter, because I take for granted that they read the various statistics, and understand the importance of the question of Indian corn as well as I do. But in that question is involved the question of all our coarse grains ; and the question is whether we are going to have the cheap corn of the western states, which is almost given away, coming into Canada and driving out not only our Indian corn, but our other coarse grain. Therefore I protest against this motion as against the spirit of the tariff which hon. gentlemen have brought down. I compliment them on the courage which they have shown in protecting the interests of the farmers to the extent to which they have done : and I appeal to them to rise above party feelings, as I have tried to do, and to follow the example set by the hon. member who represents the North Riding of my county. I appeal to them in their own interests, because I would rather see them continue in power than see the best interests of this country suffer even temporarily by a mistaken action on their part on this important question.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I do not intend to detain the House more than a single moment. I

Mr. TISDALE.

simply desire to state that the farmers of my county are almost a unit in favour of free corn. I have not yet met one man in my county who has said a single word in opposition to it. They look upon this feature of the tariff as a great boon. Most of our farmers depend on the raising of stock and in making butter and cheese, and they find it desirable that they should get this cheap corn. They look upon it as a raw material, and they sell their product and make money by the exchange. I feel confident that the farmers of my county would consider it a great boon if this proposal carried. I shall not longer detain this House, but felt it was my duty, on behalf of my constituents, to tell the House that they are in favour of free corn. At a public meeting held in my constituency for the special purpose of discussing this question, there was only one individual, and he was not a farmer, who dissented from the otherwise unanimous expression of opinion in favour of placing corn upon the free list.

Mr. McMILLAN. In rising to take a hand in this important debate, one of the most important that can engage the attention of this House, I wish to say at the outset that the farmers of this country stand pitted against the farmers of the rest of the world, and the farmers who can produce at the cheapest rate are those who will best succeed in the markets of the world. Let me say that I protest against party feeling being introduced into a discussion of this kind, and express my regret that a motion of such magnitude and importance to the people of this country, cannot be discussed except in a party spirit. We, the farmers of Canada, stand at a great disadvantage in having to feed our cattle upon the coarse grains of our own country, and I think before I am through that I shall give such evidence in favour of admitting corn duty free that must convince any impartial member of this House, and that certainly cannot possibly be questioned. As far as Indian corn is concerned, although the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has stated that Ontario raises a sufficient quantity for her own use, his statement is not borne out by the facts, because when we look into the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that during the last year of which we have a report over 3,000,000 bushels of Indian corn were imported into this country and only 9,000 bushels exported. It is evident from those figures that Canada does not raise sufficient corn for her own use. The farmers of this country are as intelligent as those of any other country in the civilized world, and know best what is in their own interests. It has been said that we can successfully raise corn in almost every county of Ontario. Such is not the case. In the very county

I represent, one of the largest farming counties in the province of Ontario, and the one which sends the largest amount of cattle to the English market, we cannot successfully raise corn so as to ripen sufficiently to be made into meal, but we can raise ensilage and that very successfully. This talk about free corn displacing our coarse grains and reducing the prices is not at all borne out by the facts. Why, hon. gentlemen opposite could not have taken a better succession of years than they did to show the contrary. They took the years from 1878 to 1881 and they pointed to the fact that in 1878, 8,000,000 bushels of corn were imported into this country for home consumption. Well, what was the condition with respect to coarse grains during that year? They neglected to go to the root of their own argument and show that the prices of our coarse grains were lowered by the large quantities imported of Indian corn. Why, when the largest amount of Indian corn was brought into this country and entered for consumption was the year when our coarse grains brought the highest prices. I can prove that as I have done it already. I am happy to be able to state that there is not a single farmer of standing who has risen in this House and opposed free corn. It is all very well for the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore), who is a manufacturer, to tell us how the poor farmer would be benefited and how he would be injured. Why does he not take the same position with regard to cotton that he does with regard to corn? Why does he not oppose the admission of cotton free of duty? He does not because it is the raw material of his manufactures and cannot be raised in Canada. In like manner corn is the raw material of the farmer and cannot be raised to a sufficient amount in Canada. To be consistent, therefore, the hon. member for Stanstead ought to support this motion to allow corn in free of duty. In 1878, when we imported 8,000,000 bushels of corn, what was the result with respect to our coarse grains? There is a report in the library and I know that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) if he thought that report would have borne out his contention, would have quoted it in this House long ago because he must have read it. But he knows well that it will not bear out the argument he has submitted to this House regarding the reduction in prices of our coarse grain, which, he says, is bound to follow the importation of a large quantity of Indian corn. In 1878 we got 11¼ cents more per bushel for our oats than the price ruling in Chicago. We also got for our barley 15 cents more per bushel than the Chicago price, and in that year, which was two years before the National Policy was introduced, we imported 8,000,000 bushels of corn. Two years later, in 1881, when the duty was put on, and we imported only

2,000,000 bushels, the price of oats in Toronto was only 2 cents per bushel over the price in Chicago, and barley, instead of being 15 cents higher in Canada than in Chicago, as it was in 1878, was 17 cents lower, although in 1881 we imported a much smaller quantity of corn. This shows clearly that the importation of a large quantity of corn did not lower the prices of our coarse grains. But let us take an international view of this question, and we must see that if the American corn does not come to Canada, it will meet our coarse grains in the British markets. In case, however, one year should not be deemed sufficient to prove an argument of that description, let me take the five years before the National Policy was imposed, and when we consumed on an average 5,581,000 bushels of Indian corn per year. What was the result as regards our coarse grains during that period? Why, our oats were selling 2½ cents higher than after the National Policy was imposed and when our consumption of corn was reduced to an average of 1,321,000 bushels per year. Our barley was selling at an average of 75 cents per bushel during the five years before the National Policy was imposed, while it was only 71 cents on an average three years later, showing conclusively that the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the effect of the importation of Indian corn free on the prices of our coarse grains is not borne out by the facts. I defy any one of these hon. gentlemen to show that such was the effect, and I point them to this report which I have mentioned, and which was got up for the very purpose of showing the effect the National Policy had upon the agricultural industries of the Dominion. And it showed the very reverse of what those who had the commission appointed expected that it would show. I take a bushel of fall wheat, a bushel of oats, a bushel of barley, a ton of hay, a ton of straw, a pound of wool, and 100 pounds of pork. For all these in October a year before the National Policy, we received \$41.28. Three years afterwards for the same articles we received only \$31.28. This shows that the National Policy did not benefit the farmers by improving the prices of their products. As a farmer, I state positively that we can produce better and we can do better when we get Indian corn to assist in our feeding. Let me give a statement that was made by one of the largest exporters of cattle in the province of Ontario. The question has often been asked why it is that beef cattle from the United States sell at higher prices in the British market than the Canadian cattle do. Let me give the opinion of one of the best known exporters in Canada:

The abolition of the duty on corn would be one of the greatest blessings to the farmers that I know of. The duty was supposed to protect Can-

adian oats, but if a farmer here was able to get feeding corn at, say, 40 cents a bushel, there would be no better grains for fattening purposes. The corn-fed American bullock from the west will dress 100 pounds of beef more than on but bullock of the live weight. Because of that, Canadian exporters are greatly handicapped in the English market, since the American exporter practically lands 100 pounds of beef free by the difference in the cattle; he has a start of \$6 or \$7 on us to commence with.

There is a statement that shows that the American farmer in the west feeding his bullocks entirely upon corn has an advantage over us of \$7 per animal—that is, of 100 pounds of dressed beef—in the British market. I dare any gentleman to contradict that statement. I am prepared to show by the results of experiments that corn is one of the very best feeds that can be obtained. The facts that I shall quote are established by experiment, and they are bald official statements of results. Gentlemen may make statements and try to set forth their ideas in a very forcible manner that by withdrawing Indian corn it gives the farmer market for his coarse grains, but it will have the same effect as had the duty on wheat when it fell in Canada 48 cents, while it only fell 24 cents in the United States. I have here the statement of results of a few experiments made with respect to feeding animals with different grains. The first I shall quote are the results of an experiment made at the Guelph Agricultural College in the year 1881-82. It was an experiment of feeding pease, oats and corn. When corn was the principal feed it took 48-10th pounds of feed to increase the weight of the animal a single pound; when pease were the main feed, it took 52-10th pounds of feed to a pound to the weight of the animal, or nearly half a pound more than in the case of corn. In oats it took 58-10th pounds. Estimating them all at 1 cent per pound, corn comes out ahead of all the others. In the case of a single animal the cost of feed was: corn, \$20.75; pease, \$22.50, and oats, \$25.10. Thus you see that in the feeding of an animal during the winter there was a saving of \$1.75 in feeding corn as against pease, and \$4.35 in feeding pease as against corn. But when you take a hundred of cattle you find that the result shows that \$1.75 in favour of corn as against pease, and \$4.25 as against oats. Will it not, then, pay any farmer in Canada who intends to feed animals, to sell a portion of his own coarse grains and purchase corn to supplement his feed? Lest I forget it, let me say that no farmer who knows about the feeding will feed hogs with corn and pease alone, but I will show that corn feed is the best staple feed, if the experiments can be depended upon. In 1883-84 an experiment was made at the Ontario Agricultural College with twenty-one head of cattle. With cornmeal as feed it took feed to the value of 8 cents to increase the live weight of the animal one

Mr. McMILLAN.

single pound. What pease were used it took 11½ cents worth of feed, and when oats were used it took 10½ cents worth, showing again conclusively that corn is the most profitable and cheapest food that we can use. And, remember, these experiments took place when there was a duty on corn of 7½ cents, and all the other grains were free. This is not a fair statement of what the results would be with corn coming into this country free of duty. Now, we were told that there was not a single county in Ontario in which the farmers were willing to have free corn. We have heard from one or two of them to-night. The statement was made here in the name of the people of Frontenac that only a few butchers and millers would benefit by free corn. But I have a statement from the Farmers' Institute of the county of Frontenac in which the statement was made that the people to be benefited were the lumbermen. And was this motion brought up by a farmer? No; it was brought up by a medical gentleman, but the farmers sat on him by an overwhelming majority, and voted that corn should come in free. Now, I have here the report of an experiment made by Prof. Robertson at the Agricultural College in Guelph in relation to the fattening of hogs. He experimented with feeding on cornmeal and salt, barley-meal, middlings and salt, pease-meal and salt, middlings, middlings and rape ensilage. And how did the experiment come out? I will just give the statement from the official report:

On August 9th, 16 hogs were separated into three pens, containing 6, 5 and 5, respectively. They were divided to be as near alike as possible in age, size and breeding. None of them were pure breed, though most of them showed Berkshire or Chester white points. They were all fed on middlings only, with salt and water, and were allowed as much as they could eat, being fed three times a day. The middlings were mixed with the cold water in the troughs immediately before the time of feeding.

This was to put the animals in an equal condition before the experiment commenced. Now, we have an experiment which was tried from the 30th of September to the 12th of October, with the result that it took 4.74 pounds of cornmeal to increase the weight on an animal a single pound; it took 4.84 pounds of pease-meal to increase the live weight of an animal one pound; and it took 4.57 pounds of barley and middlings to increase the weight of an animal one pound. Now, after these animals had been fattened they were slaughtered. After they were slaughtered they were all examined, and what was the result of that examination? Why, Sir, as far as colour was concerned:

One hog of each lot was cut through in front of the shoulders, behind the shoulders and in front of the ham. It was intended to photograph these sections, had the difference between the proportions of fat and lean from the different kinds of feed been decidedly apparent. The dif-

ference would not have been evident to the eye from an exact photograph. A few of the notes made on the spot are transcribed here :

Cornmeal fed.—Lean meat, rather brighter than the others ; equal to the pease-meal fed in firmness and proportion of fat and lean ; lard more chalky in shade than others.

Pease-meal fed.—The colour of the lean meat hardly so bright as the cornmeal fed.

Barley-meal and middlings fed.—Colour of the lean meat rather pale ; larger proportion of lean to fat than in the corn and pease-meal fed ; flesh and fat softer in body than the two other lots.

Now, with respect to the shrinkage. The middlings shrank from the weight of the live animal to dressed weight, 14.3 per cent. The weight of the pease-meal fed animals shrank 17 per cent ; the weight of the corn fed animal shrank 14.1 per cent, showing that corn produced a more solid pork, and that the pork had a better colour, and that it was equal in every respect to corn fed pork. Let me say that I believe that it is not profitable to feed pork upon either pease-meal, or corn, or middlings, alone. I have another experiment, although it does not bear directly upon the question of free corn, but it shows how false an idea it is to feed hogs even upon corn alone. This is an experiment that was made at the farm at Guelph in 1895, and I give this for the benefit of farmers generally to show how much more cheaply hogs can be fed upon a little meal and a large quantity of roots, than upon meal alone, of any description.

Twenty-four hogs were bought in November, 1895, price paid, \$31.00 ; cost of food, \$99.33 ; total cost of hogs and food, \$130.33. When sold they weighed 4,841 pounds, they were sold for \$3.85 per hundred, weighing each an average of 200 pounds ; so there was a gain of \$35.00. The cost of the peas was \$30, the cost of the milk was \$4, and the cost of the roots was \$59.29. There are 10 pounds of roots fed to these animals for every pound of grain that was fed. That corresponds with my own experience in feeding. The pork was produced at 2.69 cents per pound. I have another experiment that was made at this farm at Ottawa. Dr. Saunders came before us a few weeks ago and gave a statement with respect to hogs fed upon pease-meal and hogs fed upon corn meal alone ; and he shows that when the hogs were fed upon pea meal milk it required 3½ cents per pound to increase the live weight of the animal a single pound, valuing the peas at 30 cents per bushel. Then he comes to hogs fed upon nothing but corn, water and salt, he values the corn at 45 cents a bushel. I hold that is not a fair calculation yet he shows that corn at 45 cents a bushel produced pork at 3½ cents as against 3½ cents with pease-meal and milk. This shows conclusively that corn is one of the very best possible foods that we can have as food for animals. After one of the experiments made at the Experimental Farm

at Guelph, there is a statement in the sessional papers made by the individual who gave the report :

There is, possibly, no other form of coarse grain known to the civilized world that holds such an important place for this one for man and animals. It is a pity that Canada cannot grow enough, or even a tenth, for herself. We can produce plenty of its fodder, but proportionally little of its grain, as you know. At the same time, we have been getting it at less price, pound for pound, than our own peas, and, as it is a growing fact that as long as any kind of grain can be got for 1 cent per pound, it will pay to feed cattle upon it.

That is the case with respect to corn in Canada to-day. We cannot grow a sufficient amount for our own use. The farmers of the Dominion of Canada have to come in competition with the farmers of the western states who use free corn, and they have been able to purchase our stock animals. The British farmers were able to purchase our stock animals and take them to the British market, feed them largely upon Indian corn which they had got from the eastern countries and from the United States, and beat Canadians in their own market, on account of buying free corn. The Americans do the same to-day. They have been purchasing our stock steers during the last fall and taking them across and feeding them upon corn, and beating us with our own animals again. We cannot raise a sufficient amount of corn. I have shown that pork could be raised 3 cents per pound cheaper when fed on corn, that beef could be raised 3 cents a pound cheaper, and pork about 1½ cents cheaper ; then why not give the farmers the advantage of that ? Because the farmers of Canada cannot raise a sufficient amount of corn. You may say that the interests of those who take the lead in feeding, are not identical with the interests of the general farmer in Canada. I ask any sensible farmer if it is wise for the Government to encourage the export of coarse grains from the country. I say the farmer that is succeeding best to-day is the one that is using all his coarse grains, and putting them into beef, and mutton, and other products, and sending them into the British market. The farmer can get a bushel of corn at the present time for 27½ cents as against a bushel of oats 25 cents. We know that pound for pound corn is better feed than oats. That ought to be evident enough to any gentleman that will reason upon the subject. Did I not show in this House in 1895 that oats in the United States for thirteen years had brought a higher price than in Canada ? Now, if the coarse grains of the Americans, with all their millions of bushels of corn, as we have been told, are not brought below the value of Canada coarse grain, what harm can it do us to have free corn when we have to compete against the millions of bushels of Indian corn where

it is so plentiful that it has been used for fuel? Why should we be afraid? If the farmer has got a hundred bushels of oats, and a hundred bushels of pease for feeding, it would benefit him to sell 50 bushels of his oats or 50 bushels of his pease, and put the money into corn, and he will get an increased quantity, and a great deal better food than he otherwise could. If we are going to keep our own on the British market with our beef and our pork products, we must be placed in a position to get the very cheapest food we can. Then if corn is the cheapest food we can get, I say it is in the interest of the farmer of Canada to have his corn free. I see an hon. gentleman opposite shaking his head. He is not a practical farmer himself, he knows nothing about it, he has never tested it. There has never been a practical farmer in this House who has tested the question, that has raised his voice against free corn. It has been said that my interest is antagonistic to the interest of the farmer. I say it is not. If in no other way I am advancing the interest of the farmer because I am buying the animals that he will not feed, and great value is attached to the home market. If we had cheap feed in the shape of corn and coarse grains I am convinced that many more farmers would go into the feeding of animals. They are not in the business because they found that it did not pay to feed, but if we had large quantities of coarse grain, it could be profitably carried on. Give them free corn and you will find that a large proportion of the farmers of Ontario and of this Dominion will go into the business of feeding. We are told that every bushel of corn sent into this country displaces just so much of the product of the Canadian farmer, but that statement is not borne out in the face of the fact that we are importing over 3,000,000 bushels of corn more than we are growing. Corn is a crop that we cannot successfully grow. I hold that it is the duty of this Government to take into consideration the best means of promoting the agricultural industry and of encouraging production in the dairy line. We know that the farmer now sells his coarse grains as well as the few animals that he has whereas if he could get corn cheaply to mix with his coarse grains he would keep his stockers and he would find feeding a profitable business. If we had free corn it would encourage the enterprise of the farmers of Canada and induce them to go more extensively into the production of butter and cheese. An hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island stated that they could raise corn in their province just as well as in any province in Canada. If they can do that they have nothing to fear, with the long haul that the American corn is subjected to before it can be placed on their island. They have nothing to fear from corn from the United States. To give them free corn would be

Mr. McMILLAN.

one of the greatest benefits that the Government could confer upon the farmers of this Dominion. It would be an object lesson to many farmers who now sell their coarse grains and who would be enabled to produce a cheaper and better article to be placed on the British market and derive a mead of prosperity that they cannot hope to get without this benefit being conferred upon them. Every hon. gentleman in this House admits that upon the success of the farmers rests the foundation of the success of this Dominion and that the industry of feeding cattle and hogs and producing butter and cheese is one that must be fostered in this country and one which could not be better fostered than by giving us free corn.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House but a very few moments at this very late stage of the session nor shall I enter upon the discussion of this question on the ground that was taken by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It is a distinct part of the question of the fiscal policy of Canada whether we shall put a defensive tariff against the United States, or whether a duty should be placed upon corn or removed from corn. I shall therefore not enter upon that branch of the discussion at all, but confine myself to the pure merits of the question. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) who made a very excellent speech, I am afraid, did not make it entirely from the standpoint of the farmer. I am sure that those who have listened to him must have come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman argued from the simple standpoint of those who are engaged in the feeding of stock in Canada. There are only two classes of persons who are demanding free corn. There may be some people in Canada who say that it is unfair that they should pay higher prices in consequence of the duty being placed on corn, should such a contingency arise as that corn would be higher in consequence of that duty. From that standpoint there may be a very fair objection, and then there is another objection raised by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and those who are cattle feeders and those engaged in the production of butter and cheese who claim that they should have corn free.

I appeal especially to the Minister of Agriculture, who is I believe a practical farmer himself, and I ask him, if in placing corn upon the free list, he has considered, and considered alone, the interests of the farmers of this country, the small farmers as well as the extensive ones. I think the hon. Minister could not have been in possession of such definite information as would warrant him in taking the course he did. He no doubt knows that Canada can produce all the corn required for home consumption. Some time ago, I pointed out in the House the rapid increase of the production of corn

in Canada, even in the face of considerable discouragement. In 1885, ten years ago, there were only 167,000 acres of corn under cultivation. Five years later, it had increased to 223,836 acres, yielding 14,000,000 bushels of ears, and in 1895 the acreage had increased to 302,927, yielding 24,819,000 bushels of ears, equal to 16,000,000 bushels of shelled corn. In 1895 we imported two and three-quarter million bushels, so that our production is practically abreast of the consumption of Canada. These figures are taken from the report of the Bureau of Industry, and I say that they are conclusive evidence, that we are producing in Canada nearly all the corn that is required. Give corn that protection which is given to other coarse grains, and we shall easily produce at home all that there is a demand for. In view of this fact, let me again ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), why corn was placed on the free list any more than wheat? Why was corn treated differently from barley, or buckwheat, or oats, or rye, or any other grain. I cannot account for it unless it is that the demand has come from consumers in certain parts of Canada where no corn is produced, and also from those who are engaged entirely in feeding stock. I regret that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) is not now in his seat, because I wish to show him how little he knows about his own county. Sir, there is not a county in the province of Ontario that does not produce corn. The largest yield is in the county of Essex, and the smallest in the county of Nipissing. In the county from which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) comes, we find that the yield in 1895 was 65 bushels of ears to the acre, or equal to forty bushels of shelled corn, and yet, that hon. gentleman tells the House that he represents the views of the farmers on this question. I find that the number of bushels of oats to the acre in the county of Huron, for the same year, was only thirty-four, while the produce was sixty-five bushels of corn to the acre.

I state, Sir, that we can produce corn enough in the province of Ontario alone to supply the whole Dominion, and I am told that corn is also produced in the province of Quebec to some considerable extent. It was believed some years ago that corn growing, like bean growing, was confined to one or two counties in Canada, but it has been found that the farmers can successfully grow corn in every county—some of course with greater advantage than others—in the province of Ontario. I have no doubt that in the province of Quebec, and in some of the other provinces, there are certain kinds of corn that may be produced with reasonable profit. I wish to tell the Government, that there has been no demand from the farmers or the people of Canada generally for free corn, and there is nothing whatever to warrant the course the Government has pursued, except that for years past the

Liberal party has advocated free corn. The farmers of this country have reason to complain of the action of the Minister of Agriculture, because as I contend, he did not adopt the necessary means—and it required a great deal of energy and time—to learn the wants of the farmers when he was on the tariff commission. I understand the difficulty between learning the wishes of so large a body as the agriculturist community, and learning the wishes of those engaged in manufacturing or commercial pursuits. The hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) when the tariff commission was sitting, issued a notice to the farmers which in effect was: Let you farmers meet and pass resolutions, and then send these resolutions to me, and I will give them proper consideration. That was not sufficient for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) to do. Even though it did take a great deal of time, he should have gone among the farmers from one end of the country to the other, and if he could not afford that time, it was his imperative duty to make no reductions in the agricultural tariff until he was in possession of full and reliable information. Farmers' institutes may be engineered by men who are disposed to serve their party more than their fellow-farmers, and I deny that you can get anything like a fair expression of opinion from them. I am told that the Patrons have sent a petition to the Minister of Agriculture asking that corn be put on the free list, but I say that that is absolutely worthless. If we take as a specimen the hon. gentlemen who are in this House attempting to speak on behalf of the farmers, calling themselves Patrons or masquerading as Patrons, we can see what a bald sham it is for these gentlemen to speak to the Minister of Agriculture, or to the members of this House, in the name of the farmers, and we can see that we should not place the slightest reliance upon what they represent. These gentlemen do not speak for the people; they merely speak for themselves and for their own narrow views. If you take a Patron, and if he is a true Patron, whether he lives in Nova Scotia or western Ontario or the province of Quebec, he would represent the views of the farmers of the entire Dominion, but I venture to say, that those gentlemen merely represent the narrow views that surround them in their own constituencies, and cannot speak for the farmers of the country as a whole. God help the farmers of Canada if these gentlemen are entitled to speak for them in this House or to represent their interests here. I desire to say, that the farmers of this country are of a higher grade of intelligence, of thought, and of breadth of view, than we would believe, judging by the exhibitions we have had in this House. If the Minister of Agriculture takes these gentlemen as representatives of the farming community of Canada, he will find himself not in accord with the great agricultural interests of this country, but he will find

himself acting upon the mere whims—and I do not say this disparagingly—of men who are actuated by the most narrow views, and who are seeking re-election in their respective counties rather than seeking for the general welfare of Canada. We heard to-night one gentleman who claimed to be a farmer giving his reasons why corn should be put on the free list. I tell you that that gentleman is more of a manufacturer than a farmer. He buys the stock of his neighbour, who is less fortunate than he is himself, and he buys it for less than he himself can produce it. He wishes to buy the corn product of a foreign soil and of foreign labour to fatten the steer which he has purchased from his less prosperous fellow-farmer. What does he do? He sets up an establishment at the cross-roads for the manufacture of beef. He is no more a farmer than the man who keeps a blacksmith's shop. He is separated from the great body of the farmers of this country. If every farmer of this country could be placed in the same position that he is, his calling would be gone—why? If you took away free corn, if you took away from him the advantage he has of skinning his neighbour by buying his stock cheaper than he could produce it himself, his establishment would go down. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) this afternoon tried to show the advantage of corn as a feed. No one has disputed that. That is not the question. We say that if corn produces the best beef, if it is more desirable than any other grain grown in Canada, why not give the farmers of this country the chance to produce the grain they are able to grow for the making of beef in this country? The hon. gentleman has two things to consider. He may consider the gentlemen who have his ear, who talked the rot which was talked this afternoon about the value of corn for feeding, a question which no one disputes. These gentlemen have his ear because they are close beside him. The great masses of the struggling farmers of this country, who cannot set up establishments of that kind, have not his ear, and if they had, he would be far from doing what he is doing. Is there anything more plain than the proposition that to bring into this country any grain which is the product of a foreign country, displaces just so much of the grain of this country? There cannot be two opinions about that. If we bring in 10,000,000 bushels of American corn, it means that we must take a lower price for our own grain or export it to another country. If we export it to another country, we have to meet the competition of the American corn-grower, as well as the producer of wheat and oats in every foreign country, on the common ground of the common market. What did the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) say? He tried to prove that during the years when corn was free, oats were higher in price than they were when corn

Mr. CLANCY.

was protected. Just to show how much logic there is in a position of that kind, let me point out that the hon. gentlemen opposite have always contended that the prices of our grains were not determined in our own country, but were determined by the export prices. If that be the case—and I do not think hon. gentlemen will shrink from the argument, though they may shrink from the consequences of it—then the prices were not determined by free corn at all, but by the prices that might be obtained in a foreign country, and therefore it had not the slightest bearing on prices in any sense. I was amused at an hon. gentleman, the member for Richmond and Wolfe, who, this evening, said he wanted free corn. Have you heard an agriculturist say that he wanted free wheat, or free oats, or free pease, or free rye, or free buckwheat? No; and why? Because every one of these classes of grain is produced somewhere here in Canada, and no hon. gentleman would dare to go back to his constituents and say that he wanted to have these grains placed on the free list. The question simply resolves itself into this, whether a few counties in the province of Ontario which, more than any others have been engaged in the growth of corn, are to be singled out for no other reason than that corn is not largely produced in all other parts of the province. That seems to me a most extraordinary proposition, for the Government to place corn on the free list, while other grains are allowed to remain, and very properly to remain, with defensive duties, I say it is an unjust discrimination. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the duties on corn coming into Canada in 1896 amounted to \$207,301, whereas the duties collected upon all other grains, including wheat, barley, buckwheat, rye and oats, amounted to only \$44,000. Now, why lose the revenue on that grain alone, and compel those who have been made the victims to contribute to that loss without the slightest return or the slightest compensation in any sense, while compelled to meet the products of a foreign country in their own country? I would like to ask on what ground the manufacturer could ask for free corn, when hon. gentlemen have given them a similar measure of protection to what they have had in the past. If they asked that the duty on corn should be removed, the reasonable thing would be for the farmers to ask that the manufacturers be treated in the same way. The workingmen could not ask for free corn as consumers, because the defensive duties imposed necessarily determine whether our workingmen will have work in this country. The commercial classes could not ask for it, because they have a similar measure of protection. Then, there is only the single class who could ask for free corn, and that is the farmers themselves. If you put corn on the free list, you do it for the sake of a certain number of

cattle feeders in this country who, I say, are not farmers in the true sense. They may be engaged in other branches of farming, but they have made cattle feeding the principal feature of their business, and they are not farmers in the true sense. Then, free corn means that you are compelling the small farmers of Canada to bear the loss—and the great part of our farmers are small farmers. I venture to say that not one farmer in five hundred in the Dominion of Canada has imported corn for the purpose of feeding cattle. Therefore, you are making five hundred men the slaves of the one in order that that one may better his condition. It is said we shall have the home product consumed by the distillers. What the distillers are consuming is a mere fraction. Out of 16,000,000 bushels consumed annually, they are importing less than three-quarters of a million bushels annually. In the large American elevators there is always old and dry corn, and, at the same period the distillers will take the corn from the American elevators, because their corn must be cured for six or eight months before it is fit for use. Therefore the millers and the consumers of corn will, for the same reason, buy the older and more matured corn, or, in other words, the corn that is perfectly dry in the elevator, rather than buy the farmers' corn. The foreign growing country, with its immense elevators, in which corn is stored, and always accessible, has every advantage over our country where the farmers have their corn in cribs, and sell it out at one time in the year. Beyond doubt, it is true we grow nearly enough for our own wants, and under proper encouragement would produce in the next five years all we require for home consumption and probably some for export. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) pointed out that in one year we only exported 9,000 bushels. Well, that is the first year in which I have known corn to be exported, but we have been catching up with the demand for home consumption, and are nearly abreast with that demand, and ought soon to be in a position to export. I would like to have some good reason from the hon. Minister of Agriculture, leaving aside the question of singling out one particular branch of the agricultural industry, why corn should be placed on the free list rather than coarse grains. I shall not go into a discussion as to the effect which the importation of corn may have on the prices of coarse grains, because that effect seems to me so plain that it is not worth discussing. Nor shall I enter upon a discussion as to the good qualities of corn for feeding purposes, because that is not in question at all, but I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, even at this late day, to reconsider this very rash proposition, and I think I am within the mark when I say that he cannot be in possession of information that will warrant

him taking such a step. It is true that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been talking free corn throughout the country and they have raised expectations which perhaps they feel bound to carry out. But it seems to me beyond doubt that the farmers in Canada look to having corn put in the same position as other grains, and I therefore beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after "that" to the end of the motion, be left out, and the following substituted therefor:—"In the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient and opposed to the best agricultural interests of Canada to place Indian corn on the free list."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has appealed to me with regard to several matters relating to this question, and probably it would be uncourteous on my part if I did not answer him. He asked whether I had carefully considered this question from all points of view. Whether I had considered the different classes of farmers, and also whether, in the tariff enquiry, I had visited every section of the country and found out what the people thought on this question. I can tell the hon. gentleman that while I have not been able to visit every constituency in the country, I have gone about the country a good deal since last session, and I was present when the tariff commission met the farmers of the great province of Ontario on two or three different occasions by special invitation sent out by myself. I have studied the question from the stock keepers, the stock feeders, and the farmers' points of view, and from the great mass of information I have obtained, I came to the conclusion that this proposition was in the interest of the country. I found that the expressions of opinion of the leading farmers throughout the length and breadth of the land bore out the conclusion I had reached from my own knowledge of farming, that it was in the interests of the farming community that corn should be put on the free list, and it was only because of that consensus of opinion that I asked that corn should be put on the free list. I did not do it in the interests of any manufacturer of beef or cattle or anything else, but in the interests of the farmers of this country as a whole, and I think I can show in a few words why it is in their interest. In the first place, the hon. gentleman seems to think that farmers are not manufacturers. On the contrary, they are the greatest manufacturers in this country. Nearly all the manufactured products sent out from Canada come from the farmers. The products of the farm constitute by far the largest amount of manufactured products sent out from Canada, and bring the money of the world into Canada to pay the people's bills. He also alluded to the fact that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) is a manufacturer of beef. But he omitted to

say that my hon. friend is also one of the largest tillers of the soil in this country. He has a farm of 400 acres of the best land and the best tilled land in the great province of Ontario. It is a model to which the farmers of that province and the rest of the country can go to learn lessons in farming, and if my hon. friend from Huron is in the position he occupies to-day, if he is one of our leading farmers, it is due to the fact that he has been able to show his intelligence and knowledge of the industry by producing beef and other products from the feeding of cattle on his farm. And if to-day his farm is far more productive than it was when he began, if it is one of the model farms of this country, it is because he has been keeping stock on that farm and feeding cattle on it and keeping up the fertility of it and showing himself to be a manufacturer of agricultural products. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the man who simply raises grain, who simply converts the raw material of the soil into the crude product of crops and sells that—is the best kind of farmer. The hon. gentleman has a poor opinion of the industry of farming.

Mr. CLANCY. I said no such thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman did not say it in so many words, but the whole tone and tenor of his speech was to that effect. The whole tone and tenor of his speech was to discourage the farmers of this country from going into the higher branch of agriculture, to discourage them from keeping stock upon their lands, and encourage them instead to take from their land the whole fertility that is in it and sell it away as a crude product, thereby destroying the fertility of the farm. The hon. gentleman, if he were a farmer instead of a merchant and lumberman, would know perfectly well that that is the poorest and worst style of farming. It is the kind of farming which the people of the country are leaving, and which we desire to encourage them to leave and go into something better and higher and which will give more scope to their intelligence. I am glad to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that the farmers of Canada are leaving that kind of farming and going into a higher and better class of agriculture, and the result is they are doing more to make the country prosperous than any other class in the community. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the farmer who has his sign out on the cross road as a manufacturer. The farmers I am alluding to, the great mass of farmers, are not of that class. I venture to say there are none, except those connected with distilleries who simply feed stock and do not till the land. The feeding of stock is inseparable from the tilling of the soil. All over the length and breadth of the country, we are trying to teach

Mr. FISHER.

our farmers that stock keeping is their best interest, the best branch of the industry, and that the more they go into it, the better they will succeed. To keep this stock then they should have the best feed for stock keeping purposes, and my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) in speaking here to-night has proven pretty conclusively that corn is one of the best feeds. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) says that we can produce in Canada all the corn that is needed here and that we do not need to buy corn from abroad. The hon. gentleman himself has proved that there is only one section of this country where corn can be produced profitably. It is true that in a great many parts of the country corn can be grown successfully. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the east as well as in the west we can produce corn. In the part of Quebec from which I come we can produce corn grain, but we find that we can do other things that are more profitable to us than that, and we prefer to do the most profitable things with our lands and to buy the corn which we find it necessary to use in feeding our stock. The hon. gentleman speaks for the western portion of Ontario in which corn can be produced with a fair share of profit. I will only call attention to the words of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has been quoted on the other side with approbation. That hon. gentleman tells us that in his own county, which is distinctly a corn producing county, it was a nice question whether it was better to have the duty on corn or not. If it is a dubious question on one of the best corn producing counties in Ontario, what must it be in the great bulk of the country where corn cannot be produced except with the greatest skill and effort, and to the exclusion of other things than can be done more profitably.

Mr. CLANCY. Is he (Mr. Charlton) speaking as a farmer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was speaking from knowledge of his locality and voicing the views of the men he represents. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been quoting him as if they accepted his dictum, showing that they believed he spoke with authority. They must accept this portion of his speech as well as the other. The hon. gentleman seems to forget, and so I will remind him that east of Toronto, or certainly, east of Kingston, there is hardly any corn produced in this country at a profit.

Mr. CLANCY. What about Grenville with 100 bushels to the acre?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that here and there throughout the country you can find a field where 100 bushels of corn to the acre can be raised. I have known in my own section of the Eastern Townships large crops of corn to be raised for grain. I know also that in east-

ern Canada there are places where 35 and 40 bushels of wheat to the acre can be produced. But we do not pretend to be a wheat-producing country, and as a matter of fact, we buy nearly all our flour. We can raise corn for ensilage, and put it into the silo and make more money out of it in that way than by turning it into grain. The hon. gentleman has spoken entirely and solely for that section of the country from whence he comes. He is asking if in discussing this question I had obtained information from other parts of the country than my own, and he asked if I had spoken to farmers on the question. He warned me against the men who assumed to represent the farmers. I suppose he would not class himself in that category. He asks if my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) speaks as a farmer, but I have yet to learn that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) himself is a farmer. But I have yet to learn also that men who are not farmers cannot represent the farmers, cannot give expression on the floor of Parliament to the views of the men who sent him here to represent them, the bulk of whom are farmers. But a gentleman who is engaged in the business, as is my hon. friend from South Huron and as are other men around me, are better able to understand the intricacies of this question than an hon. member who happens to be a lumberman, a lawyer, or a doctor. And there are intricacies in this business that cannot be fully explained in a brief statement. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the feeding of stock as though this were simply a question of beef feeding. But he must know perfectly well that, in this country, the vast mass of our farmers are dairymen. He knows that in the province of Ontario an immense number of cows are kept which produce milk for butter and cheese which is exported. He knows that in the province of Quebec there is comparatively little beef produced and that the cattle of the province are used largely for dairying. In the eastern provinces there is no great quantity of beef produced, while a large quantity of stock is kept. In the North-west, which this question does not affect, a large quantity of beef is produced for export and in Ontario also, a large quantity of beef is produced for export. But the great dairy industry in the country is as much interested in this corn question as the beef producer. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few figures as to the dairying interest in this country. In a year Ontario produces 730,000,000 pounds of milk, which is worth about \$5,300,000. The production of this milk can be cheapened and facilitated by cheaper corn. The product of the cows is largely exported to the old country and if there is one thing in which Canada shines in the British market, it is in the cheese business. The province of Ontario has, to a large extent, contributed to that prominence, and the province can increase its output if it can get cheaper

food for the cows that produce the milk from which the cheese is made. The same thing is true of the province of Quebec. There are in Ontario 2,000,000 cattle, 647,000 horses, 1,295,000 hogs and over 2,000,000 sheep. These are very large figures and they represent enormous capital invested. What is the value of this stock? That depends entirely upon the amount of produce it yields for the people to sell. The more they can do with it, the greater the extent to which they can use the machine—for our cattle, that is our cows, are a machine through which we must get as much production as we can; and the manufacturing farmer in doing that wants to get his raw material, the things with which to conduct his business, as cheaply as possible. One hon. gentleman on the other side said that the farmer was a protectionist and wanted protection. I will refer for a moment without quoting instances, to the illustration of arguments of protection, and to show that, even according to their own theory, they must grant to the farmer free corn. What does the protectionist manufacturer want most of all? He wants his raw material at as cheap a rate as possible. What did we find when the tariff investigation was going on? Every manufacturer who came forward asking that the thing he produced should be protected as highly as possible, at the same moment and at the same breath, asked that the things that he used in his industry should be given to him at as low a rate as possible. So the farmer who has to produce beef in competition with the world, who has to produce butter in competition with the world wants to have the material which he uses in making butter, cheese, and beef, at as low rates as possible. Give him then free corn for use in his business. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that every bushel of imported corn displaces a bushel of our own grain. They have not considered the question fully. I say emphatically, and I do not fear any attempted proof to the contrary, that every bushel of corn brought into the country does not mean the displacement of a bushel of our own grain, but an increased production of butter, cheese and beef in this country. It means so many hundreds, and thousands, and millions of pounds of exported butter and cheese out of this country. That is what the increased importation of corn into this country means. It does not mean a reduction of the price of coarse grain. We know that the manufacturer who has free materials is able to use our own home materials which he has, to better advantage. In the experience of the friends to the south of us a few years ago, wool was placed upon the free list. The farmers of that country protested against wool being placed upon the free list, they thought it was going to ruin the industry of wool production. But what was the result? In consequence of the fact of having free-

wool, the moment that the woollen manufacturers were able to increase their business, they were able immediately afterwards to pay higher prices for the home-made wool produced in the United States. I say therefore that if in consequence of free corn, a consequence which I am sure will come about, we are able to increase our manufacture of butter and cheese in this country, the farmers who are engaged in these manufactures will consume, and be glad to get, more coarse grains to feed in conjunction with their imported corn. Hon. gentlemen say that corn is going to injure our pork in this country. That was the view taken by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald), who told us about the establishment of a pork industry in that province that was giving promise of success, and he said it would be disastrous to that industry if free corn came in, because it would injure the quality of Canadian pork. We know that is one of the cries that has been used by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to frighten the farmers and others against free corn.

Mr. CARGILL. Does the hon. gentleman think that corn fed pork is equal in quality to pork fed on mixed grains?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will wait till I have finished he will find the answer. Does the hon. gentleman think that our farmers are fools? Hon. gentlemen opposite some times talk as if they thought so. But as a matter of fact I think that the intelligence of the farmers of this country is quite equal to using as much corn as they want to feed their animals, and not using any more. The pork dressers and packers of this country want pork which has been fed on some corn; they do not want pork that has been fed altogether on corn, but pork in the feeding of which some corn has been used. I believe that the pork feeders are quite intelligent enough to know when to stop feeding corn, and that by reason of the fact that corn may be a little cheaper than it was before, they are not going thereby to deteriorate the value of the product that they are producing. On the contrary. I have confidence to believe that the farmers know that feeding corn in conjunction with skimmed milk and with clover pasture, they will be able to produce a higher quality of pork than they could without corn. We have heard the experiments described by the hon. member for South Huron to-night; and I have the dictum of a gentleman who spoke to me a few weeks ago and who is manager of the largest pork exporting company in this country, that he wanted pork in the feeding of which some corn had been used. He told me, it is true, that if corn was used altogether he did not want that pork, that it would be dangerous to the farmers if they attempted to use all corn. But, says he, I want pork in which some

Mr. FISHER.

corn has been used, and the quality of that pork is better in every respect, as well as cheaper, if corn can be got cheap enough.

Mr. BEATTIE. I know the London Packing Company refuse to take any corn fed pork, and that is one of the best packing companies in Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I grant you that Mr. Flavelle and the Davis Company would refuse to take pork that was fed altogether on corn. But they will not refuse to take pork that is fed on skim milk in conjunction with corn and corn meal or if it is fed on mixed grain and bran, and other things along with corn.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Flavelle advocated the free admission of American corn into this market?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I said that Mr. Flavelle preferred pork in the feeding of which some corn had been used.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that the members of English pork packing firms advised the farmers not to feed their hogs on the whey made from cheese and on corn, because the quality of the pork was inferior.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know the difference between whey and skimmed milk.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman seems to think he is talking to an audience who do not know the difference.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman had noticed what I said, he would know I spoke of feeding corn in conjunction with skim milk, and not in conjunction with whey.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman did not say whey.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. "Hansard" will show that I said skim milk. I knew better than to say whey, because I knew that in conjunction with whey, corn was not good food; but that whey should be used with bran and other nitrogenous foods which supplement and give the ingredients which are necessary to make up what whey is lacking.

Mr. SPROULE. How much skim milk does the hon. gentleman expect to get from cheese factories?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I spoke about creameries and butter factories. Although the hon. gentleman is not a farmer, he has lived long enough that he ought to know that whey comes from the manufacture of cheese, and skim milk comes from the manufacture of butter.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been carrying on farming steadily for the last fifteen years,

and have been connected with it for the most of my life.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then the hon. gentleman ought to have learned something by this time.

Mr. INGRAM. From the discourteous manner in which the Minister answers questions, he seems to be prepared to stay here a week or two longer.

Mr. CARGILL. I understood the Minister to say that skim milk was a product of butter manufacture; now I always thought it was butter milk.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said it came from the creameries.

Mr. CARGILL. But you said it was a product of the butter, but I always understood that it was butter milk that came from the butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman confuses the lesser with the greater. If the hon. gentleman knew more about it he would not need to be told that there is a smaller quantity of butter milk coming from butter than there is of skim milk coming from the creamery. Now, the hon. gentleman has talked about our efforts to get reciprocity, and the probability that by reason of keeping the duty on corn, we may more easily get concessions from the other side of the line. There is nobody in this House who is more desirous than I am, and the other members of the Government, to extend our trade relations to the United States. I believe in removing the restrictions upon trade. We are not protectionists, as hon. gentlemen opposite are. I would be very glad indeed if we could get a free entry into the United States for our agricultural products; but I believe most emphatically that the experience which hon. gentlemen opposite have had for some years, past would be continued for some years to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the statutory offer upon the statute-books of this country of free corn in return for free barley on the other side of the line. They know just as well as we know that that offer has been ignored, that nothing has come of it, and that in consequence the farmers of this country have not had this boon of free corn. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Stenson) said that we were doing this not for the sake of the Americans. We are asking this House to give us free corn for the sake of the farmers and of the people of Canada wholly and solely. Just as we have made a great step towards Imperial trade by reason of that preferential gift which we have given to the Empire at home, so I believe that we can cultivate better relations with the United States, not by demanding for everything that we do a quid pro quo.

Mr. WILSON. Why was that not done in everything—coal as well as corn?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We cannot do everything at once.

Mr. WILSON. The Finance Minister made a distinct statement to this House that unless the Americans would lower their duty on coal to 40 cents a ton we would keep ours up to 60 cents. Why do we not do the same thing in regard to corn?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because we cannot do everything at once. Hon. gentlemen opposite treated every article, it mattered not what it was, on its own merits, and the result was that in their tariff, as in ours, there were different duties upon different articles, some on the dutiable list and some on the free list.

Mr. FOSTER. And some specific duties.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year the United States produced 200,000,000 bushels of corn and exported 100,000,000 bushels. I venture to say that the amount of corn that would come into this country from the United States, even with corn on the free list, would be inappreciable in such a large market and with such a large production as there is in that country, and this would make a small figure in any reciprocity negotiations we might have with them. As my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) said the corn that the American produces comes into competition with our products in the markets of the world. It comes into competition with them in the shape of beef, mutton and dairy products. And, that being the case, we want to be able to get their corn to produce these very products on the same terms and as cheaply as the American producers do and which we cannot do unless we have free corn. It is because we want our farmers to be able to produce their finished products as cheaply and in as good conditions as the farmers of the United States can that we ask for the acceptance of this proposition. It is by reason of the fact that the western corn of the United States is used as feed in that country that their exports of cattle so enormously exceeds ours. If we could get their corn free to feed to our superior animals, because we have always been able to produce animals far superior to what are produced in the United States, and if we could get the feed with which to make the animals fat at a reasonable rate we could do it cheaper and better than they can. But as long as we hamper the farmers and make the conditions of their industry onerous just so much do we injure them in their competition with the farmers of the United States. There is another fact. You speak about the importation of corn, but you forget the importation of meat products. Last year we in Canada imported 11,500,000 pounds of meat from the United States. Give us free corn and

we can make that here and our farmers will be able to control their home market. How is it that the farmers of Canada are not able to produce this 11,500,000 pounds in this country? It is because the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite has prevented them from getting free corn; it is because they have been restricted in other ways and they have not been able to capture the markets of their own country, let alone to secure their proper share of the markets of the world. For these reasons, and for many others, which I have not time to go into, I ask this House to give us free corn so that the great mass of the farmers may be benefited in the industry in which they are engaged and which I am satisfied will bring greater success to them.

Mr. SPROULE. When we had free corn coming in we imported a much larger quantity of wheat than we did when we had no free corn.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to say just a word or two in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman has done just what I expected he would do; he has taken his seat without answering the question I put to him as to why the hon. gentleman had singled out corn as against all other kinds of grain to be free. The hon. gentleman sat down without saying a single word about it. If he had made any reply it would probably have been, "because they could not do everything at once." Is that not an extraordinary argument? If the hon. gentleman was doing the right thing, why not do the right thing all at once. But he tells me that I am no farmer. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am not the kind of a farmer that he is. I have not much hair on my head, but what I have I do not part it in the centre. I am not a kid-gloved farmer. I, fortunately or unfortunately, live among the mass of our farmers; I know something of the great farming interest and its wants. The hon. gentleman puts words into my mouth that I did not utter when he says that I said that the growing grain alone is the best class of farming. He must take me to be more stupid than I am in assuming any such principle. We all know that if a farmer can engage in stock-feeding and consume all his grain and export his cattle that he would have reached a state of things that would be most desirable. It is not what we would like to see the farmers do, but what the farmers are able to do that the hon. gentleman seems to know nothing about. What is the condition of the great mass of the farmers? I may say that I am familiar with the farming interest of this country and have as much acquaintance with them as the hon. gentleman. He tells us that free corn is desired by the great dairy interest. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) that he has not answered the question in that way.

Mr. FISHER.

and I tell him that he is looking above the present condition of the farmers of this country. He need not read us lessons here in the same position as other grains, and as to what is best for the farmers to do. We all know what is best, if it could be done. He may single out a few gentlemen in this country whom he desires to serve. I fear he spoke from a narrow standpoint himself, for he said that very little wheat was grown in his district. I would like to know what he knows about farming? I have an idea that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is what they call a fancy farmer, producing high grades of stock.

An hon. MEMBER. A dude.

Mr. CLANCY. A dude, my hon. friend says, and I venture to think he may not be far out. The Minister of Agriculture no doubt raises the higher grades of stock, and gets fancy prices; but let me ask him how many farmers, such as he, are there in his own province? There are very few, and consequently the duty of the hon. gentleman is not to judge all the farmers by those in his condition. He has been heralded from one end of the country to the other as a practical farmer, but I am afraid he is a farmer who is too big for the farmers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The farmers of Canada are not so small as you think they are.

Mr. CLANCY. No one said the farmers are small. I do think I know something of the condition of the class to which I belong. The hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) did me the honour to say that I was probably a merchant, or a lumberman, and he suggested that it was possible I might be a professional man. I have not the honour of being any of these, but I do claim that I have an opportunity of knowing the condition of the people. I say that we have yet to have an answer from the Minister of Agriculture as to why he singled out corn to be put on the free list. I now see the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) in his place, and I want to give him some facts about his own county. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) told us that no farmer of eminence would oppose free corn, and I suppose that we are to understand that he is a farmer of eminence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So he is.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is a member of the advisory board of the Bureau of Industries in the province of Ontario, and very few of the farmers of this country are so eminent. Very few of them get these positions and have their sons in these positions, going about lecturing throughout the province.

Mr. BENNETT. \$5 a night.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) has been feeding at the public crib, and so have his family, and yet

he claims that he is speaking for the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman told us that he would sell oats and buy corn. Now, according to the report prepared under his own guidance, we find that in his own county they produced in 1895, thirty-four bushels of oats to the acre, while they produced sixty-five bushels of ears of corn, which is equivalent to nearly forty bushels of shelled corn. The hon. gentleman has been asleep in his own county, and yet he claims to speak with authority for the farmers. I repeat that the province of Ontario is perfectly able to grow enough corn for the whole Dominion. In the counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin and North Haldimand they produce 913,423 bushels; in Lambton, Huron and Bruce they produce 430,000 bushels, and in Grey and Simcoe they produce about the same quantity. This is set out in the statistics, and I will send it over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, keep it.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon friend (Mr. Gibson) knows more about the Victoria Bridge than he does about corn.

Mr. GIBSON. And am more loyal to Queen Victoria than you are.

Mr. CLANCY. Judging by the hon. gentleman's appearance, he is moved by a very peculiar spirit in his loyalty. I have this to say in conclusion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I did not think of concluding

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Do not spoil a good speech by repeating it.

Mr. CLANCY. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) thinks I will spoil my speech, I shall sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. This is too grave a question for hon. gentlemen opposite to treat it so lightly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You cannot perorate twice.

Mr. CLANCY. Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) his opinion on corn.

An hon. MEMBER. Corn juice.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) could give us a dissertation on corn juice.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are well qualified to do that.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps I could tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) something about it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are the best authority in the House on corn juice

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. CLANCY. If hon. gentlemen opposite keep quiet I will conclude.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite understand the impatience of hon. gentlemen to conclude the debate at this late hour, but the House cannot afford to treat a question of this importance so lightly.

An hon. MEMBER. What about your conclusion?

Mr. CLANCY. I still indulge in the hope that the Minister of Agriculture will be able to tell us why he placed corn on the free list.

The hon. gentleman pointed out that the farmer wanted free corn because he wanted free material. I think I quite understood him when he made that proposition. If that is the case, the miller wants free wheat, and to be consistent why does he not make wheat free? I still ask the hon. gentleman to say to the House why he makes corn free, and not other grains? To say that he cannot do it all at once is not an answer. If the hon. gentleman is not able to answer that question satisfactorily, even to his own friends, I say he has singled out corn to put on the free list for no reason that any one can think of except to serve the interests of very few persons in this country. If the hon. gentleman can give any good reason for it, the committee will be glad to hear it; but so far the House must come to the conclusion that he has arrived at that decision without any satisfactory reason.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think the hon. Minister of Agriculture wished to misrepresent the case or to deceive the House; but by the figures he gave, if I understood him correctly, he has done so. I understood him to say that we imported from the United States last year 11,250,000 pounds of meats, and that he had taken these figures from the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If he did so, he must have taken the figures both for home consumption and export, for I feel by that report that we imported last year: bacon and hams, shoulders and sides, 1,490,000 pounds; canned meats, poultry and game, 966,000 pounds; beef, salted, in barrels, 1,639,000 pounds; mutton, 39,000 pounds; pork, barreled, in brine, 3,809,000 pounds; dried or smoked meats, and meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled, 128,000 pounds; other meats, fresh, 216,000 pounds; other meats, salted, 99,000 pounds; making a total of 8,386,000 pounds, in place of 11,000,000 pounds. I give these figures as I find them, and I know that the Minister does not want his statement to go to the country and have some schoolboy contradict him.

Mr. McMILLAN. Just a single word. I have often observed that some men, when they feel that they cannot keep up their end of the argument, resort to personalities, one of the meanest things that any man can be guilty of. What right had the hon. gentleman to refer to the way in which the Minister of Agriculture parted his hair? Nature has prevented the hon. gentleman from parting his hair in the middle. I would also ask what my son's getting positions had to do with the importation of free corn into Canada. It shows a mean and envious spirit in an individual when he resorts to personalities of this kind. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I have never asked for a position either for myself or for my son. I have been in the hon. gentleman's locality, and I can say that he is not one of those distinguished farmers who are fattening cattle of a stamp fit to be sent to the English market. When we find any individual referring to the personal appearance of another person, it shows a low, mean nature.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to suggest to my hon. friend who has made this very strong statement, that I would like him for my part to go to the "Globe" newspaper people and talk to them a little while about the way they have abused me.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have nothing to do with the "Globe" newspaper, but the hon. gentleman has been abusing the "Globe" newspaper and everything connected with it, and he must expect to get something in return.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to—  
Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask hon. members to keep order.

Mr. DAVIN. I rose, Mr. Chairman, to quote the opinion of the Ingersol Packing Company. This is a letter written to a member of this House:

Mr. A. F. MacLaren, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Your favours of the 5th and 7th both to hand. We are very much pleased to see that the members are taking a great interest in feeding corn to hogs,—

I see that the hogs are a little alarmed. They are so alarmed that although they generally fight with their snouts, they are now fighting with their heels.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask the members of the committee to keep order.

Mr. DAVIN—

—and we trust that the farmers will be so educated that they will—

Mr. CHARLTON. Commence at the beginning; I have lost the thread of it.

Mr. DAVIN. Who says commence at the beginning?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. DAVIN. The witty and pious member from North Norfolk, the embodiment of religious consistency, the least contemptible member of this House, the member of this House whom any man knows him most honours, the member of this House who, regarded from a political or religious standpoint, can be venerated as a man, a man whom I have known inside and outside of this House—and to know him well is to regard him with scorn.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Say that again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the members of the committee should not forget that there are some strangers in the gallery, and we are not conducting ourselves now in a proper manner.

Mr. DAVIN. Will you say the members of the committee on the Government side? The members on this side conduct themselves, as they usually do, as gentlemen. The members on the Government side generally have a lot of Hessians to howl, and the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) wishes to direct my attention to him. I have a great liking for that gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is my misfortune.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says it is his misfortune. Well, if it is his misfortune it is one that like others will stick to him, because I shall not cease to like the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin).

Mr. LANDERKIN. If that be the case, will the hon. gentleman bring his speech to a close.

Mr. DAVIN. I said I liked the hon. member for Grey, but not that I would do what he liked. I shall begin with a quotation:

Your favours of the 5th and 7th both to hand. We are very much pleased to see that the members are taking a great interest of feeding corn to hogs, and we trust that the farmers will be so educated that they will not attempt to feed hogs wholly on corn, as it would seriously affect the hog industry of Canada. The trouble we see from corn being imported here free and sold at a low price is, that the farmers, when they get out of their own feed of mixed grains, will no doubt buy the corn, the trouble being with a great many farmers that as long as they get their hogs fat, it does not seem to matter much to them as to the quality; so that, as far as we are concerned, interested as we are as packers, and we also believe for the good of the country, it would be well to have a duty on corn so as to prevent it being brought in for that purpose. Of course, if it is brought in for the purpose of feeding cattle and horses, and is allowed in free, the farmers will no doubt feed more or less of it to hogs. We do not think it requires any better evidence than the price of hogs in Canada at the present time to prove to the farmers' satisfaction the importance of feeding their hogs properly, that is, on pease and other grains, so as to make the quality of the pork compare favourably with Danish and Irish. If hogs were fed

wholly on corn in Canada as they are in the United States. the packers in this country could not even pay the prices that the Chicago packers are paying for hogs, because the outlet in this country for the offal, which consists of tenderloin, kidneys, hearts and sausage of all kinds, and grease, is so limited and the price is so much less that we could not compete with the Chicago packers, and, therefore, it is a very important matter to have our hogs fed on mixed grains, so that their bacon does not come in competition with ours.

We have already given you the views of a Chicago packer on the corn question, which fully covers the ground. Should the Agricultural Committee wish to meet the pork packers of this country, we should be very pleased to have our firm represented at said meeting. We, however, trust that the members will see the great importance of this industry, that they will do everything in their power to have Canada keep up its standard of hogs, both as to breeding the right kind and also in having them fed mixed grains.

In another letter dated June 8th, they say :

We presume that you understand that it is impossible to firm beechnut hog product even in the coldest day in winter, as it is so oily that it will not firm. We trust, therefore, that these matters will be so fully discussed in Parliament that the farmers will see what an important matter it is, and that the majority of them, at all events, will have interest enough in the business to still keep the reputation of our Canadian pork where it now is, and which has taken several years to educate them to that point.

Now, I intend to say a few words on the debate. I have in public and private said what I think about the way the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Department of Agriculture is managing that department. I think he is managing it well. I think he is showing great zeal, but tonight my hon. friend on my right caught him tripping. I think if he will turn up his speech to-morrow morning he will find that he committed himself to a proposition which he subsequently regarded as untenable. This feature of the policy of the hon. gentleman shows that despite his zeal to manage his department as it should be managed, he has diverged from the sound rule he had set himself of following carefully the lines pointed out by his predecessors and by his opponents at this moment on this side. What I commend in the hon. gentleman was that the moment he came into office he took up with zeal and enthusiasm the policy that I had propounded from my seat in this House again and again, and the policy that had been laid down by the Conservative party and its Ministers. In the one point of free corn, however, he has diverged from the Conservative policy and also from the tariff before the House. I do not see how he can regard this proposition as consistent with his prudent, imitative reverence for the policy of his predecessors. I heard my hon. friend from the Saskatchewan cheering those who contended that it was a good thing to let corn in free. Well, I have never

yet met a man in the Territories who thought that was a good thing. I never met a man there who did not think that to bring in corn to compete with our wheat-fed pork, would be a bad thing for the North-west. We can produce in the North-west pork and bacon such as no other country in the world can parallel, and had I supposed that the Minister of Agriculture would have diverged into a heterodoxy such as this, both from the point of view of the farmers and of the tariff policy of his Government, I would have brought down from the North-west Territories specimens of the pork and bacon we can produce and submitted them to this House. We can produce there bacon and pork which cannot be equalled even in eastern Canada. The reason for that is that the animals are fed entirely upon the lighter grain—the coarser grain, as they are called, but from my point of view, the lighter grain—and not upon corn. Experts who have been up there, men like the writer of this letter, have told me that all over the North-west Territories, and more particularly in those parts which abound in streams, in those parts where there is plenty of water for the hog, we can produce such a bacon and pork in abundance to supply the breakfast tables not only of Europe, but of this continent as well. All that is necessary is to get our farmers to go into this business, and we can build up a reputation for special pork and bacon, because of the extraordinary advantages we have. And yet, Sir, when we are upon the threshold of developing this vast west, while that great agricultural empire is opening up before us assuring Canada of the great destiny that awaits her, when we have a new Government in power that seem to be following the traditions of its predecessors, we find that in this one thing the policy is reversed, this thing which strikes at the root of an industry peculiar to Canada and special to the North-west. We have a Minister of Agriculture, who is a specialist in his way, supporting this change in our system. You cannot explain it on the ground of policy nor any other ground than this—that men like the hon. Minister, who are rich farmers, prefer to have free corn. The hon. Minister is of the class of farmers described by my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy). I do not know whether that hon. gentleman meant to be offensive, but I do not mean it to be offensive, when I say that the hon. Minister was born with a silver spoon in his mouth. But the farmer who is born with the pitchfork in his mouth and must make the best of his way, is by no means of the class of farmers to which the hon. Minister belongs. I would not mean to suggest that the hon. Minister is a spoon-fed Minister, because I have put on record before my appreciation of him. I think that up to his lights he is an excellent Minister, but the lights do not shine far enough and they are not far

enough advanced. He belongs to a class of farmers who, no doubt, will be assisted by having free corn. The rich farmer who can have a large farm and go into farming such as we see at the Experimental Farm, is benefited by this change. When I was out at the Experimental Farm the other day, praising all I saw there, a man said to me: All this is not one bit neater, not one bit more advanced than you can find on the farm of the Minister of Agriculture. Can that be said of any ordinary farmer? I have often heard my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) speak of that, denouncing the farming at the Experimental Farm. I wish I could adopt his splendid doric; it would be worth hundreds of dollars a year to me. I have heard him at the Experimental Farm declaring that this was not the farming that the farmers of Ontario could be supposed to carry out, and therefore that they could not learn from it as they might be supposed to do. There are farmers even in the North-west, I suppose, large farmers, men of great wealth, who can gain something by corn being allowed to come in free. But I say that an ordinary farmer in the North-west and the ordinary farmer in Ontario have no interest in free corn. I do not wish to obtrude myself upon the House in the discussion of questions of which I have to speak from information obtained at second-hand. I do not profess to be a farmer. I have never farmed an acre in my life. But I have mixed with farmers, I have studied farming; I have been doing my best for the farmers ever since I have taken an interest in politics. And I never did a better stroke for them in my life either in Ontario or in the North-west than in saying that I did not believe that this proposal of free corn was in the interest of the ordinary farmers of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. One of the largest pork-packing industries in Canada is in Toronto—the William Davies Company's establishment. I do not profess to know anything about farming and, unfortunately, I sent away to-day the correspondence and quotations I had in my desk in reference to this question of corn-fed pork. The hon. Minister of Agriculture introduced the name of a gentleman who, I believe, is the Managing Director of the William Davies Company of Toronto—Mr. Flavelle. I propose to vote to-night, if an opportunity is offered me, against the proposal to admit corn free of duty; and I have decided to do so because of the information I have received either by correspondence with or by letters published by the William Davies Company. This company are exporting large quantities of bacon and hams to the old country. The produce of the company is being brought into competition with the best Danish and Irish bacon. They are prepared to meet that competition provided they can get a proper class of hogs from which to make their bacon. The cor-

Mr. DAVIN.

respondence which I have had with that firm and the communications they have sent to the papers have led me to believe that the superiority of their bacon is due to the fact that the hogs purchased by them had been fed upon the coarse grains of Ontario, and not upon corn, either grown in Ontario or imported from the United States. I believe if I had the documents here I could substantiate the statement that they fear if corn is admitted free, vast quantities of it will be fed to hogs, and the high reputation they have gained for bacon will be seriously injured. They say that the possibilities of this trade are immense, if they can only continue to procure the hogs to manufacture the class of bacon they have been exporting. And I desire, with the greatest possible deference to the Minister of Agriculture, to protest against any statement made by him which would lead this House to believe that the William Davies Company are in any way in favour of having corn admitted free to this country. I think I would be justified in making the statement that I have been informed by members of that firm that they avoid buying hogs grown either in the county of Kent or in the county of Essex owing to the fact that these are large corn-growing counties. I make this statement to justify myself in the vote I propose to give, and to correct any impression that might have been made unintentionally by the Minister, to convey to the House the idea that the William Davies Company desired that corn should be admitted free into Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I want to say in reply to what the hon. gentleman has just said, that I quoted Mr. Flavelle as saying that he preferred pork which had been fed some corn; but I did not wish anybody to have the impression that I advocated feeding large quantities of corn to hogs. I say most emphatically that pork which is fed entirely on corn is not desirable for our market. But that some corn should be fed along with other things to pork, is, I believe, the most economical way of producing a high quality of pork.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am anxious to make my position understood in relation to this question. I am perhaps peculiarly placed, and some may think it strange that I should record my vote in the way I propose to do. In the discussion that has taken place nothing, was said with regard to the protection of the lumbermen. That is an industry that is very largely prosecuted in the county that I have the honour to represent; and it has been struggling for some time in the past in consequence of the imposition of a duty on corn and cornmeal. In the county I represent we raise great numbers of cattle, and the fattening of these is particularly favoured by the article of corn and cornmeal being placed on the free list. There-

fore I feel compelled to vote with the Government on this question. I have also another reason for the vote. I would vote in the interests of the farmers of Ontario on the product of corn, were it not that I am convinced of this fact, that we do not grow in Canada corn in quantities sufficient for home consumption; therefore on principle and on that ground alone, if for no other, I would feel compelled to vote with the Government. With regard to corn coming in for the use of distillers, I think if the item remained as it is, that there will be a great deal of nefarious traffic carried on, and that a great deal of the corn will get into the hands of the distillers for the manufacture of whisky by chicanery and fraud, and other means which might be corrected if the Government took the proper means. What I suggest is that the Government increase the excise duty on the distiller's product—whisky and other liquors, and they will avoid by this method all the difficulties that otherwise might ensue were distillers to buy up all Canadian grown corn for whisky, and that for domestic use to be purchased from across the border.

Mr. CARGILL. I must say that this corn question was a very live issue in my election. My opponent was in favour of free corn, and the matter was discussed at every meeting we held. My riding is largely an agricultural constituency, and I have reason to believe that the majority of the farmers there are opposed to the importation of free corn into this country. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen such as the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), a man who is wealthy and who has accumulated his wealth by dint of industry and perseverance—it is all very well for him to talk of protecting the manufacturers of this country. I do not believe that there is a manufacturer in the county of Huron to-day who has been protected since the introduction of the National Policy, that is as well off financially as the hon. member who represents South Huron. He is one of the poor farmers that the people of this country have been commiserating for the last eighteen years, who have been robbed by the National Policy. I have always contended that the farmers have received at the hands of the previous Government more consideration than any other class of the community. They have been protected exactly on the same lines that the manufacturers of this country have been protected. How do you protect the manufacturers? Why has the present Government retained the existing duties? Is it not for the purpose of enabling the manufacturers to continue their business? Certainly it is. Don't you protect the farmer in the same way? You put a duty on agricultural produce from other countries in order to prevent it from coming into Canada to compete in the home market with the Canadian farmer. In what way

do you protect the manufacturer? By putting a duty on the foreign product to keep it from coming into Canada in competition with the Canadian manufacturer. I say that the farmer is and always has been protected exactly in the same way. Some people say the National Policy has made a few rich at the expense of the masses of the people. I deny that assertion. I say that if the National Policy makes one man rich why should not all get rich? It does not discriminate. All the manufacturers of this country have equal advantages. If one man becomes a millionaire and succeeds under the fostering care of the National Policy, why does not his neighbour, producing the same article, equally succeed? We find one manufacturer starting out in this country and acquiring a fortune; his neighbour in the adjoining town, fails, and pays ten cents on the dollar. What has the National Policy got to do with the success of one man and the failure of the others? And so with the merchants. One merchant succeeds and another fails. Take all classes of the community in this country, and we find in each class certain individuals who succeed and who get along in the world while the others fail. Now, has the National Policy anything to do with the failure of one man and the success of another? I say, no. Now, in speaking about this free corn I must say that I am not in favour of it, and I have got very good reason for that. It was discussed in my own riding, and I know that eight out of every ten farmers in the east riding of Bruce are opposed to free corn. If I were speaking in my own interest I would favour free corn. The hon. member for South Huron, during his remarks this evening, tried to make the point that during the years when we imported the most corn into this country, the prices of our own coarse grains were higher. Well, that is naturally the case. When our own coarse grains are high and we can import the foreign articles at a cheaper rate, which will produce our beef and pork, certainly we will take advantage of that. But when our grains are low, that is the time we do not want to import corn, but it is when they are high. I remember distinctly a number of years ago oats were very scarce in Canada, in fact they were not to be had at almost any price. I had occasion to import a number of cars of corn. Previous to the importation of that corn I paid very high prices to the surrounding farmers for oats. They would not sell them at all; they thought they would be worth a high price in the spring. After bringing that corn into the country and supplying myself and a number of the farmers in the neighbourhood with what corn they required for feeding purposes, in the spring I could buy these oats from these farmers at from 15 cents to 20 cents a bushel less than what I offered them previous to importing the corn. This is evidence to me that the importation of corn

into this country will affect the prices of coarse grains. I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that he was specially in favour of importing corn free into this country for the purpose of producing pork and beef, and in his opening remarks I understood him to say that corn-fed pork was quite equal if not superior to pea-fed pork. I may have been mistaken in that; if I am I stand to be corrected, but that is what I understood him to say. Some days ago in the Agricultural Committee I happened to narrate a conversation that I had with a gentleman from the Ingersoll Packing Company, who told me that he did not like to pack corn-fed pork for the reason that they have established in Great Britain a reputation for Canadian bacon equal to that of the Danish bacon and very much superior to that of the American bacon. The fact is, that it is worth about 2 cents a pound more than American bacon, and he was afraid that if corn was imported duty free and fed to the hogs in this country and the product got mixed with Canadian pea-fed pork it would destroy the reputation of the Canadian bacon in the British market. Having noticed in the press that the matter had come up in the Agriculture Committee, this gentleman wired me as follows:—

Ingersoll, Ont., May 29, 1897.

To Cargill, M.P., Ottawa.

McGregor and Featherston's statements before Agricultural Committee misrepresents us. We have no hogs from Essex, positively refusing to buy them, on account of being corn-fed. We have bought some hogs from Bothwell and Thamesville, which are in Kent, but these are fed mixed grains; but we do not buy hogs west of these points, in the counties of Kent or Essex. It does not matter what breed hogs are, if fed wholly on corn, they will not do for export. Writing you fully.

INGERSOLL PACKING CO.

Their letter followed, and I will with the permission of the committee read it. It is as follows:—

Ingersoll Packing Company,  
Ingersoll, Ont., May 29, 1897.

To Mr. Cargill, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We were more than surprised this morning to read the report of the statements made before the Agriculture Committee, which misrepresents fact, and, as our name was brought into the matter, we wired you this morning, refuting the statements. The writer of this letter had the pleasure of meeting you on the 10th instant in Ottawa, and remembers well the conversation we had in the lobby over corn-feeding to hogs. He did state to you that we would not buy hogs from the counties of Essex and Kent, and, to show you, we inclose you a copy of a letter written by us on March 24th of this year to J. L. Scott, of Chatham, which shows our position in the matter. We have been getting a few hogs from Bothwell and Thamesville—which the writer did not think of as being in the county of Kent, when speaking to you—but this is as far west as we go for hogs, and even from this dis-

Mr. CARGILL.

trict we are more or less afraid of them being fed too much corn; but a statement such as McGregor and Featherston made, that lately 26 cars of hogs had gone from Essex to London and Ingersoll packers, as far as we are concerned, is untrue. We have had no hogs whatever from Essex for a long time back, and we always write people in the same strain as copy of letter inclosed, to J. L. Scott. We do not know where Mr. McGregor got the opinion that he expressed, and we regret very much that he gave publicity that the Ingersoll Packing Company prized corn-fed hogs as much as any other, as people versed in the trade would think that we knew very little about the business. To-day, we are paying \$5.25 for Canadian mixed-grain-fed hogs, while our own packing house in Chicago is paying only \$3.60 for corn-fed. Now, it is a well-known fact that, if we raised the same kind of hogs that they do in the United States, there is not a packing house in this country that could exist, because they could not compete with United States packers and pay the same money. It is only on account of the quality of the Canadian hogs being so much superior to the United States hogs that allows us to operate. We are only pleased to be able to write you on this matter to explain our position, as we do not like to be classed with certain politicians to which you referred; so that we trust, if you have an opportunity to refute the statement made by Mr. McGregor and Mr. Featherston, that you will do so.

Yours truly,  
INGERSOLL PACKING COMPANY.  
Per Pro. C. S. Wilson.

P.S.—We are not in the habit of making one statement to one man and different to another, as Alex. McClaren.

I should have read this previous letter addressed to Mr. J. L. Scott. It is as follows:—

Ingersoll, March 24th, 1897.

J. L. Scott, Esq., Chatham, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of March 23rd to hand, and contents fully noted. When you can satisfy us that the quality of the hogs from your district is all right, we shall be pleased to do a large business with you. Our experience with hogs from your district for the last two or three years has been very unsatisfactory, and only last week we tried a single deck shipped on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Chatham, and there were a good many soft hogs in them. Now, until your farmers realize the importance of the right kind of feeding, the hogs from Essex and Kent will never be suitable for export. They are similar in quality to United States hogs, but hardly as good, and if we had to kill that class of hogs, it would be better for us to make bonding arrangement and buy American hogs, which we can get at a great deal less figure. We very much regret that we cannot get hogs from your section, as we are now killing a large quantity of hogs weekly, all the year round, and it would suit us well to be able to get a supply from your district; but we had better pay a good deal more money for hogs from the north, where we can rely on the quality.

Yours truly,  
INGERSOLL PACKING COMPANY.  
Per Pro. (Sgd.) C. C. L. Wilson.

This is the opinion of the Ingersoll Packing Company, as extensive a packing company as there is in the country. In corroboration of what the hon. member for London (Mr.

Beattie) said, I will just read you a letter that I have from the London Packing Company, which is as follows:—

London, Ont., 2nd June, 1897.

Henry Cargill, Esq., M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We have learned that it was reported before the Agricultural Committee by Messrs. McGregor and Featherston that both the Ingersoll Packing Company and the Canadian Packing Company stated that they would just as soon have corn-fed hogs as any other. We beg to inform you that, if we want corn-fed pork, we would go to the States and buy it, as we can get finished pork there at prices below the present prices which we have to pay for Canadian peafed, live hogs. Of course, we have no objection to corn being imported free, as it is a good feed for cattle, horses and other farm stock, but it should not be fed to hogs.

The Canadian bacon has now a good reputation, and the price paid for live hogs is about 2 cents per pound, live weight, more off cars than the present price, off cars, in Chicago.

We would like to believe that the farmers of this country are so intelligent that, even if corn this year is very cheap, they would not spoil the reputation of Canadian bacon by feeding it. If they do, the consequence will be that the Canadian hogs will drop in price to the same level as the American hogs.

We have taken the liberty of writing to you because we heard that you have been talking against these men. Thanking you for your kindness in championing this cause, we remain,

Yours very truly,

THE CANADIAN PACKING CO.

John H. Ginge.

Notwithstanding the knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture, and with all due deference to his opinion, I have reason to believe, that men who are experts, men who are engaged in any particular calling, have a better knowledge of that particular line of business than men who are not practically concerned in it. I have therefore every reason to believe from the expressed opinion of those two packing houses that it would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmer to feed corn wholly to his hogs, but I do believe that a little corn mixed with other grain is all right. I am quite satisfied that these bacon packers are quite averse to buying corn fed pork. We now have a reputation for our bacon established in Great Britain, and it would be a very serious matter for us in any way to injure the good name which our bacon has on the English market.

Mr. MACKIE. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that it is in the interest of the farmers of Canada to get their corn free of duty. The lumber trade of Canada uses an immense quantity of pork every year, but they are obliged to get thousands of barrels of mess pork from the United States, because it is not produced in this country. I believe that if we had free corn, the farmers of Canada would raise enough pork to supply the very large demand of the lumbermen. Notwithstanding the duty of 2 cents a pound immense quantities of pork

are brought into Canada in order to meet our demands. I believe it will be to the advantage of the farmer to be able to obtain their corn free of duty, and I shall therefore support the proposal of the Government.

Mr. KLOEPFER. When the tariff commission sat in Guelph extensive farmers, like the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) appeared before it, but the small farmers were not represented. Mr. Hobson was the spokesman of the large farmers and he advocated free corn. About a week after the tariff commission sat there, the farmers of the locality who held about 100 acres of land, and are not stock feeders, expressed their dissent from the remarks made by Mr. Hobson, and declared themselves against free corn. The ordinary farmer wants to use his coarse grains, and he is not in a position to keep his cattle until they are fat, but he is obliged to sell them before that, to the butchers at home. It is only farmers who are stock raisers, like the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who want corn free for their own use, but their interests and the interests of the ordinary farmer are distinctly different. I state here, and I believe it to be true, that not one farmer out of 20 wants free corn. Free corn will make oats and pease cheaper in this country, and it will also make wheat cheaper, because the middlings will not be used by the stock raisers, if the corn comes in free. I believe also, that another result of free corn will be, that our farmers will be obliged to sell their hay at \$2 less per ton than they receive now. We know that the American farmers will not let \$1 come into Canada if they can help it, and once our money is sent over to the United States to purchase corn, we can say good-bye to it for ever. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) stated some time ago that wheat declined in price 42 cents in the United States as compared with 24 cents in Canada. How is it that they reduced the duty on wheat to 3 cents a bushel? For the next year we will find how much the price of flour will go down in the eastern provinces, while the farmers will get a good deal less for their wheat. A year from now will tell the tale. I believe the farmers should be protected as much as possible. The mechanics of this country are not afraid to pay a little more for their bread; they are willing to give the farmer a little more for everything. If the manufacturers are protected, the workingman is protected, and in the long run the farmer gets the benefit, because in the spring he can get 25 cents a dozen for eggs in the town at home, instead of having to pack the eggs and send them abroad, because before they reached their destination the price would be down. The same is the case with regard to butter and everything else of that kind. I thank the House for the attention with which they have listened to my remarks.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It was not my intention to speak on this matter, and I would not have done so had not the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) spoken so strongly against the pork purchased in Essex and Kent, and I thought it unfair to listen to that challenge without taking it up. This is a pretty large country, and it uses a good deal of pork; and it is astonishing to me to find a gentleman, with two little packing-houses, one at London and the other at Ingersoll, coming into this House and condemning the pork produced in Essex and Kent. Sir, there are no two counties in Canada that produces the quantity of pork which is produced in those two counties; and it is of the very highest quality and commands the very highest price paid in Canada. I have a letter in my possession stating that one dealer alone in the county of Essex sold more than 200 car-loads of pork to the packers in Canada, for which he received the very highest price. We may not produce the kind of pork which is satisfactory to the two packing-houses at London and Ingersoll; but they are not the whole of Canada; they are a very small portion of it. The larger portion of the pork packed in those packing-houses is exported, and they are exporting a kind of pork which was not formerly produced in this country. They require a lean, lanky hog, whereas in Essex we have been growing the fatter kind of hog. But we know that the Essex pork, the Kent pork and the Bothwell pork compares favourably with any pork produced in Canada. It is not all corn-fed pork, any more than all the pork of the east is pea-fed pork. We use mixed feed, which is the best for our purpose. Now, it is said that we ought not to import corn. We have still 7½ cents a bushel of duty on corn brought into Canada. Hon. gentlemen have been talking about the duty on corn increasing the price to the farmers, yet this year in Essex, Kent and Bothwell, fifty-six pounds of good, clean, shelled corn has been sold for 19 cents per bushel on the ear. I have been brought up in this country, and I have never known the price of corn to be so low as it is now. If protection increases the price of our farm products, why should fifty-six pounds of corn bring only 19 cents? It is a most hollow argument. It increases the wealth of the farmer to be enabled to buy corn where he can get it the cheapest for the improvement of his stock. In the county where I live, Walkers use at least 3,000 bushels of shelled corn per day while the distillery is in operation. The farmers of Essex produce the larger portion of that corn, and Walkers pay the farmers of Essex the larger portion of the duty, because they say that the corn costs so much in Chicago, they add the freight, and they pay exactly as much for the corn as they would if it came from Chicago.

Mr. CARGILL. Then you are beating the farmer out of that duty.

Mr. KLOEPFER.

Mr. MCGREGOR. These gentlemen talk about corn coming in free now. Were they not allowing corn to come into this country free for human food? And three-fourths or seven-eighths of that corn was fed for fattening purposes to cattle and hogs. In this way we had free corn in the larger part of the Dominion of Canada under the late Government, under the guise of human food; and they are the gentlemen who talk about free corn. In conclusion, I have only to say that in the counties of Essex, Kent and Bothwell we produce the best pork that is produced in the Dominion of Canada, and we will allow no packing house to run down the quality of our pork.

Mr. MARTIN. At no period in the history of Canada could it have been more injudicious to bring in corn free than it is at the present time. I say that because I do not know any period in the history of Canada when the prices of coarse grains have been so low as they are at present. There might have been a time when it was judicious to introduce corn free, that was, when the farmers of this country could not produce sufficient coarse grains to feed their stock. Every hon. gentleman knows that to-day this country produces much more coarse grains than are required by the farmers for feeding their cattle. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) urged us to rise above party politics in discussing this matter. Well, I should hope that hon. members would rise superior to party politics, not only in discussing this but other questions as well, and I would also suggest to my hon. friend that he should not only rise above party politics but above personal interests, and I throw out the suggestion without design to make any personal or offensive allusions. There was one thing which struck rather forcibly in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. He started out with evidently great faith in his ability to prove that it was necessary for our farmers to have free corn, but when a few questions were put to him he found himself obliged to shift his ground, and favoured us with this peculiar argument. He said that since we had given Great Britain preferential trade, we ought to offer something to the United States, and he thought that by admitting their corn free we might conciliate them. Having failed to prove to this House free corn was necessary for our farmers to feed their stock, he had to resort to the plea that this was after all a sop to conciliate the United States. If this be a sample of the free trade which this Government are going to introduce, it is a sample that is going to injure the farmers of this country. The Government evidently suppose that they can do anything to the farmers and the farmers will not resent it. Instead of opening up new markets for the farmers, as they promised, they are about to take from our farmer the market he has.

I shall have much pleasure in voting for the amendment.

Mr. PERRY. I wish to protest to this House against the claim of the hon. gentleman to represent the views and interests of the farmers of Prince Edward Island. He certainly does not represent their opinions on this subject. The hon. gentleman must know that the cheaper our farmers can buy the feed for their stock, especially the poorer class of farmers, the better for them. The hon. gentleman is therefore standing in the light of the welfare of his own constituents. If we look back to the 23rd of June, what do we find was the expressed will of the people? It was that the Government should carry out their policy of a tariff for revenue only, and the people of Prince Edward Island are expecting the Government to carry out that policy to the fullest extent possible, and they look with favour on this proposition to allow corn in free of duty. I should like to see the Government admit many other articles free which are used by our farmers.

Amendment negatived: Nays, 33; Yeas, 76.

Mr. INGRAM. There were hon. gentlemen on the other side who have not voted either way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not vote because I was paired with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Kendry).

Mr. GIBSON. I was paired with the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby).

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I was paired with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to divide item 357 which classes a number of the silk articles at 35 per cent and to admit some at 30 per cent and the remainder at 35. I propose that the item should read:

Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, thirty per cent.

Ribbons of all kinds and materials and manufactures of silk of which silk is the component part of largest value, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent.

The object is to reduce the duty on certain articles which are used by manufacturers, and, perhaps, I may add that they are not made in Canada, so I suppose there will be no objection.

Amendment agreed to.

Metal glove fasteners, papier-mache shoe buttons, eyelets, eyelet hooks, and shoe-lace wire fasteners.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been requested to ask the Minister of Finance to add the words, "and sewing machine attachments" and strike out the word "and" after the word "hooks." Sewing machine attachments are not made at all in the country, and the manufacturers of sewing machines have requested that these attachments be admitted free.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What do you mean by sewing machine attachments?

Mr. KLOEPFER. They are the small attachments that makes the frills, they go on the needle bar. They are not made here.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the wording in section 592:

Wire, of brass, zinc, iron or steel, screwed or twisted, or flattened and corrugated.

I am informed by the shoe manufacturers in Montreal that there is no wire that is flattened and corrugated, but that the wire is either flattened or corrugated. No wire is both flattened and corrugated.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We will change it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like the committee to change the wording of items 174 and 175, on coal, not to change them very much in substance, but that the wording might be better. There was a change made at an earlier stage which I explained. The object of the change was that we should place our tariff in such a position that we could avail ourselves of whatever advantage there might be in the American tariff. Accordingly we proposed to fix the duty at the equivalent of 60 cents per long ton, and I placed the figure at 54 cents. That is not strictly accurate, and I propose to fix it at 35 cents, which will bring it clearly within the terms of the American tariff. That duty of 53 cents is subject to the reciprocal tariff. We have also provided what we regard as an inducement to the Americans to take a further step by putting in a proviso that we shall reduce our duty to 40 cents whenever they do likewise. Now, if this is desirable, and of course that is the view which the Government have, it is unreasonable to expect that the Americans will reduce their duty to that point unless we are disposed to make it the same from the United States as from any other place. What we propose therefore is that the reciprocal duty shall apply at present to the 53 cent rate, but if the Americans should accept the offer of a 40 cent rate that would be the minimum from all countries.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very important point. That is taking up the principle of not only allowing the countries whose tariff

on the whole is of such a nature as to make it equal to that of Canada, to receive the reciprocal privileges, but it is actually taking one single article out of the tariff of a country and making it applicable to that article alone.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. That is entirely different from the principle you laid down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is desirable that we should make our offer in a form that will tempt our neighbours to accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not going to give Great Britain any preferential treatment on that. By the present duty put on coal Great Britain has a preference of one-eighth and later on of one-quarter. To-day you are going to give a preference to the United States whose tariff is way above the Canadian tariff and you are undertaking to break down the whole principle you have put forth. You are giving an equal preference to the United States that you give to Great Britain while Great Britain gives you free trade and the United States prohibition upon that line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At this particular moment the United States duty is not away up, but below our own duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is there any consistency in the tariff of that kind?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The object we have in view is twofold. First, to lower the rate upon coal in Canada, and second, to lower the rate on coal going into the United States. Both are desirable purposes. We propose to offer the Americans a 40 cent rate and if they accept that offer we shall make that the minimum duty on that class of coal from all countries. We must make this offer attractive to the Americans if we desire that they shall accept it. I shall read the clauses. Items 174 and 175 are as follows:—

Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, twenty per cent ad valorem, but not to exceed thirteen cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of fifteen cents per ton of 2,240 pounds): Provided that if the United States Congress shall fix the duty on such slack coal at a rate not exceeding fifteen cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, then the duty on such coal imported into Canada as provided in this item shall be the minimum duty on such coal from all countries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section 16 of this Act.

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal n.e.s., fifty-three cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of sixty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds): Provided that if the United States Congress shall fix the duty on such coal at a rate not exceeding forty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, the Governor in Council may by proclamation reduce the duty mentioned in this

Mr. FOSTER.

item to forty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, or the equivalent thereof per ton of 2,000 pounds, and the duty declared by such proclamation shall then be the minimum duty on such coal from all countries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section 16 of this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether my hon. friend proposes to take the discussion on this now. But so far as I am concerned I stand for the preferential treatment of Great Britain rather than of the United States. I am not going to have the Premier of this country going over to Great Britain and declaring to them on all the platforms where he is so well received, that we are giving to Great Britain a preference over every other country in the world, while on this great item of coal which Great Britain produces in abundance and which is carried by her vessels to this country give to the country whose tariff is hostile to us in almost every respect a favour as compared with Great Britain. If there is anything which marks the absurdity of the tariff principle laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite this is one of the things. My hon. friend cannot expect that to be carried without debate.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It does not give a favour; Great Britain will be in precisely the same position as the Americans.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend knows that the whole *raison d'être* of his tariff principle was that Great Britain should have the favoured place.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There are exceptions to that. There is sugar, and the manufactures of certain articles which are exceptions.

Mr. FOSTER. We have to deal with the hon. gentleman's policy and not with articles of the tariff or with single exceptions taken out. Does my hon. friend the Controller of Customs now propose to take out any items of high tariff countries and to place them in the preferential schedule and still keep the high principle that he started out with? Great Britain gives us the freedom of her market now and is she not to have a preferential tariff on those articles which she can export to our country?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may remember that the preference is offered to all nations.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not what the Premier of this country has been telling to British audiences. What he has been telling them is that Canada, out of good will and because Great Britain has given us the freedom of her market, is giving her a preference, and yet it is proposed on this article to give the same preference to the highest tariff country in the world.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The result of our declaration was that this country was open to every country willing to avail itself of our offer.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce state that on the whole the tariff of the United States is favourable to us and that therefore they should have this favourable treatment in reference to one article.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We are not only desirous that we should have the coal of the United States, but we desire that the coal at the two ends of our Dominion shall have a market in the United States. Our tariff is framed in the interests of Canada. It is in the interest of Canada and of the Canadian consumer; in the interests of the consumer as well as in the interest of the Canadian coal producer who think it desirable to offer these terms to the United States. They get no favour but even terms, and they give us even terms. The only inconsistency is in the hon. gentleman's imagination.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If it is the consumer my hon. friend is careful for, let the consumer have the benefit of the one-eighth and one-quarter reduction on British coal.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He has it now. We agree that while the duty remains at 53 cents, the preference shall be given, but if we bring it down to 40 cents, that shall be the minimum rate for all countries.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. The preference remains. It is only in the event of its coming down to 40 cents. I think the hon. gentleman ought to let that pass.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We are very anxious if we can get through with the whole tariff to-night. I think the hon. gentleman might let that be done. I grant you that the question which the hon. gentleman has raised is worthy of debate.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think we have reached our limit now.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The natural way to take it is when the Speaker is in the Chair. If it is not allowed to pass now we will lose the stage.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I wish to call the attention of the Controller to the fact that he promised to make an addition to resolution No. 14.

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. The words we intend to add are these: "or before a notary public or commissioner for taking affidavits."

Mr. **HENDERSON**. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I want to appeal once more to the Minister of Finance on behalf of the makers of carriage hardware, who have requested to have their Norway iron and steel for the purpose of making carriage hardware and threshing machinery wheels free. These manufactures have been reduced 2½ per cent on their output; and all the manufacturers of the same line have their material free. It does not hurt the manufacturers of iron or steel in this country, because these goods have to be imported. I am informed by Mr. Gillies, who is one of the manufacturers, that if the tariff is allowed to remain as it is he cannot get on.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We have endeavoured to meet as many suggestions as possible from hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do not think we can agree to that one.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I wish to move a resolution, in the same form that my hon. friend opposite had, to prevent confusion arising out of the changing of the resolutions as they passed through the House. It is as follows:—

Provided, that in the case of goods which were imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption and on which duty was paid, on or after the 23rd day of April, 1897, in accordance with the rate of duty set forth as payable on such goods in the resolutions respecting the duties of customs introduced in the House of Commons on the 22nd day of April, 1897, or in any such resolutions subsequently introduced in the said House, the duty so paid shall not be affected, nor shall the person paying it be entitled to any refund or be liable to any further payment of duty, by reason of such rate of duty being altered by any resolution introduced subsequently to that in accordance with which such duty was paid and before the passing of this Act.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before the House adjourns, I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to the incomplete nature of the return which was brought down in answer to an Order of the House, with reference to the commissioners appointed to try the political partisan cases. I find that it is altogether incomplete. For instance, so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, I do not find the name of Mr. William Wilson or the name of Mr. Atkinson, both of whom have been active in judging, particularly on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to have that return made as complete as possible. There were two or three other returns ordered, neither of which I suppose would

take half an hour to prepare, in the Post Office Department: one, correspondence with regard to dismissals at Upper Majorville Post Office; another, correspondence on Mr. King's appointment to the post office at Marsh Hill, and another with regard to the employees dismissed in the counties of King's and York.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.15 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS.

### NOVA SCOTIA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. KAULBACH asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to bring down resolutions this session granting the usual subsidy of \$2,200 a mile for the extension of the railway known as the Nova Scotia Southern from New Germany to Halifax via New Ross, to connect by branch lines with Chester Basin, Chester and Hubbard's Cove ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). That will be known when the subsidy resolutions are brought down. I am not in a position to give the information before.

### BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. KAULBACH asked :

Is it the intention of the Government, in consequence of the depressed condition of the fishing industry in the maritime provinces the past few years, to increase the bounty to fishermen by submitting a resolution to that effect this session ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright.) It is not intended this session to entertain the bounty.

### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS— ARREARS OF INTEREST.

Mr. PENNY asked :

Are the Quebec Harbour Commissioners indebted to the Government for arrears of interest on cash advanced? If so, what is the present amount of arrears for interest on that account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Yes; \$1,241,327.46.

Mr. FOSTER.

## SATURDAY SESSION.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That when this House adjourns to-day it stands adjourned until to-morrow (Saturday) at 11 o'clock a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that I shall not be able to leave the Chair to-morrow at Six o'clock under this resolution.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is more convenient that we should adjourn at pleasure without fixing any absolute hour.

Motion agreed to.

### BEHRING SEA CONVENTION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to a matter of very considerable importance which, I see is stated in the London correspondence of the "Globe," "Gazette," and a number of other papers:—

London, June 13.—The Associated Press has reason to believe that in consequence of the representations made by Col. John Hay, the United States Ambassador, to the Foreign Office, the attitude of the British Government with regard to the reopening of the Behring Sea question has undergone some modification, and that whereas some weeks ago it was believed Lord Salisbury was averse to the question being discussed until the date arranged by the Paris award, viz., next year at the present moment there is a disposition to discuss matters now. Inquiry at the Foreign Office fails to elicit what this change exactly is. The greatest reticence is displayed in the matter. At the American Embassy also the officials decline to discuss the matter.

I may say, in a very few words, and if necessary I will conclude with a motion, though I hope it will not be necessary as this matter is one of considerable importance. When the international convention was held at Paris, on the Behring Sea question, and a conclusion arrived at, the parties who represented the United States claimed, on their return to the United States, that they had accomplished completely their object, that in fact Canadian sealing in the Behring Sea was practically extinguished. That view was not exactly held by either Great Britain or Canada, and it was not very long afterwards until an agitation was commenced on the part of the Government of the United States to reopen the question on the ground that instead of having extinguished Canadian sealing, which was undoubtedly the object the United States had in view, and giving the monopoly of the entire business to the very powerful corporation to whom the United States Government had leased the American fisheries in the Behring Sea, the seals were going to be exterminated by the Canadians. It was

provided by the Tribunal that at the end of five years the question might be reconsidered, and down to the present, Her Majesty's Government, certainly with the hearty concurrence of Canada, have taken the ground that whatever information might be obtained, either by officials of Great Britain or Canada or the United States, the question would not be re-opened, but should remain as it was until the termination of the five years period. I draw attention to the fact, of which, of course, the hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware, that the Government of the United States have appointed a very able gentleman indeed, Mr. Foster, who represented them at the International Tribunal at Paris, for the purpose of devoting his entire time and energies to getting this Behring Sea question reopened by Her Majesty's Government, and not only to actively use such exertion as he can with Her Majesty's Government but to appeal to Japan and Russia and other countries with a view of forcing Great Britain to depart from the terms arranged at that International convention. Knowing, as I do, that Mr. Foster is an exceedingly able man, and knowing the persistent efforts that both great parties in the United States, and the entire press of that country, have made, from the first, to strike down a Canadian industry on the Pacific, I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the necessity of Canada being specially on the alert to do everything possible to prevent the reopening of the question. So far as I am advised, Her Majesty's Government had persistently refused to reopen it, but I am not at all certain that this information sent from the Associated Press has not a good deal of foundation. I happen to know that it was due to the persistent and energetic efforts of the very able Minister of the United States in London, Mr. Phelps, that the Foreign Office were, in the first instance, disposed to permit this question to be dealt with in a manner that no similar international question had ever been dealt with before by any country in the world, so far as I am informed.

Now, as my hon. friend knows, the Imperial Government requested the Government of Canada to name gentlemen to go in conjunction with those named by the Imperial Government for the purpose of investigating facts connected with seal life. Accordingly these gentlemen were sent out, and I noticed that Her Majesty's Government have laid on the Table of the House of Commons the report made by Professor D'Arcy Thompson who was commissioned by Her Majesty's Government to deal with this question, and I think I am right in saying that Mr. Venning and Mr. Macoun were appointed to act in conjunction, in this investigation, for the purpose of acquiring information. The American commissioner having published his report, it becomes absolutely necessary that the report of Professor

Thompson should be made public. I will detain the House for a few moments while I read a sentence or two from that report. I quote from page 25 :

I do not propose to explain all the points that an examination of the statistics suggests. But while I believe that there are sufficient discrepancies to indicate the presence of other factors in the case, yet it would, in my opinion, be useless to deny that the figures tend to corroborate the presumption that pelagic sealing is responsible for a large part of this autumnal mortality.

The general result of our investigation, accordingly, is that pelagic sealing, instead of being the one and only cause of the whole mortality of pups upon the islands, is, in fact, responsible for an unknown, but considerable, fraction of a fraction which is somewhat over one-half of the whole.

That is a very important statement and one that I think, from the best information I have, the officials sent out by the Canadian Government with the Imperial commission, would probably tend to modify ; and I draw the attention of my hon. friend to the desirability of laying upon the Table of the House the report of the gentlemen specially commissioned by Canada at the request of Her Majesty's Government to join in this commission of investigation and giving the widest publicity throughout the press to the views contained therein. There is another sentence contained in this report which is very reassuring :

In the foregoing account, I have merely set forth my observation of the herd and its past history, in so far as both together show that the alarming statements to which utterance has been given in recent years, the accounts of the herd's immense decrease, and the prophecies of its approaching extinction are overdrawn and untenable.

It is upon these overdrawn and untenable statements that efforts is being made to induce Her Majesty's Government to do that which, I think, would be a very great misfortune because it would tend to disturb the weight and importance and value of great international arbitrations and investigations such as that held in Paris. I am sure it is not necessary to say more, because my hon. friend fully appreciates the importance of the case. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the active exertions made by the opponents of a great Canadian industry whose avowed object is its extinction, and the necessity of taking every means, through the public press and official communications with Her Majesty's Government, to prevent this insidious design on the part of the United States being carried out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It became my duty shortly after assuming the office I now hold to master, as fast as I was able, this subject of pelagic sealing in Behring Sea. I appreciate fully the importance of the matter, and the department has taken note of

the recent appointment by the United States Government of General Foster to visit the Court of St. James, and endeavour, if possible, to obtain an alteration of the Paris regulations before the expiry of the five years. After studying up the question as far as I could, I determined to follow on the lines of my predecessors. So far as any action taken by the Canadian Government is concerned, we have invariably followed in the lines taken by the late Government. We have opposed in every possible way with the Imperial Government any change being made in the regulations of the Paris award governing this pelagic sealing until the expiration of the time for which it was originally fixed. Speaking generally—and I think I can say this without any breach of official etiquette—so far I have no reason whatever to fear that the British Government will take any action opposed to the representations of the Canadian Government. I may say to the hon. gentleman that this Government sent Mr. Macoun last year to make a scientific study of this question along with Professor D'Arcy Thompson and Mr. Barrett-Hamilton, who were sent out by England. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Barrett-Hamilton on his return, and talked the whole matter over with him. And when Professor D'Arcy Thompson and Mr. Barrett-Hamilton returned to England and were making their report, so important did I deem the matter, I sent Mr. Macoun from Canada to England to compare his notes with theirs, so that their report would be on the same line. tally, if possible, that is, that they should compare the data they had collected so that their reports would be on the same line. And I am happy to say that I have received assurances from England that Mr. Macoun gave the most invaluable assistance to Prof. D'Arcy Thompson in preparing his report. In one point I differ from the officers of my department in this matter. When I had read the reports from year to year and had given the matter consideration, I came to the conclusion that we had adopted a foolish policy. The United States were publishing reports of the scientists every year as soon as they were received and the newspapers were publishing excerpts from these reports, and so guiding, influencing and making public opinion in favour of their case. In England the reports were published and laid before Parliament and they proved a most valuable repertoire from which facts could be obtained from time to time. But I found there was a deep-seated aversion on the part of the gentleman who controls that branch of the department's business to publishing reports of our Canadian scientists. I argued with him, and presented the case from my point of view. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows how reluctant a Minister is in a matter of this kind which has been before the department for years, to override a strong opinion held by the gentleman in charge of the branch. He opposed

Mr. DAVIES.

very strongly the publication of these reports. I have never wavered in my opinion that he is making a great mistake. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up and I shall call Mr. Venning's attention to the fact that the leader of the Opposition agrees in the view that I hold, that the report of Mr. Macoun, which is a most valuable report, should be published. I have read both reports and compared them and I believe that Mr. Macoun's report is even more valuable than that of Prof. D'Arcy Thompson. Mr. Macoun is a man who takes the greatest pains to be accurate, he has been on the ground from year to year and he knows whereof he speaks. The data he has collected and embodied in his report, and the argument are almost irresistible as against any change in the regulations and against the views of the United States Government hold on the subject of pelagic sealing. If I am able to overcome the reluctance of my officer I hope we shall have this report published also. If I had had my way it would have been published before this. But I do not like to go in opposition to an opinion held so very strongly by Mr. Venning, that we would gain in the long run by keeping the report back. I think he has made a mistake and I shall press upon him the importance of publishing the report. I may say that the English Government has again sent Prof. D'Arcy Thompson and Mr. Barrett-Hamilton to the Pribyloff and Commander Islands, and we have sent Mr. Macoun. The Americans have also sent their scientists. I think it would be absurd, in view of the differences of opinion among these gentlemen to make any change in the regulations until the five years have elapsed. I have compared the conclusions reached by Prof. Jordan with those of Prof. D'Arcy Thompson. Though their conclusions do not agree, I am pleased to be able to say that the facts they give with reference to seal life on the Pribyloff Islands do not differ very much; and I think that by comparing the facts that Dr. Jordan gives with those of the other authorities as to the number of seals to be found at different times, the prevailing impression that pelagic sealing is destroying the seal life is entirely unfounded. I thank the hon. gentleman for bringing this matter forward, and I shall take care that the officers of my department have this matter specially drawn to their notice.

#### JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF RIMOUSKI.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked :

1. Whether Mr. Justice J. E. Larue, who is charged with the administration of justice in the district of Rimouski, was appointed with the condition that he should reside at the chef lieu of the district?
2. If not, why not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Justice Larue was appointed judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec on the 12th April, 1886, and then assigned to the judicial district of Bonaventure and Gaspé, and directed to reside at New Carlisle or Percé. Afterwards by Order in Council of 25th February, 1888, he was transferred to the district of Rimouski, but the Order in Council contains no direction as to his place of residence.

#### DISMISSALS, INVERNESS, 1879.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked :

1. How many dismissals of Dominion officials were effected in the county of Inverness on the 15th September, 1879, at the instance of Dr. Hugh Cameron, then a defeated candidate?

2. The number of appointments effected on the 15th of September, 1879, for the county of Inverness by Dr. Cameron's recommendation to replace those dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows :—1. Twelve : Hugh Gillis, Murdoch A. Ross, John Cameron, John Meacher, Michael McDonald, A. McLellan, James McGarry, Kenneth McKenzie, Malcolm McLeod, George Ingraham, John Carroll, Donald McDonald. 2. Fifteen : David Ross, Miles McDaniel, D. F. McLean, Peter Benvie, M. B. McDonald, John McLean, William Murphy, John McKenzie, D. McDermid, D. Carmichael, William Hart, jr., Allan McLennan (John's son), Angus McFarlane, J. P. McFarlane, Stephen Graham.

#### I.C.R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has no objection, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) would like to take a pro forma stage of the report of the committee relating to the Intercolonial Railway extension to Montreal and introduce a Bill—that is if there is to be no discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think there will be any discussion.

Resolution read the second time and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to confirm certain agreements entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he might state to the House that he was good enough to show me the original contract and found there was the error mentioned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the House was in Committee of the Whole I sent for the contract which had been executed between this company and the Government, and put it into the hands of the leader of the Opposition, who had an opportunity of inspecting it, and he handed it back to me. He desires me to say that the agreement as it was printed appeared to have contained the error referred to ; but in looking over the original draft before it was sent to the printer, we found that it was in the form in which the committee finally placed it, that is to say, that the error had occurred in the printed contract passing from the original draft into the present form in which it was finally executed, and in which it was before the committee, that is to say, the word "west" was not changed to "east." That has been since rectified.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Royal Military College of Canada..... \$65,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In moving this vote, it is desirable perhaps that I should explain to the committee certain important changes which are about to take place in the organization and general management of the college. As the committee are aware, for a number of years past the attendance upon this college and the number of graduates per annum have been steadily decreasing. To such an extent has this gone that, as the committee probably is also aware, many gentlemen on both sides of the House had come to the opinion, expressed pretty freely on the floor, that it would be better to abolish the college altogether. In that opinion the Government were not able to concur. They thought that the college had in the past rendered considerable services to Canada, and that particularly in view of the relations between ourselves and the British Government, it would be a great pity to destroy an institution which had in no slight degree contributed to inspire abroad a good opinion of the military capacities and abilities of the youth of Canada. But we felt that we could hardly justify to ourselves or to the House, asking for a large sum unless there was a reasonable prospect that a considerable number of our people would avail themselves of the advantages afforded by

the institution. The new commandant, Col. Kittson, submitted to the Government a scheme by which he thought it was probable that the utility of the college would be largely increased and the gross expenditure diminished to a considerable extent. The main features of this scheme, which have received the approval of the Government, are these: In the first place, the length of the period of the attendance at college is reduced from four years to three. In the next place, the annual expense inflicted on the parents of the cadets is also considerably reduced, from, I think, \$350 or \$400 a year to \$250 in round numbers. The net result is this, that whereas under the old system it required about \$1,400 a year to pass a cadet through the college, under the present system, about \$700 or about \$750 would suffice. The scheme of instruction proposed for the cadets remains essentially military. One or two subjects have been dropped, but on the whole the college remains as it was originally intended to be, a military college chiefly. I think the staff of professors is to be reduced by five, involving a saving of \$5,000 or \$6,000, and I will not require to ask the House for a vote of \$65,000, but I will ask the committee to reduce the sum to \$60,000 per annum. The professors who have been retired are Prof. Harris, Prof. Day, Prof. Wurtele, Prof. Waddell and Prof. Duval. Most of these gentlemen were retired. I may state, in pursuance of the report of the Board of Visitors who inspected the college in 1895, and who had been appointed by the late Government. I may state generally that the main alterations, apart from the reduction of four years to three, are these: The subject of free hand drawing is made optional. The course of military engineering is confined to such subjects as are necessary for a cadet passing into the Imperial service. The course in physics, chemistry and geology is somewhat reduced. The instruction in English is confined to the first and second years, it being considered that no person should be admitted into the college who was not fairly well grounded in all subjects comprised in an ordinary English education. As to mathematics, civil engineering and civil surveying, they remain with the same number of hours allotted to them as under the old system. These are briefly the changes that have been made, and it may interest the committee to know that they have already resulted in an enormous increase in the number of applicants for examination at the college. Whereas in former years the number had fallen, I am informed, to something like nine or ten per annum, I have received information from the commandant that on the present occasion, for the first time, I think, in 12 or 14 years at least, 40 gentlemen have applied to be examined as cadets, a larger number than we can possibly admit. I am inclined to think that the result of the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

changes that have been made will greatly popularize the college, and throw it open to a much larger number of persons than could formerly have competed for it. I am strongly inclined to believe also that within the space of two or three years, the college will be fully attended. It was intended in the first instance to provide for the instruction of 120 cadets. That number, as I mentioned, had greatly fallen off, and I believe that in the last few years the number was hardly more than 40 or 50 at the outside. Of course under these circumstances it was obvious that the staff was very disproportionate to the needs of the college, and that was one of the reasons which led to the reductions which have been made, under the advice of Col. Kittson. Having only three classes to deal with instead of four, it was quite obvious that a smaller number of professors is required. But I think that from all I have been able to learn as to the results of the proposed changes, they will have the effect in a very short time of restoring the college to the position that it formerly held, and of providing an ample supply of candidates from time to time. With these remarks I move that the sum be reduced from \$65,000 to \$60,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must in the first place thank my hon. friend the leader of the House for his courtesy in bringing forward this item at the present moment, compelled as I am by urgent private business to leave for London to-morrow. I need not say to the hon. gentlemen opposite how reluctantly I part from them a day or two before I otherwise would be obliged to do so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The reluctance is mutual.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated frankly to my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) my anxiety to have an opportunity of saying a few words to the House, upon what I regard as an extremely grave question. The grandest and most enduring monument that the late Alexander Mackenzie raised to his memory was the Royal Military College of Kingston. Mr. Mackenzie founded that institution in the face of considerable difficulty. He quite appreciated the unpopularity of asking the Parliament of Canada to spend a large amount of public money for the purpose of founding a military college, but he regarded the position which Canada occupied in connection with its defensive organization to be of such great moment, as to warrant him in asking Parliament for the expenditure of a large sum of public money, not only at the outset, but annually afterwards, for the purpose of giving full and complete instruction to such of the young men of Canada as wished to acquire a military education, and which would stand the country in good stead in the hour of need. The result has justified the sound opinion that Mr. Mackenzie entertained on

that occasion. I may say, that from the day of the foundation of that military school down to the unhappy hour when the present Government changed the policy heretofore pursued, the objects of Mr. Mackenzie in founding the Military College have been faithfully carried out by the Conservative Government in Canada. I regard the policy of this Government as a complete departure from the object of Mr. Mackenzie in founding the Military College, and a departure as well from the policy of the Parliament of Canada in sustaining it from year to year up to the present time. Regarding this complete change as an abandonment of all the principles on which Parliament could be asked to spend this money, I regard this measure as the death knell of the Royal Military College, and as a complete effacement of what I have already said, is the noblest monument to the memory of the Hon. A. Mackenzie in this country. I take issue at once with the statement of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), that there has been failure in the past management of the College, to maintain it in the high position that was anticipated for it. I contend, Sir, that the Royal Military College of Kingston always maintained the very highest standing in Canada and in the Empire. One of the best authorities in the British Empire, a gentleman who has given great attention to this very question, Major General Sir Andrew Clark, put on record this declaration: That the Royal Military College in Canada was second to no military school in the world. We cannot have much higher praise than that for the Royal Military College at Kingston. Major General Clark stated, that he gave this opinion, not only after a careful consideration of the curriculum of that college, but on what was more valuable still, namely, the high class of men that that college had turned out. Major General Clark was aware that eighty cadets of the Royal Military College were serving in the Imperial Army, and that no men who received their education in any other part of the world surpassed these gentlemen that Canada had sent to the Imperial army. I give that as an evidence, that the objects that were in view when this college was established have been thoroughly realized. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made disparaging remarks as to the condition in which the present Government found this college, when they came into power, and in reply to that, I shall read a few extracts from the highest authority in this country. I refer to the report of Major General Cameron who had been for many years, and who was at the time this report was made, responsible for the condition of the college. In his annual report for 1896, Major General Cameron, among other things said:

141

It is the intellectual—it is not the mechanical side of soldiering which has chiefly to be dealt with at a military entrance college.

If our critics could for a moment have realized this point, and allowed honesty guided by intelligence to regulate their remarks, they could not have yielded to the malign influence which led them to disparage the work being worthily done by the instructors and cadets here. They might have learnt that in 1893, the Inspector General of Fortifications of Her Majesty's Forces, on a deputation on military education to the Secretary of State for War, spoke of our graduates in the highest terms, saying: "The officers we get elsewhere than from Woolwich, are far better than those who come from Woolwich, either with regard to science or with regard to general education. The officers which we get from the Military College of Canada are very good men indeed: it is true we get only one or two from there, so perhaps they are the best the college can produce." Again, before a Royal Commission to inquire into the entrance examination, in 1894, they are referred to as having had a higher standard of work, and more knowledge of what was required by Royal Engineers than graduates from Woolwich.

I draw the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is now presiding over the Department of Militia and Defence to that statement, which says, that the cadets from the Royal Military College of Kingston are of much higher standing than the cadets from Woolwich.

Our adverse critics might have learnt too, that within a few weeks preceding the commencement of their attacks, general progress had advanced to a point never before attained in the history of the college, since its foundation in 1876.

We have the statement of the gentleman who had been in charge of that college for years, that instead of having lost ground, the college never stood in a higher position than it does now, or than it did at that period.

Previous to the last four years, the most distinguished gold medallist of the college was Mr. Wm. J. Stewart, who graduated so long ago as 1883, with a record of 54,656 marks.

During the last four years that record has been exceeded in four instances by from 924 to 1,802 marks.

The next highest record made previously to 1892, was by Capt. Lang, D.S.O., R.E., with 53,505 in 1883. Since 1891 his record has been surpassed seven times, by an average of 1,769 marks.

The third highest record up to 1892 was made by Mr. R. W. Leonard, with 53,271 marks this again in 1883. His score has been surpassed, since 1891, eight times, by an average of 2,760 marks.

Only three graduates named—inclusive of but one gold medallist—find place and rank as 5th, 9th and 11th, amongst the following gentlemen, who, with one exception in 1891, all graduated since 1891: Messrs. F. H. Vercoe, R. J. F. Hayter, J. F. Fraser, N. S. Ridout, G. R. Frith, G. F. F. Osborn, G. N. Cory, D. S. McInnes, G. S. Wilkes, V. L. Beer, W. C. Dumble, J. W. Osborne.

So that but for the men of 1883, all those whose names I have read, graduates of the last few years, surpassed all previous records since the foundation of the college in 1876. Moreover, prior to 1892, in only one instance did the marks of a gold medallist exceed the mere average marks of the graduating class of last year.

Ailusion has already been made to the high place accorded in 1893 and 1894 to graduates of the Royal Military College of Canada by leading expert opinion in England. In 1894, and again in 1895, extensive military surveys were made for the Dominion Government.

All the gentlemen who executed the work were cadets within the last three years:—Messrs. F. B. Osler, R. W. Brigstocke, J. E. Beatty, N. S. Ridout, H. L. Gordon, F. N. Gibbs, P. E. Thacker, F. D. Lafferty, R. E. Tyrwhitt, A. T. LeFevre, A. A. Inksetter, F. E. Leach.

In this list there is repeated only one name previously mentioned.

The survey effected gained for these gentlemen the highest encomiums from the Dominion authorities, and the marked appreciation of expert military authorities in England.

Passing to drill:—The Queen's Cup for rifle shooting by teams of eight, is probably the prize which excites most thorough competition throughout Her Majesty's regular forces. The very best marksmen can alone have the honour of representing their respective corps in the contest.

In 1895, the victory in the match for the Queen's Cup was distinguished by success far surpassing any previous record. So great were considered the merits of the victorious team, that not merely were its members personally eulogized in the warmest terms of appreciation by the Viceroy of Ireland, and Field Marshal Lord Roberts on a specially appointed parade, but they were summoned from Ireland to Windsor Castle by Her Majesty, in order that they might receive their reward from the hands of the Queen of the British Empire.

On that team of eight, the Royal Military College of Canada was represented by a graduate of 1894, 2nd Lieutenant R. H. B. Magee, of the Royal Munster Fusiliers.

This year, a graduate of 1893 carried our college colours to victory at Cairo. Winning the grand aggregate in the military contests there, he came within one point of being champion marksman in Egypt, and captured the fencing championship.

Our representative was 2nd Lieutenant J. J. B. Farley, of the Prince of Wales' North Staffordshire Regiment.

This year again, this very month, graduates and cadets have had an opportunity of proving in public competition the excellent results of drill exercises here.

The college was represented at the Toronto military tournament by 14 persons.

The sergeant instructor, three graduates of 1890, 1891 and 1894 respectively, and ten cadets.

In eleven contests they took seven first prizes and five second places.

Lieut. Panet, R.C.A., a graduate of 1891, tied with Lieut. Peters, G.G.B.G., in taking the greatest number of individual prizes.

Eight cadets:—Messrs. D. Weatherbe, J. A. Stairs, H. H. Syer, L. G. Bennett, C. deB. Doucet, F. H. Courtney, C. D. W. Unlacke, H. R. Payzant, took part in winning three first prizes and one second in five events.

The critics to whom reference has been made, and others with political views, are ever ready to associate this very regrettable paucity of attendance with wrongly imputed and undefined mismanagement of the college

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER**

But the true causes are probably these:—

The inducements to join the college have been diminished, and neither Parliament nor the general public actively evince due appreciation of the essential connection between national safety and higher military education.

The cadets' payments for the college course—at first \$650—were increased in 1880 to \$1,050, and again in 1888 to \$1,450, at which they now stand.

Concurrently, prizes offered to successful graduates have, practically, been an uniformly broken promise of appointment to the permanent militia, and the general staff, with four commissions annually presented by Her Majesty, and most liberally supplemented from time to time, by additional appointments to the regular forces.

Up to 1888, thirty-seven extra commissions were allotted by the Imperial Government.

During the following seven years, up to the present time, only two extra commissions were assigned.

During the period that the payments by cadets stood at \$1,050, they had thirty-seven extra Imperial commissions, and were further buoyed up by the expectation that effect would be given to the statutory Order in Council, providing for first appointments to the permanent militia being reserved for them.

I will not trouble the House with reference to that matter further than to say that in response to a motion made by my hon. friend Colonel Tyrwhitt, the papers were laid on the Table of the House; and I certainly think that in a matter of such importance the Government should have anticipated any motion of the kind, by giving this House at the earliest period of this session the evidence that they were going radically and completely to change the organization of the Royal Military College, and to take away every vestige of ground for asking, not \$60,000 but one dollar a year for that institution. I will briefly read the changes which have been made, to show the House what has been done:

1. The course of instruction to be reduced from four to three years.

2. The subject of freehand drawing to be eliminated.

3. The course in military engineering to be confined to those subjects which are necessary to a cadet passing into the Imperial service.

This is not the course in engineering which Mr. Mackenzie established, and which was intended to qualify a man not merely for going into the Imperial service, but for remaining in Canada, and in case of necessity giving his services to the country and making some return for the education which he had been provided at the public expense.

4. The subject of strategy to be eliminated.

5. The course in physics, chemistry, geology and mineralogy to be reduced to the requirements of a modern civil engineer, and to be made alternative as far as practicable.

6. Instruction in French to be confined to the first and second years.

7. Instruction in English to be confined to the first and second years.

8. The subjects of mathematics, civil engineering and civil surveying to have, approximately, the same number of hours allotted to them as under the existing four years' system.

9. The distribution of subjects throughout the three years to be :

First year—Mathematics, geometry and engineer drawing, English, French.

Second year—Mathematics, military topography, tactics, artillery, military administration and law, military engineering, English, French.

Third year—Civil engineering, civil surveying, physics, chemistry, geology and mineralogy, artillery, reconnaissance, military engineering.

10. The reduction of the annual fee of cadets from \$200 to \$100 per annum.

11. The cancellation of the regulation imposing a fine of \$100 upon cadets withdrawing before the completion of the full course.

12. The commandant, and such officers of the staff of the Royal Military College as are necessary, are appointed to conduct the matriculation examination of the college, in the place of the existing headquarters' board of examiners.

The regulations for the Royal Military College of Canada to be amended accordingly.

I may say that the adoption of these changes is upon the recommendation of Lieut.-Col. Kittson, at present Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston, by a report submitted by the Minister of Militia; and I may further say that Lieut.-Col. Kittson, in making these recommendations, refers to the president of the College, Major General Gascoigne and says: "In accordance with your verbal instructions." Why, Sir, fancy a young gentleman, brought out here from London to take the position of Commandant of the Royal Military College, and receiving from the Major General Commanding the Militia of Canada, and brought into this country and maintained here at a high salary, treating a subject of such profound gravity and importance upon verbal instructions. It did not even involve the necessity of the Government taking the trouble to know what instructions Major General Gascoigne was giving to the Commandant of the Royal Military College in his capacity as president. He only gives verbal instructions. Why, Sir, has anything of the kind ever been heard of, like a radical and complete change in the organization of a great institution of this country, maintained at a great expenditure of public money, being undertaken under mere verbal instructions? Though not possessing the technical knowledge of this subject to the extent which I felt desirable, I understood enough of it to know that a complete and radical change was being made in the view held by Mr. Mackenzie when this important institution was founded. All that any hon. member need do is to refer to the debates of this House, and he will find that what the late Mr. Mackenzie aimed at was the establishment of a high class independent institution. He was not willing to place it under the control of the Major General commanding the forces in Canada, but he wanted a high class Imperial officer to take charge of it, and be placed in an independent position and responsible to the country for its manage-

ment. Well, Mr. Mackenzie obtained the services of a person of that kind, in the person of Major Hewitt, who for ten years discharged the duties of that office with the greatest ability and success.

This Government, on coming into office, found in that position Major General Cameron. They found that he had been there for several years, and they knew that in Major General Cameron the country had a commandant of the highest education and occupying a distinguished position as a scientist. I need only refer to the fact that the Royal Geographical Society of London, have appointed him to represent it at the meeting to be shortly held in Halifax. I need not say that in Major General Cameron, these gentlemen knew they had, as commandant of the college, a man who had not only gained distinction in the army, but had performed in Canada most important services as Her Majesty's representative on the International boundary question between the United States and Canada. In that distinguished position, he discharged his duties with such ability that upon the recommendation of the late Mr. Mackenzie to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in England, he was given a mark of Her Majesty's approval in the decoration that was accorded to him. I am sure that during his many years of service no Government could, for a single moment, have charged him with having failed in his duty in Canada or to the department under which he served. Hon. gentlemen may say that there was a board of visitors who made a report and a number of recommendations, and who expressed their disapproval of the course which General Cameron had taken. I can dispose of that in a few words by drawing attention to the fact that not one of that board of visitors had the qualifications or experience to warrant him in criticising effectively the administration of such an institution as the Royal Military College, and I do not believe that the hon. gentleman now leading the House will say for a moment that that board was at all qualified to exercise any such function. But what did they do? Why, this board of visitors went to Kingston and adopted a very novel course. They established a star chamber. They called the professors and cadets before them and pledged their honour that any statements made by those cadets and professors would be treated as strictly confidential, and the party affected by such evidence would never know what evidence had been given. Such a course was utterly indefensible, and when the late Government read the report of these gentlemen, they simply put it in a pigeon-hole. They said that an investigation carried out in that way in which it was admitted this investigation was, could not be taken into account at all, and they never even referred the report to Major General Cameron or

much less asked him to answer any charge or statement in it.

I have something more to say, and it is this. Major General Gascoigne, after his appointment to the command of the militia of Canada, visited the Royal Military College in his capacity as president of that institution. I shall read to the House the statement which he made, and I think I can show that my remarks touching the board of visitors are amply borne out by his report. There were one or two things that were found to be well-founded, but my hon. friend will find in the archives of the department that Major General Cameron again and again asked the Government to make those changes which he considered necessary for the efficiency of the college, so that he was not open to any criticism on these points.

From the General Officer Commanding the Canadian Militia to the Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Ottawa, 2nd December, 1895.

Sir,—In accordance with your instructions, I visited the Royal Military College at Kingston on Wednesday, the 27th ultimo. I had previously notified the Commandant of my intention of visiting the college in uniform, and I was received by him with the utmost courtesy, and shown everywhere over the building; and I made a most exhaustive inspection thereof.

I visited all the classes twice during the morning, and thoroughly looked into the course of study pursued. I inspected the cadets on parade, and witnessed their drill, both infantry and afterwards artillery. I saw a large squad practiced in gymnastics, as also in fencing and single-stick practice. I thoroughly inspected the whole of the dormitories and recreation rooms, also the hospital and kitchen, and I dined with the cadets at their dinner hour. I invited any cadet wishing to see me on any subject to come forward, but there were no complaints made to me, and there appeared to be a thoroughly contented spirit among them all. I append herewith a report of certain matters which appeared to me as worthy of notice.

In conclusion, I would earnestly ask, as a personal favour, that, in consideration of this, my first visit to the college, that the Christmas holidays of this year may be extended for one week, viz.: from Monday, the 23rd of December, to Saturday, the 11th of January, instead of the 4th of January, as originally proposed. I asked the Commandant to give his consent to this extension, under the circumstances I have named, and he had no objection. I trust, therefore, that my request may be granted.

I have, &c.,

W. J. GASCOIGNE,

Major General Commanding Canadian Militia.

Major General Gascoigne also sent in a confidential report. He has, I regret to say, a strong penchant for communicating his views either verbally or in confidential reports. Why, in dealing with public matters of grave importance, he should not be willing to be held responsible for his statements, it is for him to explain and not me. He sent in a confidential report, which was also brought down, and is also under my

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hand. I may say that, in my judgment, no gentleman, no military man, no officer in Her Majesty's service, has put his name to a document more discreditable than that. He put in an official document—and I leave it to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if it has any bearing on the matter—the statement that more pipe-clay, that smartness of dress was needed, that Major General Cameron's uniform was not up to the exalted standard of General Gascoigne. He put in a statement of that kind, which I say he would not have dared to put his name to, in a document for which he would be held responsible, because it would be a violation of the rules of the service to which he belongs, for which he would at once be called to account. And Major General Cameron has not up to this hour been able to get General Gascoigne to admit that in this statement he had any reference to him. Why? Because such an admission would render him accountable to the Imperial authorities for having censured a superior officer, an officer holding a higher position in the Imperial service, which is not permitted by the rules of the service, without the party affected being furnished with a copy of the statement. But I can quite understand, and I will explain in a very few words, this wide departure from Mr. Alexander Mackenzie's views as to what a commandant of the Royal Military College should be.

From the discussion that took place when this college was founded, the position was taken by the House and had always been continued down to the present, that the head of the college should be a high military officer not under the control of the Major General of the militia. He occupied an independent position under the Department of Militia of Canada, responsible to the Minister and not to the commanding officer. Well, what is the difficulty here? No doubt Major General Gascoigne was very anxious to have removed from Canada and from the service of Canada an officer whose position was superior to his own, and he went so far in violation of the principle on which the college was founded as to propose that a young officer of the militia should be found to take the position that Mr. Mackenzie, in founding the institution, had asked should be given to an officer holding a high position in the Imperial service. Major General Gascoigne wanted a young man, one, I suppose, who would allow him to direct him by verbal instructions to which he is so partial. But when he comes to the gist of his report and puts on record a declaration as to the character, standing and position of the college, he can find nothing, absolutely nothing, to suggest that had not already been brought to the attention of the department by Major General Cameron himself. What does he say:

So far as I was able to judge, the military instructors were all exceedingly keen, energetic and zealous officers, with a great desire for the welfare and good of the college. They set a good example to the cadets, take a great interest in their recreation, as well as their studies, and I was in all respects satisfied with all. I look forward, at no distant date, to all these appointments being held by Canadian officers who have themselves been graduates of the college, are, therefore, well acquainted with the college, and must, therefore, have a great additional interest in its welfare. The terms of appointment of these officers should always be limited, so as to admit of their being always up to date; but, by employing Canadian officers, who had obtained their commissions in the Imperial service, through the college, it would greatly tend to raise the status of the college in the eyes of the people of Canada, and would go far to dispel the idea (erroneous though it be) that the annual gift of four commissions in the Imperial army to the college, was a loss, rather than a gain, to Canada, by taking away four of her best men. If these men returned to Canada as instructors, she would be not only benefiting them, but also would herself derive benefit from them.

I was perfectly satisfied with all the professors, with the one notable exception of the French instructor.

And I may say, so far as that is concerned, that Major General Cameron had already called the attention of the Government to the necessity of having what he considered a more active, energetic, and able French instructor. But he never proposed that French should be taught by an Englishman. The only French gentleman connected with the college has been sent away—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) may rest assured that Prof. Duval will be replaced by a gentleman of French birth.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must take the matter as I find it. I find that under the present commandant of the institution the French instructor is an Englishman.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think my hon. friend has in his hands the report of the Council in which it is expressly declared that, as regards the French professor, he is to be replaced by a Frenchman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am delighted to hear it, but it is news to me. If this point is covered by the report that I have, it has escaped my attention. But I shall come to it if it is in the return. But I say that whoever may be the French instructor, he will not be able to teach the pupils to read or write or speak French during the period of their instruction.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to convey a wrong impression as to the facts. On the 26th April, 1897, the Order in Council was passed, and it reads in part as follows:—

The Minister, accordingly, recommends that, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Royal Military College Act, Your Excellency may be pleased to approve the change proposed, except as to the substitution of an English professor in French, and that they be published in the "Canada Gazette."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears, however, that Lieut.-Col. Kittson wanted an Englishman appointed to teach French.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That, however, was not approved by the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That fact has escaped my attention. I am glad to find that this is to be remedied. But I have taken the facts as published in the "Canada Gazette," and I do not think this appears there. I shall come to that by-and-by; but I may say that if the ablest French instructor in the world were sent to the college he would be wasting his time and the time of his pupils, because the French course has been so completely altered as to make it impossible to teach the English students French. Englishmen do not learn French with the facility with which Frenchmen learn English, and our deficiencies must be taken into account in this matter. I will pass over the paragraph respecting the hospital, and come to that headed "The Cadets—their appearance, physique and deportment:"

I was greatly pleased with the physique and general appearance of these young men. Take them all round, they were a body of youths of whom Canada may justly be proud. They were of unusually good physique, well set up, with a healthy appearance and pleasant manners. I noticed that their hair was not kept as closely cut as should be in a military, or indeed in any other college, but, with this trifling exception, to which I directed attention, there was nothing whatever to take exception to, but quite the reverse.

So that, apart from the recommendation, which Major General Cameron had already made, that there should be a more able French teacher, the only possible suggestion that this gentleman, who says that he has examined the college critically and gave not only the general report but this confidential report to the Government, could make, was that the hair of the students was not cut quite as short as, in his judgment, it should have been—not quite short enough, I suppose, to show that they were following the great example of the Major General commanding the militia. Notwithstanding the deplorable fact, which he insinuated, that the dress of the commandant of the Military College was not quite up to the Gascoigne standard, he does not find in the cadets any evidence of want of smartness or want of attention, or anything to indicate a failure on the part of the commandant to maintain the efficiency of the college, except this one matter

of the length of the cadets' hair. Doss this bear out the statements of the visitors of the college? No, Sir; it sweeps away every insinuation, every statement they have made. The report proceeds:

I feel confident that every one of these young men, whatever his futuro may be, whether civil or military, will leave the college, greatly benefited by his stay there; will be improved in tone and manner, and will, therefore, be a better citizen of this great Dominion. The country should, therefore, be proud of the college, and do its utmost to improve and help it.

Yet, when he is called upon by the Government to give instructions to a young man who comes out from England to take the place of the experienced officer who has his charge, he gives his instructions verbally and that results in striking down every important military characteristic of this college, as I shall show before I sit down:

I consider that the mixture of civil and military education is a most happy one, the discipline taught by the military element of the college being of the utmost benefit to all alike, whether their destination be civil or military, and, as the number of military openings to young men is exceedingly limited in Canada, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a civil education side by side, and I consider that this is most happily arranged.

It is not necessary for me to say more than that you have there from the hand and over the signature of the gentleman who shows his anxiety to have Major General Cameron removed from the college, a declaration that everything in the college except the length of the hair of the cadets, was everything that could be desired and that the college was in a position of which Canada ought to be proud. I draw the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the fact that, from the time Major General Cameron took the position of commandant of the Royal Military College down to the time when he received less notice than would a domestic in a gentleman's house in England, in not a single case did the Government draw Major General Cameron's attention to anything that he had done of which they disapproved. Now, I ask my hon. friend whether, under these circumstances, he thinks it was just to the Government of this country, that it was just to the Parliament of this country, that it was just to the people themselves, to strike down, and change and remodel completely from top to bottom, a great institution founded for the purpose of promoting the defensive organization of Canada, without taking the advantage of the opinions of those well qualified to give them. The Government were not obliged to follow opinions, they were not obliged to accept any opinions; they were in a position, if they thought, in their judgment, it would be wise, to make a change because they

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

thought it would be desirable to replace Major General Cameron by another officer. I find no fault with that; but I say that here the Government of Canada was treating with an officer of the Imperial Government, with a gentleman who came recommended from the Imperial Government as qualified to take that position; and I may say here that Sir R. Thompson, who had been for a long period Under Secretary of State for War in the War Office of England, told me, when Major General Cameron was ordered to the commandantship of the Royal Military College, of Kingston, that he did not know an officer in the service of Her Majesty that was better fitted to do full justice to that position, or that would be more satisfactory to the Imperial Government. Why, Sir, the answers to the questions given by the hon. gentleman the other day as to the tenure of office on the part of the professors' staff in that college, show that no professor on that staff, much less the commandant, is permitted to resign his position without six months' notice, and then it must apply to the end of the year. Now, I would ask my hon. friend whether, under these circumstances, the Government were not bound to give similar consideration to the commandant of the Royal Military College, one whose predecessor, Major Hewitt, had held the position for ten years and then resigned it because he wished to go back into the Imperial service, not because he was called upon to do so by the Government of Canada; and my hon. friend told me they could not keep him because the Imperial Government refused to loan his services any longer, and therefore he was compelled to leave the position of his own accord, and at the instance of the Imperial Government. But I say that General Cameron, holding that office, having been appointed without any reference to any limit of time, was entitled by law—and I put that to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in view of the regulations of the Royal Military College preventing any man on that staff from leaving the service without, practically, a year's notice, because it must be six months' notice, and must be terminable at the end of a year—I put it to my hon. friend whether Major General Cameron was not in a position by a fiat to claim a year's salary, or to receive from the Government six months' notice, or a year's notice, and then if they desired him to vacate his office, that he should be treated as a gentleman and as an officer, as a man holding the high and influential position that he did. And what did he get? Why, he gets a confidential communication from Major General Gascoigne, who is so partial to confidential communications, saying that the Government proposed to make a great change in the Royal Military College, and would be greatly obliged to him if, at fifteen days' notice, he would clear out and

vacate his office. I say that in all the history of the Government of this country, disreputable as have been some of the things that have been done, you will find it difficult to parallel such a transaction as that on the part of any Government that has ever been in Canada. Under the circumstances, I say that it is most unjust. I do not, for a moment, say this in support of Major General Cameron. I am proud to know the position he occupied in Canada and in Great Britain, the Imperial Government having again and again borrowed his services from the War Office to enable them to deal with great and complicated questions like the Alaskan boundary, and other important questions in which they required scientific attainments of such a high order that they wanted to get his assistance. Only the other day Her Majesty's Government brought down a volume of a report of Major General Cameron's on the Alaskan boundary, made at the request of Lord Rosebery, who had obtained his services from the War Office for the purpose of dealing with that difficult and complicated question. I say that under these circumstances is there a gentleman in this House who will not say that the Government failed in its duty, in what it owed to itself, much less to General Cameron, in notifying this gentleman through a private communication, which I had the greatest difficulty in extracting from them, and it required weeks before we could get it laid on the Table of the House—a confidential statement that the Government wanted him to resign, and, of course, he did so, but it was a forced resignation. The moment the Government intimated that they wanted his office, he had no other course to pursue but to tender his resignation. But I do not think that the fact of that being a forced resignation, under the circumstances, qualifies the indisputable moral claim that he has to be regarded under the rules and regulations of the college where he was serving. Now, I felt that this is a somewhat technical subject, and one with which the Major General was much better able to deal, and I asked him for his views, and sent him a copy of these regulations which were going to establish such a radical change of the whole basis of the Royal Military College as should make any independent member of this House refuse to support it in the new and changed conditions, for reasons to which I shall call the attention of the House directly. I sent for a report from Major General Cameron, and I will read the brief criticism with which he has favoured me upon this subject, and for which he is willing to be held responsible here and everywhere :

**Remarks on the Reorganization of the Royal Military College of Canada.**

From the steps which have been taken in the reorganization of the Royal Military College of Canada, it is no longer doubtful that its true re-

lation to the defensive organization of this country has been lost sight of, and that the advantages sought from it and offered by it are about to be sacrificed by inexperienced and reckless attempts to attain some wholly deceptive standard—if, indeed, there be any defined result aimed at.

If regard be had to the relation of the Kingston College to the defensive organization of Canada and to the conditions prevailing in the country, it must be apparent that its proper sphere differs widely from that which limits in England either Sandhurst, the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, or the Staff College.

I invite the attention of the House to that statement, that those institutions are entirely different from the Royal Military College at Kingston. Those institutions are merely the means of entrance into the Imperial army, and when in the Imperial army, the whole course of instruction is aimed to carry them up and on until they become thoroughly qualified in all those branches that it was the aim and object of the Military College at Kingston to teach.

The aim of Woolwich Academy and of the college at Sandhurst is to give such an elementary military education to the schoolboys entering them as may fit them for passing—it may be at the age of seventeen and eighteen—directly into Imperial service regiments, where the rudimentary knowledge of principles and methods they have received, is continuously developed and applied throughout their service, aided by such additional instruction as is furnished by the Staff College, the schools of gunnery and infantry, the artillery college, the school of military engineering, cavalry school camps of instruction and an almost endless list of opportunities with motives for continuance of military studies while on the active list.

Here every member of the House will see the broad line of distinction between the Royal Military College, of Kingston, and Woolwich, or any other of those preliminary places, which are merely the opening to admit those parties into the position in which they have to become thoroughly educated and qualified for their military duties. The aim of the Military College at Kingston was to give such an education, so complete in itself as to enable these parties, when they went out of it, to discharge these duties in any position to which they might be called in the future.

Consequently, in England no inconvenience is felt in giving the cadets merely such an education as fits them to join regiments—it might almost be said that no more need be done or is done at the military entrance schools in England.

But in Canada, the system of defensive organization requires much more than this to be done, under much less favourable circumstances.

Canadian cadets have no inducement to keep up, on leaving college, the military education they have there received, much less have they any inducement to pursue their military studies at the close of their Kingston course of training.

So, it is absolutely necessary in order to be on that list, that the military training and education should be as complete as possible.

The attainments of the Kingston cadet, especially in mathematics and elementary physics, on joining, are insufficient to enable him to properly appreciate any but rudimentary military instruction; and it is not until his education has made considerable progress in some branches of what have been termed a civil education, that he is in a position to appreciate a large part of what is necessary in his military training.

Moreover, the present condition of the country is such that candidates for entrance into the college cannot be induced to come forward in sufficient numbers for the purpose aimed at, unless those who succeed in qualifying are either assured of public employment in the future, or assured of receiving such a general education in addition to military training, as may give them at least as good a prospect of success in civil life as is offered to them by the civil institutions of the country.

Not only, then, should the military training at Kingston be more advanced than at Woolwich or Sandhurst, but it should embrace all that is included in the Staff College, and much of that embraced in the School of Military Engineering and School of Gunnery, which latter are attended only by officers after they are commissioned.

Unless at least this standard be kept steadily in view, it will be impracticable to develop the college so that it may meet the requirements of this country's defensive organization. It is only by the thorough mastery of subjects, in the absence of continued subsequent practice, cadets can be turned out who will be capable of efficiently discharging military duties when, on an emergency, the public would naturally look to them for assistance. But the thorough mastery is unattainable, if the course of instruction be curtailed and compressed. The college has by no means yet arrived at the required standard of instruction to justify any pause in endeavour to raise it.

The case now presenting itself is this:

The standard of military education at the college sufficient for the education and training required by the defensive organization of Canada; the civil education at the college having hitherto been inadequate; the duration of the course insufficient for the education and training required by circumstances; and the inducements offered to candidates insufficient to attract enough of them, the Government adopts the following measures:—

1. It reduces the military education at the college, by elimination and curtailment of subjects, and by reduction of time for training.

2. It reduces the civil education by elimination and curtailment of subjects and reduction of the staff.

3. Reduces the duration of the course from four to three years.

4. Makes an abatement of \$100 a year in charges against the cadets.

5. Makes a vague statement that such of the cadets as shall gain a place in the upper half of their respective graduating classes may receive certain unnamed military appointments; and

6. Places responsibility for conducting entrance examinations upon the Commandant, assisted by such of the staff as may be necessary.

The changes noted in 1, 2 and 3 of the above, are manifestly injurious to the interests of cadets, their college and the country.

No. 4—Reduction of the fees by \$100 annually; does not promise permanent effect, if at all. During the four years, 1880-83, when payments by cadets were \$250 a year, the average number joining the college was only 15 a year; yet from 1892-95, while the charges against cadets were as

high as \$362.50 a year, the average number joining annually was over 17; the reduction of \$100 a year and of the course from four to three years, now adopted, makes the average annual charge \$266.66, or \$16.66 higher than the annual payment from 1880-83, when only 15 a year were attracted to the college. The comparatively larger number of cadets (24 a year) who joined during the four years, 1885-88, was synchronous with the allotment of no less than 33 extra commissions in the Imperial service. The effect of no more extra commissions being granted is causing a falling off in the number of cadets in attendance—commenced in 1889 and continued till 1892, when all who had been attracted by the extra commissions, had left the college. Thereafter, the average was over 17 matriculants, and, allowing for casualties, this number would give somewhere between only 50 and 60 in actual attendance at the college.

5. The newly promulgated condition, that a graduate shall be eligible for employment by the Canadian Government only in the case of his passing out in the upper half of this class, is a curtailment of the prospects hitherto in force, all graduates having heretofore been alike eligible. Moreover, in 1885 all members of the graduating class took their diplomas with honours.

I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) to this fact: that those who stand at the bottom of their class, but who are still higher in their attainments, and receive more marks, than those who obtained the highest position in the class in previous years, are under this arrangement to be entirely ineligible:

Why should any individual who has graduated with honours, be at the bottom of his class, be deemed outside the number of those who are eligible for public appointment?

Again, Imperial service commissions are not unfrequently won by Kingston graduates who pass from the lower half of their class. That such as these should have their eligibility for public employment in Canada curtailed, is not consistent with even the contention that this country's military school standard should not be higher than of English military schools.

6. The College Act prescribes how the college entrance examinations are to be conducted. It does not appear how the provisions of the Act, until amended—which in this respect it has not been—can be varied by an Order in Council.

The change, moreover, is an objectionable one. If commandants are to be replaced every five years, they may be assumed to be ignorant of the educational conditions of Canada, and fitness to conduct civil service examinations is not amongst the qualifications to be expected in officers selected to be commandants. The young officer who, it is considered, should occupy the position by the present Government, has passed from an English school into a military one, and thence into his regiment—a history which almost precludes a possibility of such a one being able to adjudicate intelligently as a civil service examiner.

So, that the commandant has been charged with duties that eight out of ten commandants would probably be unable to discharge. The course of his instruction, and the conditions under which this young gentleman who is now the commandant, has been brought up, makes it next to impossible that he should be able to discharge

the duties of a civil service examiner. He is called upon by the change in the Act, to discharge duties which in my judgment he will only attempt to discharge with the greatest possible injury to the public service :

A provision in the College Act, as it stood originally, compulsorily ruled that the college course should be one of four years.

Experience brought to light that this rule was unjust and undesirable in several cases. From illness and other causes, the operations of the law had sometimes the effect of quite unnecessarily depriving a cadet not only of his diploma, but of all benefit he had in prospect when joining the college, with the additional serious disadvantage that the special curriculum of the Kingston College put it out of his power to find another institution in the country at which he might pursue his studies uninterruptedly.

Under these circumstances, the mandatory provision of the Act was made discretionary.

Since that amendment, there have arisen demands for the reduction of the length of the college course.

The permissive language of the Acts admits the interpretation that the course may be less than one of four years, but this was not the purpose of the amendment, and scarcely justified the action of the Government in the reduction it has made to three years by Order in Council, without reference to Parliament.

Of Col. Tyrwhitt's questions, only No. 2 was answered. Major Kittson reports revenue from 90 cadets at \$100 will be \$9,000, nearly as now. Forty-seven times 200, but omits \$5,994 direct additional public expense, messing forty-three extra cadets, 46 cents for 300 days, besides other extra charges of college. The two hundred dollar fee includes tuition, board and lodgings, &c. University fees include only tuition. McGill Applied Science fee is \$150. Hitherto four years studies at college, each, for mathematics, military engineering, French, English, and freehand drawing, now to be two years without any drawing.

I would draw the attention of my hon. friend to this statement because under these circumstances he will have to leave the \$65,000 in his Estimates, owing to the blunder that has been made in the calculation. You are to have two years of French taught there, which I believe to be utterly inadequate for the purpose intended. I intended, Mr. Chairman, to have made some further remarks with reference to the dismissal of Sergeant-Major Morgans, whose only claim to be dismissed, it appears, was that having brought the standard of his department up to the highest possible pitch, he was obliged to return to England, owing to his connection with the Imperial army. The Government of Canada having knowledge of the immense value of the services applied to him to come out again, and the charge that his drill is not up to standard has been absolutely disproved by the communication from the Imperial authorities, who find that his drill instruction was not only up to date, but that he was able to prepare the cadets of the Royal Military College of Kingston, for a successful competition with that gallant Highland regiment of Toronto, a team

from which has now defeated a team from a crack regiment in the Imperial service, in the great military exhibition on the other side of the Atlantic. That shows that Sergeant-Major Morgans was one of the last men whose services should have been dispensed with. I believe that the Government will have to reconsider the terms upon which they propose to get rid of a number of these officers.

As a last word, I implore the Government from my seat in Parliament to stay their hand from striking down the Royal Military College at Kingston. The more we examine the proposition of the Government the more we find that there is no excuse for it. Let this policy of the Government be the changed standard of the Royal Military College at Kingston, and you sweep away the only *raison d'être* for its existence. You will have that military college imperfectly discharging duties that can be better performed by the universities in Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Quebec. If you make this radical change in the Military College, you will place it in competition with the great educational institutions of this country who can perform that particular work better, and you will make the Military College inefficient and ineffective for the purpose for which it was intended when it was founded. What can justify for a single moment the expenditure of \$60,000 of public money per annum to hold this miserable, ineffective competition with institutions which will perform the service much better? There can be no justification; and if my hon. friend will look at this matter impartially, if he will review the foundations of this Royal Military College, as laid deep and strong by the leader of the former Government of which he was a member, and in whose action he no doubt entirely concurred, he will find that the views which the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie entertained and enforced on this House, and upon which he got this Parliament to assent to the establishment of this institution, are not being fulfilled by what is proposed, and will come to the conclusion that he will be doing the grossest injustice to Canada, to the Government, and to all concerned, if he insists on making this complete and radical change in the organization of a Royal Military College which has commanded the admiration of the ablest military authorities, and the declaration from the highest sources that there was no military college in the world superior to that at Kingston. Maintain that college at the high plane at which Mr. Mackenzie placed it, and at which we have endeavoured to maintain it down to this hour, and it will have no more ardent supporter than myself; because, as a defensive measure for Canada, I regard it as of the most vital importance. But persist in this radical change which is now proposed to Parliament, and I will feel it my duty, and I believe hon. gentlemen on

both sides of the House will feel it their duty, on a future occasion, when there will be more time to deal with this important question, to take the ground either that the Royal Military College at Kingston shall be maintained in all its integrity, and fitted to perform the great work for which it was founded, or that the public money expended on it shall be saved, and that the work now done under these changed regulations shall be left to be performed, where it will be performed infinitely better, by the existing educational institutions of Canada.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I need hardly observe that I shall have something to say in reply to my hon. friend when the proper time comes; I have not time now, as the hour for adjournment has arrived.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.05 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

FRIDAY, 18th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. **CLARKE**. Before the House proceeds with the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the leader of the Government to the 53rd Order in the Public Bills and Orders, for the second reading of Bill (No. 94) an Act to commemorate the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by making her birthday a perpetual holiday. This Bill stands in the name—

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I must object to any interference with the Orders of the Day. That matter will be attended to at the proper time, but it is not advisable to interject any extraneous matter into our work.

Mr. **CLARKE**. I was going to ask if it is the intention to place this Bill on the Government Orders?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We will attend to that at the proper time. The Government are not going to be dictated to as to the way in which they carry on their business.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

Mr. **CASEY**. Before the House passes to the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask the leader of the House a question of which I have given him notice, in connection with Bills Nos. 2 and 3 amongst Public Bills and Orders. These are Bills which have engaged the attention of the House for more than one session already in one shape or another, which have engaged the attention of a committee during this session, and which are now in a form to be pronounced on by the House as a whole. I would say that the difficulties of holding meetings of the Select Committee to which they were referred, on account of the meetings of the larger committees, have delayed the progress of the inquiry into these Bills this year, and also that the normally short time allowed for public Bills during the session has been unusually and unduly curtailed this year, in the hope of getting through business before the Jubilee Day, which hope appears to be a little evasive at the present time. In view of all these facts, I have urged the hon. leader of the House to give us an opportunity of having this Bill discussed before the House this session. We got into committee on it the other night, but the hearing was postponed because the Bill was not reprinted as amended. It is now reprinted, and I beg to urge on the hon. leader of the House, with all the force I can possibly command, the desirability, in the interest of a large and influential class of the community, of letting us have a hearing for this Bill before the whole House.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I must say that I do not think I can hold out any hope to the hon. gentleman at this stage of the session. The Government business is very important and urgent, and it will take all the time the House is likely to feel disposed to give to its consideration. I am not in the slightest degree desirous of depreciating the importance of these measures, but I may remind the hon. gentleman that a great many members of the House have left and many more desire to leave, and they are emphatically measures which should be considered in a full House.

### POST OFFICE ACT.

Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Post Office Act was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

2. Section fifty-five of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—  
“55. When, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the lowest tender received after public advertisement for the performance of a mail contract is excessive, he shall not be compelled to accept the said tender, but may, in his discretion, either readvertise the said contract for fur-

ther competition, or offer to any person willing to undertake the contract such lesser sum as he deems a reasonable and sufficient price for the said contract, and may enter into a contract with such person as will accept such offer."

Mr. SPROULE. This is really a very bad provision, because it puts it in the hands of the Postmaster General to let these contracts without tender. If the system is followed up of continuing contracts, which seems to have prevailed for several years past, it may lead to great abuse. If the hon. gentleman took the right to re-advertise the contract or give it for a little time, it would not be so objectionable, but to leave it in his hands to give the contract to whom he pleases, and for any amount he likes—it may be a dollar less than the lowest offer he has received—is unreasonable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I certainly have no desire to take any power that is not necessary for the proper working of the department. The present law is certainly inapplicable and has to be amended to be of any utility at all. Under it, when the lowest tender is deemed excessive, the Postmaster need not accept the lowest tender, but may offer to the persons from whom tenders have been received, each in his turn, beginning with the lowest, such sum as he deems a reasonable and sufficient price for the contract. He therefore begins by offering it to the lowest tenderer, and if there are twenty tenderers, it may take months to get a contract completed, and this has caused much embarrassment. In the Acts relating to Public Works and Railways there is a provision authorizing the Minister by Order in Council to pass the lowest tender if he deems it expedient, and there is a similar provision in the Railway Act. I do not propose to pass by the lowest tender at all, I do not ask any power to award the contract to any person at a higher price, but I want a practical scheme to place the contract lower than the lowest tender. If the hon. gentleman prefers an Order in Council I have no objection to that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the principle upon which this clause is founded in the Post Office Act, and that is that we cannot give a contract without asking for tender. Then the law goes on to carry that to its logical consequence by providing that if the lower tenderer does not accept, then the Postmaster General shall have authority to ask the one above him if he will accept, and if he will not, the one above him again, and so on. If there are 20 tenderers the Postmaster General must begin at the lowest and go up to the last, so as to carry out the principle upon which the whole of the law is founded. Now, the hon. gentleman by this clause destroys that whole fabric.

He seeks to have it provided that after he has called for tenders, if he is not satisfied with the lowest tenderer, he shall, without further notification or calling for tenders, award the contract to whomsoever he pleases without tender. This would be doing away with the cheque provided by the present Post Office Act, a check which, I think, is a very good one. The hon. gentleman has frequently complained of the lowest tender not being accepted. I ask the hon. gentleman if he is not adopting a mode which would permit him to set aside the lowest tenderer and to give the contract virtually without any contract at all. I am very much opposed to this clause as I think it is contrary to the whole theory of our Post Office Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not asking to ignore the lowest tenderer; I have always maintained that the contract should not be let at a higher price than that of the lowest tenderer, and that it should go to the lowest tenderer if he were able to give the security that the law requires. But there are cases where the lowest tenderer is not sufficiently known, there are combinations of various kinds, and I have had occasion to encounter these already. I say that if the lowest tender is excessive, we should not be bound by it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then the contract should be re-advertised.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But how long time will that take? It takes some weeks to get ready for advertising a contract. Then it is to be advertised for six weeks. At the end of that time, let us say there are 20 tenderers. If the lowest tenderer will not accept, then, under the present law, you must proceed to offer it to the next man. He must have a reasonable time to reply. In Canada, that may mean two or three weeks. And this may have to be done over and over again. In a case in which you had 20 tenderers you might not get a contract made much inside of a year. It is an impracticable scheme. If we let the contract at a lower price than the lowest tender nobody is hurt.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) when in opposition often complained of partisanship in these matters, and I ask him if, under the system that he proposes, where he is not obliged to call for new tenders, he would not have the power to give the contract to whomsoever he pleased. During my occupancy of the position that the hon. gentleman now holds, I had to meet the very difficulty to which he now refers. The way we had to get over it—and there is no other way—was to make a temporary arrangement with the old contractor to continue the work until the new tender was accepted. But the hon.

gentleman will admit that the whole system of contract under the Post Office Act is based upon the principle of calling for tenders. If tenders are to be called for, you should not have a clause in your Act which would permit you to set that principle aside and give the contract to any persons you choose to select without tender.

Mr. BENNETT. The adoption of this clause must, of necessity, do away with all prospect of parties tendering, because, after tenders have been called for, the Postmaster General will be the sole arbiter as to whether or not the lowest tender is too high. If he arrives at the conclusion that it is too high, then recourse will be had to a party friend to suggest or approve the name of some other person. By way of illustration take the following case:—Tenders are called for the carrying of the mail between two points. After three months advertising—I think that that is the length of time usually allowed—it may be that there are half a dozen tenders or there may be twenty. Assume that the lowest tender is for \$150. The Postmaster General may, in the most arbitrary way, say that \$150 is too high. Then the party "pull" would be used. The candidate of the Government or their representative in the riding would at once appeal to the Postmaster General, and, after finding out that John Jones had a tender in for \$150 would submit that John Smith was prepared to do it for \$149. Then the party "pull" being used, John Smith would be given the contract at \$1 less than a party who has tendered in open competition. The Postmaster General or his officials cannot make any cast-iron rule to guide them in judging whether tenders are at reasonable and fair prices. I have a case in mind where the post office is a mile from the railway station, and another case where the post office is only a hundred yards from the station. Surely the Postmaster General does not know the particulars of every case from one end of the Dominion to the other, and so he cannot judge whether the amount offered is a fair one or not. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that such a law as is here proposed would do away with all belief in the fairness of awarding contracts. Every man will say: There is no use in me tendering; the Postmaster General is an autocrat, and even though my tender may be the lowest, he will award the contract to some party friend at a dollar or two less. Under the present practice tenders are publicly advertised for for three months. Persons in the locality who know the circumstances of the case put in their tenders, but the Postmaster General assumes to judge whether the lowest tender is a fair one or not. The Postmaster General seeks to justify this Bill by saying that there is something of this kind in the Public Works

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Department. But there is a marked distinction between certain cases arising in the Public Works Department or the Railways and Canals Department, and the work of the Post Office Department. Suppose there is an accident to some public building or some public work, it may be necessary to make repairs without calling for tender. But in the Post Office Department no such contingency can arise. The time is known when the contract must expire, and three months before that time it is duly advertised. Tenders are sent in, and, under this proposed law, the Postmaster General can award the contract to whom he pleases, satisfying his conscience by giving the contract at \$1 less than the lowest tender. The result of the passage of such a clause will put an end to all fair and square dealing in the matter of railway mail contracts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that my hon. friend will have to reconsider this clause. It means the abolishment of the system of tender and of contract, and hands over the making of contracts to the Postmaster General, who does not even require to have the approval of the Governor General in Council.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, a desire to lessen the expenditures of his department, but surely he has not fully considered this proposition which, as the leader of the Opposition has said, practically does away with tenders. Why don't he come right down and say, the system of tenders is all wrong, we have got tired of it; the public and my department are better without it. Why do we insist upon tenders? In order that there shall be a fair notice to fair people who understand the matter, and that they should get fair-play; so that if it is conducted, as I believe it will be under the Postmaster General, no one man can know, until it is past change, who is the man that gets it. Why, in the interest of your own department, don't interfere with a principle like that. I am as much interested that the hon. gentleman should conduct this on sound principles, as if a Government I were supporting were in power. In the interest of the Government, and in the interest of the people, we want them to believe that you have got a system where there should be fair-play, where there shall be tenders, and in case of any fraud under the present system the hon. gentleman has full power to remedy it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—if there is going to be a long debate on this clause, I would ask that clauses one and three stand for the present, and that we go on with the others. I will just say, speaking to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), that it did not cross my mind that this proposition interfered in the slightest degree with the

soundness of the principle of advertising for tenders, because it implies that the contracts shall not be let at even the price of the lowest tender. I make that remark to prevent any misunderstanding. With the permission of the committee, I would like to have these two clauses stand, and proceed with the next.

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask the hon. gentleman, in view of the strong feeling, to let this clause be eliminated, and bring it on at another session.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let it stand for the present.

Mr. TISDALE. We know that if it comes up again in a short time, we shall have a small committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not going to take advantage of the committee. If any hon. gentleman desires to assist me in framing a clause that will get over the difficulty, I will be happy to let it stand for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES TUFFER. The shortest way would be to withdraw this clause, which is regarded as an objectionable one, and take time during the recess to consider it with care.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let the two clauses stand for the moment.

On section 4.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason of the hon. gentleman's change of policy in this respect?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Promotion examination is an examination of scholarship, and we provide, in lieu of that, a case examination, as it is called, a technical examination in the work of their office.

Mr. FOSTER. Conducted by whom? You take them out from the examination of the Civil Service Commission entirely.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be competent to conduct a case examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Up to this time the railway mail clerks have been under the same law and the same system of promotion as all other civil service clerks, that is, they have had to conform to the general rule that when they pass from class to class they have to pass on promotion examination. That promotion examination has been under the civil service law, and has been conducted by the civil service examiners. Now, my hon. friend proposes to take them out from the civil service, so far as promotion examinations are concerned, and to say, with reference to railway mail clerks, that they shall not be obliged to pass a civil service promotion examination. I do not see anything that is provided in place of that in this Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section 130 provides for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain a case examination?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principal work of a railway mail clerk is what is known as sortation, that is, when he receives his mail matter on board train, he has to proceed with this sortation for the purpose of its distribution on the different routes. If he is familiar with the geography and the postal map of the country, he can accomplish his case work rapidly. There may be mistakes; mail matter is misdirected and more clerks are required in order to keep up efficiency, and the case examination is made the test of efficiency. A mail clerk would not be put on board of a car if he were not familiar with the technical work of his office—if he were not nimble and quick-minded.

Mr. FOSTER. I see what the hon. gentleman means. I have not very much objection to that, but there is only one case that might occur. For instance, you have a large number of clerks in the service. The man who is going up to a higher class, say the highest class, ought to be a man who has a considerable amount of education over the rest, over those who have mere technical knowledge so that he might be able to write a good report and do work like that. A man might possess these qualities and yet they might not be taken into account at all, while the man possessing a greater amount of technical knowledge might be promoted in preference to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that this system will be extremely welcome to ambitious mail clerks. My idea is that the prizes of this department should be awarded upon merit and promotion will follow honestly as it ought as the result of case examination. It will only be efficient men who will be promoted. It has already produced a marked benefit, indeed so much so that the Controller of Railway Mail service thought that perhaps his superintendents were not fully reporting errors in the misdirection of letters. They have been numerous in the past, and now they have become so rare that the controller communicated with his superintendents to see whether they were fully reporting the errors. He found that they are reporting in all cases. The mail clerks feel the stimulus of the knowledge that they will be rewarded according to merit.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the object which the Postmaster General has in view, but I do not think this clause is going to carry it out. The hon. gentleman leaves to this new officer the very head of the branch, where all the mail clerks are to be found, the duty of conducting the examination and deciding as to the

efficiency of these clerks. I could understand it if the hon. gentleman had, for instance, a board composed of the Deputy Postmaster General, the controller and one more, but it is leaving the ambitions of these young gentlemen that the hon. gentleman has referred to and which he desires to satisfy and whom he desires to promote on the basis of efficiency, too much in the hands of one man. The same objection seems to permeate the whole of this Bill. It is centralizing everything in the hands of the Minister or the controller, or somebody else contrary to the ordinary practice in that department. I know from my experience of the department that the railway mail clerks are a most deserving class. They are efficient, they are intelligent, they are underpaid and they are exposed in the carrying out of their duties to considerable danger. Several of them have lost their lives in the performance of their duty by accidents on railways or upon steamboats, and I am prepared to say that every possible facility should be given to them. I do not want to interfere at all with the benefits that the Postmaster General wishes to confer upon them, but I am of the opinion that he should not leave the examination entirely in the hands of the controller. This feature of the Bill, I think, is open to considerable objection. I would not wish to give my sanction to a proposition of that kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any great objection to that, but I do not find in this Bill any provision which makes it necessary for a clerk to pass an examination in this class. What method of selection does the Minister propose to follow in making promotions?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The case examination is a test examination.

Mr. IVES. But supposing that the controller finds that a certain mail clerk is not efficient, what follows from that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume he would not get whatever rewards the service holds out. In the past men have been promoted who were not efficient; I do not think the present system may be regarded as by any means perfect.

Mr. IVES. Supposing the controller for any reason desired to get rid of a mail clerk or to favour some mail clerk, after this test examination the controller reports to the Minister that Mr. So-and-So is slow, and that he makes mistakes. Will dismissal follow from that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no such improper object as that.

Mr. IVES. I do not mean that it is an improper object; it might be quite proper. What I want to know whether the Bill furnishes authority to dispose of those who are inaccurate or inefficient.

Mr ADOLPHE CARON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. First of all, the examination whilst it takes place under the direction of the controller must take place in every part of Canada. The system of case examination is conducted by cards. The clerk is put in a room with his case before him as if he were in a mail car and he is given his mail matter to distribute. There is a report made of that and that report shows the percentage of error in this practical case examination. This is a matter of record all over Canada. These records will be taken and will be within the reach of this House. The result will be open to the public through Parliament and the controller and those responsible for the administration of the law will be bound to respect the result of that comparative and competitive examination. As to what would follow if a man became unfit for his work I suppose the same remark would apply to any one else in the civil service; he could only be dismissed by Order in Council as he can only be appointed by Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the Minister is there any provision in this Bill providing for an examination in either case or any other kind?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, in section 130.

On section 5,

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General takes great power here. He practically takes power to form a separate and independent branch, and he ought at least to give his views as to how he proposes to work it, and as to whether it is going to entail the appointment of new officers, or whether it is to be formed within the present departmental staff.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is quite right. The creation of this branch does not involve the appointment of new officers. As a matter of fact, the branch is practically in existence to-day. The Bill provides that the controller shall be a gentleman of at least fifteen years' service; the superintendents to be at least of ten years' service.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Post Office Department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the Post Office Department. They are rather promotions in the department. The controller will have practically the most responsible office in the service, with the exception of the deputy head. He will have his head office at Ottawa, and whatever clerical assistance is necessary. The superintendents throughout the Dominion will carry out his orders, and communicate directly with him instead of through the cumbersome machinery heretofore in force, namely, the inspectors throughout the country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I take it that the controller will be like the chief post office inspector in the other branch, and that his jurisdiction will apply merely to the railway mail clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And the work on railways.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What salary does the Postmaster General intend giving to the controller.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$2,500.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is just about the salary of the inspectors.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief inspector gets \$2,800.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble with this Act is that it creates another department. You have a controller and you will have superintendents, and I suppose they will be as numerous as the post office inspectors all over the country. The Bill provides that you may appoint "such other employees as are from time to time necessary." It seems to me as though it must result in creating a lot of new offices to be filled. I imagine that the work which is necessary to be done by the superintendents might be done by the present post office inspectors, who are located in districts and divisions throughout the country: If you appoint inspectors all over Canada you will have, I suppose, to give them a higher salary than an ordinary clerk, and you will have to give them clerical assistance, and thus create extra expense.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that these superintendents will do the work which heretofore has been done by the post office inspectors in the different divisions? Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to retain the post office inspectors?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As far as the railway mail service is concerned, I propose to wipe out all divisions. The railway mail service is one service for all Canada, and it will be under the control of its head officer, subject of course to the other higher control. The superintendents will receive orders direct from him. Whenever I can utilize those now in the service I intend to do so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These duties are now performed by the post office inspectors?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Will the same number of post office inspectors remain as now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a matter I will be able to deal with better when I see what the effect of this Bill is, and to what extent it reduces the work of the inspectors. I have not the least hesitation in saying that there has grown

up a system of red tape, which if I had time at my disposal I could explain. I can say without reservation that the adoption of the system will promote efficiency and economy. It will not involve any increase in the staff, but on the contrary, will work the other way.

Mr. SPROULE. If you appoint a controller and superintendents, you will have to give clerical assistance in the different offices and pay rent. It seems to me impossible to work out this system successfully without increasing the staff. If it did not increase the staff, it would not be so objectionable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no item in the Estimates asking for an increase, and on the contrary, this will result in a substantial reduction of the staff. Already by its application, beginning with 404 railway mail clerks the number is now reduced by 25 by reason of doing away with these divisions, and the better management under the more businesslike method that is now adopted. If time would permit I could go into the details which I have in my possession.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the very great objection to asking us this afternoon to undertake legislation on so important a matter. In order to legislate with wisdom, we ought to have all these details in reference to which my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has been informing himself so diligently, and which he knows, but we do not, and which he declares there is no time to give us an opportunity of learning. The objection is in asking us to pass important legislation of this kind at such an hour of the session as this. It is all very well for the Minister to say that this is not going to involve extra expenditure, and that he is going to make out a machinery which will be on the one hand more effective, and on the other hand cost us nothing more. The Minister may do that, but there is nothing within the Act itself to compel him to do so, although there is within the Act unlimited power given to him. He may make a controller, he may make as many superintendents as he chooses, and he may have just as many other employees as are necessary, in his opinion, to carry out the work. The power given is unlimited—I am not going to say that the hon. gentleman will use it, but he may or he may not. He says that if he had time he could give us all the details which would justify this change abundantly. I think it would be a good plan for him to take time to master the details, and at the end of next session he could pound that information into us, and if the information commends itself to the House we will give him the legislation he wants. It does seem to be a very late hour of the session to undertake such important legislation.

Mr. IVES. I would like to know distinctly from the Postmaster General whether his scheme involves the doing away with the services of the present post office inspectors. It looks to me as if it would be in the power of the Minister under this Bill practically to appoint new men, and to dispense with the services of most of the present post office inspectors as being no longer necessary. I think we ought to know whether he intends to discharge the present post office inspectors as being no longer required.

Mr. QUINN. Inasmuch as we have not the details concerning the changes which will be necessary, should this legislation be passed, I think it would hardly be right of the committee to enact such a law as this at this time. Provision is made here for the appointment of a controller of the railway mail service of Canada, together with superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees as are deemed necessary—that is, I presume, as are deemed necessary by the Postmaster General. The Bill seems to me to be providing for a large number of officers without this committee knowing anything about the offices to be filled, the duties of the officers who are to fill these offices, or the persons who are to be removed from the service in order that those officers may take their places. In other words, it seems as if this committee were asked to provide means by which a large number of officers may be dismissed from the Post Office Department in order to make room for others. Now, I for one do not feel inclined, at this date of the session, to assume the responsibility of allowing this section to pass, providing for the dismissal of officers who have been in the service for a number of years, in order to make room for others who, according to this section, may be taken, either from some other public department, or from the streets—that is, they may be political friends of the Government. While the Government have a perfect right to fill the service with all their friends if they can, I do not think they ought to ask the committee at this particular time, to pass legislation to afford them the means of doing this; and I certainly view with some fear the enactment of a law of this kind, which would give the Postmaster General the right, without any notice at all, to dismiss from the public service a number of worthy employees, and fill their places with others. When the hon. gentleman says that this change does not entail any extra expenditure, that it seems to me, is the keynote to the transaction, and means that the intention is to dismiss officers who are at present in the public service, and to replace them with other persons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As this afternoon was set apart for the consideration of another measure, and as the com-

Mr. FOSTER.

mittee seems so interested in this Bill, I will not press it any longer at this moment. I will move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 3870) declaring it expedient to grant and appropriate for a line of railway from Lethbridge, in the territory of Alberta, through the Crow's Nest Pass, to Nelson, in the province of British Columbia, a sum not exceeding \$3,630,000.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think I shall ask the committee to allow me to present this resolution without making any very extended remarks on the subject, and I do so for several reasons. In the first place, the resolution has been for some time on the Table, and I think it expresses with a good deal of minuteness the terms of the arrangement under which it is proposed to grant aid to this undertaking from Lethbridge to Nelson; and, in the next place, I understand from the leader of the House that the hon. gentleman leading the Opposition desires to avail himself of the only opportunity which will be afforded him this afternoon to express his views upon the proposal of the Government. For this reason, I very gladly take up the subject, although I have not, I confess, been able to gather the material together which I should like to have gathered, for the purpose of entering somewhat fully into this subject. It is not because I consider this matter an unimportant one by any means that I shall not present at great length the views which I entertain and which are entertained upon it by the Government. I do regard the proposal now submitted to the committee as one of very great importance. I regard it as of great importance from the standpoint of the considerable sum of money involved in it; but I regard it as of still greater importance, because the undertaking which is to be aided to this extent, should Parliament so determine, is, I think, one of the greatest possible value and the greatest possible interest, not only to British Columbia but to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. I am not at all indifferent to the financial side of this proposal. I am fully conscious of the feeling which exists, not only in Parliament but throughout the country, that the utmost care, prudence and economy should be exercised by the Government and by Parliament in the extent to which they grant aid to these undertakings. I am fully conscious of that and I know that there are many who think that to add to the public

debt in aid of railway or any of these other undertakings is a course of action that ought to be taken cautiously and after the most mature consideration. I sympathize in that view, and I think I speak the views of the Government, as a whole, in saying that the Government sympathize entirely in it. But, Sir, while that is so, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there are circumstances arising in a portion of this country, a country of vast extent and area, which render it imperative that the Government should lend a helping hand to the prosecution of certain works, if the inexhaustible resources which Canada possesses are to be properly and sufficiently developed. Instead of its being economy to stay our hands. I maintain it would be nothing short of waste if, upon careful study and examination of any proposal submitted to us, we are satisfied that the undertaking is one which will open up large resources of great value, the development of which will stimulate all other industries in the country and greatly add to its wealth. Were we to withhold from such deserving enterprises the necessary aid, we would be recreant to the valuable trust which devolves upon the Government of this country, not only in the interest of the present but the future, we would fail in our duty, if we did not grasp the necessity of the situation, if we failed to advise Parliament and to impress upon the country the propriety of giving the reasonable aid required for the prosecution of an enterprise of such importance. That brings us to the question whether this enterprise is one of the character I have described, whether it comes within the category of those which would justify us in adding to the obligations of the country by assisting in their development, and on this question I consider, I am in a position to speak with confidence and some authority for several reasons. In the first place let me say, that I have traversed, if not all the route of the proposed railway, a considerable portion of the country which will be served by this railway, and have had opportunities of forming a judgment as to the nature of the development going on and as to the rapidity with which that development is likely to proceed, if this road be constructed, and whether my judgment has been soundly exercised or not, I have been led to the conclusion, as a result of my visit to that country, that it was necessary the Government should take up the scheme of railway construction through the Crow's Nest Pass. I did not reach any conclusion as to the particular method in which this subject should be dealt with. As a result of my examination of the situation I was not able to conclude either that the Government should take the matter up as a Government undertaking, or aid its construction by a company, but I was convinced that until the Government did the one thing or the

other, there would not be for many years to come a railway constructed through that portion of the country, and I have not altered my mind in that regard by anything I have since heard or seen, either in the public press or otherwise. I know that there has been the opinion expressed that possibly the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been able, without assistance at all from the Government, to carry out that undertaking successfully. I know that in the report of a meeting of the shareholders of that company, which was held two months ago, the statement appeared that if the Government did not assist the Canadian Pacific Railway they would take hold of the work themselves without assistance. But I believe that that statement was not so much the declaration of a fact within the knowledge of the company itself as a statement put forward perhaps for the purpose of creating an impression for other ends, it may be upon public opinion or the Government of the country, and not that the company was in a position to take up the very large outlay involved by the construction of the line; because I believe that neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other company at this time is so well situated that it would be able, without our aid, to construct the work. Therefore I think it is not too much to say that unless the Government came to the aid of any company that was in a position to assume the undertaking or unless the Government undertook to build the road itself, many years would have to elapse before the construction of the Crow's Nest Railway would become an accomplished fact.

This is by no means a new question. It has been widely discussed in the public press. It has been more or less the subject of discussion outside the public press. Proposals have been laid on the Table of Parliament with regard to this very question, and our hon. friends opposite, when they were in power, seemed greatly impressed with the importance of coming to the assistance of a company which was willing to carry that work forward, and laid upon the Table certain proposals looking to that end. It is true they were not passed, and I do not know that they were even discussed in Parliament; but they were laid on the Table of the House and public attention was thereby attracted to the subject, in addition to the discussions that have taken place in the public press. But in various ways the construction of a railway into that great mineral country has become a live question, and it is necessary that the Government of the country should deal with it. It was because we were impressed, as a Government, with the importance of this matter that my colleagues thought it prudent that I, as Minister of this department, should take the first opportunity to visit the section of the country to be affected

by this railway, for the purpose of gathering all the information I could so as to be able to advise them upon the subject. And this, as I have said, is what I have done. I returned from British Columbia with a strong conviction that, for many reasons, it was necessary that something should be done, that whatever amount was deemed necessary for the Government to expend either to construct or aid the construction of that undertaking—and I think this is the general feeling of the country wherever the subject has been wisely studied—the sooner the work was undertaken the better it would be for Canada, and the sooner would we begin to receive the benefits which we hope will follow from the construction of the road. Now, the question, as I have said a moment ago, as to whether or not Parliament should act, must depend upon the judgment of Parliament as to the importance of this particular railway and as to the value of the country which is to be traversed. Some persons have criticised the proposal—and it is not an unnatural criticism, I am bound to say—upon the ground that this sum of \$11,000 a mile for over 300 miles of railway is to be paid for railway construction, while the country which you wish to enter and through which you propose to run your line, is almost entirely a mineral country; in other words, that the advantages that you say the country offers, the inducements which it offers, the wealth which you say lies there, cannot be known except by further development, and upon that further knowledge alone would it be wise for us to undertake this work. It is argued that until we know whether there is this mineral wealth which has been referred to, it is unwise to incur this considerable debt for the purpose of pressing this undertaking forward. When that objection is raised one is naturally led to inquire; Is it not reasonable, when you have examined the ground, when you have had recourse to all the reliable and authoritative sources of information that are available with regard to the character of the country, if the result of this examination leads you to believe that there is that wealth there, is it not imperatively necessary that a railway should be constructed, that transportation facilities should be provided in order that development may take place? You cannot look for development to precede the construction of railways and the providing of transport facilities. One is consequent upon the other, it is true, but the development is consequent upon the providing of these necessary facilities. So that those of us who believe that we should have better knowledge before we move in the direction of providing these railway facilities, who say that we must know whether the resources are there to justify this expenditure before we make it, would practically be raising an insuperable obstacle to the

Mr. BLAIR.

development of the country. We must have the railway if we are determined that we shall have that country developed in respect of the resources which I am led to believe, relying upon authoritative data, are practically inexhaustible, and the development of which must necessarily not only add to the wealth and importance of the country, but greatly increase its population, and in increasing its population, must very much increase the revenues of the country to be derived from customs duties.

Now, I am going to take a few moments, if the committee will indulge me, to refer to some of the official, and I think, reliable information which has been collected in respect to this British Columbia country. I have here the official report of Mr. W. A. Carlyle, provincial mineralogist, a man of unquestioned standing. I presume that hon. gentlemen opposite know him well. I do not know him, but I am informed that he is a very careful, conservative, cautious man. He has got together a great deal of information with regard to British Columbia which, I am sure, is of value, and I believe will be of interest to this committee, for, if we are to take the statements that Mr. Carlyle furnishes us—which appear to be put forward with care and which appear to be the expressions of a moderate, cautious man—if we were to take these statements as approaching anything like the facts with regard to the mineral wealth of British Columbia, there cannot be a lingering doubt in the mind of any man as to the wisdom of the policy of liberally contributing to the immediate construction of this important railway. According to the returns that this gentleman has collated, I see that there has been a gradual and what would seem to me a comparatively rapid increase in the mineral output of the province of British Columbia within the last six or seven years. The products of the mines in British Columbia in 1890 amounted in value to \$2,600,000—I am giving the committee the round figures. In 1891 they amounted to \$3,500,000; there was a slight falling off in 1892, when they amounted to somewhat over \$3,000,000; in 1893, they were \$3,588,000; in 1894, \$4,225,000; in 1895, \$5,655,000; in 1896, \$7,146,000. The statement I read professes to show the values of gold, silver, lead and copper that were produced. Now I am warranted, I believe, in pressing this statement on the attention of the committee, not only as an accurate statement, but as one which effectually disposes of the doubts which arise in many minds that the development of British Columbia, up to the present, may have been merely a spasmodic development; that the figures for 1896, showing a gross value of over seven million dollars in the output of these descriptions of metals, may represent merely a spasmodic production, and that it was not a regular development. Well, in confirmation of the statement that

such is not the case, but that the development has been so gradual and so regular as to afford convincing evidence that it is certain to grow in the future, I think the figures I have just given are sufficient for that purpose. Now, I find, in referring to the results as between 1895 and 1896 as to districts, that in the Cariboo district, in 1895, there was turned out \$282,000 worth; in 1896, the production increased to \$384,000. In the West Kootenay the product in 1895 was \$2,223,000; in 1896, it had run up to \$4,000,000. And so in the various other districts of the province. Because it must not be supposed, and I apprehend there are few hon. gentlemen in this committee who are not aware of the fact, that it is only in one section of British Columbia that this mineral wealth lies. There has been development in Cariboo, there has been development in West Kootenay and in East Kootenay, and in various other sections. If the information which has been furnished us from various sources is to be believed, there is scarcely a portion of the southern part of British Columbia, at all events, where we may not reasonably expect a very considerable development as respects its mineral productions, as soon as proper facilities are afforded for that purpose. Without going into the details as to the particular district, I will content myself with reading a statement of the general results, taken from the pages of the book of Mr. Carlyle. Now, Mr. Carlyle goes at length into the merits of the different districts:

The production of the Kootenay mines, when compared with that of many of the mining centres in other countries, will not appear so very large to a casual reader; but, when all the conditions are understood, that an entirely new country of large territorial extent is being rapidly opened up under difficulties, that the supply of needed capital, until recently, has been meagre, and that in reality not a single mine has had time to do sufficient development to put it on a really proper basis for extraction of ore and further exploratory work, this production will then be seen to indicate a most flourishing and hopeful condition of affairs.

He goes on to refer in similar terms to many other districts in the province. Now, I have in my hand another authoritative statement which I think it proper to put in possession of the committee. A representative of the Imperial German Government took occasion to visit British Columbia, and spent some months in the portions that I have mentioned, including the Boundary district, of which he made a careful study. He himself was a mineralogical expert, and had studied the situation in Australia, in South Africa, and in other mineral countries of the world; and, I suppose it was on account of his ability in that regard that the Imperial German Government charged him with the duty of making to them a careful report of the possibilities and of the outlook

of the province of British Columbia, and of the neighbouring state of Washington. He went over both these sections of country. I will only take up the time of the committee by reading an extract from this interesting report. To me it was an exceedingly interesting report, because it was not only a careful and conservative report, the report of a man who apparently was determined not to exaggerate the condition of things at all, but it was a report at the same time of one who had no interest in overstating the case in any way, but who only wished to present the facts for the information of his Government.

Mr. WILSON. What is the name of the gentleman?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. His name is Hans Geise. He went over all the different districts of British Columbia that I have named. He went first through Rossland, then into the West Kootenay section, the East Kootenay section and Boundary Creek, up to Lillooet, and his survey of the situation embraces all these various portions of British Columbia. In referring to Boundary Creek he says:

The third division is the Boundary Creek itself, with its various camps. Here it is not so easy to decide the question of the superiority of any one spot over the other. Midway is here the central point of a wider country, but it is outside the cluster of Boundary Creek camps. There have, therefore, sprung up in the Boundary Creek Valley three little villages, Greenwood City, Anacanda and Boundary Falls, of which each calls itself the most advantageous, and, therefore, the place of the future; but, as they are all close together, and the valley narrow, the supposition seems but natural that the whole valley will be, some time, one continuous line of city life for several miles.

Now, I want the committee to understand the value of this report; there is the information of an independent authority, there is the opinion of a man who had no interest whatever in exaggerating the favourable conditions which exist in that country. He was making a report for the information alone of his own Government; and we find here that he makes a statement, after having looked the ground over, and with the knowledge which he has of the effect of mineral development in other portions of the world, that the supposition is but natural that the whole valley of Boundary Creek will be some time one continuous line of city life. Well, now, what does such an ultimate accomplishment depend upon? Why, it depends solely upon there being transportation facilities afforded, and railway construction, and means by which the people who are willing to go in and develop that country may get in supplies, and fuel, and carry the products of their mines out of the country. It only depends upon that, and it does seem to me a serious question whether it is not the duty of Par-

lament to lend every possible aid, without delay, in order that we may come into possession, so far as possible, the exclusive possession, of this valuable territory. Because the committee must not lose sight of the fact that this important section of country lies immediately adjacent to the boundary of the United States, it is not very far from an extensive trunk line of railway. It will not take many miles of railway to be laid down in order to penetrate into that Boundary Creek section. Now, the people on the southern side of the border are liable to do in respect of that Boundary country what they have almost done in respect of the Kootenay district, they are liable, by building a section of railway into that country, to get possession of it from a business and a trade point of view, and they are liable to divert the trade away from our own country, from the east and from the coast, and carry it to the south of the line. To my own personal knowledge, they have been doing this with respect to Kootenay. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact which only requires to be known, I think, to make a grave impression upon the minds of this House and of the public generally, that the people of the United States belonging to the state of Washington, appreciating the advantages of the possession of British Columbia and of the valuable minerals which are there undeveloped, built a railway up into the Kootenay country and got possession of the business and the trade of that country, and have built up the city of Spokane wholly out of the business which has originated in the province of British Columbia. To-day the city of Spokane is a flourishing city of 35,000 people. You go into that city and get into conversation with business men and they will tell you that the business prosperity and growth of that place from a little village of seven or eight thousand inhabitants a few years ago has been due to the development which has taken place in British Columbia. These people were there and they took advantage of that trade. I say that it is a matter of considerable importance for the committee to discuss as to whether we will retain possession of this country from a business point of view or whether we will let the people to the south of us take that trade from under our eyes and become possessed of it in the sense in which the conditions of business will tend to the transfer of that trade in that direction. In a general way this German official concludes his survey of the situation in these words, and I think it will be of interest to the committee if I should read the closing observations of this gentleman upon this subject. He says:

What the result of these rich and seemingly unlimited mineral deposits will be on the country in which they are found to-day, seems beyond conception.

Mr. BLAIR.

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen of this House to the importance of this statement. There is the testimony of an outside authority; it is not the testimony of a man who is looking for a railway subsidy and who is probably under an impulse to colour the information which he furnishes. There is a competent and independent authority to which we should attach importance. He says:

Experts who have seen the South African and West Australian gold fields, are unanimous in their opinion, that the British Columbia mineral fields rank well with either of them, and, all circumstances considered, it seems superior to both. In South Africa, the gold-bearing rock is the bed of an old lake about 65 miles long and 35 miles wide, and the conglomerative rock in which the gold appears, varies in width from 3 to 100 feet. Only the bodies of smaller and medium width contain enough gold to be worth working. The average value of the ore is only \$10. The country is dry and inhospitable, and the lumber for timbering the mines is lacking entirely.

The West Australian mines may be very rich, but the conditions of the country are still more unfavourable; timber and water are lacking absolutely. To-day, they are facing there a proposition to lift water 2,500 feet and to carry it over a desert country 225 miles. Besides this, the ore is said to be low grade. The British Columbia mining district has enormous bodies of high-grade ore, and still farther greater ones of low grade; the ores are said to be most excellent for matting and smelting purposes, as they carry their own flux.

The territory in which the gold-bearing rock is found here, is without doubt far larger than the South African.

All the materials for mining and smelting purposes, as timber, coal, lime, water, &c., are plentiful and close at hand. Power to great amounts can be generated almost everywhere from the swift mountain streams. The climate is, all the year round, mild and agreeable; winter does not set in until late in the year, and, although there is almost continuous snowfall, the winters are not cold, except for a short period in January.

Farming is possible in all the valleys; large agricultural districts in the state of Washington and the Canadian province of Alberta are close at hand to furnish food enough for millions of people who will some time need their products.

The district will soon be traversed by several railroads, and every mining camp that will warrant it, will be tapped by them.

Now, there is an opinion, I think, to which we might well attach importance. It comes from a source independent at all events of the country through which this road is to travel, and these statements answer the questions that I asked at the outset and ought, I think, to remove the doubts, if any exist, as to the wisdom of the Government of the country at once, before it shall have been exploited by others, before it shall have fallen into the possession of any outside power or country, availing ourselves of the trade that will result from the construction of this work.

Mr. LOUNT. May I ask the hon. gentleman what the report is from which he has just quoted?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This report was sent by this gentleman to the German Government. I do not know the circumstances further than I am informed that the gentleman who made the report made it at the instance of his Government. I was first informed in regard to the existence of this report by a gentlemen whom I met in New York, and he was able to procure a copy of it for me. I thought it would be valuable, and I found on reading it that it was of very great value. I have ventured to read these extracts because they put the committee in possession of the opinion, at all events, of an independent authority, and one may fairly conclude, of a competent authority. And if you read the report you will see that this gentleman is careful in stating his opinions. The conclusions which he has been led to are conclusions of the utmost magnitude to the people of this country, conclusions which justify the Government in assuming that there are possibilities of development in British Columbia of which we have not hitherto dreamed. There is a duty resting upon the shoulders of those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of Canada not to allow the time to slip away, not to unduly delay in putting the country in possession of those necessary facilities—facilities which, before all things, are needed in order that we may take advantage of the great wealth of this country. If we want to keep the people who have come into British Columbia with such rapidity, and to induce others to come, something must be done, and that now, to stimulate the production of the wealth of that country. The resolution asks that Parliament should give aid to the extent of \$11,000 a mile towards the construction of this railway. You will observe that the Government in presenting the proposition in this form has decided that it is better that aid should be given to this extent than that the Government should undertake to carry the work through as a Government work. No doubt there are many who thought that it would have been better that the work should have been taken up by the Government, but I apprehend that though to a greater or lesser extent that idea may be sympathized with by members of Parliament, concerted action is necessary in this matter and that we have to rely upon the support of Parliament to carry out the conclusions at which we have arrived. These were not conclusions that we arrived at without as much thought as it has been possible for us to give to the subject and without providing all reasonable, possible, safeguards in the terms which are here embodied.

I know that when the various sub-clauses of this resolution are read, it will occur to those who read them, that possibly better terms should have been secured than have been secured, before the Government decid-

ed to give large assistance towards any railway company, or, more particularly, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the carrying out of this undertaking. But, Parliament and the country will have to rest assured that the terms which we have embodied here are the most favourable terms which could have been secured, if we were to carry out this work at all, or if we were to render any assistance to a company in aid of the construction of the railway. At all events, that is the case at the present time. What might be accomplished years hence, no man can say. But, if we were to come to any understanding with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of pushing this work through now—building the first two hundred odd miles as we expect to before the close of 1898—these terms which are presented to Parliament in this resolution are the best that could be secured. The committee will have noted that we have sought to ensure the country a large measure of relief from the rates which have obtained since the Canadian Pacific Railway was started. We have imposed conditions upon the company which are very largely restrictive of their present powers. We have embraced in one of the sub-clauses of these resolutions a considerable list of articles which go into very large consumption among the people of the western provinces, and we have secured an agreement on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway that very substantial reductions will be made upon the existing rates. We have also received the consent, on their part, that the rates upon all goods—whether they are shipped in or shipped out, either going into or coming out of any portion of the province which is covered by the route of this railway, or any freight or merchandise which either is shipped into British Columbia over this line, or shipped out of British Columbia over this line—are to be subject to the control and supervision of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as is the case with other railway companies in Canada. To the extent of the shipment of goods from any part of Canada to British Columbia, and the shipment of goods from any part of British Columbia traversed by this line, to any part of Canada, there has been secured in the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, a recision of that existing ten per cent clause. From this day forward, so far as that class of merchandise between the several points is concerned, the tariff of rates shall be under the control of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council so long as that tribunal exercises control in these matters; or under the control of a commission, if a railway commission shall ever be constituted for that purpose.

A great deal has been said—and I am not going to refer to it at much greater length—with regard to the immense land subsidy which the Canadian Pacific Railway will

fall heir to under its arrangement with another company incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, and which is to earn a subsidy from the Government of that province if this road is built. I refer to the company known as the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. That company has had promised it, under provincial legislation in the province of British Columbia, a land subsidy of 20,000 acres per mile for the length of this railway, and the land which is in that subsidy and which will pass to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company includes, as is believed, a very large area of valuable coal lands. It is not known as to whether there is much other mineral lands or not, but it is absolutely known that a large portion of the lands in the immediate vicinity of the Crow's Nest Pass are valuable coal lands which will pass over to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, when this road is constructed. It is known that an understanding has been arrived at between the Canadian Pacific Railway and this British Columbia Southern Railway, under which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acquire a portion of the coal lands, although not all the lands which are known to be coal bearing. I believe an estimate has been formed that the amount of coal-bearing lands in this 20,000-acre-a-mile belt, aggregates something like 200,000 acres, or 250,000 acres in all. I believe an estimate of that kind has been formed. Of course that whole belt is not bearing coal of equal extent or of equal value. Portions of it are very much more valuable than other portions, but the area is a large one unquestionably. The deposit is a deposit of very great value, and, under the arrangement which has been entered into between the British Columbia Southern Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway a portion of the coal-bearing belt is to become the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company: the balance remaining the property of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

Mr. FOSTER. How are these proportions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I am not quite familiar with the details of the arrangement concluded between the British Columbia Southern Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I am well aware, from the information I have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they will be in a position to carry out the terms of the proposal which we make to them, namely, the condition which we impose upon them before they can get any subsidy for this road, to give us a title in fee of 50,000 acres of these coal lands. They may not have, under their existing arrangement, a right to the possession of the property in that large area. They may

Mr. BLAIR.

not have, under the arrangement they have made, contemplated getting so much of the coal land; but they will have to revise their arrangement so that if they are to get less they must now get more, in order that they will be in a position to carry out the condition which we here impose, and which we make a condition precedent upon their receiving from us any subsidy whatever in respect to this railway.

Mr. FOSTER. As there is an estimated area of 250,000 acres of coal land, and as the Dominion Government now is to come into possession of 50,000 acres, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) lead the House to suppose that the previous division between the British Columbia Southern Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is of such a nature as that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will have to revise it in order to get that 50,000 acres for us, even though they get none for themselves?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We are to come to the conclusion that the British Columbia Southern Railway Company is going to have 200,000 acres of this invaluable coal land for nothing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to their getting it for nothing, I must leave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to draw inferences from the facts which he may be in possession of, or from such facts as he may gather. I would not like to say that the British Columbia Southern Company are getting the land for nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not have to build the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to say that the British Columbia Southern Railway are getting the lands for nothing, because I am told—I cannot verify the accuracy of the statement—but I am told that the British Columbia Southern Company has expended something in the neighbourhood of about \$100,000 in cash. If they have they are not getting the lands for nothing. They will earn the lands as a condition attached to the construction of this railway. If the railway is built, the lands will go to them; and if the railway is not built, they do not get the lands. There is no doubt a very great value attached in the popular imagination to the coal lands in that district. People sit down and calculate, or, if they cannot calculate themselves, they have some one else to calculate for them, what is likely to be the gross tonnage in coal contained in this large tract of land, and it totals up to millions upon millions of tons. Now, this may be all true. This area may be all that it is supposed to be;

it may possibly be very much less ; because this is, after all, very largely a matter of conjecture. The reports furnished by the officers of the Geological Survey are to the effect that the outlook is very promising for a large development of coal in that district, and that the coal area is an immense one. That is their judgment from the outcrop ; but that is only conjecture after all. The inference we may fairly draw, however, is that there will be an amount of coal found there which will probably supply all the coal which that section of country at all events will require for many hundreds, perhaps thousands of years to come. There is, however, I think I ought to point out, a disposition in some quarters, after figuring out the immense quantity of coal which is deposited there, to put a value on each ton of coal, and on this calculation to conclude that the people who are getting this railway subsidy are getting millions of dollars worth for the building of a few hundred miles of railway. Now, it does seem to me in all reason, if we are to approach the subject from a rational standpoint, that these calculations are all extremely illusory, and extremely exaggerated. You can at any time buy these coal lands of British Columbia from the province for \$5 an acre. There is a company which owns some 10,000 acres of lands immediately in the neighbourhood of where this Crow's Nest Pass Railway will be constructed, and which bought them from the British Columbia Government for something less than \$5 an acre. That is the value which the British Columbia Government put upon their coal lands. True, after the railway is built the value may be greater. I hope that it will be ; I am confident that it will be. Perhaps the fact that these lands are lying there unreachd by railway communication has had a great deal to do with their remaining fixed in value at this low price. But even after the railway is built, the value of the coal, it appears to me, will be infinitely greater to the country—to the people who want to get it for manufacturing, mining and other purposes—than it will be to the people who own the lands ; because the people will not own the monopoly by any means. There was a danger that they would have a monopoly, because, unhappily, as I think from a public point of view, the people who own these 10,000 acres of coal lands, lying adjacent to this railway, are the same people who are connected with the British Columbia Southern Railway Company ; and there would have been a monopoly if the British Columbia Southern Railway Company had built this railway and had got this land subsidy for the building of the railway ; because I believe that the area they would have got as a land subsidy would have covered nearly all the coal lands found in British Columbia. I may state that I was, myself, very much impressed when I was in British Columbia, with the danger which lay in the creation

of such a monopoly, which would ensue if this railway were to be built by the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, and I took occasion upon the platform to call the attention of the people of that province to the danger which lay in this monopoly being built up, which would be a monopoly not only in coal lands, but in timber lands, and in whatever other value there might be in the lands which were to be earned as a subsidy for building this road.

Mr. FOSTER. Did these land grants carry the mineral value ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They carry all but the royal metals. They carry the baser metals, I think ; but it is only fair to say that they are subject to the regulations made by the province of British Columbia. So that under the regulations which relate to prospecting and mining development, the monopoly which the ownership of these lands would give in the direction of ordinary mineral development would not perhaps be very considerable or very alarming. But it struck me that the fact that so stupendous an area of the lands of that province carrying coal and bearing timber, would be a serious drawback to the future development of the province, if the lands were to fall into the hands of any one corporation ; and since the subject has been practically dealt with by the Government, we have taken means by which I think we have secured the future of that country against its being placed at a disadvantage by reason of the existence of monopoly in either of these directions. We think we have absolutely secured the country against the possibility of a monopoly being created which will have any obstructive or injurious effect upon the future development of that province. We have provided, in the first place, that before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall earn this subsidy, they will secure the transfer to the Government of Canada, in the interest of the people of Canada, of at least 50,000 acres of these coal lands. Now, when we are getting 50,000 acres of these coal lands, according to the way some people calculate their value, we are getting enough to build this railway forty or fifty times over. But according to the practical view, according to the actual value attached to these lands now, or as it will be after the road is completed, we are not, I think, getting a property of any great pecuniary value. It is not from the standpoint of its actual value in dollars and cents that we have felt an interest in annexing this condition to the giving of the subsidy. I do not put it forward to this committee that in these 50,000 acres we are getting a property worth so many dollars ; that is not a fact which seems to me to be worthy of very much consideration ; but it is that by securing these 50,000 acres we have it in our power to prevent the possibility of the

creation in that country of a great coal monopoly which could strangle the mineral development of British Columbia if it had it in its power. That is the value that we attach to this condition. We are not getting these 50,000 acres for the purpose of putting them on the market for sale and finding a purchaser and getting something into the treasury of Canada. That is not our object. Our object is to have them under the control of the Government, so that if ever the time does come when the people who own those coal lands do not use them as they should do, not affording the people a fair opportunity to get the coal at reasonable prices by reason of a combine or monopoly, we have it in our power to create the competition or stimulate the competition which we believe necessary in order to secure to the people what they have a right to expect, the means of purchasing the coal at fair prices. That is our object in getting possession of these 50,000 acres of coal land. Why, when you consider after all, what a vast body of coal is contained in an acre of ground, you can imagine what an immense quantity there is in this area of 50,000 acres, and how idle it is to attempt to put a value upon that coal by the ton or by the acre. It is a fact, I believe, that in any ordinary colliery district, the coal-bearing area does not exceed five or six hundred acres; and if a man who wants to start a colliery, finds that he has five or six hundred acres, he considers that in that area he has enough coal to last him and his children and his children's children, and yet produce a very large output from year to year. So that one is apt to get lost when endeavouring to make any calculation with regard to the quantity of coal which is to be found in such a country as that. All we have desired to do is to put the Government of this country in such a position that it may, for all time to come, control the situation and prevent, for all time to come, any monopoly being created. The same view holds good with regard to the timber lands. A very large portion of the timber is burnt, but there still remain very large timber areas to draw upon, and this timber question is one which is becoming more acute yearly in British Columbia. The people do not like the idea of their timber lands being held by large monopolies, by companies which will dole it out at such prices as they can squeeze out of the people, and will afford no facilities at all for the miners to get this most valuable article at reasonable prices. It is necessary that our miners should have timber if they are to prosecute their mining operations successfully. Our object is to secure the people of British Columbia against what we venture to think has been the somewhat inconsiderate legislation of their own province. Our object is to protect the people of British Columbia, of the mining sections at all events, against the disastrous consequences which will flow

Mr. BLAIR.

from the possession of these valuable timber lands by monopolies. We have, by the conditions of this contract, secured the people of British Columbia against such danger for all time. We do not want these lands for the purposes of speculation, but are endeavouring to subserve higher and better interests than securing immediate pecuniary return by the acquisition of this property by the Government, and I think we have embodied in this convention such conditions as will for ever protect the people of British Columbia against any monopoly either in the production of coal or timber. How have we done that? We require that these lands, when they are earned as a subsidy resulting from the construction of this railway, shall be sold according to such regulations as this Government may see fit to impose from time to time. We shall thereby be enabled to secure that those lands shall be sold at reasonable prices and that the timber or coal shall be sold at reasonable prices if the people do not buy the lands as well. We have surrounded this transaction with every possible safeguard. We have vested in the hands of the Government supreme control, so that these lands and this coal and timber and other valuable assets, which the building of the railway will open to the world, will be held in trust for the people of Canada by their Government for the time being. I do not think it would be possible to give the people any better protection than we are securing to them under this agreement.

An hon. gentleman asks me how we propose to make the selection of these 50,000 acres of coal lands which we are to get. We cannot say just at this moment what we may conclude will be the best method of making that selection. But it is open for us to determine how that selection shall be made. We have reserved to the Governor in Council the right to determine how it shall be made. We are going to make sure, at all events, that we are not going to get the skimmed milk and give them the cream. We are going to make sure that we shall have as good a section as they have or as remains unchosen. If we think it advisable, we may consult the Geological Department and make the selections according to the advice of the experts of that department. Our judgment is not formed on that question, it is a matter we will see to later, but we have so reserved such control to ourselves that there is no possibility of our having forced upon us an inferior quality of coal lands.

I have endeavoured hastily and in a very crude way to run over these propositions in order that the House may have before it the reasons which actuate the Government in presenting this matter for your consideration. I should like to have a strong expression of approval in respect of this proposal. I believe that when the news reached the people on the Pacific coast, and

more especially the people in the districts of Sandon, Trail, Rossland and the Slocan country, they received it with feelings of an inspiring character. I believe that the news that the Government had determined to render assistance for the construction of this road was accepted as ensuring a most stimulating and beneficial effect upon the development of British Columbia. I am the more anxious because I attach a great deal of importance to the early development of this country, and I can tell those of you who have not visited British Columbia, that they need to go out to that province in order to form some adequate conception of the value of that territory. No man can visit British Columbia and go into its mining camps and see the life and activity prevailing there, and witness the infectious spirit of hope and confidence that prevails, without feeling prouder and stronger in his confidence in the great future of Canada than he ever could have been before. That is the feeling I brought away with me from the Pacific coast. I never despaired of the future, I never felt any want of confidence in the prospects of Canada; but after I had visited that country and seen it for myself and formed the best judgment of its resources I could, I came away with a greater idea of the future of Canada than I ever possessed before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to have the opportunity of saying a few words on this subject, which is one of very great importance; and I am glad to be able to say that I have listened not only with interest but with warm approval to a great deal of what has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) who has just resumed his seat. There is one point on which we all agree, and that is that it is impossible to overrate the enormous mineral wealth that British Columbia possesses; and we also, I believe, all agree that it is the duty of the Government to take such measures as will open communication between the great North-west and the eastern portion of this Dominion and that great mineral region as promptly as possible. One of the advantages of great mineral wealth is that it induces, perhaps more than anything else, a great and rapid influx of population into a country. And, even when population is brought in for such substantial reason as the enormous mineral wealth that British Columbia is now developing it does not require to be said that the agricultural question becomes one of great importance, and the feeding and providing for such population is a matter of moment. We all agree upon another point, and a most important one, to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) drew the attention of the committee, and that is that we are so situated that that portion of British Columbia which has thus suddenly burst into such activity and which gives

such a great and, I have no hesitation in saying, such undoubted promise of a splendid future, is so situated that it was cut off from the eastern portion of Canada as well as from the western portion. It was cut off from the coast and from the cities of Victoria and Vancouver, and it was to a very large extent entirely cut off by the Rocky Mountains from the eastern portion of Canada, except by a circuitous route by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and navigation, when navigation was open. But, in addition to that, it was in such a position to be tapped, as it was tapped by lines of railway communication connecting with the great railways of the United States, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific Railway, which has already obtained access by Spokane, by the construction of a line of railway into this portion of our country. There can be no doubt that, under these circumstances, it became a matter of vital importance, not only to the province of British Columbia, which has a good future to have so suddenly developed such an enormous portion of mineral wealth, but to the whole of Canada, that this great country into which population is pouring where towns of considerable importance are rapidly being built up, and to which immense capital is being drawn, should not be made tributary to a foreign country. It was under the conviction that it was necessary not to lose an hour in obtaining access from other portions of our own country for that section of British Columbia, that the late Government, after careful examination, came to the conclusion that they would be warranted in asking a very large appropriation from this Parliament for the purpose of providing that railway communication. The committee will remember that the late Government came to a resolution asking authority from this Parliament to vote not less than \$20,000 per mile for this railway communication, as a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the rate of 3½ per cent interest, for the purpose of enabling them to promptly construct this road, and that in addition to that the late Government were prepared to give a subsidy of \$5,000 a mile for these 330 miles to extend the railway from Lethbridge to the Columbia. Under these circumstances, I need not tell the committee that we are prepared—because we hold exactly the same views when on this side of the House that we held when on the other side—we are prepared to give any Government assistance in carrying out the policy to which we had committed ourselves, as necessary for the promotion of great Canadian interests.

Now, this question of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is one with which the House has been made tolerably familiar by the discussion of it in almost every portion of the press for many months past. So I shall take only a few moments to draw the attention of the committee to what I consider

the great salient features of the scheme. I learned with infinite pleasure that the Government had abandoned the idea or intention of building this railway as a Government work. I am quite aware that a portion of the press giving a considerable support to the Opposition has put forward this policy of the construction of the road through the Crow's Nest Pass as a Government work. I confess that I was astounded to find that, with the evidence that we had before us of the result of the construction and operation of Government railways in Canada, a single intelligent man could be found in this House, or out of it, who was prepared to advocate such a policy in this case. Why, Sir, all we have to do is to look at the facts that we have before us. We have already solved, we have set at rest for ever, in my judgment, in the minds of any reasonable or intelligent man the question whether it is better for Canada to construct a railway and operate it as a Government work, or by the aid of a private company. Sir, this country, from the necessity of the case—for it was made part of the compact of confederation, and necessarily so—was obliged to undertake the construction of the Intercolonial Railway as a Government work. It was not a matter of choice at that time, but a matter of necessity. And what is the result? Any person who will take the trouble to look at pages 650 and 651 of the *Statistical Year-Book of Canada* will find the whole story told. We constructed a railway from the city of Halifax, a large, enterprising city with a great trade, offering the finest harbour on the continent of America as a means of communication for the ocean trade. We carried that railway to St. John, another fine harbour, another large town, and, I may be permitted to say, of still greater energy and enterprise than Halifax, and there were reasons for that. But, Sir, we have then run this line of railway through an open, cultivated country, with all the towns bordering upon the St. Lawrence up to Quebec, and with what result? With the result that to-day we stand face to face with a debt of no less than fifty millions of capital expenditure, and year after year a large deficit to be taken out of the treasury of Canada for the purpose of paying the expenditure over and above the capital expenditure, and over and above all that we can make out of the road. Then I take another thing. Government railways are bad enough in the hands of the Conservative party, but in the hands of the Liberal party they are startling. I do not hesitate to say that this page under my hand, these figures which, it is said, cannot lie, give an evidence of the most striking character as to what you may expect from the construction, and operation, and management of Government railways in the hands of the Liberal party. If you will take the trouble to look over the five years

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

from 1874 to 1879 under the management of my hon. friends opposite, and when they had the advantage of having a very able man, Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, as Minister of Public Works, and with this railway under his control, you will find that no less than \$3,010,500 were sunk in constructing and in operating the Intercolonial Railway during those five years, over and above every dollar that could be obtained from it. That includes the Prince Edward Island Railway for the same period. Well, I am glad to be able to present a contrast. Fortunately for Canada, those gentlemen were relieved of the duty and responsibility of administering the Intercolonial Railway, and with a very good result. You will find on the same page the figures which show that during the five years under Conservative management we spent only \$490,887 over and above all that we could get out of the Intercolonial Railway, and which increased the debt of the country only to that amount. So I am glad to be able to present a contrast and to be able to show that during our five years of management the deficit over all that could be got out of that road, was reduced from \$3,010,500 to \$490,887.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. How much out of that fourteen or fifteen millions was added for capital account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will find that he will not strengthen his case by that, because if he will look at capital account he will find that that will not give him any satisfaction. I did not make these accounts, these accounts were submitted to the Auditor General, and, therefore, no exception can be taken to them. I am only glancing at these facts as an evidence that whether Liberals or Conservatives were in power, I would deplore in the strongest manner any attempt in this country, by any Government, I care not who they are, or who they are composed of, to construct another government railway, that is the position that I take. And I feel it right at the same time to show that comparing our five years with the five years of Liberal rule, we have a balance of \$2,600,621 to be placed to our credit; and I need not tell my hon. friend that that sum stands to the credit of myself as Minister of Railways during that period. Now it is not necessary for me to say more than to express the relief with which I heard the statement of the Minister. I confess that when I learned that the Minister of Railways had come back from British Columbia with his mind made up—and I am not quite sure that he had not a syndicate made up as well as his mind—to take this work up and construct it as a Government work. I confess that I was startled, and I felt that it would be the greatest calamity that could happen to Canada for her to undertake to construct

that road from Lethbridge to Nelson, or to the Columbia River, as a Government work. Because, as I said before, Governments cannot construct railways in an economical manner, they are under pressure, they are under influence, they are under embarrassments that do not apply to companies. Suppose a Government undertakes the construction of a railway, what is the position? They ask for tenders, tenders come in. Hon. gentlemen know the howl that is raised by the Opposition, whoever they may be, if the lowest tender is not taken; and yet it is a tender that a company who have got to find the money out of their own pockets, would not look at in their own interest and would set it aside, and they would be consulting their own financial position by taking a much higher tender. So I say that the Government have not the latitude, they have not the means of saving public money as a private company can save theirs. Then when it comes to the operation of the railway, where are you? Why, Sir, every gentleman sitting behind the Minister of Railways wants to get a friend, or a relative of a friend, or some active supporter, put upon the road. He says: You have got a thousand employees, and one more cannot make much difference. He puts the screws upon him, and succeeds in crowding some one on to the railway.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman knows how it is himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know how I suffered in resisting that pressure. But I point my hon. friend to the evidence showing the extent to which I resisted it when I put that \$2,600,000 balance to my credit in five years, over and above all that was sunk. But there is a worse thing than that with reference to a Government railway, and nobody has experienced it more than I have myself. When you have built a road, and when you have over-manned the road, as you are almost compelled to do by the pressure that is put upon you, unless you are more than a man, there is a worse thing still, and that is that every man who has got a ton of freight to carry over the road, brings all the political influence he can upon the Government and the department, to carry that for nothing. Therefore, the Government is not in a position to preserve the interests of the public, nor to manage a railway in the same manner that a private company can manage it. I am glad to say that I need not pursue that question, because my hon. friend who has just sat down, has relieved our minds, and my mind especially, from the fear that the Government would jeopardize the best interests of Canada by an attempt to construct this as a Government railway.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the committee rose at six o'clock I was concluding my remarks in reference to the impolicy of constructing railways by the Government, and I have only a single word to add to it, which I omitted, and that is that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, which forms a part of it, now stands at \$58,758,504. I find that the amount paid for construction and rolling stock, and which I suppose includes the interest on the money, is stated in the Statistical Year Book, totalled before confederation at \$13,881,461. Since that time the amount expended on construction and rolling stock brings the capital account up to \$122,750,702. I find that the expenditure for operating the road over and above any receipts from it amounted to \$8,251,737, and the small amount we have which occurred in the first few years before we had constructed any material portion of the road is \$304,849, which leaves a balance of \$7,946,888 to be charged against the road for the amount expended over and above all its earnings. I would not have wasted the time of the committee in speaking of this if it were not that I find from the press of the country, which I have closely followed during the past few months, in the face of these facts, that there are actually to be found people in this country who talk about the advisability of constructing railways by the Government. In addition to the point I made as to the much greater success of the operation of the Government roads by the Conservative Administration, I may draw the attention of the committee to the fact that we find under the present Administration exactly the same state of things that occurred before. We find that the deficit of the Intercolonial Railway, according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) during the present year will be about double that which it was in the previous year under the administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). Now, I come to the consideration of the further features connected with this matter, and that is as to who should construct this railway. I may say that the late Government were committed, as I have already stated, to the construction of that road by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I will tell the House frankly that it never occurred to me for a single moment, and I have some little knowledge of the railway question in Canada—it never occurred to me as a possible contingency that anybody else should be asked to construct that road. The fact of the position that they occupy, the interests that they have at stake, the ability that they have shown to secure the rapid construction of railways all indicated to me the advisability of securing the construction

of that road, and the Government of which I was a member were pledged to that company to give assistance to the extent to which I have already referred. I have read a great deal of nonsense in the press—I do not hesitate to apply that term—in reference to the arrangement that was made between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the purpose of securing the construction of that great work. And some people, assuming that every person has been asleep for the last seventeen years, arrive at the conclusion that the time has come when they could actually talk to the people about the enormity of the contract made by the Conservative Administration of which I was a member at the time I was Minister of Railways and Canals, with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have no hesitation in saying that if ever a contract vindicated itself in the history of this country, it is the contract made on that occasion. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to be a little incredulous on that point.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid you will have a big contract on hand to convince the public of that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the Government of Canada had not had the good fortune in the interest of Canada to secure that contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company there might have been half a dozen changes of Government during the last eighteen years, and we would never have had that road open to-day. That is my judgment, and is an important judgment in view of the difficulties that we encountered. Hon. gentlemen when they talk about the advantages, privileges and franchises that we gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when that contract was made, forget that without these franchises and privileges no such contract would have been made and Canada would have been to-day without that great line of inter-oceanic communication that binds the provinces together from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I am not an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am not under any obligation to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not hesitate to say so, and I think I may go further and say that I have a good deal of reason to complain of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I am speaking here to-night as a public man on a public question of what I regard as of vital importance to this country. And it is due to hon. gentlemen opposite and to the House without respect of party that I should frankly state these things as they present themselves to my mind. The committee will naturally infer from what I have said that I am prepared to support this very important proposal that is now submitted. I do not hesitate to say that I am—and

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I will give the committee briefly my reasons for taking that position. I felt that I was making a wise and judicious arrangement in the interest of Canada when I pledged the support that I did pledge for the purpose of accomplishing that undertaking. In my judgment, the terms that are in the proposal made by the Government are much more onerous than the terms I proposed. I proposed to give \$5,000 a mile for 330 miles, which amounts to \$1,650,000. That was an absolute subsidy without any consideration whatever except the prompt construction of the road, and I attached the most vital importance to the prompt construction of the road. I will tell the committee frankly why. Every hour, every day, every year that that work was delayed was giving a greater opportunity to the great republic to the south of us and to foreign railways in that republic to lay hold of and utilize the major portion of the advantages that the people of Canada were entitled to have and which I wish to see flow down through Canada and over to the shores of the Pacific instead of passing to the south into a foreign country. That great mining population in British Columbia would be dependent upon our neighbours to the south for all their machinery and all their supplies, if this means of communication were not opened up. I therefore considered the prompt construction of the road, by the parties best able, beyond question, to do it, as an actual necessity. It has been intimated, and the Minister of Railways referred to this afternoon, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might construct this road without assistance. I have given that subject the best attention in my power, and from my connection with the financial circles in London, I know as much as most men in regard to that question, and I do not believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, without large and substantial aid from the Government of Canada, could accomplish the work. I found it necessary to give substantial aid in order to procure the prompt construction of this road. We all know that the Government of British Columbia had given a very large subsidy to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, and we know that for years that province has endeavoured to tempt capitalists to build a line which would connect the Pacific coast of British Columbia with the coal mines of the Crow's Nest Pass and the great mineral country at Rossland and Kootenay. These coal lands are said to be of enormous value, but, valuable as they are, they did not tempt capitalists to invest, and no substantial progress was made towards the construction of that railway. I arrived at the conclusion, and I have seen nothing since to change my opinion, that to secure the prompt construction of this great work, it was absolutely necessary to give, and to give to the Canadian Pacific Railway Com-

pany, substantial assistance. In addition to the \$1,650,000 of direct subsidy, or \$5,000 a mile, we proposed to loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, \$20,000 per mile for twenty years at 3½ per cent. Well, Sir, that loan would cost the country nothing. On the contrary, looking to the rate at which money could be obtained in London by the Government of Canada, we regarded that as a transaction that would return to the Government one-half per cent per annum. With the credit that Canada then and now has, the money could be borrowed at 3 per cent, and I have had an actuarial calculation made, which shows that the Government of Canada would have made \$493,613 out of it, which is the present value of half per cent per annum on the amount of \$6,600,000 which was the extent of the loan. That amount deducted from the subsidy would have left the cost to Canada, under the arrangement which we proposed, at \$1,156,387. Now, Sir, the proposal of the present Government is to ask Parliament for \$3,630,000, or \$11,000 a mile. So far as the bald figures are concerned, our proposal was at least more than \$2,000,000 less than is now proposed by the Government for this service. But, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that for the prompt construction of this road even the subsidy now proposed is one that I think Parliament might entertain, especially in connection with the statements made by the Minister as to the other conditions that are obtained under this grant. I am not in a position to estimate how much should be taken off the amount asked by these resolutions in consideration of the coal lands we get and in consideration of the reduction in freight rates which, although not immediately inuring to the Government, is a matter of great importance to the country. Perhaps I do not estimate them as highly as hon. gentlemen opposite do. I believe there has been a great deal of misapprehension with regard to freight rates, and I will frankly tell the committee why I think so. When there are complaints of this monopoly, and of the mode in which the freight rates oppress the people of Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia, it might be well to remind those who complain that but for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway that country would not have been opened up at all. When that contract was signed by myself as representing the Government, and the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, there was only one village of a few hundred people from the eastern terminus of Nipissing to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. The House will understand why I was taunted on the floor of this House by gentlemen then in opposition who were not disposed to treat these questions on the broad and just grounds I treated them, the House will understand that I was taunted with the fact that the road never would be constructed, notwithstanding the

enormous subsidies we gave. That prophecy was much nearer realization than most people know. I was told that if the road was constructed there was no traffic to support it, and a railway engineer committed himself to the calculation, that it would take \$6,000,000 per annum to operate the road over and above its receipts. All these difficulties ought not to be forgotten when the people are talking about railway freight rates. They should remember that they would not have been oppressed, because there would have been no railway to oppress them, but for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which it has now become fashionable to describe as an extravagant contract made by the Government. Large as undoubtedly were the subsidies granted by the Parliament, were it not for the fact that that contract was in the hands of men of great experience in the construction of prairie roads, namely, the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway; had it not been that these men had made a gigantic fortune, and had that fortune in their possession before they undertook the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the syndicate never would have been able to carry that road to completion, notwithstanding all the subsidies we gave them. When people are talking about extravagant railway rates, and the manner in which the road oppresses them, it should not be forgotten, that the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are receiving at the present time the munificent return of 2 per cent per annum on their money.

Under these circumstances I do not think there is any ground for the criticisms that have been offered in that direction. I say more: I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, committed to such a gigantic enterprise as they have been committed to, opening up and developing the country as they have opened it up and developed it, are as deeply interested in making their rates such as will be attractive of population, and as will induce the settlement of the country, as the Government and the people of Canada themselves. The amount which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get for an acre of land in Manitoba or the North-west to-day, is utterly insignificant compared with the value to them of having that land settled. It would pay them to give all their lands away. It would be a magnificent financial operation for them if they could give all their lands away for nothing, provided they could get enterprising and industrious settlers to cultivate them and provide freight and traffic for their road. Under the circumstances I am not prepared to say what deduction should be made, because I take it that it would be to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reduce their rates to the lowest point that is possible in order to induce traffic and travel

and settlement, and in order to induce people to raise the produce to be carried over the road. But these terms are infinitely better, in my judgment, than the construction of the road by the Government; and, apart from the Government of Canada, I know of no means by which this road could be constructed; and why? From Lethbridge to Nelson, along the whole 330 miles that are to be constructed, I do not suppose that to-day there are a thousand people. But the construction of this railway will be the means of access to that country, and will fill it up, and develop these great coal fields, which are now useless to Canada, and will in that way be of enormous advantage to British Columbia and to Canada. I was glad to hear that, in connection with the construction of this Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the Government proposed to secure the prompt extension of the railway from Nelson to Penticton. I do not know what the proposition of the Government was, or who the parties were with whom they were negotiating that transaction; but in my judgment it is a matter of great importance to Canada that that extension, opening up that magnificent boundary region, where there are mines of great value, if it can be secured by any fair and reasonable inducement, I do not care under whose auspices it may be constructed, should be promptly carried through. We want not only the extension from the eastern portion of our railway system at Lethbridge to Nelson—which I have no doubt will be constructed with the great energy and promptitude which have always characterized the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—but we want the great mineral region beyond, which is of great value to Canada, opened up as well. I do not intend to detain the committee in listening to my very rasping voice further than to say that I regard the measure now submitted to the committee as of such great importance that I am not disposed to deal with it too critically, nor have I the means at my disposal to do so. I can only say that if this is the best proposal that can be submitted to secure the prompt construction of the road, I for one am prepared to give it my humble support.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would be very hard indeed to please if I objected very seriously to the criticism of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman has appeared in many roles. To-night he appears rather in the part of the prophet Baalam, who would be disposed to curse but is obliged to bless, by reason of the excellence of the measure we have brought down. As I have said, I propose to say but a very few words, not exactly in reply, but by way of commenting on some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman drew a comparison between the management of

**SIR CHARLES TUPPER.**

the Intercolonial Railway under himself and its management under my esteemed and lamented colleague and leader, Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, and he brought out, by methods of arithmetic best known to himself, a clear credit of \$2,600,000 on the right side of the balance sheet. All I can say is that if he was entitled to the credit of that amount, he took it all out of us in the case of the construction of a very well known short line railway, which was to have shortened the distance by forty-seven or forty-five miles for every pound of freight and every passenger that came from the maritime provinces to any other part of the Dominion, but it was whittled down by actual arithmetic to four miles, according to a statement made by Sir John Macdonald in this House. But I call the attention of the House to the utter fallacy of the statement made by the hon. gentleman with respect to the expenditures and the deficits which occurred on the Intercolonial Railway during the period of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration and his own. In the first place, all men who know anything about railway management know very well that when starting a new railway of several hundred miles in length, you cannot in the first two or three years hope to make as good a return as you can afterwards. That we will pass over, however. But I would like to call the attention of the House to this important fact, that under Mr. Mackenzie the annual charge for interest paid out of the public chest was about \$1,500,000 a year on the cost price of the Intercolonial Railway, whereas under the hon. gentleman the capital account had swelled to \$50,000,000, so that in his time the annual interest charge amounted to \$2,000,000, a difference of \$500,000 a year, which, multiplied by the five years he speaks of, would wholly absorb his imaginary surplus. However, that is an old story, and I am not going to waste any more time about it. I would merely call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact. He contracts the terms which he and his Government were willing to offer for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway with those contained in the proposal brought down by my hon. friend. It is true, I believe the hon. gentleman intended to give only \$5,000 a mile as a free gift; but I understand that he was likewise going to lend \$20,000 a mile, I suppose on the security of the road alone.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. I may tell my hon. friend that everything the company had, subject to its present liability, was to be the security.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They would have taken, then, a second mortgage for the \$20,000 a mile. I think most business men will agree that our proposition, even if it contained no other advantageous features, was quite as good

for the people of Canada as the hon. gentleman's. Candidly, I would about as soon give \$10,000 or \$11,000 to a railway company as give them \$5,000 and lend them \$20,000. However, that is a matter of detail and of opinion. But this I may point out to the hon. gentleman. He may estimate the concessions that we have obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at a small or a large value, as he pleases; but those concessions refer not merely to the right of operating on the Crow's Nest Pass line. Remember the Government of Canada are able to control the rates on everything which goes from any part of the Crow's Nest Pass to any portion of Canada, and on anything which comes from any part of Canada to any section of the Crow's Nest line. The reduction of 3 cents per 100 pounds on all the grains going eastward from Manitoba cannot be computed at less than several hundred thousand dollars per year. Now, the difference between the proposals is practically that we give, if you choose so to call it, some \$5,000 or \$6,000 per mile to the Canadian Pacific Railway for constructing this line, and we are paying them a further sum of \$5,000 or \$6,000 in return for valuable privileges to the whole North-west and eastern Canada as well. That is the bargain which we have made and which we respectfully submit to the House, and to say the least, it is quite as valuable and advantageous to the people of Canada as the bargain which the hon. gentleman when Premier (Sir Charles Tupper) was willing to implement, putting entirely on one side, for the moment, the fact that he was ready to lend this corporation \$20,000 per mile in addition. Now, I agree with the hon. gentleman (and it was a special reason which weighed very heavily indeed with the Government in advising the House to proceed with this bargain) on two points. I believe he is right in stating that this is a very valuable territory which is to be developed, and which can only be developed by a railway. I believe that the construction of a railway into that country will, in all probability, lead to bringing there a population of many thousands of consumers, who will afford a very valuable market to the inhabitants of the North-west portion of Canada and also to our manufacturers in the east. More than that, I agree with him also that it is a matter of moment to us that the great traffic which certainly will spring up if the representations which have been made to us are confirmed even to only one-tenth or one-twentieth of the extent to which they appear likely to be confirmed, should be preserved to the people of Canada. A great deal of their trade is now being diverted to American channels. I need not say to business men in or out of this House that there is no one thing more certain than that if once that trade be allowed to flow into American channels, we shall find it extremely diffi-

cult to recover it. These are two reasons sufficient to induce us to do what otherwise we might hesitate to do, ask the House to proceed with an enterprise which necessarily involves an addition of three or four million dollars to the public debt. I admit that we are taking risks, as hon. gentlemen opposite were willing to take risks last year. But most men who will take the trouble to make themselves acquainted with the enormous mineral resources of British Columbia, particularly in the territory which we are about to open, must know how absolutely indispensable it is for the inhabitants of that region and the promoters of these mining industries to obtain, not merely a supply of the ordinary necessities of life at reasonable rates, but to obtain a cheaper supply of coal, and they will agree in thinking that the risk is well run and that it is, on the whole, in the interest of the people at large that this money should be expended for the purpose of securing new trade and developing the resources of that very valuable region. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman substantially agrees with us in the grounds and the reasons on which we have ventured to ask the House to support this proposition. I do not deny that, to a certain extent, all these things are experimental, but I do believe, after giving the matter every possible consideration, that if this railway is constructed, from the very nature of the case, you will have ten dividend-paying mines in Rossland and the adjacent country for one under existing circumstances. And no one thing is more likely to aid Canada and bring immigrants to the North-west than the opening up, in various portions of it, in British Columbia and the province of Ontario, not to speak of the other sections of the country, of large and well developed gold fields. Every man who has studied the progress of the Australian colonies knows that it was slow and in many cases attended with great drawbacks until the time of their gold discovery. From that time they advanced with leaps and bounds; and while I am not at all disposed to prophecy as to what may take place in Canada, I do say there is a concurrence of circumstances at present which renders it important that Canada should be ready to take advantage of the extreme attention now being paid to her affairs in the mother country. Sir, it is not in any spirit of greed or self-speaking that we recently made the offer we did to the British people through the medium of our tariff. It was not in any spirit of self-seeking or greed that we exerted ourselves to cause Canada to be well represented at the approaching Jubilee, but I am justified, looking at what has occurred, in saying that whatever may have been the motive, the result has been most gratifying to everybody who has the honour and interest of Canada at heart. I believe that never in the whole course of our history has Canada occupied so high a position or at-

tracted one-hundredth part as much attention in the motherland, and that is another reason, if reason be needed, why we can venture to take this risk in the confident hope that the money we are now expending will be repaid to us a hundred fold before we are many years older.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I listened with considerable interest this afternoon to the explanations by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) of the resolution which embody the proposals of the Government in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I agree with him on one point, and that is that the proposal of the Government may be fairly criticised. At the same time, I hardly agree in the views of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). He not only offered his warm approval of the proposals but went a step further and emphasized the point that no Government should construct or operate a railway. Evidently his lot, while he was in control of the Railway Department, was not a happy one, and I presume that he gave expression to his personal opinion based on his personal experience. According to the best information I possess, I understand that the people of this country, especially the people in the western section of Canada, taking their opinions as voiced in public meetings and through the independent press, are almost unanimously of the opinion that this Government would be fully justified in not only constructing but operating this Crow's Nest Railway, which is bound to be a dividend paying enterprise from the start. I am aware that nothing I can say on this question will have the weight which an exact knowledge of the country and its conditions obtained by hon. gentlemen who have visited it and who have already spoken or who may follow me, will have, and I approach this subject with all the diffidence of an eastern tenderfoot on a new trail. But at the same time I must say that I am greatly disappointed with the terms which the Government have made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think that the bargain is a good one except for the Canadian Pacific Railway and its assistant the British Columbia Southern Railway. What the Canadian Pacific Railway gets is very clear. It gets over \$11,000 a mile of cash subsidy for 330 miles of its railway, amounting to a total of \$3,630,000. That is what the people contribute in money to the building of the road, the entire cost of which is estimated at \$7,000,000. At an outside estimate, the Canadian Pacific Railway will have to raise less than \$3,400,000 to pay the entire cost of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. It would be serious indeed, it would be unheard of if the Canadian Pacific Railway had to raise even 40 per cent of the cost to provide itself with a property which will be commercially successful from the start. The Canadian Pacific Railway is saved

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

from that evil by the overwhelming generosity of the Government of British Columbia. The public resources of British Columbia are transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway to the tune of 20,000 acres per mile, and that is not ordinary land, but coal land, yielding, according to the estimate of Prof. Selwyn, about 30,000,000 tons per square mile. So the Canadian Pacific Railway gets in cash \$11,000 from the people of this country, and 20,000 acres of land or 31,000 square acres for every mile of railway it builds. The question is: how much is this land worth? I hold in my hand the report of Mr. Fernie of the Crow's Nest Company, of which he was the superintendent in 1892. Mr. Fernie says of one part of this coal field: "It will average at least 10 miles wide the whole of the 35 miles." This would be 35 square miles of coal land in one block or 224,000 acres. He also declared that the area of the coal fields was 288 square miles or 184,000 acres, or twice the area mentioned by Dr. Selwyn in his report of 1891. I am omitting the value of town site lands from this calculation; but the bare facts are that the Canadian Pacific Railway gets in public money \$3,630,000 and in coal lands from British Columbia, 134,000 acres. That is what the Canadian Pacific Railway gets; now the question is, what does the Canadian Pacific Railway give? I have read these resolutions and I must say that the concessions promised by these terms are mighty poor value for so much good land and so much good money. It is all right to turn to mathematics and figure out how much the deduction of 3 cents per 100 pounds will be worth to the farmers of Manitoba. The calculation is that this reduction will be worth \$600,000 per annum to the farmers of that province. Well, if we are going to consult calculations of figures, why not pay due regard to the figures of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). That hon. gentleman figures that at one cent a ton for the coal the Canadian Pacific Railway would get \$39,000,000. So, if this House is to be governed not by facts but by calculations, then the calculations show that the Canadian Pacific Railway will get a great deal more out of the country than that the country can ever dream of getting out of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As to the reserve of 50,000 acres of coal lands, some hon. gentleman may talk as if the Canadian Pacific Railway were providing this land at their own expense. Well, if 50,000 acres of coal land retained by the Dominion Government for public purposes is of a great value—and we heard the Minister of Railways on that question—what must be the value of 134,000 acres of coal land taken from the public by the Canadian Pacific Railway under the charter of the British Columbia Southern Railway?

I cannot discuss the technicalities of this arrangement, but I do say that the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway has given nothing which it would not have been forced to concede if the Government had gone the right way about it. I am not an enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I confess I would think more of that great corporation if it had more friends amongst the people who are at its mercy. Indeed there are ample reasons for believing that in the territory where there are no other roads but the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people believe that they are ill-used, and in that belief I share. Had the Canadian Pacific Railway management known how to run the road the Kootenay district would, to-day, have been far ahead of its present development, for the Canadian Pacific Railway then would have done the work which American small-fry corporations were not afraid to attempt. From all I can learn the Canadian Pacific Railway has no policy—but the Shaughnessy policy with the settler, the miner and the merchant. The only policy that that great corporation knows for those who are subject to its monopoly is to squeeze out of them the last drop of blood they can lose and not die. That line of policy had discouraged and disheartened the people, and that discouragement and disheartenment has tended to keep other people from filling up that country.

No man is blind enough to overlook the work that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done for Canada, but while admitting the work that that road has done for this country, it can be contended that Canada has done a great deal, yes, in the opinion of a great many people, more than it should have done, for that great corporation. Indeed, Canada has done so much for the Canadian Pacific Railway that I think it is about time Canada should have a chance to consider what it can do for itself. Now, I am not hostile to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I am an enemy to the idea that any great corporation, any such corporation as this, shall be a governing force or factor in the politics of this country.

The proposed arrangement is, in my judgment, both a disappointment and a misfortune to this country. The country is disappointed because it expected from this new Government something better than a few paper guarantees in exchange for millions in land and millions in money. The country has reason to be disappointed, because the Government has missed a chance of settling this question in a way that would have saved the people from oppressive freight rates and also from the cost of building railways in British Columbia. I am trying to approach this question as a Canadian whose ardent desire is to see prosperity in every province of this great confederation, and as an Ontario man who does not want to see his own province burdened for the development of other provinces. I believe that if the Government had dealt in the right way with the British

Columbia legislature and the British Columbia Government they could have secured to the people of that province a great many privileges which the older provinces foolishly threw away. As I understand, the situation in British Columbia is altogether different from that in some other parts of the country. The Kootenay country has advanced ahead of the railway, while in parts of older Canada the railway has developed in advance of the country. It seems to be admitted that there is traffic enough in sight to make the Crow's Nest Pass Railway a paying road from the start. It was believed that British Columbia had in its possession or under charters which it could have revoked, lands sufficient to pay for all the railway that that province would use. There was the definite charge made that the British Columbia Southern charter represented the desire of a band of schemers rather than of the people of British Columbia and if this Government had wanted to protect the people they could have found reasons for the disallowance of that Act. The disallowance of that Act would only have been the striking out of legislation which the Government could have replaced. The Government could have helped the people of British Columbia to use their land for the benefit of themselves and of the whole confederation. If the British Columbia legislature had listened to reason, the lands of the province and the credit of Canada could have been united in providing the railways essential to the prosperity of the province. The lands of that province, properly administered, would have paid over and over again for the cost of building these railways. I am not in favour of building the railways of British Columbia at the expense of the Dominion, and, for that reason, I had hope that the Dominion would assist the province to use the provincial resources for the benefit of the province. But if the resources of the province are to be used for the profit of commercial brigands and charter robbers who have British Columbia by the throat, the lands of the province will be frittered away before British Columbia has all her railways built. Then whenever she wants a railway built she will knock at the door of the Dominion treasury and the time is coming when British Columbia will be so strong that she will not knock in vain. The present Government had a great opportunity to work out a proper understanding between the people of British Columbia and the people of older Canada. The real protectors of the Dominion Treasury are the men who would have British Columbia build her own railways with her own means; and the real raiders on the Dominion treasury are those who would have British Columbia give her lands away to private corporations and individuals. All I can say is that this Government has missed a great opportunity. The Dominion of

Canada is not indebted to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Although I am not a Liberal, I am somewhat familiar with the views of many of my fellow-countrymen who adhere to the Liberal cause, and I believe that the rank and file of the Liberal party have an idea that the Government owed its success at the polls last June more to the favour of the people than to the influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those Liberals are stupid enough to think that the Canadian Pacific Railway did all it could to defeat their party. I am not suggesting that the Liberal Government should return evil to the Canadian Pacific Railway for all the evils that the Canadian Pacific Railway has dealt in the past to the Liberals at the polls; I am only expressing my regret as a Canadian that this Government has not been strong enough to do right. The present arrangement may be satisfactory enough to partisans who provide campaign funds, and who claim the right to provide a policy for the Government when that party is successful at the polls. But there are others. Every party gets something of its strength from the allegiance of faithful men who are not wealthy, and who serve their party and take their pay in the triumph of its principles. I do not think that the best opinion in the Liberal party will approve of an arrangement by which a railway is to be built with the country's public lands and money, which are to be for ever used for the purpose of the oppression of the people, certainly for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It matters not what other Governments might have done. I hold that this Government had greater opportunities and more information than any of its predecessors; and therefore I must protest against this policy, and vote against these resolutions.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a few words to say, first with regard to the time when these resolutions are submitted to the House; secondly, to the nature of the resolutions themselves and their application to the country. I consider it decidedly out of place, in the interest of calm deliberation of this House and in the interest of this country, that these resolutions should be submitted at this late stage of the session. To-night we are within a few days of the end of the session, fully one-third of the members have gone home, or will leave to-night before these resolutions are finally dealt with by the House. The people's representatives who are sent here to do the work of the session, will have gone home, and then those who remain will vote away millions of money belonging to the country and will incur heavy liabilities to be added to the debt, at a time when the anxiety to leave this House is so great that they cannot be fairly considered, nor will they be fairly considered by this House. I say

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

it is most unfair to the country, it is most unfair to the people's representatives that they should not have had these resolutions at an earlier stage during this session. Some may say: Oh, your party when in power did the same thing. Sir, I repeatedly remonstrated with them on account of the large votes they asked for towards the end of the sessions. I thought it wrong in them, and I think it wrong in this Government. I think it unjust to the country and unfair to the House. It does not enable the members of Parliament to do their duty to their constituents or to the country. Now, at the present time, according to the last Public Accounts, I find that the net debt of Canada, on the 31st of June, 1896, was \$258,497,432. What have we added to that debt during the present session? The engagements to which we have committed the country during this session are equivalent, in my judgment, to not far from twenty-nine million dollars added to the debt of this country. Before giving details, I want to draw the attention of this House to the professions made by the present Government when they were in Opposition. They told us that one of the great needs of the time was economy, stringent economy in every department in the public service. When the Patrons put that as one of the planks in their platform, the Liberal party said: You and I are just exactly the same; why, we have been fighting on that line for years, and if returned by the people, we will do what we can to exercise stringent economy. There is no necessity for running up a public debt and we can carry on the affairs of the country without adding to it. But what has been the history of the present session? The engagements entered into this session are equivalent to an addition to the debt as follows:—Extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal by the purchase of the Drummond County Railway and by the annual subsidy that is given to the Grand Trunk Railway, will amount to a sum that would pay the interest on seven million dollars, and we are committed to that for 100 years. If we had added seven millions more to our debt, the average rate of interest which we would have to pay on that debt would about equal the yearly sum which we shall have to pay on account of this railway extension. Then take the steamship subsidy that we voted the other night. Now, I am not condemning that vote, because I believe it is one that will do a great deal of good, but I am only drawing attention to it because the Liberal party who are responsible for it, said only two short years ago that the country was piling up a debt beyond its means and beyond its needs. The steamship subvention, according to the calculation of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I always regarded as an able man in figures, is equal to an addition

to the debt of this country of about eighteen million dollars. Now, we come to Crow's Nest Pass Railway, which we have under consideration; and we propose to vote for that \$3,630,000. In addition to all that, we expect some time during the next few days to vote \$300,000 to help to enlarge the Victoria Bridge at Montreal. Now, take these transactions together, and what do they mean? They mean that the engagements to which this Government have committed the country during this present session of Parliament are equivalent to an addition to the debt of about \$28,970,000—nearly twenty-nine million dollars added to the debt in one year by the Government who said only two short years ago that the country did not require to make any addition to the debt to carry on its affairs, that the country required stringent economy and if the people returned them to power they were going to exercise stringent economy. Is this an evidence of it? I would like to ask the people of the country, I would like to ask the representatives of the people here, if this is an evidence of economy. Add the engagements entered into during the present session to the existing debt, and it all amounts to \$287,500,000 instead of \$258,000,000. Is that nothing to the people of the country? Do the ratepayers of Canada think nothing of it? Is it a small matter that they should be asked here, in the dying hours of the session, when a large number of the members have gone home, to assume a further debt of over \$3,500,000, all inside a few hours, as if it was no consideration, as if the money was just as easy to raise as it is to pass the resolutions through the House? I do not think the ratepayers of this country will be satisfied. I do not think the people will look with unconcern upon the Government who always preached economy when they were in Opposition. Now it may be fairly asked, What does this mean? How will the country be benefited by it? There are two features of it that have attracted my attention. In the first place, the Government have succeeded, by a very liberal expenditure of money, in conciliating for the time being the two great railway corporations of the country. They have given the Grand Trunk Railway Company \$300,000 to help them enlarge their bridge that they would have to enlarge themselves to meet the necessity of their own traffic. In the next place, they have committed us to an expenditure of \$140,000 for 100 years to have the use of the outlet of the Grand Trunk Railway. Surely that ought to be sufficient to appease them for the time being, and make them friendly to the present Government. Now, as a matter of political policy, this may be good business, I admit, but I am safe in saying that the people will not be inclined to endorse the hon. gentlemen. I am sure that they will not be willing to look upon this

transaction in a favourable light. Now, then, we turn from that. We have conciliated the Grand Trunk Railway Company and we have supposedly made them friends of the present Government. But we have that great Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that octopus that is stretching out its claws all over this country and bringing everything into its power. We are conciliating them to the tune of \$3,630,000, which is the subsidy for the time being, and in addition to that they are getting 450,000 acres of mineral land which they got from the British Columbia Government through the British Columbia Southern Railway. This is a stroke of business for the present Government. They have done admirably, because they have conciliated both the great railway corporations, made friends of them and they may expect to benefit by that. But who is going to pay for all this? I represent one of the constituencies of Ontario. Where is the expenditure of this money to take place? The portion of it which has been given to the Grand Trunk and the Drummond County Railway will be expended in the province of Quebec, and the rest, which is going to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, will be expended in British Columbia, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. The people of Ontario, the central part of this Dominion, representing about one-half of the population of the country, must pay about one-half of the whole debt, yet not a dollar is to be spent in that province. What will Ontario think of this expenditure? Will Ontario be satisfied with it? I am quite sure she will not, because she has been committed and she must pay the piper. She must pay her portion of this. That portion comes pretty nearly being the whole of it, and she will get very little in return for it. This expenditure is a great mistake. But the two great railway companies have been appeased. What does this expenditure mean to this country? It further strengthens the hands of what has been regarded and represented by hon. gentlemen opposite on the Treasury benches as one of the greatest monopolies that Canada ever had, to the extent of that large amount of money, and also to the extent of inclosing a large quantity of the finest coal and mineral territory in British Columbia, thereby shutting out anything like competition from other railway companies. It not only does that, but it chains up that great country in the west from having the benefit of competition by railways for a long time to come, if ever. You have given this company the control of one of the passes through the mountains and they will now control another when this road is built, so that there will be no inducement for any other railway to go in there. The great cry from that country has been that there has been no competition. And now they will not have the competitor that they are entitled to from the railway

corporations. This arrangement will shut this out of competition for a long time to come, for twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years. It leaves the people at the mercy of that great railway corporation, the corporation which the hon. member for Toronto says has never shown any mercy whenever it was in a position to extract blood or money out of the people. They have given us an arrangement in the way of freight rates, but if you analyse the items, the concessions do not amount to very much. It is true that they seem big in some lines—33 per cent on the line of fruit that is carried there. The amount of fruit will not be large during the next ten years. What does that mean to the people of Canada, the Northwest and British Columbia. It looks a large item, but it does not amount to as much as it would seem. Then there is a cut of half a cent a hundred weight on grain, as far east as Port Arthur. It stops there, apparently for fear that Ontario would get any benefit from this large expenditure. They have reduced their freight rates on a few lines and as far as they go they are certainly in the right direction. But the company give us no equivalent for the consideration that they receive. We have strengthened the hand of a monopoly; we have made it impossible for that western people to hope to get competition from any other railway company at any rate for a long time to come. Railways from the east are working westward all the time, but they will not be able to get through that great mountain stretch and give the people competition. We have given that company a great deal of money. The time ought to come when they should be satisfied and when they would not expect any more from us. I find we have given them over \$65,000,000 and over 22,000,000 acres of land, and yet their insatiable maw is not satisfied, and they are as anxious as ever to get more. Has not the time come when we should cry a halt in this? I think the people of Canada have come to the conclusion it has. I am not going to make a comparison between the offer made by the late Government and that made by the present Government. In my opinion, the offer of the late Government was infinitely ahead of that which has been made by the present Government for the country. Have hon. gentlemen considered that this road would have been built without the country being committed to a dollar's expenditure? If we had not given them that money the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have built that road anyway, because in their last report I find the following statement:—

But even with these important facilities for handling the traffic of the mining districts, your company will continue to be at a disadvantage in competing with the American lines (which have already reached Nelson, Rossland and other important centres in these districts) until it shall have direct railway connections of its own. Un-

**Mr. SPROULE.**

til then the greater part of the mining traffic will be beyond its reach, and will continue to be, as at present, carried by the American lines southward.

Your directors are strongly of the opinion, that any delay in securing your interests in that direction will be extremely dangerous—that unless your company occupies the ground, others will, the demand for shipping and travelling facilities being most urgent. The directors feel that they cannot too strongly urge the immediate construction of a line from Lethbridge to a connection with your Columbia and Kootenay Railway at Nelson, a distance of 325 miles, and, anticipating your approval, they have already taken steps towards commencement of the work on the opening of the spring.

The unfavourable conditions which have prevailed for the past three years, have prevented any effective action towards providing for the traffic of the mining country, but the directors feel now that the improved position and prospects of the company, together with the magnitude of the interests at stake, will fully warrant this important step.

Therefore, I say we are justified in believing that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have built that line whether they got a subsidy from the Government or not. But they have never been very dilatory about asking. They have succeeded admirably in the past, and they are always willing to ask. In my opinion, they would have built that road whether they got the subsidy or not, but if they can get a subsidy, it is just so much easier to build it as it costs them just so much less. Now, to my mind, the great problem that is looming up in Canada is the transportation problem. To-day we are under two great railway corporations that appear to have no souls and no consideration for the people when their financial interests are at stake. These two railways are coming closer and closer together; they are arranging traffic over certain portions of their lines, and they are reaching an understanding with regard to the running of the railways. Notwithstanding the millions of money that Canada has voted for these railways, we have practically no railway competition in the country to-day, and the onerous burdens that are being heaped on the people from year to year, make it absolutely compulsory on the Parliament of Canada to exercise control over these great carrying corporations. The time is not far distant when Canada will be obliged to deal with these railway corporations in a very different fashion from what we are doing to-day. Whether that be done by a railway commission, or some other power, I do not know, but if my judgment is worth anything, and if the signs of the times mean anything, public sentiment will be so strong a few years hence, that no Government will be able to withstand it unless they deal energetically with the transportation problem in Canada. It must be dealt with in the interests of the people of this country, and the sooner we tackle it the better. We should not

now, year after year, and session after session, be constantly extending their powers and giving them more of the country under their control, so as to make it more and more difficult to control them in the future. I regret exceedingly that the Government, at this very late stage of the session and when the interest in the session is practically over, has submitted to this House resolutions which mean an addition to the debt of this country of \$3,630,000. I do not think that the electorate of Canada will look upon this proposition with any great satisfaction, nor do I believe it will raise the Government in the estimation of the people. I believe that the people of Canada will regard this proposition of the Government, as entirely out of harmony with their declarations before they came to power to the effect that if returned, they would exercise the most stringent economy in the management of the financial affairs of this country.

Mr. BOSTOCK. These resolutions show that the Government are prepared to carry out as well as they possibly can, an arrangement to develop the resources of British Columbia. That arrangement will benefit the mining district of West Kootenay, in, that it will settle the question as to what is going to be done about smelters in that country. We have in West Kootenay a large amount of ore ready for smelting, and the great drawback to developing mines up to the present time has been the difficulty of getting in fuel for the smelters. The building of this Crow's Nest Pass line will bring coal to the West Kootenay smelters at a reasonable rate, and will enable them to treat these ores in our country, as of course should be the case. There is a keen discussion at the present time in Rossland, as to whether the smelters should be erected there, or whether they should go to Northport in the United States, and the people of Rossland are anxiously awaiting the announcement that this railway will be constructed. The construction of the line through the Crow's Nest Pass will practically decide that question, and will entail the smelters being built on Canadian soil. It is difficult for people in the east who do not understand that country to realize what an advantage that would mean. We have now in West Kootenay three smelters, one of which I am sorry to say is at present shut down and certainly the fact of being able to get cheaper fuel will materially help to open that smelter again. These smelters employ a large number of men, and help largely to develop the country. It is needless to state, that it is very much better and very much more profitable for us to smelt our ores in Canada, than to send to the United States as has heretofore been the custom. I have a statement from the "Rossland Miner" of the 6th of this month, which shows that a total of 25,705 tons of ore were shipped from that camp alone from the 1st January, 1897, to the 5th of June

in this year. This ore was shipped from twelve camps as follows:—

	Tons.
LeRoi.....	17,906
War Eagle.....	4,990
Columbia and Kootenay.....	569
Iron Mask.....	1,514
Jumbo.....	91
Josie.....	203
Cliff.....	141
Red Mountain.....	56
Evening Star.....	21
Giant.....	21
O. K.....	56
IXL.....	12
Total.....	25,705

The House will see that a large quantity of ore is being shipped out of that camp alone at the present time. Then again we find, that in the Slocan country, for the nine months from July, 1896, to March, 1897, the shipments have amounted to 14,434 tons. Very nearly all of that ore has been shipped to smelters out of the country, because the smelter at Nelson which has been working for some time has found that it can get nearly all the ore it required out of its own mine, and therefore it has not been treating much ore from other mines. Then, again, if we look at the customs returns they show very clearly the manner in which business has been developing in that country. The customs returns for the port of Nelson, which covers all the outports of the West Kootenay country, in January, 1896, amounted to \$5,982 and in January, 1897, \$11,057. The returns for the corresponding month of the ensuing year, therefore, nearly doubled. In February, 1896, the customs returns were \$4,580, and in February, 1897, \$10,072. In May, 1896, the customs returns for the port of Nelson amounted to \$5,688, and in May, 1897, they amounted to \$41,572. From these figures, which I believe are as nearly correct as can be obtained—I have been obliged to take them from a newspaper not having any official return—it will be seen the greatly increased revenue which the country is obtaining from that part of Canada. That, of course, is only one section of the country that is going to be benefited, and very largely benefited, by the opening up of this Crow's Nest Railway. We have to the east of the west Kootenay country what is known as East Kootenay, and I notice that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition stated that he did not think that at the present time there were more than a thousand people between Lethbridge and Nelson. I do not know what the population of the town of Lethbridge or the population of the town of Macleod is at the present time, but I know that the town of Fort Steele in the east Kootenay country, which has at present practically no means of encouraging its development, has increased in population from about 250 on the first of January of this year to something over 1,000 people at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are there after the prospectors have gone out ?

Mr. BOSTOCK. There are more than 1,000 in the country around, but the town of Fort Steele is increasing very fast indeed. I mention this because there has been nothing special done to open up that part of the country. There has been no new road made, and the steamers on the Kootenay River which run down to Jennings, have had very bad luck ; I am sorry to say that two of them have been wrecked. So that the tendency has been rather to retard that part of the country than to develop it. I only mention this to show how the population of the country is increasing, and, as soon as work is commenced on this railway, and the people know that it is going through, there will be a large development in that country. The other part of the country that is going to be immediately benefited is the country between the Columbia River and Okanagan; because that Boundary Creek country all through is exceedingly rich in ore, as was shown to the House to-day by the hon. Minister of Railways by what he read from the report made by a gentleman for the German Government. That report is in no way exaggerated, because other men of renown in the mining world have given their opinion in very much the same terms. The only difficulty is that the ore is a low-grade ore, and needs transportation facilities for its proper handling. At the present time there are towns springing up in that country. Only the other day a gentleman who was here from Midway told me that at the present time there are two stages running from the town of Grand Forks down to Marcus, on the Spokane and Northern Railway, and that they come in every day crowded with passengers. The danger we are under in that country is the same as we were under in the West Kootenay country with regard to Rossland. The natural tendency is for people to come into the country from the south, and we are very much in danger of all our trade and business being dragged that way. We have really to fight against the natural outline of the country, and try to direct the trade north instead of letting it go south. So that, speaking in the interest of the country itself, I think we have to take hold of this question at once and do the best we can with it. I do not mean to say but that possibly, by waiting, we might have been able to wring better terms out of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am quite aware that there are a large number of people who think that could be done, and that perhaps delay would have been to the advantage of the country. But I do not myself think it would be altogether a good thing to delay. I think the Government have taken into their careful consideration the position of the whole matter, and have probably done the very best they could under the circumstances. I do not

Mr. BOSTOCK.

propose to discuss the clauses of this agreement, because it is one of those agreements which we can better judge of by the way it works out than we can by its terms on paper. In an agreement of this kind a great deal more depends on the men who carry it out, and on the way in which it is carried out, than on the actual statements put down on paper. I consider that the arrangement made with regard to the coal lands in the East Kootenay country is going to give the Government a very strong lever for keeping down the price of coal, and for keeping a check on the way those lands are handled. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) raised the question of competition in railways. So far as British Columbia is concerned, it is hopeless for us to expect to obtain competition in railways, because wherever you come to build a railway, you will find that that railway will necessarily have to go through some place where it is almost impossible to get another. Consequently, the idea of competition in railways in British Columbia is an almost hopeless impossibility. The only way we can look forward to dealing with our railroad question in that country, in my opinion, is by having a very strong Government control, ending, eventually, by the Government taking the railroads and operating them itself. Although I have studied this question carefully, and talked to a number of people about it, I am of opinion that this country is at the present time hardly ready to go in for the Government ownership of railways. I do not agree with the objection that is always raised when this question is brought up. We are always told, "Oh, look at your Intercolonial Railway." Well, I think there are other ways in which a Government railroad can be handled than the way in which the Intercolonial Railway has been handled. I think it is not a good thing for a country to have a large business concern like a railway so closely in touch with the political machinery of the country. Other countries have certainly found a solution of the difficulty, and I think that in time the people of Canada will find themselves obliged to take hold of this question and handle the railways in some way themselves, as has been done in other countries. But, from my experience, and from what I have learned in talking to the people of this country, I do not think they are prepared to take hold of this matter at the present time. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take up the time of the committee any longer. I have made these few remarks because I think this arrangement is a good one for the country and for the constituency I represent, and I hope to see it successfully carried through.

Mr. OLIVER. As representing one of the two constituencies through which the Crow's Nest Pass Railway will run, I must ask the indulgence of the House for a short time. The district of Alberta is doubly

interested, in that it not only includes a large part of the proposed line, but it necessarily must be the principal Canadian source of supply of the farm produce consumed in the Kootenay region. Therefore, there is a strong desire on the part of our people, for local reasons, to see the Crow's Nest Pass Railway built, being assured that under any circumstances they will receive a considerable material profit, both by the actual construction of the line and by the increased convenience of access to the mining region which under any conditions it will afford. With us it is not a matter of whether the line should be built or not, or of when it shall be constructed; we in Alberta want the line, and want it now. Therefore, I am bound to support the general proposition to build a line of railway at once through the Crow's Nest Pass.

There is no question to my mind about the desirability of the railway. The only question is as to the desirability of the terms; whether under the present bargain the country gets the worth of its money, gets what it is paying for, and gets the most that could have been got for the money. This, I take for granted, is fair matter for inquiry and criticism. If the country is paying for something, it should know what it is getting for what it is paying.

In so far as the terms announced protect the vested interests of the established town sites in southern Alberta, they are most satisfactory, and a marked and wholesome departure from the policy formerly prevailing, especially as they do not add one cent to the public charges in respect of the railway. They are merely a proper exercise of governmental authority in support of the interests of the people, but for which the Government is not less entitled to credit.

There is no doubt that the early construction of the road will be a measure of improvement, as compared with existing conditions, just as the building of any new line of railway improves conditions as compared with what they were when there was no railway. But when under the new conditions introduced by the existence of the railway the question of competing in putting the products of the farm on the consuming market arises it is not then a question between railroad and no railroad. It becomes a question of getting such a rate that the cost of producing and hauling to market shall together not exceed the market price. Unless the railroad enables this to be done, it fails of its principal purpose. Without this it is not worth its cost to the public, and does not repay the public aid granted. This is a particularly important consideration in connection with this Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the chief hope in regard to which is that it will make possible the profitable development of vast bodies of low grade ore in Kootenay, which

development depends more on low freight rates than upon anything else.

Looked upon merely as an ordinary local line, chiefly for the mutual benefit of Alberta and Kootenay, the project would probably not appeal strongly enough to the House to have warranted the Government in asking the large amount of aid indicated. That amount is doubtless based on benefits expected to accrue to interests other than those merely of Alberta and Kootenay. As the aid is admittedly large considering the mileage to be constructed, it is fair to assume that the rate and other concessions contained in the bargain are held to be value to the country in general for a large part of the money to be paid. So, in considering the merits of the bargain, it is proper to consider not only the length of new line that will be built but how far the conditions attached will beneficially affect the interests concerned, and whether the benefits are such as should accrue under all the circumstances.

The building of this road was expected to mark a turning point in the affairs of the west. This was the principal inducement persistently held out by the newspaper advocates of material aid towards its construction.

A great deal has been promised, and therefore a great deal is expected; much more than would be under ordinary circumstances.

In the west, as in all Canada, and there probably more than anywhere else in Canada, the question of transportation is the great question. That question was popularly supposed to be solved when the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain was made for a line from ocean to ocean. Whether it has been solved, every farmer, every producer, every dealer in the Dominion must answer that it has not. The question of transportation is not in this day a question of railway against no railway: it is a question of one railway against other railways more or less favourably circumstanced, more or less ably managed, and handled more or less with an eye to the interests of one or other section of the community, or this or that region or country. There is no question of "railway or no railway" in this country now, wherever the circumstances will justify construction. The question is one solely of rates and management, and it is because the railway rates have been distinctly against the west in particular and in general from the first that Manitoba and the Territories have shown so much less rapid progress than was expected when the Canadian Pacific Railway was first aided. It is for the same reason that the trade of eastern Canada with the west has not increased as was hoped at the same time, partly because the trade is not there to be done, and partly because, owing to the more advantageous railroad situation of the United States manu-

facturing and commercial cities of Chicago, St. Paul and Spokane, a large proportion of the trade of the west is done from those cities. And as the duties are lowered a proportionately greater share of the trade will be done by them, unless the rates of transportation between eastern and western Canada can be reduced to a level very far below what they have yet been. A general and adequate cheapening of the rates from eastern and throughout western Canada would develop the west, and enable the east to reap the sole outside profit of that development. A failure to bring down the rates to the point of final effective competition with the lines of the United States is to fall short of the mark; is to continue to retard the west, and to divide its trade between eastern Canada and the United States, to the increasing advantage of the latter. It is because of the universal recognition of this fact that the prospect of a radical change in the condition of the western transportation problem was hailed with universal satisfaction throughout the Dominion; and it has simply been taken for granted by all parties that the Crow's Nest Pass line must be built, not because of the line itself, but because of the new railroad policy of which it was to be at once the announcement and the commencement.

Subsections (c), (d), (e) and (f) are the parts of the resolution which are of general interest, as embodying the new western railway policy of the Government, and stating the compensation which the people of Canada receive for the additional aid and privileges granted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in respect to this line. It is desirable that these sections should be carefully examined to see how far the public receive value in their provisions, and how far they meet circumstances as they exist, or are likely to arise. If we are to be thankful we may as well know as exactly as possible what we have to be thankful for.

Subsection (c) provides for the control by a commission, of railway rates on all freight to and from the Kootenay country, on all Canadian Pacific Railway lines in Canada. This certainly reads well, and as a provision for preventing discrimination against persons or places should be of value, provided the commission acts with a single eye to the interest of the people. But without some further declaration as to considerations which shall or may be the basis of the regulations it cannot be used to effect a general substantial reduction such as the trade and production of the west, or for that matter of the east as well, require and demand. The fact that it cannot be so used is proven by the necessity for subsection (d) which provides for certain specific reductions. If the railway commission were to have power to absolutely reduce rates subsection (d) would not be necessary. The existence of subsection (d) practically restricts and limits subsection (c); and if subsection (c) gives

no power to compel an absolute but only a relative reduction of rates, it gives no power that is not already inherent in Parliament without consideration to the railway company, and, therefore, does not represent one cent of the three and a half millions to be paid.

A railway commission, unless so specifically empowered, cannot ignore the right of capital invested in the railway to a return, based upon what such an investment would be likely to receive if placed elsewhere; nor can it ignore the mileage of the railway, or refuse to give a mileage allowance based on what other railways earn.

The mere power to regulate rates, without the power to actually reduce them, does not meet the case in which Alberta, or for that matter all Canada, finds itself regarding the trade of Kootenay.

Our local position is this: At present North Alberta supplies grain, hay and vegetables, and South Alberta cattle, to the mining regions, over the Canadian Pacific Railway main line from Calgary, and its branch lines and steamboat connections. Our competitors who supply by far the largest part of the produce consumed in Kootenay are the farmers of the Palouse district of eastern Washington and northern Idaho, for whom the city of Spokane is the trade centre. Until February last their rate on grain was 25 cents per 100 to Nelson, which is a central point in Kootenay, while our rate was 50 cents per 100. Even with the duty in our favour we were not able to do business. In February last (no doubt in view of possible competition), the Canadian Pacific Railway cut the rate from Edmonton (which is the principal grain shipping point) to Nelson to 35 cents per 100. With the duty in our favour this enabled us to compete with the Spokane 25 cent rate to certain Kootenay points most conveniently situated for us, and less conveniently placed for them. But had it not been for the high duties we evidently could not have competed, except at a very much lower price for produce at the point of production on our side of the line, as compared with the price on their side. When the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is completed the difference in haul will be 150 miles from Spokane to Nelson, against 600 miles from Edmonton to Nelson.

The question for us is: Will control of rates by the railway commission enable us to finally compete over the Crow's Nest Pass line with our rivals in the neighbourhood of Spokane when our competition becomes sufficiently keen to warrant them in cutting their present rates in order to meet it? Either we of Northern Alberta must have the same rate over 600 miles of railway as our rivals get over 150 miles, or we must sell our produce proportionately cheaper than they do; or they must do the trade, and we must do without it. True, we have the duty in our favour; but if we have to depend on the duty to hold for us the

markets of our own country we cannot credit the terms of the railway bargain with doing so. This is not the understanding that we would wish to have as to the value of the bargain under consideration. This is not what we are paying three and a half millions of dollars for.

Cheap freights will develop Kootenay, and if Alberta supplies Kootenay with produce the development of Kootenay will mean the growth and prosperity of Alberta; and the growth and prosperity of both Kootenay and Alberta will mean a lightening of the taxes of the people at large by increasing the numbers of those who are able to pay taxes, as well as increasing their ability to pay. Their development will mean an increased demand for the manufactures, and a wider field for the commerce of eastern Canada, so that even eastern Canada is interested in this question of local freight rates from Alberta to Kootenay.

The question is not one merely of a cent higher or lower, but possibly involves, in the last resort, getting down to the bare cost of hauling in order to hold the trade for our own country. Unfortunately this is not only the condition of Alberta in regard to the trade of Kootenay, but it is to an even greater degree the condition of the eastern Canadian merchants and manufacturers regarding the same trade, and, indeed, applies to all the trade of eastern with western Canada. Inasmuch as the haul is much shorter from St. Paul and Chicago than it is from Toronto and Montreal, unless the Canadian cities can get—not a rate that will allow an equal earning on capital represented in the Canadian railways, not that will allow an equal mileage earning with United States railways, but the same rates over the greater distance that their United States competitors get over the shorter distance, they cannot compete, save for the duty.

To overcome this geographical disadvantage, Canada has bonused her railways to the extent of many millions, so that the railway companies would be relieved of the cost of constructing their extra length of line, and would be compensated from the public treasury for extra cost of operation, to the end that Canada should have as low rates between its points of production and distribution as our neighbours. In other words, we have paid out of the national, provincial, or municipal treasuries, from one-half to two-thirds of the proper cost of all the railways of Canada, in the hope that by the companies only having to provide for interest on the balance of cost out of earnings we would have low rates of transport. Instead of this we find that practically every mile of road in Canada is carrying every dollar of bonded debt that could be floated on it, the interest on which has to be met, if at all, out of earnings; and, consequently, while we have aided the railway enterprises of our country more liberal-

ly than probably any other country, we are paying the very highest railway rates. Not only so, but the very railways that we have bonused so largely actually carry freight more cheaply for our neighbours and competitors generally than they do for us. There has not been a railway train ever run over the Canadian Pacific Railway between Montreal and Vancouver, either way, that has not given, or been ready to give, United States traffic and travel more favourable terms than Canadian. This is the position in which we find ourselves, and this is a position which a railway commission cannot cure.

This is the general position we were in before the bargain under discussion was negotiated, and this is the position we are in yet; not only so, but the proposed line itself is not exempted from the vast privileges as to issue of bonds, which render substantial reductions of even strictly local freight by a commission impossible, except for a further consideration.

If subsection (c) contained a provision that the railway companies were only to be allowed earnings on the proper cost of their lines, less the amount of bonuses received, then it would be of some effect; but as long as unlimited bonding powers are allowed, and the rights of bondholders are recognized as they must and should be, a railway commission cannot even measurably solve the railway problem of Canada.

The right of Parliament to provide a commission for the equalization of freight rates, irrespective of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway agreement, has never been questioned. That right has not been added to by this arrangement; and, if the arrangement was necessary in order to secure the assent of the Canadian Pacific Railway to such a commission, it is to be feared that after the commission is appointed the further assent of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be required before it will take beneficial action even within its limited sphere.

Subsections (d) and (e) provide for reductions on certain freights, both east and west. It is to be regretted that they do not state in so many words the exact rates at which the commodities affected will be carried; because the value of the reduction can only be measured by comparison with the rates now existing, which are not generally understood, particularly as regards west-bound merchandise. The new rates will depend absolutely upon what the present rate is placed at. But the present rate is left indefinite, so that the ordinary person cannot tell where he is at in making a calculation. No doubt special cut rates, or rates as they stand after rebates being granted, will not be those from which the reductions will be made. It is just possible that in some cases when the calculation comes to be made, the reduction, while substantial on paper, will be very difficult to locate. However, I do not know but that we in Alberta would be

glad to exchange the somewhat gauzy provisions regarding control by a railway commission for the application to our Kootenay trade of the definite cut of three cents a hundred on produce. But this cut does not apply to us in our trade with Kootenay, and should we avail ourselves of it on our east-bound freight, I fear that a cut of three cents per hundred pounds from a present rate of 50 cents per hundred would hardly make the Montreal market profitable to us at present prices of wheat and oats.

The fact that a bargain is now being negotiated by the Manitoba Government, under which, for a yearly payment of \$100,000 a reduction of 10 cents per hundred pounds on east-bound grain, and a 25 per cent reduction on all west-bound freights is to be made, as against the 3 cents per hundred reduction on east-bound grain, and 10 per cent reduction on some west-bound freight secured under this bargain, shows: First, that the present reduction is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the case, or a further payment of \$100,000 a year would not be proposed by the parties chiefly interested in this reduction to secure the further one; second, that if a 10 cent per hundred and a 25 per cent reduction can be secured for a payment of \$100,000 a year, in so far as the aid to the Crow's Nest Pass road is repaid by the 3 cent reduction, the money is simply being thrown away. We are absolutely not receiving 1 cent of value for those reductions, for the money has to be paid over again to secure a reduction that will be adequate, and which will cover the one now made. The project to buy relief from high freight rates for Manitoba by a bonus to a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass is far-fetched, and therefore must be dearly bought. It is by control of the only Canadian line from Winnipeg to the lakes that the Canadian Pacific Railway is able to keep its hand on the throat of Manitoba and the west. It is on this section that Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly can be broken most cheaply and completely for the benefit of both eastern and western Canada. That is how less money will do more work there in relief from high rates than in the Crow's Nest Pass.

But I do not wish to minimize the reductions, such as they are or may be. There is plenty of room for them, and they are badly needed, whether big or little. It must be plain, however, that whatever they are, they are not more valuable than the ownership of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and what that ownership implies, or they would not have been conceded for that ownership. Stripped of unnecessary words, the issue in this matter was not whether Kootenay should be further opened up by Canadian railways, but whether, when Kootenay was opened up, it should mean the strengthening or breaking of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway in western Canada. It was to break this monopoly

that the people of Canada were willing to pay the money necessary to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. While this railway is most desirable as a local line, it has not been advocated as such, and that was no reason for the hot newspaper controversy regarding it. The controversy was waged on the question of monopoly; and the freight rate and other concessions is the price which the Canadian Pacific Railway is willing to pay for the continuance and more firm establishment of their monopoly of western Canadian transportation. The feeling throughout the North-west is, that the people are working their farms and conducting their respective businesses on shares with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that that company is getting the lion's share. It costs one bushel of grain to send another to market over the lines of the company. The rates are based simply on what the company are pleased to consider the traffic will bear, and their estimate is generally pitched too high. If people could see any probability of relief from these conditions they would work hopefully; but, under the policy of the late Government, which at first by legislative enactment, and afterwards by differential treatment, actually debarred railway competition, there was no hope, and the natural result has been the slow progress that has been so much complained of.

Taking the reduced rates and other concessions for what they are claimed to be worth, they do not sufficiently meet the case as it exists in the necessity for lower freight rates, while the agreement regarding them makes the new Government a party to the continuance of the monopoly established by their predecessors. The chance of further reductions is shut out, as far as it can be shut out, by the fact that the Government, on the one hand, has decided against a policy of railway competition in the west, either by aiding competing lines or by Government construction, and, on the other hand, having paid three and a half millions of dollars to get certain reductions of freight rates, they will be bound to argue that the reductions secured are sufficient. The Canadian Pacific Railway will use their success in this case as a precedent for demanding further bonuses when the demand for further reduction becomes so pressing that it must be conceded. Under this arrangement, the North-west settler is to be the decoy of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that company is to squeeze him until he squeals loud enough to compel the Government to come to his assistance, and then the Canadian Pacific Railway will demand the price of relaxing the freight-rate screw, either in the purchase of its lands or in aid to additional branches to still further strengthen its monopoly. Is it to be expected that the North-west will prosper under such a policy, or that the trade of eastern Can-

ada will expand by reason of the progress of the west under such circumstances, or is it to be wondered at that a spirit of thankfulness does not diffuse itself, like a broad and happy smile over the face of the North-west because of this bargain? The people of the west will, I believe, when they understand the position, object to being placed in it. They do not wish to stand before the people of Canada, everlastingly clamouring against existing conditions, which require the payment of Government money to relieve them from. When it is only the action of the Government in insisting on the maintenance of monopoly, and in paying Government money to secure that monopoly, that makes the conditions as they are and perpetuates them.

There is no doubt that, had a policy of competition in railway transportation been adopted by the Government, either by the encouragement of the introduction of other railway systems under like or more favourable restrictions than have been agreed to by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or by the construction of the line as a Government work, there would have been a much greater immediate reduction of rates than that now promised, and reasonable grounds to hope that they would be followed by further reductions, as circumstances required, without further cost to the Canadian people. The fact that the Government had thereby announced that it was against monopoly, would have inspired the confidence both of capital and labour throughout and in respect of the North-west, and substantial progress according to the conditions of the country would have followed.

As to the cost of Government ownership and control. The present arrangement will cost the country \$3,500,000. Absolute Government ownership would have cost, say, as much more, or \$7,000,000 in all. But, will the present arrangement only cost the country \$3,500,000? The Canadian Pacific Railway will have to borrow the balance of the money required to build the line; there is no doubt that a bond issue of \$30,000 a mile will be allowed, and the bonds will be sold. That is to say, the road will have a bonded debt of nearly \$10,000,000 on the 330 miles. Who will pay the interest on this debt? It must be paid, if at all, out of the earnings from the traffic on this or some other part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. In other words, the people of Canada will have to pay the interest on the \$10,000,000 just as surely as they will have to pay it on the \$3,500,000. The difference will be perhaps a higher rate of interest will be paid on the \$10,000,000 than on the \$3,500,000. To put it in another way: Under absolute Government ownership and control, with rates at bare cost of hauling, the people of Canada would have to pay 3 per cent interest on \$7,000,000, whereas, under the present arrangement, with no assur-

ance of anything like as low rates, they will have to pay interest on \$13,500,000.

The objection to Government control of railways seems only to apply to the region west of Lake Superior. Only the other day the House agreed by a huge majority to provide interest on a capital sum of \$7,000,000 to secure merely running rights for the Intercolonial over the lines of other roads to Montreal. Although other lines existed which gave direct connection they were not satisfied. They must have absolute rights for the Government railway, or a profitable business could not be done. No one will pretend that the expenditure of \$7,000,000 on the extension of the Intercolonial will be as profitable a business undertaking as would the operation by Government of the railway through the Crow's Nest Pass, and yet the money was voted ungrudgingly. Then why should it be grudged to be used for a purpose universally acknowledged to be of prime necessity, to have an assurance of ten times the profit, and which at the same time would have absolutely relieved a great part, and measurably relieved the whole, of the west from the monopoly which at present enslaves industry and paralyzes enterprise throughout its length and breadth.

Government construction would have secured the active competition of four great trunk lines of railway between eastern Canada and Kootenay; that is: the Canadian Pacific, the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, all running in connection with the navigation of the lakes, and the three latter with the Grand Trunk Railway as well. It would have ensured the lowest possible local rates, both between the North-west and Kootenay and between the coal and silver mines of Kootenay; and if it is agreed that the interests of Winnipeg and of Manitoba in the trade of Kootenay would have been ignored by that arrangement, so they are by the present one, as well as they were by the construction of the Soo line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But a break would have been made in the rule of railway monopoly in the west, which would have been in the interest of Manitoba as well as of British Columbia, and the country would not have to pay interest, directly or indirectly, on nearly as many millions of dollars; and all this without the necessity of operating the road for a single instant. Government ownership does not involve Government operation, but it does involve absolute and unquestioned control of rates down to the bare cost of haul; which is what the whole of this country stands most in need of.

If it is going to be necessary to buy each reduction of freight rates to the west at the price paid for those now secured, before the rates are brought down to the level that the progress of the west and

the profit of the east demands, it would be cheaper to parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway from Vancouver to Fort William with a Government line.

But that would not be necessary. A Government line from Winnipeg to Fort William, over the Rainy River route would open up new and valuable country, and would give access at the lowest possible rates from eastern Canada to the North-west, and from the North-west to the ports and markets of the east.

I fervently hope that no deal will be made regarding the opening of the Rainy River district that will close that route against effective competition, as has been done in this case, as far as this agreement shows upon its face. To have a Government railway over that route between Winnipeg and Port Arthur is the only remaining hope of the west of relief from railway monopoly through Canadian territory.

Once the prairies are reached the railway question is nearly solved. It is the cost of construction from the prairies to the lakes on the east and to the ocean on the west that makes monopoly in the North-west possible. The western outlet is now stopped by the bargain under discussion. It is to be hoped for the sake of eastern Canada that the eastern one will not; for it only means that if relief be not granted through Canadian territory and to a Canadian port, it will come through United States territory and to a United States port, for there must be relief.

Subsection (d) provides for running powers being granted other railways over the Crow's Nest Pass line. While this is a desirable provision, it does not appear that it should figure as value for any part of the money paid in respect of the railway; for the concluding sentence of the same section distinctly intimates that the right to grant running powers to other railways already existed. Such a provision has been inserted in all, or nearly all, the railway charters granted this session without consideration. It does not appear that this provision is of much greater value in preventing monopoly than clause (c) is to secure a general reduction of rates. The value of the privilege of using the track through the pass depends upon the terms upon which it can be secured. It must be clear that another company paying for the use of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway must be in a very much less favourable position for giving low freight rates than the Canadian Pacific Railway, which having been presented with a great part of the cost of the road by the Government may levy interest on the balance of the cost from the company intending to compete with them for the trade of the district: if not indeed on the whole cost; and not alone on the whole cost, but on the whole bonded debt, for all the resolution provides to the contrary.

Mr. OLIVER.

The fact that there is no direct connection through to the coast by that line makes competition more difficult, or indeed makes effective competition impossible under the present arrangement; and the proposition to place the 200 miles of road from Robson westward under separate control, and with different arrangements, destroys the possibility of effective competition for all time, as far as it can be destroyed.

Had the Government constructed the road, running powers might have been granted to all railroad companies desiring to compete for the trade at rates absolutely fixed from time to time by the Government; we would then have had what we are now paying for without getting—a guarantee of active competition and an assurance of living rates for the public. Certainly it would not have been as profitable for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I am not aware that this country owes that company anything. The country has carried out to the full every agreement made with the company; has discharged all its obligations and is entitled to a clear receipt; while the promises made on behalf of the company, whose enlightened self-interest was to be a sufficient guarantee that the interests of the Territories were safe in the railway company's hands, have utterly failed to materialize. Hard facts have proven that the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the country are not identical.

Under sections (h) and (i), regarding control of certain coal and timber lands, the Government stands somewhat in the position of a landlord, one of whose tenants holding a perpetual lease had allowed himself to be swindled out of a large part of his most valuable property, and the landlord, instead of compelling the return of the property, as he was able to do under the rights which he held, compromises with the thieves and accepts a small fraction of the plunder, thereby becoming a party to the steal of what is in a sense his own property. If the absolute government ownership of 50,000 acres of the coal lands of British Columbia is a necessity for the public welfare, it proves the iniquity of the transaction which irrevocably passes hundreds of thousands of acres into the hands of a single corporation. We are indeed at a low stage if we can only compromise on these terms in regard to the ownership of stupendous values of public property and vast areas of the public domain.

If we admit that the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway is an injury to the west, and, therefore, to the east—and certainly the leaders of the party now in power have educated the people for many years to believe that—it is the duty of the Government to fight that monopoly, not to fatten it.

The country gives \$3,500,000 and gets the use of 330 miles of railway practically on the company's terms. The company gives

certain slight reductions in certain freight rates—greater reductions than which could have been secured from less money in other ways—and gets a further and more complete assurance of monopoly throughout the great Canadian west.

It would pay Canada well to give three millions, or ten millions, to free the west from railway monopoly; but it does not pay Canada to give a fraction of three and a half millions to entrench that monopoly more securely than ever by enabling it to close the only southern gateway through the Rocky Mountains from effective competition for all time.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) here says that I do not know what I am talking about. I can only reply that I am in a position to know what I am talking about, and if I do not know, it certainly shows very bad judgment on the part of the electors of Alberta who sent me here to oppose railway monopoly. They have had better opportunities of knowing me than the hon. gentleman has had. I will not reply to the hon. gentleman that when he made the remark he did not know what he was talking about, but I think the House will agree that he did not. However, under all the circumstances, Southern Alberta can stand this bargain if the rest of the country can. We get the greater share of the immediate benefit and they do most of the paying and losing.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I observe that it is customary for hon. gentlemen, upon rising to address the committee, to say that they are not going to take up the time of the committee. I am not going to apologize in that way at all. I have not very much to say, but I am going to say it, and I do not know how long it will take. I do not propose to reply to all the trueisms and to what I might call the platitudes of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman has given vent to a great many high-flown sentiments in regard to Government control of railways. We have not arrived yet at that Utopian period of handling our railway system in Canada, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) bears in mind that the Government which he supports did not build the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they were not responsible for the existence of that road, that they simply had to take things as they found them when they came into office, and made the best of it, I think he will, perhaps, see that there is not quite as much in the remarks which he has been making as he thought. I may say that, coming as I do from the great wheat-growing region of Canada, I am perfectly satisfied with this contract. I consider that it is the best possible contract that the Govern-

ment could have obtained, and it is very much better than I expected they would be able to obtain. I think that the hon. gentleman who has just sat down must have been neglecting the files of the papers which come here from Manitoba and the North-west, because if he had looked at them he would have found a chorus of congratulation to the Government upon the good contract which they have implemented. I take exception to some remarks made here tonight by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, don't.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I do it with all humility. I venture to criticise the sayings of such men as he is and of his leader, but I do it in all humility. I have the right, as a member of this House, to criticise the statements of any member on either side of the House. The terms proposed by the late Government were held up by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) as being vastly superior to the terms of the present contract. And he claims that there would have been a gross profit to the Government which was lending the Canadian Pacific Railway \$20,000 a mile, of \$493,613.

Taking the present contract, the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will receive at the least calculation—even though they do, not increase in number and even though they do not produce more wheat in that country during the next twenty years than they now produce—the people of that country will have a gross profit of \$15,000,000 in twenty years. There is no doubt that the reduction in the freight rates are going to be the means of saving to the people of Manitoba and the North-west of at least \$750,000 a year. I take exception to the statement of the leader of the Opposition, when he said, that that country would never have been settled were it not for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not stand up here for one moment as an advocate for the Canadian Pacific Railway; I am no particular friend of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have heard that statement here, but let me ask, where would the Canadian Pacific Railway be were it not for that country? Every one knows that it is the country lying between Moosomin and Fort William which pays any profit which the Canadian Pacific Railway have on their whole line. If the trade of that country to the Canadian Pacific Railway were taken away, the rest of that line would not pay at all. It is the country up there which is supporting the railway, and not the railway which is supporting the country. Had the policy of the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie been carried out, and had the railway been built as the country required it, the country would have prospered and would not have this millstone tied around its neck; and the present Government would not have to make the best of

a bad bargain, which the hon. gentlemen who went out of office in June, 1896, left behind them. I agree with the leader of the Opposition in some of his remarks, and the ex-Minister of Finance will note that great minds occasionally run in similar channels. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that it would pay the Canadian Pacific Railway to give away their lands, and that the policy they have pursued in regard to their lands, and also in regard to the manner in which they have treated the settlers all through the North-west, has been fatal to their own prosperity. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) spoke in regard to Government construction of this road. There appeared to most people to be only two alternatives, either, the Government had to build this road, or the Canadian Pacific Railway had to build it. I cannot see, nor have I ever been able to see, how anything was to be gained by the Government construction of this railway. If there had been any possibility of getting direct connection to the east or to the west, I would have been in favour of Government construction, but there was not. All those who know the amount of traffic which the Canadian Pacific Railway at the present time has on its western divisions, will see that the building of a line parallel to it would have been the most extreme folly. If these four great corporations up there would have been knocking at the door of the Government and anxious to compete for Government railway freight, what is the reason that the late Government felt, as the present Government feels, the necessity of having the Intercolonial brought into the city of Montreal, when they had two great railway corporations rapping at their doors and competing for their freight from the city of Quebec. We would have exactly the same condition of affairs up there. The people of the country would not have had any benefit from Government construction of the Crow's Nest Pass road, to say nothing of the enormous expense in which it would have involved the country. Again, had the Government built that road, we would have had none of these concessions which we now receive. Had the Canadian Pacific Railway, as one hon. gentleman proposed, been in a financial position to build that road and had it been permitted to do so, we would not have those concessions on freight rates. But, I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to the fact, that his leader stated to-night that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were not in a financial position to construct that road themselves. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) differed from his leader, but even if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) were right, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway had built the road, we would reap none of the benefits which will accrue to the country from the

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

present bargain. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) both alluded to the fact that they were Ontario men, and that they objected to the expenditure of vast sums of money for the development of the west. I beg to inform these Ontario men, that we admit that Ontario has done nobly by the west, and that the west appreciates what Ontario has done in the past. But, there are men in Ontario so narrow that they do not, and cannot, see that the whole future of the Dominion of Canada depends upon the development, the progress and the growth of the great country to the west. For every dollar that Canada invests in that country in matters of this kind, she will be fully repaid. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) spoke about soulless corporations. Well, we never claimed in the North-west that the Canadian Pacific Railway had any soul. We do not think that it has; I have even heard whispered in the not very distant past, that the Canadian Pacific Railway was so much without a soul, that it was almost on its uppers.

Mr. BENNETT. Make a sketch of that joke.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. That is a joke, yes. Now, we have heard a great deal to-night about the transportation problem. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) as well as myself, advocate the Government control of railways. I believe we ought to own the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe that if the country owned the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if it were controlled—not in the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway was controlled by the late Government—but if it were controlled by a railway commission composed of men entirely apart from politics, and run in the interests of the country, it would have been a much cheaper undertaking, and it would redound very much more to the credit of the people of Canada than it does at the present time.

I wish for a few moments to go into the question of these concessions in this contract. In the first place, I will take the concession in regard to grain rates, and we must not belittle that concession. Even if the people of Manitoba and the North-west do not increase, and even if the productive power of that country does not increase, the saving to the people of Manitoba and the North-west, will amount, on grain alone, to something like \$500,000 a year, one year with another. Some years it will be much more and some years a little less, but we are perfectly safe in putting it at this figure. Let us see what that means to the individual. We will say that a man lives on a quarter section, and has 80 acres in wheat, and gets 30 bushels to the acre or 2,400 bushels of wheat altogether. By

the reduction in freight rates which is secured by this contract, he will have an increase to his income—because a penny saved is a penny gained, and the best way in the world to make money is to keep it when you have got it—this man will have an annual increase to his income of between forty and fifty dollars. Now, to some of these lordly gentlemen on the Opposition benches, and perhaps to some on the Government benches, that may seem a small sum, but when you bear in mind that the profit of the Manitoba and the North-west farmer on his wheat has been exceedingly small, that the cost of producing that wheat is in the neighbourhood of 30 cents a bushel, and that he has had to sell it at 40 cents a bushel, and in many cases at even less, on account of the drawbacks to which he is subjected in connection with the grading process in the grain trade and in other respects; suppose he sells that wheat at 40 cents, giving him a profit of 10 cents a bushel—or rather, we do not want the 40-cent price continued, and we will go up to 50 cents and suppose he has a profit of 20 cents a bushel, then on 2,400 bushels he will have a profit of \$480 with which to pay his store bills and other obligations. Unfortunately, there are too many farmers in the North-west who do not go into mixed farming and keep stock. The consequence is that they have to buy almost all the necessaries of life. It is a great pity; it will be remedied in time; but as matters are, these people purchase their meat and many other articles which the farmers in Ontario produce for themselves. Now, I want to point out to hon. gentlemen that this sum of \$45 added to an income of \$480 is going to be a very important matter to the North-west farmer. It may not be much to some people who are wealthy or well-to-do, but to the man whose income is small, and who is struggling along with a mortgage and with a family, it is a great deal of money; and, on behalf of the farmers of the North-west, I feel very much pleased that such a concession has been obtained. Mention was made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Oliver) of the railway which the members of the Manitoba Government have been promoting. That road is still, so to speak, in the air—it is an air line, and we do not know whether it will ever be built or not. Even if we had a competing line from Winnipeg to Duluth, we have not the feeders with which to supply that line. Hon. gentlemen may not know the difficulties under which settlers in Manitoba and the North-west labour. Take, for instance, the town in which I reside, Portage la Prairie. It is an 18-cent point; that is to say, it costs 18 cents per hundred pounds to send wheat from Portage la Prairie to Fort William; it also costs 18 cents per hundred pounds to send wheat from Portage la Prairie to Duluth over the Northern Pacific;

Portage la Prairie being one of the few points where these roads meet. The Manitoba and North-Western Railway runs into Portage la Prairie, and connects with both of those roads; but it has an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which was very aptly termed an octopus to-night by an hon. gentleman who was partly responsible for the fastening of that octopus on the people of Canada. By this arrangement, Neepawa, which is sixty-one miles from Portage la Prairie is a 19-cent point; that is to say, you can ship a hundred pounds of wheat from Neepawa to Fort William for 19 cents. But if you want to ship a hundred pounds of wheat from Neepawa to Duluth, it costs you 30 cents. This is because the Manitoba and North-western will not transfer their freight to the Northern Pacific on the same terms that they will transfer it to the Canadian Pacific; and the Manitoba and North-western charges a local rate of 12 cents a hundred pounds for the sixty-one miles between Neepawa and Portage la Prairie. You can see that even if we had a competing line from Winnipeg to Duluth, just as soon as we started to ship wheat over that line, we would be charged the local rate to Winnipeg by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also, perhaps, by the Northern Pacific. The Northern Pacific Company have a line of their own running to Duluth, and it is not at all likely that they would gratuitously handle wheat and deliver it to the Winnipeg and Duluth Railway. However, that project is in the air, and we do not know whether it will amount to anything or not. In the meantime, we have this arrangement, and it is very much better to take what we can get and be thankful, than it is to refuse a benefit in hand and wait for something that we might never receive. The reduced rates on fruit and other articles coming into the country are also a very great benefit to the settlers in the North-west. An hon. gentleman opposite said that there would be no fruit, or very little, shipped over that road, and that that reduction would not amount to anything. Mr. Chairman, we have in that country very little fruit, as you know. We have only the very small fruits. Our climate is not suitable for growing the larger fruits, and every year we use enormous quantities of apples brought in from Ontario, and we pay large prices for them. But as they are the only fruit that we can get which is within the reach of moderately poor men, and as we have to pay very high prices for them, the reduction of 33½ per cent on them is going to be a very important item to many a farmer and to many a wife and family in Manitoba and the North-west. We have also the reductions on other goods coming into the country. All these things will amount to a very large gross saving per annum. Then, we have the concession in regard to the Government regulations of freights into and

out of the Crow's Nest country. Hon. gentlemen talk about the advantage and the powers which have been conferred upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, but this is the first time that any of these powers have been taken away. This is the first time that corporation has agreed to give up anything. It has discovered that it cannot deal with this Government as easily as it dealt with our friends of the Opposition when they were in power. It has found that it must give up something, and, as a consequence, we have the Government control and regulation of freight rates between every point on the Canadian Pacific Railway and every point on the Crow's Nest Railway both coming in and going out, and my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) knows well what that means to the people he represents. That means that the people at Edmonton and Red Deer, the people on the line of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and the people on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, can send into that market their produce, which has hitherto been spoiling on their hands. A very fertile country lies between Calgary and Edmonton, but the people of that country have not been able to sell their produce at remunerative rates. The consequence has been that many good settlers who were taken in there by the Canadian Pacific Railway have had to leave for the want of a market. It means that Alberta wheat, mutton, oats, hay, butter, cheese and other products are going into that country, and are going to be consumed. I may say, as one who lives 1,500 miles nearer the mountain country than you do here, that we have every confidence in the future progress and development of the great mining country of the west.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not already reduced the rates on these western lines much below their present tariff rates for all farming products going into the Kootenay country?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes, that was simply a foretaste of benefits to come. They wanted to let themselves down easy.

Mr. EARLE. What I want to get at is that their rates there are now reduced from 10 to 20 per cent below their general rates, and that under this arrangement they will not be lowered beyond what they are at present.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The Government will regulate that matter; I do not have the control of it personally at present. Then, we have the running powers over the new road through the Crow's Nest Pass. That is a very important item. It is a very good thing to have, and I have no doubt that that privilege will be carefully conserved in the interests of the people of Canada by the present Government, which contains among its members some business men who, when they

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

make a contract, make it on business principles and in a business way. The proviso with regard to coal is surely of great value for the North-west. I do not wish to paint prospects in too bright a hue, but it appears to me that one result of the action of the Government with regard to the coal lands, taken in conjunction with their action in reserving the right to regulate freight rates into and out of that country, will have a very good effect in lowering the price of fuel all over the North-west. That coal, which is to be put on the cars at a price of not more than \$2 per ton and to be hauled by that road, the freight rates of which are to be controlled by the Government, must actually enter into competition throughout Manitoba and the North-west with the coal from the Galt mines and the anthracite coal on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we may look for a reduction in the price all along the line. And in that country where wood is scarce and the coal available not of first-class quality, the settlers may congratulate themselves upon the action the Government has taken. We have had some rather strong language from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down with regard to the action of the Dominion Government respecting this coal land. Now, the hon. gentleman knows it to be a fact that the Dominion Government has no control over the lands of British Columbia. He knows also that, as a Liberal, he strongly objected to the principle of disallowance. We all did that. In Manitoba and the North-west we are a unit on that point. In fact, a very large number of converts were made, and the more intelligent and more liberal-minded of the Conservative party in Manitoba came over to our ranks on that very question, and no Liberal can defend, for one moment, a principle which involves interference with provincial autonomy. The Government have not reserved the lands but obtained them by transfer as a guarantee that the coal mines will be operated and worked in such a manner as to secure satisfaction to the general public. With regard to the price of timber lands and other matters, I am also pleased with the terms of the contract. I have not so much interest in these matters as in the other, but I say, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, and more particularly on behalf of the people of Macdonald, whom I have the honour to represent, that the contract gives great satisfaction, and I trust that it will be implemented and carried out and prove to the advantage, not only of the people of the North-west, but of the whole Dominion.

Mr. McINNES. Early in this session I introduced a resolution calling on the federal authorities to disallow a certain Act which had been passed by the local legislature of British Columbia, and which granted to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company an enormous tract of land in

the Kootenay country together with mineral rights which we know to be of fabulous value. Incidentally on the discussion of that resolution, I discussed the whole project of building a line through the Crow's Nest Pass, and consequently at this late stage in the session, I do not intend to repeat myself at any great length. But inasmuch as at that time I was dealing with theories rather than actual conditions, and inasmuch as the Government have submitted to us a definite proposition, I deem it only right that I should make a few explanations of the stand I propose to take. The points at issue seem to be these: Is it reasonable for a line to be built there at all, and if so who shall build it? and if a private company should build it, what terms should we exact from them? Now, as to the desirability of railroad construction there can be no serious doubt. If there were any, I think that it has been effectually removed by the speeches we have had this afternoon from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). The leader of the Opposition has intimate relations. I understand, with parties who are thoroughly familiar with the conditions in that country. The Minister of Railways and Canals has had the good fortune to visit that country himself, and it is only what I should expect from one who has had the opportunity of visiting that country, and informing himself of its conditions and prospects, that he should have declared himself so convinced of the necessity of better railway facilities. I shall, therefore, not discuss the question of the advisability of constructing this road, for its advisability seems to be generally conceded. The great question then arises who should build it. I took the stand, in the early part of the session, that the Government should build it, and notwithstanding the strong remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon to the effect that no person of reason or intelligence could take that stand, I persist in it. I have heard nothing to warrant me in departing from my belief in that regard. The hon. leader of the Opposition brought out arguments which are very familiar with regard to the question of a Government building and operating railways, and if the occasion required it, they could be amply answered, but that is not necessary for our purpose to-night. I believe in the Government ownership of railways, and I think that this is a case in which Government ownership could be put into practice with very great advantage. The country is a new one, and if the principle be right that the people should own the railways and operate them in their own interests, then in that new country we should start upon right principles and create conditions which would be advantageous to future generations. Not only have we the fact that the country is a new one and therefore

more adapted for the inception of new principles, but we also have the assurance of those who are familiar with this proposed line that when built it will undoubtedly be a paying investment, so that though it might cost twice the amount of cash which the present proposition will entail on the treasury, yet in fact it would cost the ratepayers of the country not one cent if they built it themselves and it was operated absolutely in their interests. There is another reason why the Government should construct that road, and that is the nature of the country. It is a very mountainous country. In a great number of places there are passes through which it is absolutely impossible for two lines to run, and since there can be only one line, the Government should have retained absolute control over it, and the only way in which the people can absolutely control a railway. I submit, is to own and operate it themselves. There is another reason why I was anxious for the Government to build this line. I believe firmly that if the Government were to build it the Canadian Pacific Railway would be so anxious to gain access into the Kootenay country, that the Government could have dictated terms to the Canadian Pacific Railway far more advantageous than the ones we have before us. That may seem strange to hon. gentlemen who have accepted the statement circulated broadcast that this line would begin nowhere in particular and end nowhere in particular. That is another mistake, for if it begins at Lethbridge, it begins at the junction of four transcontinental railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific and the Quincy and Chicago, and would go through the Pass and terminate in one of the finest mining camps in the world, and what will probably be one of the best markets on this continent. So that it is perfectly absurd to say that it begins and ends nowhere. So important would that little line be and so anxious would the Canadian Pacific Railway directors be to get connection with that large mining centre, which it would open, that I believe the Government, if they were to own that line, and act discreetly and judiciously, and not in too great haste, could exact most valuable concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government, however, have not seen fit to take into their consideration the proposition to build that line themselves, but have decided to allow a private company to build it, exacting, of course, certain conditions from the company. Now, of all companies, I submit that it is unfortunate that the right to build this road should have been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. In that province we wanted an independent line. The Canadian Pacific Railway has great power there, as it has in other parts

of the country, and we wanted relief from it. It does seem to me, and I think that most of the people will think that this further assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway will greatly increase their power for good or evil. So, Sir, I regret very much that since the Government has seen fit to aid a private company, they have not gone a little slower and aided a company which would have been independent and would have given some competition to the line which at present has control of the commercial interests of the province. But they have seen fit to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway and have exacted certain conditions from that company for the assistance they have given. So far as they exacted any conditions or concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway, so good. But, if you look at the conditions, I think you will agree with me that they are not all that we might have expected. For myself, I may have expected too much, or I may minimize the value of these concessions. But I think we will agree that conditions more favourable to the country might have been demanded. Subsection (c) gives to the Government the right of control of freight going into the Kootenay country. That, if lived up to, would be a tolerably valuable concession. But I submit that the Government will find great difficulty in supervising the rates of all traffic that goes into that section of British Columbia. And even if they did succeed in supervising those rates thoroughly and up to our expectations, what would it amount to? They would merely compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to give reasonable rates. They could not deny the company such rates as would allow a profit for transporting goods into that country. So, if they act under this clause as they should, they will simply exact honest conduct on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway towards the people. It does seem strange to me that it should be regarded as a great concession from the Canadian Pacific Railway that they are prepared to submit to a provision which will simply compel them to act honestly by the people. By sections (d) and (e) you will notice, specific rates are provided with regard to certain goods. These represent deductions, most of them of 10 per cent, but one of 20 per cent and one of 33½ per cent. These are not large reductions and it seems to me that they are such reductions as self-interest would have caused the Canadian Pacific Railway to make later on. As a matter of fact, we in British Columbia know that the Canadian Pacific Railway during the last winter, did, voluntarily and without any pressure from any Governor in Council or commission or committee, reduce their rates into the Kootenay district by 10 per cent. As time goes on and competition becomes keener—and it is becoming

keener day by day—they would be compelled, as a matter of self-preservation, to reduce their rates still lower.

Now, there are several provisions relating to the coal and the timber and the disposition of the land which the company acquires by virtue of purchasing the charter of the British Columbian Southern Railway Company. These provisions, I certainly admit, are a great advance on what we have usually received at the hands of the Government when dealing with the Canadian Parliament. They are in the right direction, beyond a doubt. But there is no doubt about the immense value of the timber and the coal there and of the land. Why in the world should the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be favoured to the extent of retaining that enormous wealth? If you go into a calculation of the value of the coal land you will find that it runs into millions of money. And what has the Canadian Pacific Railway done, or what will they have done if they build this line to warrant the people in sanctioning the foolish gift that was made by the British Columbia legislature.

I am very sorry to see with regard to these conditions that they are not in favour of the coast part of British Columbia. I may say at the outset that the people on the coast in British Columbia are not in favour of the building of this Crow's Nest line. You will readily understand that this line will merely give easier access to their country for the merchants of the east, and the result will be that the merchants of the coast, who naturally think that that trade, being within their own province, and they having developed it in the first place, and are entitled to it, will not be satisfied with the building of this line without the building of a similar line into their country from the coast which will enable them to compete with the merchants of the east on equal terms. Not only do they object, therefore, to the building of this line without a similar assistance to a line from the coast into the Kootenay, but you will find, on reading the resolution, that the unequal position in which they are put by the building of the Crow's Nest Pass road has been increased. You will observe that there is a list of articles on which there are certain reductions. But the reductions only apply when these goods come from a point east of Port Arthur to points west of Port Arthur. Now, there is no reason, I submit, why that same position should not apply in favour of the merchants of the Pacific coast; and so strongly do I feel upon that point that when these clauses are taken up seriatim, I intend to move that the same provision be extended so that the merchants of the coast may have the benefit of the same reduction when they send goods east on the line, and I hope that, out of a spirit of fairness,

the committee will support resolutions having that in view.

Now, the concessions, I submit, are not what we might have expected. But even if they were of enormous nominal value, you will admit that they are, so far, mere paper concessions, and that the real value of them will depend on their administration. Now, I do not say this in any offensive way or to reflect on any member of the late Government or of the present Government; but we do know that it is very difficult to get members of the Government or appointees of a Government to act in an absolutely impartial way when dealing with large and powerful corporations. I think it is not too much to say that if the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has the carrying out of these provisions, hon. gentlemen of a different political faith from the Government will not be entirely satisfied that that Railway Committee of the Privy Council are acting in the straightest manner possible. I have no doubt at all that if the Conservative party were in power, and were called upon to administer these resolutions, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would have practically no faith at all that they were being administered in the interest of the people and not in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. So I say, that these concessions, while they might be of value in themselves, although I do not concede that, yet their real value depends upon their administration; and when it is remembered that a political body, or, at all events, the nominee of a political body in this country, will have the administration of them, I submit that, if they were strong, their strength is seriously weakened. Now, admitting that these concessions are of some value—and there is no doubt that they might be, if properly carried out in the interest of the people—we have got to consider what we are paying for them. We are paying a very large sum; we are paying from this Parliament \$3,600,000, and they are receiving from the province of British Columbia a land grant of six million acres. If you value that at \$1 per acre, the lowest valuation any financier will put upon land in this country, it makes another grant to them of six million dollars. Then, if you consider the value of the coal which they require, their subsidies simply run up into many millions. The Minister of Railways rather belittles the idea of making an exact calculation of the value of these coal lands. Well, I cannot altogether agree with his way of looking at it. I think the stand he took with regard to that matter was untenable. I come from what I think is probably the largest coal-producing district in this Dominion, and I know it is a common thing for coal mines there, with coal seams only 7 feet thick, and with coal 700 or 800 feet down in the earth, to

be sold for \$200 or \$300 an acre. Now, the hon. gentleman said that the valuation the British Columbia Government put upon these coal lands was \$5 an acre, because that was the rate they could be leased for from the provincial government. That is rather a fallacious argument, it appears to me. I have known a great number of people to go out in my district and get a lease of coal lands, or what they presumed were coal lands; they put down a diamond drill, and the moment that they discovered they were coal lands, they did not think of selling them for \$5 or \$10 an acre, but they began to figure out closely, according to the thickness of the seam of coal, just how many tons there were, and they put a valuation on that coal at the mouth of the pit, so much per ton, and they valued them properly accordingly. Now, the argument that because the local government merely charged \$5 an acre for a lease, and that, therefore, that is the valuation they put upon the land, is exploded in another way. A miner pays \$5 for a free miner's license, and he can go out and take up a hundred mining claims, if he wishes. If one of those mining claims proves to have mineral wealth worth millions, according to the Minister of Railway's contention, the valuation the government would put upon that claim would really be the value upon the miner's license, namely, \$5—a conclusion which is rather weak. Now, I have dealt with the concessions and with the value which the province of British Columbia and this Government is paying for them, and I submit there is a terrible gulf between the value of the concessions, even estimating them in the largest way that they have been presented to the House—there is a large gulf between the value of those concessions and the value of subsidies in mineral land and in mineral wealth which the people, represented by this Government and by the Government of British Columbia, are extending to the company.

Again, as a member from the west, I wish to point out to this Committee, that there is no restriction in these resolutions with regard to the class of labour which is to be employed upon that road. I have heard—I do not know how true it is—that the contract has been let to an Irish-American for the building of this road. I think that if there is a possibility of such a thing happening, members who are older and more experienced in these matters ought to have some provision inserted in these resolutions which would prevent such a thing taking place. But I do know, that if these resolutions are allowed to go through in their present shape, the road will be built entirely by Asiatic labour. The Canadian Pacific Railway has built a line in our province before, and they built that line altogether with Chinese labour. They imported coolie slave labour from China in great ship loads, to the ex-

tent of between 5,000 and 10,000. Those coolies have remained with us, and have been a curse to the development of that country ever since. Now, at the present time there is, unfortunately, an overstocking of the labour market in British Columbia; white labour has to go begging for work. In my district alone I know that there are hundreds of able-bodied men who cannot find manual labour, and who have to live by manual labour. Now, if this work goes on, it will be a very fortunate and timely relief to that class in the province. There are plenty of hands in the province to take hold of this work and build it. That being so, I submit that this Committee should support any resolution which is offered, when these resolutions are considered in detail, which will have the effect of preventing the Canadian Pacific Railway from employing Chinese or Japanese upon the construction of this work.

Mr. Chairman, I advocated, in the early part of the session, as the proper policy with regard to this whole subject, that the federal authorities should disallow the grant of land and mineral wealth to the British Columbia Southern Railway, which was subsequently acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The result of that would have been that all that enormous wealth would have gone back into the hands of the people and could have been dealt with to their advantage. I think, if that Act were disallowed, and if the Government here, not upon their own responsibility, but in conjunction with the Government of British Columbia, undertook the building of this road, the advantages to the people would be far greater than they are likely to enjoy in any other way. I certainly adhere to that position to-night as strongly as I did when I first ventured to suggest it to the House. I have only this to say in conclusion, that, consistently with the position I then took and as I believe, in the undoubted interest of the country at large, I cannot endorse the present resolutions submitted to the House. But if they do pass, I hope they will pass with amendments which will prevent Chinese and Japanese labour being employed, and which will also give western merchants the same advantages as the eastern merchants in trading in that country, and that the results of the line in operation will be far more advantageous than I can bring myself to believe they will be.

Mr. BENNETT. I think after the startling expenditures that have been announced in this House in the last few days that the country will hail with delight the close of this session. It is something horrible to contemplate what might follow if the session were prolonged for another fortnight. With the public debt standing at \$260,000,000, and now expenditures of nearly \$40,000,000 more, with these startling figures I think I am entitled to make the complaint that the

Mr. McINNES.

Government have not treated their own supporters and more particularly the country fairly in bringing down these expenditures at such a late period of the session. There has, I have no doubt, been a considerable amount of method in their madness, if it can be characterized as madness, because I think the major part of the community and more especially the province of Ontario will regard these vast expenditures as madness, in postponing these expenditures until this late day. However, we all do know this that when wolves are in pursuit of prey they never quarrel until they have run their prey down, and that seems to be the spirit by which hon. gentlemen opposite are actuated. In this case the prey has been the expenditure of public money, and now that the hon. gentlemen from Quebec have got their Drummond County Railway under way, and those hon. gentlemen from the west have their Crow's Nest Pass they are engaged in saying how much of the pelf, pillage or plunder whichever you may call it, will be distributed amongst themselves. I say that it is particularly unfair that the Government after three months of the session have brought down this resolution at this late day. I do not propose to go into the details of this resolution, as that has been done by a number of hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, but as a representative of Ontario I do complain that the Government have not treated the people of that province fairly in postponing the bringing down of these large expenditures to the dying hours of the session without opportunities for that fair measure of discussion that would have been afforded to the matter that it deserves. I shall make no complaints on the score that the hon. gentlemen opposite have broken their promises in increasing the debt, and as they have done that I have not been disappointed because after the pledges that these hon. gentlemen have made in the past and after their performances I am not disappointed in their not carrying out the promises which they have made. But there is this consoling reflection that while hon. gentlemen are piling up millions upon millions one of them, the Postmaster General, has to announce to the House that by the exercise of prudence and sagacity he has been able to save \$15 or \$17 on a mail contract. I suppose that may be taken as a guide of the calibre of hon. gentlemen opposite. I must compliment the Minister of Railways and Canals that he is a master of large projects and it must be to us a matter of regret that we have not as a Minister representing Ontario the Minister of Railways and Canals, because then we might have some prospect in store, but as it is we will have to make as much as possible out of the honour and glory which attaches to the achievements of the Postmaster General in his savings upon mail contracts. In the meantime unlimited public money is to be spent and the province of

Ontario is coming out at the small end of the hunt.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not intend to say very much in regard to this matter to-night, but I could not let it pass without saying a few words. I feel that it has been a very important subject to this country; the bonusing of railways has been a live question among the farmers during the past few years. On the platform it has been spoken very strongly of not only by supporters of the Government but by members opposite. When farmers take a position adverse to the practice of bonusing railways it is generally said that they are not progressive and that they are stick in the muds. I wish to deny that. There is no class in the community that is so loyal to every scheme which has for its object the advancement of the public interest as the farmers. I care not what Government has projected it, they are willing to bear the burden and they are ready to do it in a manly and patriotic spirit and say nothing about it. But now in view of what has been going on during the last few years they feel obliged to cry halt. We know that the farmers are divided somewhat on the subject of bonusing railways. Some of my Patron friends in Manitoba and the North-west Territories do not share the view which I have referred to. That is a new country; it requires railways and they are therefore not in accordance with the other view. It leaves me in a rather peculiar position in regard to this matter. In this case we feel that there are reasons which will warrant us in favouring this scheme, but not in the way it is proposed at present. We feel that it could be done in a different manner as my resolution mentions. We have expended many millions of dollars for railroads in the past. If our population had increased in accordance with our hopes it would have been very well, but in consequence of circumstances which it is not necessary for me to mention, it has not increased so that the burden falls heavily upon the population that we have. It is an evident fact that there is no country in the world which has as many miles of railway in comparison to its population. In Canada 16,000 miles of railway are kept in operation at the expense of 5,000,000 people. An hon. gentleman told me that among the last statements made by the late Sir John Macdonald was that we must cry halt, and that is the feeling we have in this country. I think today it would have been wise if the Government had held their hand and not gone so fast. The country as a whole feels this very strongly. It may be that they can see further than we can on this question, but I cannot see the wisdom of the proposition myself. Speaking about granting this enormous amount of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway I cannot see on what ground they can ask for it. Judging from their own reports their earnings last year were over \$8,000,000. On this railway and on many

other railways public money has been improperly expended in their construction and the burden has fallen upon the country. It is said that they must protect their investments and get dividends out of their roads. If those men in the old country or wherever they may be, allow their money to be extravagantly expended and recklessly wasted I cannot see why future generations should be called upon to recoup them for their carelessness. When the Grand Trunk Railway was built two dollars were spent where one would have done, and in the management the same practice was followed. It is the same way with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every day we have evidence of the extravagant manner in which these lines have been built, and this extravagance has been running on up to the present time. I will say, that of the three great transportation schemes projected by the present Government, to my mind the extension of the Intercolonial Railway is the only one that will bring direct benefit to the farmers as a whole, and particularly to the farmers of Ontario who are the great burden bearers of this Dominion. Some have argued that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway was an extravagant arrangement, but it is evident that something was needed to bring that line to Montreal. I do not know whether the Government could have made a better bargain or not, but it was inevitable that they should make some bargain, and I feel myself that in the long run it will result in good. Even the late Government felt that it was necessary to do something in this direction. If I were travelling along a road and some accident occurred, and I wanted to get to the end of my journey, I would pay an extra price for a horse or wagon in order to get there. I feel it may be the same with the Intercolonial Railway. In the long run I believe that the Intercolonial Railway extension proposal will be good for the country. In this belief I supported it, and the more I look into it the better I am satisfied with it. If the western country is so rich in mineral wealth as is claimed for it, I cannot see on what ground the Government could not have made another bargain. I am not against the scheme itself, because I feel that something in that direction should be done.

Mr. CASGRAIN. For the Government every time.

Mr. ROGERS. I am for this Government or any other Government that will do right. I think the country should in some way be recouped for the enormous amount of money we are going to spend on this railway. Although the scheme of the old Government was extravagant in its way, I think there is something in it, but on the other hand it is contended that if that scheme were carried out we would not get these concessions which the farmers of Mani-

toba and the North-west have under the present contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The history of great mining countries in the past does not warrant us in spending much money for their development. It is true that great fortunes have been made in mining regions, but it cannot be said that these fortunes ever conferred much benefit on the country, because when these men make wealth they start off to a foreign clime to spend it. It is my desire and, that is why I moved the resolution, that this money should be paid back to us in some way.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not take up the time of the House to any very great extent, and it occurs to me that the important business of the session would not have been left to this late hour if there had not been so much time wasted in long hours of oratory. It would be better for this country as a whole, if we had not so many orators in the House. Judging from my little experience here, I can say to my constituents, that it would be much better if the people of the different ridings throughout Canada, did not go hunting around to get orators to represent them in this House, as has been the custom heretofore. As regards the resolution of which I have given notice, I have waited until the very last moment to find if I could get some support for it, but I have failed to do so. I am not discouraged, because even though I should be the only one in the House to support it, I feel that it is right. I did have a little support from the hon. member from Toronto, but I find that he has slinked out, and left me alone, and under these circumstances I cannot put the resolution to the House. I believe the feeling of the country is very strong against extravagant expenditure, and I give a word of warning to the representatives of the people here, that their constituents will hold them responsible for it. Our Railway Committee has been besieged for railway charters—many of which in my humble opinion are no more sensible than if a charter were asked for a railway to the moon; and we know that the granting of these charters is followed up by requests for Government bonuses. I really do not know where all the money is going to come from; and I warn the representatives of the people here, that they should be more prudent in expending the public money. If I could have obtained any kind of support for my resolution, I would have divided the House on it; but under present circumstances it would be useless to do so. I will let it go now, believing that in the future there will be some sterling farmers here, whether they be called patrons or independents, who will support such a proposition as that I have laid down in the resolution.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very much disappointed that my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) who leads the patron hosts in this House, has not seen fit to enlighten us as to what his resolution is.

Mr. ROGERS. I will read it if you wish.  
An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry for my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers). His first impulse was good; he was going to read it, but just as soon as one of the members of the Government told him to sit down, he came to the conclusion not to.

Mr. ROGERS. You told me that before, but it is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. I am much disappointed—

Mr. ROGERS. I will send the resolution over to you and you can read it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a very good resolution, indeed. I find that it says:

That the said grant is wrong in principle, unjust to the rest of the country, and contrary to the pledges of retrenchment in public expenditure made by the Liberal party.

The sentiment is good, but I do not see that my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) is going to take any action on it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to say a word or two with reference to the resolution which we are asked to vote. Along with others who have spoken on this side of the House, I wish to enter my protest, that legislation of this kind has been kept from the House until one or two days of its prorogation. A matter of more than \$3,000,000 is to be expended, and the Government has put this Parliament in the position of attempting to discuss the subject, when two-thirds of its members are away, or are so very anxious to get away that they will give no mind effort, and no presence of theirs towards the discussion of the question. The hon. gentlemen have treated this House as no Liberal Government, looking at the professions of Liberal statesmen, would ever be supposed to have treated a Parliament. More than that, Sir, when the resolutions are ultimately brought down, in the dying days of the session, when the members are scattering or have scattered, there is not the least information laid before the House as to the route, as to the cost of building, as to what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get as compensation from other sources to be accounted against the cost of building; all of which one would think would be a necessary element if the House were going to be asked to consider whether \$11,000 per mile was a fair contribution, or whether some lesser sum per mile might not be a fair contribution. The Minister of Railways, Sir, never intended that this House should consider

the question at all. He never intended that a single man on his side of the House should raise an independent voice against the propriety of \$11,000 being just the amount that ought be granted—nothing less, and nothing more. Does not any man see that, when we are voting the people's money for a public project which we approve of, we ought to look upon the people's money as a trust, and that it should be voted only in the amount that is actually necessary? Ought it not to strike a responsible Minister, when he asks Parliament for such a vote, that he ought at least to give us some information as to the character and condition of the country through which the road is to be built, and as to its probable cost? He is the Minister of Railways; he has his staff of officers; and it is his business, before he asks this House to vote a dollar of subsidy to any road, to give this House that information. But he has not given us one single iota of information on those points. The road which is to be built may pass through a country in a large portion of which it may not cost \$10,000 a mile to build. For all we know it may pass through a country in nine-tenths of which it may not cost \$10,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would you like to give \$5,000 per mile and loan \$20,000 per mile more on a railway that was going to cost only \$10,000 per mile?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend tries to excuse himself for the lack of information he is giving to the House by putting a question to me. I would say that if I were selling—if my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson)—

Mr. GIBSON. He is too old to be sold.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I think so. He would not be bought; but he would sit in this House and vote money out of which it is said contractors' pay is to come, and it is said that my hon. friend is the fortunate contractor. But yet he is too old to be bought. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways interjects a question to screen himself from what he knows is a fair criticism, namely, that he has not given to this House one iota of information as to the quality and character of the country through which this road is to be built, and its probable cost. He has his officers; that road had been surveyed: the information is at his hand; and, when my hon. friend feels the force of that criticism, he tries to break it by asking whether we would give \$5,000 as a subsidy, and make a loan upon that road if we had no information on the subject. No, Sir; the late Government had information upon the subject, and placed its proposal before the House in the shape of a resolution on the Order paper;

and if the late Government had been able to press that proposal to a conclusion, the Minister of Railways at that time would have given the information to the House—such information as we ask—which would be necessary to enable the House to make up its mind whether that contribution was or was not a just one. And so my hon. friend's question had no point at all, because the late Government's resolution simply was put on the Order paper, and the House was not, owing to the pressure of business, asked to vote upon it, and consequently the information was not given. But again I press the point, which every gentleman who hears me will acknowledge is a fair point, that we are asked to give a subsidy of \$11,000 a mile for 330 miles of railway, and we have not from the Minister of Railways' lips, or in any paper put before the House, the least information as to the character of the country through which it is to be built, or as to the estimated cost of the railway per mile. So that the House is asked in total ignorance, to re-echo what the Minister has proposed.

Mr. LISTER. You had all that, and you were going to lend the railway \$20,000 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly the Government which preceded the present Government had the information upon which it made up its mind what to ask the House to give; and the Government of that day would never have thought of coming to the House and asking for that vote without first laying the information before the House as a basis on which it thought that would be a sufficient contribution. There is not a man sitting on either side of this House who would do private business in this way. I see men of business capacity before me who do large business of their own. Is there one of them who would invest \$11,000 or any sum of money on the information which is before this House to-night with reference to that road? No business man would do his own business in that way. Ought we not do the business of the country on as good and solid a basis as a business man would do his own business? This House has given \$3,200 a mile to some railways, \$6,400 to some, other subventions to others, always according to the difficulties of the road to be built and the financial considerations affecting it. There is another point. The amount of contribution that this Government should take out of the people's money to build the road should be affected by the other subsidies given for the same purpose from other sources. We learn from the newspapers that the \$11,000 a mile we are asked to give is not the only contribution that that road gets. We have heard from the hon. Minister of Railways himself of the 250,000 acres of land which he said were

given to the British Columbia company, and which have since transferred their charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway. What information has this House from the Minister of Railways with reference to that? He has told us that these lands are invaluable, and there is not a man in British Columbia who will declare that they are not of immense value; and it may be that these lands, which have been transferred from the British Columbia Company into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway are as much or more than the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to get for its construction of this line. To the extent that they are valuable, they should be taken into consideration by this House when asked to decide whether or not we should give \$11,000 per mile. Is that unreasonable? There is no man in this House who will say that it is, and yet we are asked to vote \$11,000 without one scintilla of information being given us by the responsible Minister as to how much the value of these lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway has had transferred to it from the old chartered company. What more? The Government which preceded this one could have got that road built for \$5,000 subsidy per mile and a loan of \$20,000 a mile at 3½ per cent for twenty years. What does that mean? Now, I agree in what has been said here to-night more than once—and it is from my personal knowledge and belief that I speak—that I would as soon have that road running from Lethbridge into the Kootenay and thence to the Columbia as any similar one on the continent of America, so far as paying traffic is concerned. And I say that because of the value of the resources which lie along the track of that road, and which will depend absolutely and entirely on it for transport. The two elements of coal and ore will of themselves make a large traffic. I say then that from the point of view of traffic that road will compare favourably with any other similar line that you may take in the Dominion. Yet we are asked to give it \$11,000 per mile without being vouchsafed the least information as to whether in view of the possible traffic transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the franchises and land grant of the British Columbia Southern, is not in itself a sufficient contribution. But apart from that you have the fact that the late Government could have got that road built at \$5,000 per mile and a loan for twenty years. You may say: Would not that loan be a gift. It would not by any means. It would have been a loan secured on the road itself, in the first place, and guaranteed by the Canadian Pacific Railway as a whole, in the second place. That fact, taken in connection with the character of the traffic which would develop on that road, would make that security as undoubted as any that could be given, and would make it a certainty that the loan would be repaid at the

Mr. FOSTER.

end of the twenty years. What then would be the cost? The cost to the Dominion treasury, under that arrangement, would be just a shade over \$1,000,000 instead of \$3,630,000 that we are asked to vote to-night. Now, I enter my protest against two things—against the bringing of such legislation as this down to this Parliament at the dying days of the session and against the insult to the common sense and intelligence of the members of the House, by asking us to vote without a scintilla of information being vouchsafed to this House upon which they could make up their minds and judgment, if the courtesy were extended to them by the Minister of thinking that they had any judgment or minds to make up.

Now, then, with reference to the whole question, outside of these criticisms. As one member of the Liberal-Conservative party, I have been in favour, and am to-day just as strongly in favour of that road being built and the country opened up. It is a necessity for the country, in the first place, and it will be a benefit to the Dominion as a whole to open up that country. For that reason, I am in favour of the policy, but we criticise the terms and the way in which it has been presented to us. I believe that \$2,000,000, at least, more is being paid than the road would have cost this country if built according to the plan of the late Government. At the same time, the Government take the responsibility. It has a majority in this House, and with this protest against the exorbitant character of the terms and the way this legislation has been forced upon this House at this late hour, I do not propose to vote against the resolution, because I believe it to be of the utmost importance that that country should be opened up. The bargain is an extravagant one, in my belief. It will cost \$2,000,000 more to the country than the scheme proposed by the late Government. Only, it is fair to state that this Government claim that they have got certain reductions in freights in the North-west which we did not make a condition in the scheme we had. Whatever comes out of that is to be offset by the subsidy, but it will be found not to be by any means a sufficient offset, considered in the light of the much larger subsidy which has been given to that road.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one word before the resolution is carried. I want to refer for a moment to the observations made by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) the leader of the Patron combination. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, is the leader of the Patron party in this House, and he, I understand, with other members of that party attended the caucus called by the Government to discuss this question. I do not know whether they were with the majority that agreed to carry this resolution or not. But the hon. gentleman was bold enough to give notice of a motion that he

would move when this question came up. He made a speech to-night but he did not read, nor did he move, the motion of which he had given notice. He intends to go home and point out to the Patrons in his constituency and perhaps to those in my constituency and elsewhere where he may take the platform, that he made a certain speech and gave notice of a certain motion, and to tell his hearers that he did not move that motion because the rest of the Patrons had quietly taken their pay and gone home, and there was no one to second it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will second it.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says that he will second it, but the member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) had not the manliness to move it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You are getting out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I will not get out of order. The hon. member for Frontenac did not move his resolution. He said he was willing to trust the Government. But the Patrons, wherever they spoke in the last election announced, as they did in their platform, that they would oppose any more subsidies being granted to railways. But the hon. gentleman from Frontenac goes it blind and thinks that the subsidy to the Drummond County road is a splendid scheme. He also goes in for the fast steamship line subsidy, and he thinks that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is a good thing and will support it. Yet he will talk to his constituents of the motion which he intended to move. But he had not the manliness to move it.

Now, when the Canadian Government acquired the North-west country and inaugurated the National Policy, the inducement was held out to Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, that this new country would rapidly fill up with a farming population and would assist to build up the industries of the eastern provinces. And ever since I entered this House fifteen years ago, the representatives of the eastern provinces have voted cheerfully for any grant to any enterprise that was asked for for the benefit of Manitoba and the North-west Territories and British Columbia. And I say, as an Ontario man, that I think the representatives from those provinces are treating us with ingratitude. They come forward to-day with a scheme asking the eastern provinces to contribute towards millions of money to help them to open up and develop their country. And yet what do we find these representatives from these provinces doing? We find them fighting against every industry in existence in the eastern provinces. They look to the eastern provinces for money to build their railways and develop their country, but they want their own money to flow over into the United States.

They want agricultural implements placed on the free list, so that they may buy them in the United States. Barbed wire, binder twine, coal oil—they wish to have the right to purchase everything in the United States and close up the industries in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. Now I wish to say that, for myself, I am in favour yet, notwithstanding the ingratitude I have seen shown by the representatives of British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-west Territories toward eastern industries—

Mr. EARLE. Leave out British Columbia; it has not opposed eastern industries.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some of the representatives of British Columbia have done so. For instance, our friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell).

Mr. EARLE. He does not count.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am pleased to know that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) approves of what I say, and I believe that Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces have dealt fairly with British Columbia, and that it is the duty of the representatives of that province to see to it that the industries of Ontario are not sacrificed even if they have to pay a little more for their goods, on the ground that they would rather buy them in Canada and keep the money in the country than send to the United States for them, seeing that they have to look to us to assist enterprises like the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has placed in my hand a pamphlet entitled "Principles, Policy and Platform of the Liberal party." In that I find the following:—

Prohibition of the bonusing of railways by Government grants, as contrary to the public interest.

The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion Government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation, favourites of the Government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of public money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the Government for the future homes of hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over, without consideration or justification, to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of lines whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in Parliament by the Liberal party, and this resolution is in harmony with the attitude of the Liberal party upon this question. (See resolutions 3 and 6, Liberal platform.)

The Patron platform on this subject is in accordance with this declaration. Yet these gentlemen, both Liberals and Patrons, approve of subsidizing this line of railway

and of every other project of the kind. I suppose that there are railway subsidies to be brought down by the Government yet—after three-fourths of the members have left for home. My hon. friend from Frontenac, will say that he cannot see through it, but he will trust this Government, as he does on the Drummond County and fast line schemes. I would like to see the hon. gentleman when he had the courage to write out, or had some one write out for him, a notice of motion and had it printed in the Votes and Proceedings so that he might put it in his pocket and keep it to show to his friends with the remark: There is a notice of motion I gave, but I could not get a seconder.

Mr. ROGERS. Will you second it?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from East Northumberland will second it or the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) will second it.

An hon. MEMBER. Will you second it?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I will not second it; because I will not be a party to a humbug. He said he could not get a seconder, but my hon. friend from East Northumberland offered to second it, and the hon. gentleman did not even read it, and he says: I have confidence in the Government that there is something good in this scheme, so I will support the Government and see the road carried through.

Mr. POUPORE. I have not troubled this House very often so far in making speeches, nor do I now propose to dwell at any length upon this subject. I would like, however, to say a word or two upon it, on general principles. A great deal has been said about this Crow's Nest Pass Railway within the last year. I did have an opinion that the building of this road was a necessity to develop the region of country in which it is intended to be built. I have learned also from time to time that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were making extensive surveys of that country to ascertain the feasibility of building a road through it. I came to the conclusion myself that if there was any institution, or any combination of men, or any company on the continent of America who could put that scheme through with advantage to Canada, it was the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I came to that conclusion judging by the past achievements of that company in building a railway running, you may say, from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. In that gigantic enterprise they constructed a railway overcoming very great barriers, a railway which is to-day an ornament to Canada. I then felt that no small company, no other company perhaps in Canada, was so well suited, was so well able to construct this important Crow's Nest Pass Railway, as was the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is stated by some hon.

Mr. TAYLOR.

gentlemen on this side of the House that it is unfortunate more information has not been placed upon the Table of the House so as to enable the members to form their opinions upon this subject with greater knowledge of the facts. I think myself that it is unfortunate. It would have been better perhaps if fuller information had been given to the House. But it is possible that the Government have information themselves to warrant the bargain in which they have entered with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Government have made extensive surveys in that country, they must have informed themselves of the cost of building a railway there, and judging from the slight information which I have received from time to time, I think myself it will be a very expensive road to build. I have heard the statement made time and again that the construction of that road would not cost more than \$8,000 to \$10,000 per mile. But I have been told on the other hand on the very best authority that the road cannot be constructed for less than \$25,000 or \$30,000 per mile. Now, if that be the case, there are few companies who would undertake that project, few companies in fact able to undertake that project of constructing a road of that length, costing so much money, unless they received considerable assistance from some source or sources. If I understand the question correctly, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company secured a charter from the British Columbia Southern Company, which was obtained from the British Columbia Government. This Government it seems granted 25,000 acres of land per mile to that company to construct this road. The British Columbia Government must have known the particular features of the country through which that road has to pass, and I suppose that was the reason which induced them to grant 25,000 acres per mile to help that company build it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company having made surveys, discovered that that subsidy would not be sufficient inducement to them to build the road and, they naturally come here and say to the Government this road is going to be of vast benefit to Canada, it is going to develop the dormant resources and the very great wealth of that section of Canada. Now, here is what the road is going to cost, here are the advantages that will flow to the people of the west by the road being built. Now, I presume the Government is composed of business men. I do not know what arguments were used which induced the Government to grant \$11,000 per mile; but to my mind \$11,000 is not an exorbitant grant to that company for undertaking that important road. I speak not from any definite or positive knowledge of my own, but from information that I have gleaned from one quarter and another. I have got this information quite recently, and it shows

how the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway will benefit all that portion of the country west of Port Arthur. It seems that one of the conditions of the bargain is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will reduce their freight rates 3 cents per hundred pounds commencing next year. I think the reduction is to be  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents next year, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents the year following, and thereafter the rate per hundred pounds upon all freight west of Port Arthur, will be reduced 3 cents per 100 pounds. Now, let us apply that 3 cents per 100 pounds on freight that is coming from the west. I have in my hand a statement that is authentic, which shows the volume of freight that has passed over the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Port Arthur since 1891, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read it. In 1891 there were 15,822,990 bushels of wheat carried from points west of Port Arthur; in 1892 the quantity was 18 millions, in round numbers; in 1893 the volume of wheat was 15 millions; in 1894, 17 millions; in 1895, 20 millions, and in 1896, 24 million bushels. Now, apply 3 cents per bushel reduction upon 24 million bushels of wheat. The reduction will be equivalent to 18 million pounds, and you will find a benefit accruing to those who ship from points west of Port Arthur, to the extent of \$540,000, to say nothing of flour; I am speaking now of wheat alone. We find, then, that all those who ship grain or other freight from points west of Port Arthur will derive a benefit of at least \$540,000 per annum, providing trade does not increase in future. But let us assume, and I think with safety that we can assume, that the increase will continue in the future as it has in the past, and it will be seen that this volume of trade must grow very materially year after year; therefore all those who ship from points west of Port Arthur will derive vast advantages from the Canadian Pacific Railway by that reduction in rates. I do not mention this for the purpose of supporting the Government. I feel, however, that the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches must at least have some consideration for the interest of Canada, and although I am not in political accord with those hon. gentlemen, I do not for a moment believe that they would sit down and enter into a bargain that is wholly one-sided for the benefit of a private company like the Canadian Pacific Railway, without taking into serious account the interest of Canada. If we are to believe all we hear on this subject, why, we must characterize the gentlemen who preside over the destinies of Canada to-day as a set of traitors to the interest of this country. Well, I do not feel so ungenerous as to accuse them of that. Nobody has asked me to make a speech in their praise, and it is not my purpose to do so; but I do feel as an independent Liberal-Conservative, which I claim to be, that I ought at

least to give credit where credit is due. Now, looking at the question on the whole, and considering it on general terms, I feel convinced that the Government should not of itself undertake to build railways. We have an example of the result of the Government building railways, in the Intercolonial Railway, a railway that has been piling up deficits for years since its construction, and the Government of Canada cannot get out of that obligation for the simple reason that it was part and parcel of the compact of confederation. The road was built as a political obligation, and it is an asset of Canada which has to be maintained. Whether it pays or not, this country has to keep that road in operation.

While on this subject, I may mention this, if I am permitted to do so: The other evening when the question was under debate and the vote taken I recorded my vote in favour of bringing the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. My reasons for doing so are these: As a business man, I thought that the stopping of the Intercolonial Railway at Point Lévis without facilities for connecting with the other railway systems of Canada was one of the causes that led to the deficits of that road in the past. I felt that it was the duty of any Government to undertake the task of bringing the Intercolonial Railway in touch with the American system of railways in Montreal. The means employed by the present Government to accomplish that end rest entirely with themselves. I assume none of the responsibility for them. Different views have been expressed in regard to it. We have been told that it was a bargain; some people call it a huge steal. I do not believe so myself, and as I am only speaking now for myself, I shall express myself as I feel. I do not believe that it was a big steal, and I believe that the route adopted was the best available one by which to get into Montreal. It has been said that a great deal too much has been paid for the Drummond County road. It is contended on the one hand that a certain amount has been paid for the line, and on the other hand we find, on fairly good authority, that it cost very much more. The Government is utilizing a road known as the Drummond County road, a road passing through a fertile portion of Quebec, a road that is developing the latent resources of that part of the country, which are unlimited. The Government, in using the Drummond County Railway as a portion of their scheme, adopted the best method within their reach. I say this without expressing an opinion as to whether or not the country is paying too much for it. The Government must be held responsible by the people of Canada for the details. I approve of the principle of buying the Intercolonial Railway west to Montreal only. I do not want any of my hon. friends on this side of the House, nor do I wish to assure my hon. friends on the other

side of the House that my vote the other evening was an indication of my wavering in my political convictions. I am just as firmly convinced and just as firmly satisfied with my political convictions to-day as I was when I first became a Liberal-Conservative in 1878. My reasons then for becoming a Liberal-Conservative were, I think, very well founded. I was very strongly in favour of any Government or of any party which would introduce a system to protect our native industries and develop our latent resources. When the National Policy was introduced in 1879 I felt that we were starting in the right direction. I have never had any reason to change my opinion in that regard; I am still a believer in that policy of protection to our native industries. I feel complimented as a Liberal-Conservative, and I am flattered to know that the party which had combated us for eighteen years, upon coming into power discovered that we were right and that they were wrong. I am glad to know that, but I will add, that any measure emanating from the Government side of the House, henceforth, which conserves the principle of protection to the native industries of Canada shall have an independent and fair support from me in this House. I do not want that to be interpreted wrongly. I want it to be understood that I shall vote for every measure upon its merits, regardless of what one party or another may think of it. In that I am expressing simply the views which I hold. I perhaps may not be considered a very good party man; I would be sorry if some of my friends think I am not. But it is very gratifying to me to know I shall always claim the right of acting and judging of measures for myself. I simply ask my friends on this side of the House to understand that it is not a case of my deserting them, but a case of my exercising my own judgment on the merits of any question before the House. I do not think I have much more to say, except this, that I believe the policy of the Government building and operating railways is a mistaken one. I believe that if the late Government had remained in power they would not have put that principle in force. I believe if they had remained in power and had been called upon to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway they would have done it by the same plan which has been adopted by the present Government. Whether they would have given \$11,000 or \$5,000 a mile is another matter, but I will add that it takes two to make a bargain, and I presume that the present Government, in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway is operating so many lines of railway already, reasonably felt justified in coming to the conclusion that that company was best able to carry out the construction of this road. If a vote should be demanded upon it I shall vote for the measure.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall only detain the committee for a few minutes, as in all

Mr. POUPORE.

probability there will be no other opportunity in the House for the discussion of this question. I am one of those who believe that a railroad should be constructed through the Crow's Nest Pass. The question, by whom it should be constructed, may be an open question. Some may think that the Government should undertake it, while others believe that it should be given to some independent company. I must say that I am not at any time very favourably impressed with Government undertakings of this kind. They are gigantic; a large amount of money is to be expended, and I think there is very great danger, perhaps, of something improper being done in such an undertaking on account of the pressure which may be brought on the Government in connection with a work of this kind. I desire to say, however, that if this road is to be built by a company I do not think we have in this country at the present time any company better able and better equipped to undertake that road than the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have large means; they have men of ability in matters appertaining to the construction and operation of railways, and in every respect I think they are better fitted to undertake a matter of this kind than any other company we could get. However, I am not enamoured with the plan upon which this road is to be constructed. It seems to me to savour a good deal of the preferential trade policy of the Government. It is a policy of all giving and very little getting. The Canadian Pacific Railway seems to have a long way the best of the deal. We are giving them, as I understand, a bonus to the extent of \$3,630,000.

We have almost no information with respect to what is to come out of the British Columbia subsidy; but in order that we may be induced to give that money for the construction of the road, we are informed that we are to obtain certain reductions in freight rates. These reductions, in my mind, are very small indeed. Out of all the items named—and they are only a few of the articles of merchandise that will be carried—only two of them exceed 10 per cent of a cut in the rates. The large bulk of the articles enumerated are only to be reduced to the extent of 10 per cent, and that is comparatively insignificant. The pressure of public opinion would, in the near future, have compelled the Canadian Pacific Railway to concede this to the people of the western country. The reduction of 1 cent per bushel on the rate for oats is very trifling indeed, and the reduction of one and four-fifths cents per bushel on wheat is not a very large reduction on an article whereon the freight has been so high. This, however, may not be altogether a fair way of looking at the matter. British Columbia is the province that will be most benefited by the road, and British Columbia will certainly be a great gainer. We are told that British Columbia has the coal and the mineral wealth,

and that the development of these mineral resources will bring to that province a large amount of gain. Then, if British Columbia is going to be such a large gainer by this undertaking I think we can fairly look to British Columbia to do what the other provinces have done in the past, viz.: use their natural wealth to construct their own railway, or, at any rate, to do that before applying to the central Government to build it for them. I have no doubt that this scheme will be adopted by the House. I regret very much that it should have come down almost at the closing hour of the session, and that such short time should have been given the hon. members of this House to investigate it. I feel that when the members go home, they will not be able to convey to their constituents any clear idea of what this scheme is. The matter will have to be left largely with the Government. While that is the case, as there likely will be no division on this question at the present time, I simply wish to state my views with regard to it. Anxious as I am to see that road constructed, and preferring instead of as a Government road to see it constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am forced, by reason of the circumstances, to cast my vote against the resolution.

Mr. POWELL. I wish to call the attention of the Government to a point which occurs to me. In section (e) the resolution says :

There shall be a reduction in the company's present rates and tolls on grain and flour from all points on its main line, &c.

The particular point is this : The Government, under statutory power, have approved by Order in Council of a tariff schedule of rates for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is the reduction contemplated by that section a reduction from the tariff rates or is it a reduction from the rates and tolls that are at the present time actually charged by the company ? I understand there is a difference between the two.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a reduction from the rates and tolls actually charged by the company, which are, in most cases, very considerably below the tariff schedule.

Mr. POWELL. I do not intend to discuss the matter, but I submit, as a proposition of law, that such is not the true construction of that section. Where there are two subject matters, one recognized by statute and the other outside of the statute, in the construction of that statute the former must be taken to be within the meaning of the legislature. Here, under powers of a statute, a tariff having been prescribed, that must be the tariff taken in construing the section.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Look at section (d).

Mr. POWELL. I intend to call attention to section (d), as strengthening my argument. It says :

A reduction shall be made in the general rates and tolls of the company, as now charged.

There is a difference in the language used, and that difference in the language used means that there is a difference in the sense; the first being the rates that are actually now charged, and the other language being general. I throw the point out to the Government, and I submit it to the lawyers of the House to look closely into it, and see if, as a matter of legal construction, the construction which I put upon the clause is not the correct one. I am not going to prolong the discussion upon this matter. My own opinion is, that we have already invested enough money in the western country, and in any other portion of the country for that matter, unless there is some very strong reason why we should make further grants. The people of the country generally believe that the period of large expenditure, and accretions to the public debt should be at an end. For that reason, I am opposed to the present scheme.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have taken note of the hon. gentleman's objection. As to the intention of the agreement I have no doubt, and in the formal bargain with the company, pains will be taken to make that beyond any possibility of doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask if in the agreement there is any provision made for the time this road is to be finished ? The resolution says :

The company shall construct, or cause to be constructed, the said railway by such route and according to such descriptions and specifications and within such time or times as may be provided for in the said agreement.

What provision is there in the agreement with regard to time ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The bulk of this road is to be completed, as I understand, at the end of next year ; that is within about eighteen months.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is so, the time is reasonably short, but it would be well to know for a certainty what the provision of the agreement in that respect is.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will understand that this resolution which we are now considering embodies the salient portions, no doubt. But, of course, he will

see that it would be necessary to extend and expand these in the usual way in which these matters are done by legal gentlemen. These points to which he has alluded will be specifically defined in the agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend tell me whether or not the Government have any estimate as to the probable cost of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With regard to the question, when the railway will be built, the expectation is that the agreement to be entered into under the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will undertake to build a considerable portion of the line between Lethbridge and the Kootenay Lake by the first of the coming year. They think that there may perhaps be a hundred miles completed by that time. They propose to complete the road to Kootenay Lake, a distance of a little over 200 miles, at the end of the following year, that is, by the first of January, 1899. As to the balance of the road, we have not yet come to any definite understanding with the company. The probability is that immediately upon the completion of the road to Kootenay Lake there will be put on a car ferry, which will give direct car accommodation with the line to Nelson. That mode of connection will be continued during the following year, under a lease, while the company are constructing the railway along the shore of Kootenay Lake and making the connection with the line at Nelson. These are our present expectations as to the time for the completion of the road. Of course, there may possibly be some little modification one way or the other in respect to this question of time, when we come to complete our arrangements more definitely. As to the probable cost of the road, I may say that, so far as I can learn, as I am informed by the officers of my department, there has been at no time any Governmental surveys of the route which this railway is likely to traverse. The only information in the possession of the late Government, and the only information in our possession, has been obtained from the officers and engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or rather has been obtained through the company as the result of surveys which have been made by their officers. We have a very careful statement made by them as to the cost of the different sections of the road, and that statement shows that it is expected that, outside of the equipment the road will cost between \$25,000 and \$26,000 per mile. Not that every mile or every section will cost that. Some sections will of course be easier of construction than others, and will of course be built at a somewhat smaller rate. There will be a good deal of heavy outlay getting out of Lethbridge. A very large amount of trestle-work will be required there, and perhaps, in making the connection at or near Macleod. From that point

Mr. RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to the Foot Hills the work will probably not be so expensive ; but, after getting into and beyond the Pass, there will be a great deal of very heavy work. Taking it altogether, the information we have is that the cost of the road, taking one mile with an other over the 330 miles, will be in the neighbourhood of \$25,000 or \$26,000 per mile.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend tell us what point the 330 mile extension will reach ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That point will be Nelson. The distance may not be quite 330 miles ; that will depend on the surveys and the location of the road. It may be possible to get the connection within the 330 miles, but it is not expected that the mileage will fall short of that to any great extent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it fairly well ascertained what point on the Kootenay the road will strike ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is not. The line which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been contemplating will not, I think, pass far from Fort Steele, perhaps five or six miles distant. However, the question of route is one which we reserve to ourselves the right to approve and control, and I think it not unlikely that we shall find it necessary to procure some independent information on that point before the question of route is finally settled.

Mr. IVES. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the arrangement, are to have the coal lands excepting those alternate sections which are to be under the control of the Government. I would like to know whether, in the contract to be made with the company, it is the intention of the Government to fix a price for coal or coke delivered at Rossland and other mining centres. The main object of this railway is to serve the mining district, to take in manufactured and other goods from the east, and coal and coke from the Canadian Pacific Railway coal lands, which are being acquired from the British Columbia Government. To make the road a real and substantial benefit to that country, it seems to me there should be some agreement as to the price of coal delivered in Rossland or to the smelters in that district ; and I would like to know whether that is to be provided for by the arrangement between the Government and the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is right in the main in his statement of facts, but not entirely so. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I believe, under the arrangement which they have entered into with the British Columbia Southern, will not become

entitled to any coal lands at all, except those which they have engaged to secure and to transfer to the Government. All the coal area which does not pass to the Government will remain the property of the British Columbia Southern Company. That is, I understand, the nature of the agreement between that company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The latter company will not be the owners of an area of coal lands. Under their agreement with the British Columbia Southern Company they secure to themselves only 5,000 acres out of the whole coal bearing area. We have insisted upon that body of coal lands being increased to 50,000 acres. They secure that quantity, and make it over to us; but, as I understand the arrangement, they get no other portion of the coal lands. Now, we have, I think, taken a great deal of care, and have made arrangements which will secure to the consumers of coal that coal shall be obtainable at a low price. Every one who is familiar with the conditions existing in British Columbia knows that at present coal brings a very high price, and that coke which is suitable for the purposes of smelting costs in the neighbourhood of from \$14 to \$16 a ton. We have made arrangements under which the owners of the coal area not transferred to us will be obliged to put coal from their mines free on board the cars at a price not exceeding \$2 per ton, and even that price is subject to the regulation and control of the Governor in Council. If we are satisfied, from inquiry, that the coal miners are getting at this rate, a larger profit than they ought reasonably to exact, we can reduce the price. Two dollars is the maximum price. And I may add that we have this lever by which we can control the owners of the coal lands. The moment they exact any higher price or fail to produce a sufficient supply, we have it in our power to throw upon the market open to public competition the coal property we possess and thus make it possible for other parties to go into business.

Mr. IVES. That involves a contract between the Government and the British Columbia Southern Railway as well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it does. We have not found up to this moment that it has. We make our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway and they must make theirs with the Southern Eastern. If the Canadian Pacific Railway fail to make such a contract with the Southern Railway people, or if the latter fail to manage their coal property in such a way as to carry out our agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we can put our properties in the market, and give opportunity to others to come in and compete. The hon. gentleman spoke of coke. We have not mentioned coke, because we consider that the price of coal will govern

the price of coke. But if coke is not reduced as required, I apprehend that by putting our coal properties on the market, competitors will go into the business, not only of mining but of manufacturing as well.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the area in which seams are exposed and workable? Would it cover an area of more than 5,000 acres?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very much more than that. A large portion of the coal area is very close to the railway in several places, and I do not think there is any room for doubt as to the quantity and quality of the coal.

Mr. IVES. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman can compel the British Columbia Southern to sell coal free on board the cars at \$2 per ton unless he has some arrangement with them. His contract, which is wholly with the Canadian Pacific Railway, cannot affect coal lands belonging to the British Columbia Southern Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I concluded that when we became the owners of 50,000 acres of coal-bearing land we have got in our hands all the guarantee which we could have desired against the coal lands being tied up and the prices increased.

Mr. IVES. There is a general impression that the leading directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway have practically become the proprietors of the British Columbia Southern and its coal lands. In that case, we are paying them indirectly a still further subsidy for the construction of this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am assured by the gentlemen representing the Canadian Pacific Railway, the president and the vice-president, that they have no interest at all in the company which will hold the residue of these lands after they are earned and acquired. I could not state with any certainty who compose the British Columbia Southern. I believe that Colonel Baker is one. Messrs. Hanson Brothers, of Montreal, are concerned and represent a number of other persons interested.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman for some information. I see that this section provides for a reduction of rates or tolls for the carriage of grain or flour "from all points on its main line, branches or connections," west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur points east of 3 cents per hundred pounds." As I interpret that it means a reduction of the rates of grain from points west of Fort William and Port Arthur to Fort William and Port Arthur and not to points east.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think that the arrangement in reference to transportation provided that if grain was carried by way of the north shore of Lake Superior to points east, the reduction would apply to that also.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The resolution does not say so.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I know, as a matter of fact, there is very little, if any, grain carried in that way. If it is carried in that way, it is carried during the winter season and at much lower rates than it would be carried during the season of open water.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is in the winter time that it would be most important, because then you must use the railway.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In the winter season, I am informed, the rates are lower.

Mr. **SPROULE**. But if I understand this correctly, their lowest rate would be reduced, whether winter or summer. It is not usual for winter rates to be lower than summer rates, they are generally much higher. This is a matter of considerable importance especially to the people of Ontario, who bring down a lot of grain over that road. If the reduction were made only to Port Arthur it would be an unfortunate thing for people in Ontario, and also a bad arrangement for the people of Manitoba and the North-west from whom the grain is received.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Is not something left out here? Surely it is intended to cover all points east.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. It seems to me that it is not important. It is intended to benefit the shipper, and he gets the reduction. It does not matter to him whether that reduction is made west or east of Port Arthur.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think that on reading the subsection it will appear clear that what I stated is correct.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Surely it should read "to Fort William and Port Arthur and points east." As it is now it does not mean anything.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There does seem to be a slight anomaly there. I think the word "and" should be inserted as suggested. In the discussions between the officers of the company and ourselves, the subject of the carriage around lake Superior during the winter season was mentioned, and it was agreed to give a reduction to points east, so that Fort William and Port Arthur should not be the extreme points to which they would agree to carry grain and to which the reductions

Mr. **SPROULE**.

would apply. When the arrangements as settled and agreed upon is consulted, I think it will be found that there has been an error in the printing. The word "and" should be inserted certainly. I now move that the word "and" be inserted,

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) tell me what points were covered by the British Columbia Southern charter?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If my memory serves me well, the British Columbia Southern Railway Company's charter covered a line from the Pacific coast through to the eastern boundary of the province.

Mr. **McINNES**. If it is proposed to carry the resolutions in entirety, I have a couple of amendments to propose. Under section (d), it is provided that reductions should be made on certain goods going westward. Now, in all fairness, merchants on the Pacific coast should have an equal advantage with those in the east. There should be no discrimination in this regard in favour of one as against the other. With equal privileges, the merchants in British Columbia can cater to that important country's trade, especially since the preferential tariff with Great Britain. Goods can come around the Horn, and land at a price that will enable merchants to sell them profitably in competition with merchants from the east. I would move that in section (d), after the word "company," the following be inserted:—

And from all points west of the Cascade Range in British Columbia, on the company's railway, to all points east of the said Cascade Range, on the company's main line or on any line throughout Canada owned, leased or operated by the company.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not mean to say that the amendment as proposed here had better be incorporated in the clause to-night; I think perhaps it would be well that it should stand until to-morrow, and we could put ourselves in communication with the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway to see whether this amendment would be likely to disturb the arrangement which has been made. I would be very glad to confer with them upon the subject, and there is no particular object in concluding the matter to-night. It could be moved, and the sense of the committee taken upon it. If we ascertained that it would be a serious block to the conclusion of the arrangement, then the committee had better determine whether these words should be inserted.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are we ratifying an agreement here or are we passing a simple resolution proposed by the Government?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not suggesting that the committee should express any opinion upon it to-night, but I am willing that the matter should stand until to-morrow. I think it is only fair to the hon. gentleman that the suggestion he makes should be considered; and if it cannot be favourably considered, then of course the statement can be made to the committee when it resumes consideration of the resolution.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Surely the hon. gentleman must see that if the committee passed this agreement, he cannot possibly alter it afterwards. It is to be submitted afterwards to the Canadian Pacific Railway to see whether they consent to it or not.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is not my proposal.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Your proposal is to submit it to the committee, and if the committee agree to it, there is an end of it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have either to accept or reject it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is doing himself very little justice by stating the proposition in that way. I say that the consideration of this resolution should stand until to-morrow, and in the meantime I can have communication with those who are representing the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to ascertain whether they would favourably consider the proposal which the hon. gentleman has made. I think it is entitled to consideration, and if they are willing to consider it, it can then without detriment to anybody be inserted as an amendment to the resolution. If they are unwilling to accept it, then of course the resolution must stand as it is. If the committee, when we resume, upon the amendment being proposed, are prepared to accept it, then the arrangement is at an end. That means that the committee have defeated the resolution.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I may have misunderstood the Minister, for I certainly understood him to say that we should take the sense of the committee upon it.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Not to-night.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think the hon. gentleman is the only one who understood that I suggested that we take the sense of the committee upon it to-night. The committee must understand that this is not an agreement, it is nothing that has been signed, sealed and executed between the parties. These are the conditions which we have imposed upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which they have accepted. There has not been any writing at all passed between us. If this committee should reject the terms of the arrangement, or if they should add any-

thing to it which would not be acceptable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, then the whole transaction is at an end. We are bound to nothing, they are bound to nothing.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Then does my hon. friend want that to be a consummation of his labours?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the Government gone into the matter with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and made a hard and fast arrangement, after long negotiations, and come to the conclusion that this is an instrument that we are both agreed to? Then is the hon. gentleman from British Columbia to interject new matter and imperil the whole thing. Does my hon. friend want this to pass or does he not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think there is any possibility of its being imperilled unless the committee should reject the resolution as we finally ask the committee to pass it. But if, on consultation with the other party to this understanding, they are willing that there should be another amendment made, if they are willing that the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) should be added, we would be only too glad to add it. Then I come to the committee and say that it is agreeable to the other party that such an addition should be made. If, on the other hand, they say that the arrangement will be at an end, then we will say to the hon. gentleman that we cannot accept his proposition.

Mr. **GIBSON**. It is a business proposition.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think so. Everything possibly may be said against the proposal. I think the only thing that is involved is the matter of delay.

Mr. **IVES**. I understand then from the Minister of Railways that the whole subject is an open question, and that amendments may be considered by the committee in modification of this arrangement. Now, if such is the case, I certainly think it will be a great improvement to have the whole of these coal lands vested in the Government of Canada. I do not see for myself anything that the British Columbia Southern Railway Company has done in connection with this project which entitles them to a property which is supposed to be worth millions of dollars. They got a charter, they have built no railway, they have done nothing. The Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway have had to come forward and fill the breach, the Government with a subsidy, the Canadian Pacific Railway with their skill, ability and energy, and the

railway is to be built. Why should the British Columbia Southern Railway Company retain coal lands of incalculable value? What have they done? And if this railway arrangement is open to amendment I certainly should move at a later stage that it be amended in the direction that the Government of Canada shall retain possession of the whole of these lands if they are to give this subsidy.

Mr. McINNES. I might as well read the other amendment that I have prepared, so that it may be considered between now and to-morrow:

That the said company shall not become entitled to any assistance specified in this resolution until it has satisfied the Governor General in Council that no Chinese or Japanese have been or are employed on the construction of said railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend the Minister of Railways accepting that in the same manner. It seems to me that if this were done it would destroy the whole arrangement and might prevent the Crow's Nest Pass from being built at all.

Mr. McINNES. I am not introducing this with the object of in any way embarrassing the Government in carrying out the arrangement, but what I am doing I am compelled to do on account of my stand in the past and my conviction at present in reference to this railway. I think these are resolutions that we could fairly pass and insist upon the Canadian Pacific Railway accepting. If the Canadian Pacific Railway, in view of all the concessions that we are prepared to give them, will not accept these small modifications, then I will be prepared to cast the whole thing out, and I think the House would be justified in doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. After days and months of negotiation between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, they have come to this agreement. The hon. member (Mr. McInnes) asks that the Government leave something out or put something in. If he insists upon this and the Minister is facile enough to say that an agreement which has been come to by the Government and the company can be opened up by my hon. friend instead of being firm and saying "This is the agreement that we have come to; it must be accepted or taken," if my hon. friends take this course upon them proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver, they will be responsible for not having that invaluable country opened up.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand, Mr. Chairman, that these resolutions were to be considered to-night. There are others which might be considered as well. Why cannot we consider one as well as the other. Where is there any situation that prevents us from considering one any more than the other. If the Government can leave it

Mr. IVES.

open for this session, all the better I say for the country. If they had a little time to consult with the parties, some of these propositions might be accepted. It would be a safer plan to allow them time to consult and see if they would not be accepted.

Resolution to be reported.

#### I.C.R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved second reading of Bill (No. 142) to confirm an agreement entered into with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway Company and Her Majesty for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I appeal to my hon. friend the leader of the House. It is now half-past one. We will be utterly unfitted for any business to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a matter of very grave moment in the general interest to send this Bill on to the Senate. It has been fully discussed, unless the hon. gentleman wants further discussion upon it; and there has been a division.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand that this Bill has been discussed at all. There was not even an explanation of the provisions of it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot conceive what objection hon. gentlemen can have to this. They have divided upon it, and they know very well that the thing must go through now.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the Bill even printed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We want to give the Senate an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. IVES. You will not take the last stage.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives) objects to it.

Mr. IVES. I object to the last stage going through to-night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will not take the last stage if it is objected to.

Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1898, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons. Government House,  
Ottawa, 18th June, 1897.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Now I think after we have done such excellent work, that we will be ready to take a couple of hours more. I suggest that we proceed with the final stages of the tariff. There are a few matters held over. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means. The only remaining resolutions are those relating to the export duties, and while the subject is important I think perhaps it is not necessary that we should discuss it. I propose to read the resolutions, and if there be no objection they may be adopted. The first resolution deals with the export duties on logs and is substantially the resolution of the last tariff; inserting, however, some words with regard to pulp wood. It is:

That it is expedient to enact that, if any country imposes a duty upon the articles enumerated in item 577 in Schedule B to this Act, or upon any of such articles when imported into such country from Canada, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the "Canada Gazette," declare the following export duties, or any of them, chargeable upon logs and pulp wood exported from Canada to such country, that is to say: on pine, Douglas fir, spruce, fir balsam, cedar, elm and hemlock logs, and pulp wood, an export duty not exceeding three dollars per thousand feet, board measure; and in case of the export of any of the above mentioned logs or pulp wood in shorter lengths than nine feet, then a rate per cord may be levied in the same way, not greater than the equivalent of the above mentioned rate per thousand feet, board measure; and such export duty shall be chargeable accordingly after the publication of such proclamation: Provided that the Governor in Council may by proclamation published in like manner, from time to time remove and reimpose such export duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that in a matter of this importance, and which will not I hope involve much, if any, discussion, it would be better if these resolutions should appear on to-morrow's paper, and that we should then take them up. I think it would be far better that these export duty resolutions should be passed in a separate Bill.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And take the stages of the tariff apart from that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I would suggest.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Very well.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the question of elm logs, which I see are included in the proposal with regard to export duties. These logs, as exported from Canada, are taken exclusively from lands belonging to individuals, and not from the public domain. Therefore I would like him to consider the advisability of not including elm logs with those to be subject to an export duty, as otherwise a hardship will be entailed on a good many farmers.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. In regard to item 279 and 280, I want to make to my hon. friend an appeal for an industry, to wit, the making of wood axes. I want to suggest that they be taken from 280, and put in to 297. The effect of that will be to make them subject to 30 per cent instead of 25 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid it is too late now for us to take that up. I know that the suggestion would give rise to considerable discussion, and therefore I think it better to let the duty stand as it is.

The following resolutions were adopted:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to revise and consolidate the Acts and parts of Acts now in force respecting the duties of customs, and that for this purpose it is expedient to repeal the following Acts or parts thereof not heretofore repealed, viz:—

57-58 Victoria, Chapter 33, intituled: "An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs."

53-59 Victoria, Chapter 23, intituled: "An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894."

59 Victoria, Chapter 8, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894."

And to provide otherwise by enacting that the following be substituted in lieu thereof:—

1. That unless the context otherwise requires,  
(a) The initials "n.e.s." represent and have the meaning of the words "not elsewhere specified";

(b) The initials "n.o.p." represent and have the meaning of the words "not otherwise provided for";

(c) The expression "gallon" means an imperial gallon;

(d) The expression "ton" means two thousand pounds avoirdupois;

(e) The expression "proof" or "proof spirits," when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, means spirits of a strength equal to that of pure ethyl alcohol compounded with distilled water in such proportions that the resultant mixture shall at a temperature of sixty degrees Fahrenheit have a specific gravity of 0.9198 as compared with that of distilled water at the same temperature;

(f) The expression "gauge," when applied to metal sheets or plates or to wire, means the thickness as determined by Stubbs's standard gauge;

(g) The expression "in diameter," when applied to tubing, means the actual inside diameter ;

(h) The expression "sheet," when applied to metals, means a sheet or plate not exceeding three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness ;

(i) The expression "plate," when applied to metals, means a plate or sheet more than three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

2. That the expressions mentioned in section two of "The Customs Act," as amended by section two of "The Customs Amendment Act, 1888," whenever they occur herein, or in any Act relating to the customs, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning assigned to them respectively by the said section two and any power conferred upon the Governor in Council by "The Customs Act" to transfer dutiable goods to the list of goods which may be imported free of duty is not hereby abrogated or impaired.

3. That subject to the foregoing provisions and to the requirements of "The Customs Act," Chapter thirty-two of the Revised Statutes, as amended, there shall be levied, collected and paid upon all goods enumerated, or referred to as not enumerated, in Schedule "A" hereto appended,—the several rates of duties of customs set forth and described in the said schedule and set opposite to each item respectively or charged thereon as not enumerated, when such goods are imported into Canada or are taken out of warehouse for consumption therein.

4. That subject to the same provisions and to the further conditions contained in Schedule "B" hereto appended, all goods enumerated in the said Schedule "B" may be imported into Canada or may be taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, without the payment of any duties of customs thereon.

5. That the importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in Schedule "C" hereto appended, is prohibited ; and that any such goods if imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and may be destroyed, and that any person importing any such prohibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

6. The whole or part of the duties hereby imposed upon fish and other products of the fisheries may be remitted as respects either the United States or Newfoundland, or both, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in the said countries respectively.

7. That the export of deer, wild turkeys, quail, partridge, prairie fowl and woodcock, in the carcase or parts thereof, is hereby declared unlawful and prohibited ; and any person exporting or attempting to export any such article shall for each such offence incur a penalty of one hundred dollars, and the article so attempted to be exported shall be forfeited, and may, on reasonable cause of suspicion of intention to export, be seized by any officer of the customs, and, if such intention is proved, shall be dealt with as for breach of the customs laws ; Provided, that this section shall not apply to the export, under such regulations as are made by the Governor in Council, of any carcase or part thereof of any deer raised or bred by any person, company or association of persons upon his or their own lands.

Mr. FIELDING.

8. That regulations respecting the manner in which molasses and syrups shall be sampled and tested for the purpose of determining the classes to which they belong with reference to the duty chargeable thereon shall be made by the Controller of Customs ; and the instruments and appliances necessary for such determination shall be designated by him and supplied to such officers as are by him charged with the duty of sampling and testing such molasses and syrups ; and the decision of any officer (to whom is so assigned the testing of such articles) as to the duties to which they are subject under the tariff shall be final and conclusive, unless upon appeal to the Commissioner of Customs within thirty days from the rendering of such decision, such decision is, with the approval of the Controller, changed ; and the decision of the Commissioner with such approval shall be final.

9. That in the case of all wines, spirits, or alcoholic liquors subject to duty according to their relative strength of proof, such strength shall be ascertained either by means of Sykes's hydrometer or of the specific gravity bottle, as the Controller of Customs directs ; and in case such relative strength cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct use of the hydrometer or gravity bottle, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample and the subsequent test in like manner of the distillate.

10. That all medicinal or toilet preparations imported for completing the manufacture thereof, or for the manufacture of any other article by the addition of any ingredient or ingredients, or by mixing such preparations, or by putting up or labelling the same, alone or with other articles or compounds, under any proprietary or special name or trade mark, shall be valued for duty purposes under the provisions of subsection two of section sixty-five of the Customs Act.

11. That all medicinal preparations, whether chemical or other, usually imported with the name of the manufacturer, shall have the true name of such manufacturer and the place where they are prepared, and the word "alcoholic" or "non-alcoholic" permanently and legibly affixed to each parcel by stamp, label or otherwise ; and all medicinal preparations imported without such names so affixed may be forfeited.

12. That packages when imported shall be subject to the payment of the following duties, viz.:

(a) All bottles, flasks, jars, demijohns, carboys, casks, hogsheads, pipes, barrels, and all other vessels or packages, manufactured of tin, iron, lead, zinc, glass or any other material capable of holding liquids—and all packages in which goods are commonly placed for home consumption, including cases, not otherwise provided for, in which bottled spirits, wines, or malt liquors or other liquids are contained—and every package being the first receptacle or covering inclosing goods for purpose of sale—shall in all cases, not otherwise provided for, in which they contain goods subject to an ad valorem duty or a specific and ad valorem duty, be charged with the same rate of ad valorem duty as is to be levied and collected on the goods they contain, and the value of the packages may be included in the value of such goods ;

(b) Provided that all such packages as aforesaid containing goods subject to a specific duty only, and not otherwise provided for, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent ad valorem ;

(c) That packages not hereinbefore specified, and not herein specially charged with or declared liable to duty, and being the usual and ordinary packages in which goods are packed

for exportation, according to the general usage and custom of trade, shall be free of duty ;

(d) Provided further, that all such special packages or coverings as are of use, or apparently designed for use other than in the importation of the goods they contain, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as would thereon be levied if imported empty or separate from their contents.

(e) Provided also, that packages (inside or outside) containing free goods shall be exempt from duty when the packages are of such a nature that their destruction becomes necessary in order to release the goods.

13. That any person who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which shall be on the person accused, sends or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession, any bill-heading or other paper appearing to be a heading or blank capable of being filled up and used as an invoice, and bearing any certificate purporting to show, or which may be used to show, that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars, and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months, in the discretion of the court, and the goods entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

14. That with respect to goods imported for manufacturing purposes that are admissible under schedule "A" hereto appended for any specific purposes, at a lower rate of duty than would otherwise be chargeable, or exempt from duty under schedule "B" hereto appended, the importer claiming such exemption from duty, or proportionate exemption from duty, shall make and subscribe to the following affidavit or affirmation before the collector of customs at the port of entry, or before a notary public or commissioner for taking affidavits :—

I, (name of importer), the undersigned, importer of the (names of the goods or articles) mentioned in this entry, do solemnly (swear or affirm) that such (names of the goods or articles) are imported by me for the manufacture of (names of the goods to be manufactured) in my own factory, situated at (name of the place, county and province), and that no portion of the same will be used for any other purpose or disposed of until so manufactured.

15. That nothing contained in the foregoing provisions shall affect the "French Treaty Act, 1894," or Chapter three of Fifty-eight-Fifty-nine Victoria, being "An Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada."

16. That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the Reciprocal Tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be entered for duty, or taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rates of duty provided in the Reciprocal Tariff set forth in Schedule "D."

(a) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b) That the Governor in Council may extend the benefits of such Reciprocal Tariff to any country which may be entitled thereto by virtue of any treaty with Her Majesty.

(c) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of this section.

17. That whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any number of them, to unduly enhance the price of such article, or in any way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any Judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Supreme Court or High Court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists ; with power to such judge to compel the attendance or witnesses and examine the same under oath, to require the production of books and papers, and with such other necessary powers as may be conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purposes of such inquiry, and if such judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council may place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty upon it, as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as may be deemed advisable for the effectual conduct of such inquiry.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to cancel all Orders in Council and all departmental regulations contrary to or inconsistent with any of the provisions of the foregoing resolution or of the schedule thereto.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the rate of duties of customs payable on goods imported into Canada shall take effect on and after the 23rd day of April last.

Provided that in the case of goods which were imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption and on which duty was paid, on or after the 23rd day of April, 1897, in accordance with the rate of duty set forth as payable on such goods in the resolutions respecting the duties of Customs introduced in the House of Commons on the 22nd day of April, 1897, or in any such resolution subsequently introduced in the said House, the duty so paid shall not be affected, nor shall the person paying it be entitled to any refund or be liable to any further payment of duty, by reason of such rate of duty being altered by any resolution introduced subsequently to that in accordance with which such duty was paid and before the passing of this Act.

#### SCHEDULE "A."

##### GOODS SUBJECT TO DUTIES.

##### *Ales, Beers, Wines and Liquors.*

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottle, sixteen cents per gallox.

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon), twenty-four cents per gallon.

Cider, not clarified or refined, five cents per gallon.

Cider, clarified or refined, ten cents per gallon.

Lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits, sixty cents per gallon, and when containing more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.

Lime juice and other fruit syrups and fruit juices, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Spirituos or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at a rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, as follows:—

(a) Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine; gin of all kinds, n.e.s.; rum, whisky, and all spirituoso or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p.; amyl alcohol or fusel oil; or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack, or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.e.s.; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

(b) Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, or medicinal wines (so-called), or ethereal and spirituoso fruit essences, n.e.s., two dollars and forty cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(c) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks containing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent ad valorem; when in bottles, flasks or other packages, containing more than four ounces each, two dollars and forty cents per gallon and forty per cent ad valorem.

(d) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and forty cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(e) Vermouth, containing not more than thirty-six per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than twenty-six per cent of proof spirits, ninety cents per gallon; if containing more than these percentages respectively of proof spirits, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

(f) Medicinal or medicated wines containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirits, one dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry,

Mr. FIELDING.

elder and currant wines, containing twenty-six per cent or less of spirits of the strength of proof, whether imported in wood or in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain a gallon), twenty-five cents per gallon; and for each degree or fraction of a degree of strength in excess of the twenty-six per cent of spirits as aforesaid, an additional duty of three cents until the strength reaches forty per cent of proof spirits; and in addition thereto, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than a quart but more than a pint, three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles; containing not more than a pint each but more than one-half pint, one dollar and sixty-five cents per dozen bottles; containing one-half pint each or less, eighty-two cents per dozen bottles; bottles containing more than one quart each shall pay, in addition to three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles, at the rate of one dollar and sixty-five cents per gallon on the quantity in excess of one quart per bottle, the quarts and pints in each case being old wine measure; in addition to the above specific duty, there shall be an ad valorem duty of thirty per cent.

But any liquors imported under the name of wine, and containing more than forty per cent of spirits of the strength of proof, shall be rated for duty as unenumerated spirits.

*Animals and Agricultural, Animal and Dairy Products.*

Animals, living, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Live hogs, one and one-half cent per pound.

Meats, n.e.s. (when in barrel, the barrel to be free), two cents per pound.

Meats, fresh, n.e.s., three cents per pound.

Canned meats, and canned poultry and game, extracts of meat and fluid beef not medicated, and soups, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mutton and lamb, fresh, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Poultry and game, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Lard, lard compound and similar substances, cottolene and animal stearine of all kinds, n.e.s., two cents per pound.

Tallow and stearic acid, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Beeswax, ten per cent ad valorem.

Candles, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paraffine wax candies, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Soaps, viz.: soap, common or laundry, one cent per pound.

Soaps, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Pearline, and other soap powders, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Castile soap, mottled or white, two cents per pound.

Glue, liquid, powdered or sheet, and mucilage, gelatine, and isinglass, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Feathers, undressed, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Feathers, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Eggs, three cents per dozen.

Butter, four cents per pound.

Cheese, three cents per pound.

Condensed milk (weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty), three and one-quarter cents per pound.

Condensed coffee with milk, milk foods and all similar preparations, thirty per cent ad valorem.

- Apples, including the duty on the barrel, forty cents per barrel.
- Beans, fifteen cents per bushel.
- Buckwheat, ten cents per bushel.
- Pease, n.e.s., ten cents per bushel.
- Potatoes, n.e.s., fifteen cents per bushel.
- Rye, ten cents per bushel.
- Rye flour, including the duty on the barrel, fifty cents per barrel.
- Hay, two dollars per ton.
- Vegetables, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Barley, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Dutiable breadstuffs, grain and flour and meal of all kinds, when damaged by water in transit, twenty per cent ad valorem, upon the appraised value, such appraised value to be ascertained as provided by sections 58, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75 and 76 of the Customs Act.
- Buckwheat, meal or flour, one-fourth of one cent per pound.
- Cornmeal, including the duty on the barrel, twenty-five cents per barrel.
- Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, seven and one-half cents per bushel.
- Oats, ten cents per bushel.
- Oatmeal, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, half of one cent per pound.
- Rice, cleaned, one and one-quarter cent per pound.
- Rice and sago flour and sago, and tapioca, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Rice, when imported by makers of rice starch for use in their factories in making starch, three-fourths of one cent per pound.
- Wheat, twelve cents per bushel.
- Wheat flour, including the duty on the barrel, sixty cents per barrel.
- Biscuits, not sweetened, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Biscuits, sweetened, twenty-seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.
- Macaroni and vermicelli, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, the weight of the package to be in all cases included in the weight for duty, one and one-half cent per pound.
- Seeds, viz.:—garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sun-flower, canary, hemp, and millet seed, when in bulk or in large parcels, ten per cent ad valorem: when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Mustard, ground, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Mustard cake, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Sweet potatoes and yams, ten cents per bushel.
- Tomatoes, fresh, twenty cents per bushel and ten per cent ad valorem.
- Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, n.e.s., the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, one and one-half cent per pound.
- Pickles, sauces and catsups, including soy, thirty five per cent ad valorem.
- Malt, upon entry for warehouse subject to excise regulations, fifteen cents per bushel.
- Extract of malt (non-alcoholic), for medicinal and baking purposes, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Hops, six cents per pound.
- Compressed yeast, in bulk or mass of not less than fifty pounds, three cents per pound; in packages weighing less than fifty pounds, six cents per pound, the weight of the package in the latter case to be included in the weight for duty.
- Yeast cakes and baking powder, the weight of the packages to be included in the weight for duty, six cents per pound.
- Trees, viz.: Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds, three cents each.
- Grape vines; gooseberry, raspberry, currant and rose bushes; fruit plants, n.e.s., and shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, n.e.s., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, two cents per pound.
- Cranberries, plums and quinces, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Prunes, including raisins, dried currants and California or silver prunes, one cent per pound.
- Apples, dried, desiccated or evaporated; dates, figs, and other dried, desiccated or evaporated fruits, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Grapes, two cents per pound.
- Oranges, lemons and limes, in boxes of capacity not exceeding two and one-half cubic feet, twenty-five cents per box; in one-half boxes, capacity not exceeding one and one-fourth cubic feet, thirteen cents per half-box; in cases and all other packages, per cubic foot holding capacity, ten cents; in bulk, per one thousand oranges, lemons or limes, one dollar and fifty cents; in barrels not exceeding in capacity that of the one hundred and ninety-six pounds flour barrel, fifty-five cents per barrel.
- Peaches, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, one cent per pound.
- Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages, the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, two and one-quarter cents per pound.
- Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, two dollars per gallon.
- Preserved ginger, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Jellies, jams and preserves, n.e.s., three and one-quarter cents per pound.
- Honey, in the comb or otherwise, and imitations thereof, three cents per pound.
- Tea and green coffee, n.e.s., ten per cent ad valorem.
- Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, two cents per pound and ten per cent ad valorem.
- Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof and substitutes for, including acorn nuts, n.o.p., two cents per pound.
- Extract of coffee, n.e.s., or substitutes therefor of all kinds, three cents per pound.
- Chicory, raw or green, three cents per pound.
- Chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, four cents per pound.
- Cocoa shells and nibs, chocolate, and other preparations of cocoa, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Cocoa paste, chocolate paste, cocos and cocoa butter, n.o.p., four cents per pound.
- Nuts shelled, n.e.s., five cents per pound.
- Almonds, walnuts, Brazil nuts, pecans and shelled peanuts, n.e.s., three cents per pound; and nuts of all kinds, n.o.p., two cents per pound.
- Cocoanuts, n.e.s., one dollar per hundred.
- Cocoanuts, when imported from the place of growth, by vessel, direct to a Canadian port, fifty cents per hundred.

Cocoanut, desiccated, sweetened or not, five cents per pound.

Nutmegs and mace, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Spices, viz.: Ginger and spices of all kinds, unground, n.e.s., twelve and one-half per cent ad valorem; ground, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Fine salt in bulk, and coarse salt, n.e.s., five cents per one hundred pounds.

Salt, n.e.s.—in bags, barrels or other packages—the bags, barrels or other packages, being the first coverings or inside packages, to bear the same duty as if such packages or first coverings were imported empty, seven and one-half cents per hundred pounds.

*Fish and Products of the Fisheries.*

Mackerel, one cent per pound.

Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half cent per pound.

Salmon, fresh, one-half cent per pound.

Salmon, pickled or salted, one cent per pound.

All other fish, pickled or salted, in barrels, one cent per pound.

Foreign caught fish, imported otherwise than in barrels, or half-barrels, whether fresh, dried, salted or pickled, not specially enumerated or provided for by this Act, fifty cents per hundred pounds.

Fish, smoked and boneless, one cent per pound.

Anchovies and sardines, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than five inches long, four inches wide and three and a half inches deep, per whole box, five cents.

(b) In half boxes measuring not more than five inches long, four inches wide and one and five-eighths deep, per half box, two and one-half cents.

(c) In quarter boxes measuring not more than four inches and three-quarters long, three and a half inches wide and one and a quarter deep, per quarter box, two cents.

Anchovies and sardines, when imported in any other form, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fish, preserved in oil, except anchovies and sardines, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fresh or dried fish, n.e.s., imported in barrels or half barrels, one cent per pound.

Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, including oysters, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Oysters, shelled, in bulk, ten cents per gallon.

Oysters, shelled, in cans not over one pint, three cents per can, including the cans.

Oysters, shelled, in cans over one pint and not over one quart, five cents per can, including the cans.

Oysters, shelled, in cans exceeding one quart in capacity, an additional duty of five cents for each quart or fraction of a quart of capacity over a quart, including the cans.

Oysters, in the shell, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Packages containing oysters or other fish, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Oils, spermaceti, whale and other fish oils, and all other articles the produce of the fisheries, not specially provided for, twenty per cent ad valorem.

*Books and Paper.*

Albumenized and other papers and films chemically prepared for photographers' use, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FIELDING.

Books, viz.: Novels or works of fiction, or literature of a similar character, unbound or paper-bound, or in sheets, including freight rates for railways and telegraph rates, bound in book or pamphlet form, but not to include Christmas annuals or publications commonly known as juvenile and toy books, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, or parts thereof, n.e.s., not to include blank account books, copy-books, or books to be written or drawn upon, ten per cent ad valorem.

Advertising and printed matter, viz.: Advertising pamphlets, advertising pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals; illustrated price books, catalogues and price lists; advertising almanacs and calendars; patent medicine or other advertising circulars, fly-sheets or pamphlets; advertising chromos, chromotypes, oleographs or like work produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, and having any advertisement or advertising matter printed, lithographed or stamped thereon, or attached thereto, including advertising bills, folders and posters, or other similar artistic work, lithographed, printed or stamped on paper or cardboard for business or advertisement purposes, n.o.p. fifteen cents per pound.

Labels for cigar boxes, fruits, vegetables, meats, fish, confectionery or other goods or wares; shipping, price or other tags, tickets, or labels, and railroad or other tickets, whether lithographed or printed, or partly printed, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts and all similar work unsigned, and cards or other commercial blank forms printed or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Printed music, bound or in sheets, ten per cent ad valorem.

Photographs, chromos, chromotypes, artotypes, oleographs, paintings, drawings, pictures, engravings or prints, or proofs therefrom, and similar works of art, n.c.p.; blue prints, building plans, maps and charts, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, glossed or finished, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mill-board, not straw board, ten per cent ad valorem.

Straw board, in sheets or rolls; tarred paper, felt, or straw board; sandpaper, glass or flint paper, and emery paper or emery cloth, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paper sacks or bags of all kinds, printed or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Playing cards, six cents per pack.

Paper hangings or wall papers, borders or bordering, and window blinds of paper of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Printing paper and paper of all kinds, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Ruled and border and coated papers, papeteries, boxed papers, pads not printed, papier-maché ware, n.o.p.; envelopes, and all manufactures of paper, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

*Chemicals and Drugs.*

Acid, acetic acid and pyroligneous, n.e.s., and vinegar, a specific duty of fifteen cents for

- each gallon of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof, and for each degree of strength in excess of the strength of proof an additional duty of two cents. The strength of proof shall be held to be equal to six per cent of absolute acid, and in all cases the strength shall be determined in such a manner as is established by the Governor in Council.
- Acid, acetic acid crude, and pyroligneous crude, of any strength not exceeding thirty per cent, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Acid, muriatic and nitric, and all mixed or other acids, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Acid, sulphuric, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Acid phosphate, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Sulphuric ether, chloroform, and solutions of pyroxides of hydrogen, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- All medicinal, chemical and pharmaceutical preparations, when compounded of more than one substance, including patent and proprietary preparations, tinctures, pills, powders, troches, lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences and oils, n.o.p.; provided that drugs, pill-mass and preparations not including pills or medicinal plasters, recognized by the British or the United States Pharmacopœia, or the French Codex as official, shall not be held to be covered by this item; all liquids, containing alcohol, fifty per cent ad valorem; and all others, liquid or not, twenty-five per cent.
- Pomades, French or flour odours preserved in fat or oil for the purpose of conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, when imported in tins of not less than ten pounds each, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Perfumery, including toilet preparations (non-alcoholic), viz.: Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes, and all other perfumed preparations, n.o.p., used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Liquorice paste and liquorice in rolls and sticks, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Paraffine wax, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Articles, viz.: Antiseptic surgical dressings, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings plain or medicated; surgical belts and trusses, electric belts, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Surgical and dental instruments and surgical needles, (not being furniture) ten per cent ad valorem,—until 1st January, 1898, and thereafter to be free.
- Cod liver oil, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- and dry and liquid fillers, anti-corrosive and anti-fouling paints commonly used for ships' hulls, and ground and liquid paints, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.
- Paris green, dry, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Ink for writing, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Blacking, shoe, and shoemakers' ink; shoe, harness and leather dressing, harness soap, and knife or other polish or composition, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Putty, of all kinds, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Turpentine, spirits of, five per cent ad valorem.
- British gum, dextrine, sizing cream and enamel sizing, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Varnishes, lacquers, japans, japan driers, liquid driers, and oil finish, n.e.s., twenty cents per gallon, and twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, lard oil, neatsfoot oil, and sesame seed oil, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of the products of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, costing less than twenty-five cents per gallon, five cents per gallon.
- Crude petroleum, fuel and gas oils (other than naphtha, benzine, or gasoline) when imported by manufacturers (other than oil refiners) for use in their own factories for fuel purposes or for the manufacture of gas, two and one-half cents per gallon.
- Oils, coal and kerosene distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum, and products of petroleum, n.e.s., five cents per gallon.
- Barrels, containing petroleum or its products, or any mixture of which petroleum forms a part, when such contents are chargeable with a specific duty, twenty cents each.
- Lubricating oils, n.e.s., and axle grease, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Olive oil, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Essential oils, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Vaseline, and all similar preparations of petroleum for toilet, medicinal or other purposes, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

#### Coal.

- Opium.*
- Opium, crude, the outward ball or covering to be free of duty, one dollar per pound.
- Opium, powdered, one dollar and thirty-five cents per pound.
- Opium prepared for smoking, five dollars per pound.
- Colours, Paints, Oils, Varnishes, &c.*
- Dry white and red lead, orange mineral and zinc white, five per cent ad valorem.
- Ochres, ochrey earths, raw siennas, and colours, dry, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Oxides, umbers, burnt siennas, and fire-proofs, n.e.s.; laundry blueing of all kinds, rough stuff
- Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, twenty per cent ad valorem, but not to exceed thirteen cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of fifteen cents per ton of 2,240 pounds): Provided that if the United States Congress shall fix the duty on such slack coal at a rate not exceeding fifteen cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, then the duty on such coal imported into Canada, as provided in this item, shall be the minimum duty on such coal from all countries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section 16 of this Act.
- Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal, n.e.s., fifty-three cents per ton of 2,000 pounds (being the equivalent of sixty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds): Provided that if the United States Congress shall fix the duty on such coal at a rate not exceeding forty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, the Governor in Council may by proclamation reduce the duty mentioned in this item to forty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, or the equivalent thereof per ton of 2,000 pounds, and the duty declared by such

proclamation shall then be the minimum duty on such coal from all countries, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in section 16 of this Act.

*Earthenware, Cements, Slate and Stoneware.*

Building brick, paving brick, stove linings, and fire brick, n.e.s., cements, n.e.s., and manufactures of clay or cement, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Earthenware and stoneware, viz., demijohns, churns or crocks, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Drain tiles, not glazed, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Drain pipes, sewer pipes, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed, and earthenware tiles, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

China and porcelain ware, also earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured and Rockingham ware, white granite or iron stoneware, "C.C." or cream-coloured ware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Baths, tubs and wash-stands of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Cement, Portland, and hydraulic or water lime, in bags, barrels or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, twelve and one-half cents per one hundred pounds.

Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, ground not clacined, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, calcined or manufactured, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, twelve and one-half cents per one hundred pounds.

Lithographic stones, not engraved, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Grindstones, not mounted, and not less than 36 inches in diameter, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Grindstones, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Flagstones, sandstone and all building stone, not hammered or chiselled; and marble and granite, rough, not hammered or chiselled, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Marble and granite, sawn only; flag stone and all other building stone, dressed; and paving blocks of stone, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Marble and granite, n.e.s., and all manufactures of marble or granite, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of stone, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Roofing slate, twenty-five per cent ad valorem; provided that the duty shall not exceed seventy-five cents per square.

Slate mantels and other manufactures of slate, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Slate pencils, and school writing slates, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mosaic flooring of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.

*Glass and Glassware.*

Common and colourless window glass, and plain coloured, opaque, stained or tinted, or muffled glass, in sheets, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Ornamental, figured, and enamelled coloured glass, vitrified or painted, chipped, figured, enamelled, and obscured white glass; stained glass windows, and memorial or other ornamental window glass, n.o.p., and rough rolled plate glass, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Plate glass, viz.: Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes, not exceeding twenty-five

square feet each, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Plate glass, bevelled, in sheets or panes, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Silvered glass, bevelled or not, and framed or not, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

German looking-glass place (thin plate), unsilvered or for silvering, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Glass demijohns or carboys, empty or filled, bottles, decanters, flasks, phials, glass jars and glass balls, lamp chimneys, glass shades or globes, cut, pressed or moulded crystal or glass tableware, decorated or not, and blown glass tableware, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Bent plate or other sheet glass, and all other glass, and manufactures of glass, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Spectacles and eye-glasses, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Spectacle and eye-glass frames, and metal parts thereof, twenty per cent ad valorem.

*Leather, Rubber and Manufactures of.*

Dongola, cordovan, calf, sheep, lamb, kid or goat; kangaroo, alligator, or other upper leather, and all leather, dressed, waxed, glazed or further finished than tanned, n.e.s., harness leather, and chamois skin, seventeen and one-half per cent ad valorem.

Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; sole leather, and belting leather of all kinds, tanners' scrap leather; and leather and skins, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Glove leathers, tanned or dressed, coloured or uncoloured, when imported by glove manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of gloves, ten per cent ad valorem.

Japanned, patent or enamelled leather, and morocco leather, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Leather-board, leatheroid, and manufactures thereof, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Whips of all kinds, including thongs and lashes, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Belting, of leather or other material, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Boots and shoes, and slippers, of any material, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of raw hide, and all manufactures of leather, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

India-rubber boots and shoes; rubber belting, rubber cement and all manufactures of india-rubber, and gutta percha, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

India-rubber clothing and clothing made waterproof with india-rubber, rubber or gutta percha hose, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, rubber mats or matting, and rubber packing, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

*Metals, and Manufactures of.*

Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use, one dollar per ton. Nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be re-manufactured in rolling mills.

Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, and cast scrap iron, two dollars and fifty cents per ton.

- Ferro-silicon, ferro-manganese, and spiegeleisen, five per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, puddled bars and loops or other forms n.o.p., less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings, two dollars per ton.**
- Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, girders and other rolled shapes or sections, weighing less than thirty pounds per lineal yard, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.o.p., seven dollars per ton.**
- Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, joists, girders, tees, stars or other rolled shapes, or trough, bridge, building or structural rolled sections or shapes, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.e.s.; and flat eye-bar blanks not punched or drilled, ten per cent ad valorem.**
- Bar iron or steel, rolled, whether in coils, rods, bars or bundles, comprising rounds, ovals, squares, and flats; and rolled shapes, n.o.p.; and rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, eight inches or less in width, number eighteen gauge and thicker, n.e.s., seven dollars per ton.**
- Universal mill or rolled edge bridge plates of steel when imported by manufacturers of bridges, ten per cent ad valorem.**
- Rolled iron or steel plates not less than thirty inches in width, and not less than one-quarter of an inch in thickness, n.o.p., ten per cent ad valorem.**
- Rolled iron or steel sheets or plates, sheared or unshaped, and skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, n.e.s., seven dollars per ton.**
- Skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, when imported by manufacturers of wrought iron or steel pipe for use only in the manufacture of wrought iron or steel pipe in their own factories, five per cent ad valorem.**
- Rolled iron or steel sheets number seventeen gauge, and thinner, n.o.p., Canada plates, Russia iron, flat galvanized iron or steel sheets, terne plate, and rolled sheets of iron or steel coated with zinc, spelter or other metal, of all widths or thicknesses n.o.p., and rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, thinner than number eighteen gauge, n.e.s., five per cent ad valorem.**
- Chrome steel, fifteen per cent ad valorem.**
- Steel, in bars, bands, hoops, scroll or strips, sheets or plates, of any size, thickness or width, when of greater value than two and one-half cents per pound, n.o.p., five per cent ad valorem.**
- Swedish rolled iron and Swedish rolled steel nail rods under half an inch in diameter, for the manufacture of horse-shoe nails, fifteen per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron and steel railway bars or rails of any form, punched or not punched, n.e.s., for railways,—which term for the purposes of this item shall include all kinds of railways, street railways and tramways, even although the same are used for private purposes only, and even although they are not used or intended to be used in connection with the business of common carrying of goods or passengers, thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Railway fish plates and tie plates, eight dollars per ton.**
- Switches, frogs, crossings and intersections for railways, thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Locomotives for railways, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel bridges, or parts thereof; iron or steel structural work, columns, shapes or sections, drilled, punched or in any further stage of manufacture than as rolled or cast, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size or in whatever stage of manufacture, n.e.s., and steel shafting turned, compressed or polished; and hammered iron or steel bars or shapes, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel castings, in the rough, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Stove plates, stoves of all kinds, for oil, gas, coal or wood, or parts thereof, and sad or smoothing, hatters' and tailors' irons, plated wholly or in part, or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Springs, axles, axle bars, n.e.s., and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, for railway or tramway or other vehicles, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Cart or wagon skins or boxes, thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Cast iron pipe of every description, eight dollars per ton.**
- Wrought iron or steel boiler tubes, n.e.s., including flues and corrugated tubes for marine boilers, five per cent ad valorem.**
- Tubes of rolled steel, seamless not joined or welded, not more than one and one-half inches in diameter; and seamless steel tubes for bicycles, ten per cent ad valorem.**
- Wrought iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, over two inches in diameter, n.e.s., fifteen per cent ad valorem.**
- Wrought iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, two inches or less in diameter, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Other iron or steel pipe or tubing, plain or galvanized, riveted, corrugated or otherwise specially manufactured, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel fittings for iron or steel pipe, of every description, and chilled iron or steel rolls, thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel cut nails and spikes, (ordinary builders'); and railroad spikes, one-half of one cent per pound.**
- Wrought and pressed nails and spikes, trunk, clout, coopers', cigar box, Hungarian, horse-shoe, and other nails, n.e.s., horse, mule, and ox shoes, thirty per cent ad valorem.**
- Wire nails of all kinds, n.o.p., three-fifths of one cent per pound.**
- Composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails, fifteen per cent ad valorem.**
- Iron or steel shoe tacks, and ordinary cut tacks, leathered or not, brads, sprigs, and shoe nails, double pointed tacks, and other tacks of iron and steel, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Screws, commonly called "wood screws," of iron or steel, brass or other metal, including lag or coach screws, plated or not, and machine or other screws, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.**
- Coil chain, coil chain links, and chain shackles, of iron or steel, five-sixteenths of an inch in diameter and over, five per cent ad valorem.**
- Barbed wire; and galvanized wire for fencing, numbers nine, twelve and thirteen gauge, fifteen per cent ad valorem, until 1st January, 1898, thereafter free.**
- Buckthorn, strip fencing, woven wire fencing, and wire fencing of iron or steel, n.e.s., fifteen per cent ad valorem.**

- Wire, single or several, covered with cotton, linen, silk, rubber or other material, including cable so covered, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Wire, viz. :—Brass wire, plain, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Copper wire, plain, tinned or plated, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Wire cloth, or woven wire of brass or copper, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Wire of all other metals or kinds, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Wire rope, stranded or twisted wire, clothes line, picture or other twisted wire and wire cable, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Wire cloth or woven wire, and wire netting, of iron or steel, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Needles, of any material or kind, n.e.s., and pins manufactured from wire of any metal, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Lead, old, scrap, pig and block, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Lead, in bars, and in sheets, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Lead pipe, lead shot and lead bullets, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Lead, manufactures of, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Brass and copper nails, tacks, rivets and burrs or washers ; bells, and gongs, n.e.s., and all manufactures of brass or copper, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Zinc, manufactures of, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Nickel anodes, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Iron or steel nuts, washers, rivets, and bolts with or without threads, and nut, bolt and hinge blanks, and T and strap hinges of all kinds, n.e.s., three-quarters of one cent per pound and twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Builders', cabinet-makers', upholsterers', harness-makers', saddlers', and carriage hardware, including butt hinges, locks, curry combs or curry cards, horse-boots, harness and saddlery, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Skates of all kinds, roller or other, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Gas meters, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Safes, doors for safes and vaults ; scales, balances, weighing beams, and strength-testing machines of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Carvers, knives and forks of steel, butcher and table steels, oyster, bread, kitchen, cooks', butcher, shoe, farrier, putty, hacking, and glaziers' knives, cigar knives, spatulas or palette knives, razors, erasers, or office knives, pen, pocket, pruning, sportsman and hunters' knives, manicure files, scissors, trimmers ; and barbers', tailors' and lamp shears, horse and toilet clippers, and all like cutlery, plated or not, n.o.p.,—When any of the above articles are imported in cases or cabinets, the cases or cabinets shall be dutiable at the same rate as their contents, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Knife blades or blanks, and table forks of iron or steel in the rough, not handled, filed, ground or otherwise manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Celluloid, moulded into sizes for handles of knives and forks, not bored nor otherwise manufactured ; also, moulded celluloid balls and cylinders, coated with tin-foil or not, but not finished or further manufactured, and celluloid lamp shade blanks, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Bird, parrot, squirrel and rat cages, of wire, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Files and rasps, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, saws, wedges, sledges, hammers, crow-bars, cant-dogs and track tools ; picks, mattocks, and eyes or poles for the same ; anvils, vises ; and tools of all kinds, for hand or for machine use, including shoemakers' and tinsmiths' tools or bench machines, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, pronged forks, snaths, farm, road, or field rollers, post-hole diggers, and other agriculture implements, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.e.s. ; shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for the same ; and lawn mowers, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Britannia metal, nickel silver, Nevada and German silver, manufactures of, not plated, and manufactures of aluminum, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Sterling or other silverware ; nickel platedware, gilt or electro platedware, wholly or in part, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Telephone and telegraph instruments, electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors, dynamos, generators, sockets, insulators of all kinds ; and electric apparatus, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Electric light carbons and carbon points, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Carbons over six inches in circumference, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Lamps, side-lights, and head-lights, lanterns, chandeliers, gas, coal or other oil fixtures and electric light fixtures, or metal parts thereof, including lava or other tips, burners, collars, galleries, shades and shade holders, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Lamp springs ; and glass bulbs for electric lights, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Babbit metal, type metal, phosphor tin and phosphor bronze in blocks, bars, plates, sheets and wire, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Type for printing, including chases, quoins and slugs, of all kinds, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Plates engraved on wood, steel, or other metal, and transfers taken from the same, including engravers' plates of steel, polished, engraved or for engraving thereupon, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, n.e.s., and matrices or copper shells for the same, one and one-half cent per square inch.
- Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or partly of metal or celluloid, one-fourth of one cent per square inch, and matrices or copper shells for the same, one and one-half cent per square inch.
- Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Buckles of iron, steel, brass or copper, of all kinds, n.o.p. (not being jewellery), thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Guns, rifles, including air guns and air rifles not being toys, muskets, cannons, pistols, revolvers, or other fire arms ; cartridge cases, cartridge primers, percussion caps, wads, or other ammunition, n.o.p. ; bayonets, swords, fencing foils and masks ; gun or pistol covers or cases, game bags, loading tools and cartridge belts of any material, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Agate, granite, or enamelled iron or steel hollow ware, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Enamelled iron or steel ware, n.e.s.; iron or steel hollow ware, plain black, tinned or coated; and nickel and aluminum kitchen or household hollow ware, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Tinware, plain, japanned, or lithographed, and all manufactures of tin, n.e.s., and manufactures of galvanized sheet iron or of galvanized sheet steel, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Signs, of any material, framed or not; and letters of any material for signs or similar use, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fire engines and fire extinguishing machines, including sprinklers for fire protection, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Brass pumps of all kinds, and garden or lawn sprinklers, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Printing presses, printing machines, lithographic presses and type-making accessories therefor; folding machines, bookbinders', book-binding, ruling, embossing and paper-cutting machines, and parts thereof, ten per cent ad valorem.

Sewing machines, and parts thereof, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Steam engines, boilers, ore crushers and rock crushers, stamp mills, Cornish and belted rolls, rock drills, air compressors, cranes, derricks, percussion coal cutters, pumps, n.e.s., windmills, horse-powers, portable engines, threshers, separators, fodder or feed cutters, potato diggers, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm wagons, slot machines and type writers, and all machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Machine card clothing, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mould boards or shaves, or plough plates, land sides, and other plates for agricultural implements, when cut to shape from rolled plates of steel, but not moulded, punched, polished or otherwise manufactured, five per cent ad valorem.

Mowing machines, harvesters self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders, weeders, and malleable sprocket or link belting chain for binders, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Trawls, trawling spoons, fly hooks, sinkers, swivels, and sportsman's fishing bait, and fish hooks, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Patterns of brass, iron, steel or other metal (not being models), thirty per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures, articles or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, and whether wholly or partly manufactured, thirty per cent ad valorem.

#### *Vehicles.*

Freight wagons, drays, sleighs and similar vehicles, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Buggies, carriages, pleasure carts and similar vehicles, n.e.s.; including cutters, children's carriages and sleds, and finished parts thereof, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Railway cars (or other cars), wheelbarrows, trucks, road or railway scrapers and hand carts, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Bicycles and tricycles, thirty per cent ad valorem.

#### *Manufactures of Wood, Cane, Cork.*

Cane, reed or rattan, split or otherwise manufactured, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Corks, and other manufactures of cork wood or cork bark, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Sawed boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Lumber and timber, manufactured, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Pails and tubs of wood; churns, brooms and whisks, washboards, pounders and rolling pins, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Veneers of wood, not over three thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness, seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.

Mouldings of wood, plain, gilded or otherwise further manufactured, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wood pulp, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of wood, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Fishing rods, walking sticks and walking canes, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Picture frames and photograph frames, of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Umbrella, parasol and sunshade sticks or handles, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Coffins and caskets, and metal parts thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Show cases, of all kinds, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Billiard tables, with or without pockets, and bagatelle tables or boards, cues, balls, cue racks and cue tips, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Vulcanized fibre, kartavert, indurated fibre, and like material, and manufactures of, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Blinds of wood, metal or other material, not textile or paper, thirty per cent ad valorem.

House, office, cabinet or store furniture, of wood, iron or other material, in parts or finished; wire screens, wire doors and wire windows; cash registers; window cornices and cornice poles of all kinds; hair, spring and other mattresses, bolsters and pillows; including furniture springs and carpet sweepers, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Window shade or blind rollers, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

#### *Jewellery and Material therefor, &c.*

Watch cases, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Clocks, watches, watch glasses, clock and watch keys, and clock movements, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Watch actions and movements, ten per cent ad valorem.

Precious stones, n.e.s., polished, but not set, pierced or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, ten per cent ad valorem.

Composition metal for the manufacture of jewellery and filled gold watch cases, ten per cent ad valorem.

Jewellery for the adornment of the person, including hat pins, hair pins, belt or other buckles, and similar personal ornamental articles commercially known as jewellery, n.o.p.; and all manufactures of gold and silver, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fancy writing desks, fancy cases for jewellery, watches, silverware, platedware and cutlery; glove, handkerchief and collar boxes or cases, brush or toilet cases, and all fancy cases for similar fancy articles of any material; fans, dolls and toys of all kinds; ornaments of alabaster, spar, amber, terra cotta or composition; statuettes and bead ornaments, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Gold, silver, and aluminum leaf, Dutch or schlag metal leaf; brocade and bronze powders and gold liquid paint, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

*Minerals.*

Asbestos in any form other than crude, and all manufactures thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Plumbago, not ground or otherwise manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.

Plumbago, ground, and manufactures of, n.e.s., and foundry facings of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

*Musical Instruments.*

Pianofortes, organs and musical instruments of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Brass band instruments; parts of piano fortes, and parts of organs, twenty-five per cent ad valorem. Provided that musical instrument cases shall be dutiable at the same rate as their contents when imported containing the instruments.

*Textiles, Hats, Furs, Etc.*

Cotton batts, batting and sheet wadding, cotton warps and cotton yarns, dyed or not, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton fabrics, white or gray, bleached or unbleached, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Damask of linen, stair linen, diaper, napkins, doylies, table and tray cloths, sheets, quilts, towels and like articles of linen or cotton, or of linen and cotton combined, made up or not, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Embroideries, n.e.s., laces, braids, fringes, cords, elastic, round or flat; garter elastic, tassels and bracelets, n.o.p.; braids, chains, cords or other manufactures of hair, n.e.s.; handkerchiefs of all kinds; lace collars and all similar lace goods; lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk, or other material; shams, curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed; regalia, badges and belts of all kinds, n.o.p., linen, silk and cotton clothing, and all other articles made up by the seamstress from linen or cotton fabrics, n.o.p.; corsets of all kinds, corset clasps, busks, blanks and steels, and corset wires, tipped or untipped, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

(a) White cotton embroideries, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Jeans, sateens and coutils, when imported by corset and dress stay makers for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Collars, and cuffs, of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite or celluloid, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shirts of any material, and ladies or misses blouses, and shirt waists, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Crapes, black, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Ribbons of all kinds and materials and manufactures of silk or of which silk is the component part of chief value, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton sewing thread in hanks, three and six cord, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Cotton sewing thread and crochet cotton, on spools or tubes, or in balls, and all other cotton thread, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FIELDING.

Silk in the gum, or spun, not more advanced than singles, tram and thrown organzine, not coloured, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Sewing and embroidery silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Jute cloth, uncoloured, not otherwise finished than bleached or calendered, ten per cent ad valorem.

Horse clothing of jute, shaped or otherwise manufactured, thirty per cent ad valorem.

All manufactures of hemp, flax or jute, n.e.s., or of flax, hemp and jute combined, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Bags or sacks of hemp, linen or jute, and cotton seamless bags, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Felt, pressed, of all kinds, not filled or covered by or with any woven fabric, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Hair-cloth of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Sails for boats and ships, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cloths, not rubbered or made waterproof, whether of wool, cotton, unions, silk or ramie, sixty inches or over in width and weighing not more than seven ounces to the square yard, when imported exclusively for the manufacture of mackintosh clothing, under regulations to be adopted by the Governor in Council, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Featherbone, plain or covered in colls, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Stockinettes for the manufacture of rubber boots and shoes, when imported by manufacturers of rubber boots and shoes, for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Cotton duck, gray or white, n.e.s., twenty two and one-half per cent ad valorem

Oiled silk and oiled cloth, and tape or other textile india-rubbered, flocked or coated, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, alpacas, orleans, cashmeres, henriettas, serges, buntings, nun's cloth, bengalines, whip cords, twills, plains or jacquards of similar fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat, or like animal, not exceeding in weight six ounces to the square yard, when imported in the gray or unfinished state for the purpose of being dyed or finished in Canada, under such regulations as are established by the Governor in Council, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Socks and stockings of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Knitted goods, n.e.s., undershirts and drawers, and hosiery of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shawls of all kinds; railway or travelling rugs and lap dusters of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Wool, viz.:—Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, South Down combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools, such as are grown in Canada, three cents per pound.

Worsted tops made from such wools as are mentioned in this item, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Yarns, woollen and worsted, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Yarns, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or like animal, costing thirty cents per pound and over, when imported on the cop, tube or in the hank by manufacturers of woollen goods for use in their products, twenty per cent ad valorem.

- Fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel, and ready-made clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal, n.e.s.; blankets, bed comforters, or counterpanes, flannels, cloths, doe-skins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, over-coatings and felt cloth, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Mats, door or carriage, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Carpeting, rugs, mats and matting of cocoa, straw, hemp, or jute; carpet linings and stair pads, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Turkish or imitation Turkish or other rugs or carpets; and carpets, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Enamelled carriage, floor, shelf, and table oil-cloth, linoleum, and cork matting or carpets, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Window shades in the piece or cut and hemmed or mounted on rollers, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Webbing, elastic and non-elastic, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Umbrellas, parasols and sunshades of all kinds and materials, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Gloves and mitts, of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Hats, caps and bonnets, n.e.s., and hat, cap and bonnet shapes, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Braces or suspenders, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Boot, shoe and stay laces, of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Fur skins, wholly or partially dressed, n.e.s., fifteen per cent ad valorem.
- Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Church vestments of any material, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Sundries.*
- Ships and other vessels, built in any foreign country, whether steam or sailing vessels, on application for Canadian register, on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery and all appurtenances; on the hull, rigging and all appurtenances, except machinery, ten per cent ad valorem; on boilers, steam engines and other machinery, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Canoes, skiffs, or open pleasure sail-boats, of any material, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Canvas and sail twine of hemp and flax, when to be used for boats' and ships' sails, five per cent ad valorem.
- Blasting and mining powder, two cents per pound.
- Cannon, musket, rifle, gun and sporting powder and canister powder, three cents per pound.
- Nitro-glycerine, giant powder, nitro and other explosives, three cents per pound.
- Glycerine, when imported by manufactures of explosives, for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Torpedoes, firecrackers, and fireworks of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.
- Lamp wicks, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Photographic dry plates, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Emery wheels, and manufactures of emery, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Lead pencils, pens, penholders and rulers of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Magic lanterns and slides therefor, philosophical, photographic, mathematical and optical instruments, n.e.s.; cyclometers and pedometers; and tape lines of any material, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Tobacco pipes of all kinds, pipe mounts, cigar and cigarette cases, cigar and cigarette holders, and cases for the same, smokers' sets and cases therefor, and tobacco pouches, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Trunks, valises, hat boxes, carpet bags, tool bags or baskets, satchels, reticules, musical instrument cases, purses, portmanteaus, pocket-books, fly-books, and parts thereof, n.o.p., and baskets of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Frames, clasps and fasteners, for purses and chatelaine bags or reticules not more than seven inches in width, when imported by manufacturers of purses and chatelaine bags or reticules, for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Buttons, viz.: Pantaloon buttons wholly of metal, and shoe buttons, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Buttons of all kinds, covered or not, n.o.p., including recognition buttons, and cuff or collar buttons (not being jewellery), thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Combs for dress and toilet, including mane combs of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Brushes, of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Hair, curled or dyed, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Artificial flowers, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Twine and cordage of all kinds, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Rope, when imported for the manufacture of twine for harvest binders, five per cent ad valorem.
- Binder twine or twine for harvest binders of hemp, jute, manilla or sisal, and of manilla and sisal mixed, ten per cent ad valorem, until January 1st, 1898; thereafter to be free; and all articles upon which duties are levied which enter into the cost of the manufacture of the said twine shall for this purpose then be free, under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.
- Hammocks, lawn tennis nets, sportsman's fish nets, fish lines and chalk lines, n.e.s., and other articles manufactured of twine, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
- Sugar, Syrups and Molasses.*
- All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent per pound; sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings, or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, one-half cent per pound; the usual packages in which imported to be free.
- Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing any admixture thereof, three-fourths of one cent per pound.
- Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, candied peel and pop corn, one-half of one cent per pound, and thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
- Maple sugar, and maple syrup, twenty per cent ad valorem.
- Syrups and molasses of all kinds, n.o.p., the product of the sugar cane or beet, n.e.s., and all imitations thereof or substitutes therefor, three-fourths of one cent per pound.
- Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the

cane without any admixture with any other ingredient, when imported in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing, the package in which imported, when of wood, to be free.

- (a) Testing by polariscope forty degrees or over, one and three-fourth cents per gallon;  
 (b) When testing by polariscope less than forty degrees, and not less than thirty-five degrees, one and three-fourth cents per gallon, and in addition thereto, one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

#### *Tobacco and Manufactures of.*

Cigars and cigarettes, the weight of the cigarettes to include the weight of the paper covering, three dollars per pound, and twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cut tobacco, fifty-five cents per pound.

Manufactured tobacco, n.e.s., and snuff, fifty cents per pound.

Foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act, after 30th June, 1897, ten cents per pound, to be computed on the weight when ex-warehoused.

- (a) Foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act, after 30th June, 1897, fourteen cents per pound, to be computed on the weight when ex-warehoused.

All goods not enumerated in this Act as subject to any other rate of duty, nor declared free of duty by this Act, and not being goods the importation whereof is by this Act or any other Act prohibited, shall be subject to a duty of twenty per cent ad valorem.

#### SCHEDULE " B. "

##### FREE GOODS.

Articles for the use of the Governor General.

Articles when imported by and for the use of the army and navy, viz.: Arms, military or naval clothing, musical instruments for bands, military stores and munitions of war; also articles consigned direct to officers and men on board vessels of Her Majesty's navy, for their own personal use or consumption.

Articles imported by or for the use of the Dominion Government of any of the departments thereof, or by and for the Senate or House of Commons, including the following articles, when imported by the said Government or through any of the departments thereof for the use of the Canadian militia:—Military clothing, musical instruments for military bands, military stores and munitions of war.

Articles for the personal or official use of Consuls General who are natives or citizens of the country they represent and who are not engaged in any other business or profession.

Travellers' baggage, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Carriages for travellers and carriages laden with merchandise, and not to include circus troupes or hawkers, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada; books, pictures, family plate or furniture, personal effects and heirlooms left by bequest.

Settlers' effects, viz.: Wearing apparel, household furniture, books, implements and tools of

Mr. FIELDING.

trade, occupation or employment, guns, musical instruments, domestic sewing machines, typewriters, live stock, bicycles, carts and other vehicles and agricultural implements in use by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada, not to include machinery, or articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment, or for sale; provided that any dutiable article entered as settlers' effects may not be so entered unless brought with the settler on his first arrival, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty, until after twelve months' actual use in Canada; provided, also, that under regulations made by the Controller of Customs, live stock, when imported into Manitoba or the North-west Territories by intending settlers, shall be free until otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council.

Animals and articles brought into Canada temporarily and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or of competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association; (but a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals or articles would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not re-exported within the time specified in such bond).

Horses, cattle, sheep, swine and dogs for the improvement of stock, under regulations made by the Treasury Board and approved by the Governor in Council.

Menageries, horses, cattle, carriages and harness of, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Admiralty charts.

Typewriters, tablets with movable fixtures, and musical instruments, when imported by and for the use of schools for the blind, and being and remaining the sole property of the governing bodies of the said schools and not of private individuals; the above particulars to be verified by special affidavit on each entry when presented.

Globes, geographical, topographical and astronomical; maps and charts for the use of schools for the blind; pictorial illustrations of insects or similar studies, when imported for the use of colleges, schools and scientific and literary societies; manuscripts and insurance maps, and album insides of paper.

Philosophical instruments and apparatus—that is to say, such as are not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in universities, colleges, schools, scientific societies, and public hospitals.

Botanical and entomological specimens; mineralogical specimens; skins of birds, and skins of animals not natives of Canada, for taxidermic purposes, not further manufactured than prepared for preservation; fish skins; and anatomical preparations and skeletons or parts thereof; and specimens, models and wall diagrams for illustration of natural history for universities and public museums.

Books, viz.: Books on the application of science to industries of all kinds, including books on agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fish and fishing, mining, metallurgy, architecture, electric and other engineering, carpentry, ship-building, mechanism, dyeing, bleaching, tanning, weaving and other mechanic arts, and similar industrial books; also books printed in any language other than the English and French languages, or in any two languages not being English and French, or in any three or more

- languages ; and bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, religious tracts and Sunday school lesson pictures.
- Books, embossed, for the blind, and books for the instruction of the deaf and dumb and blind.**
- Books printed by or for any government or by any association for the promotion of science or letters, and official annual reports of religious or benevolent associations, and issued in the course of the proceedings of the said associations, to their members, and not for the purpose of sale or trade.**
- Books, not printed or reprinted in Canada, which are included and used as text books in the curriculum of any university, incorporated college or normal school in Canada ; books specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, libraries of universities, colleges and schools, or for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific or art association or society, and being the property of the organized authorities of such library, and not in any case the property of individuals,—the whole under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs, provided that importers of books who have sold the same for the purpose mentioned in this item, shall upon proof of sale and delivery for such purpose be entitled to a refund of any duty paid thereon.**
- Books, bound or unbound, which have been printed and manufactured more than twelve years.**
- Newspapers, and quarterly, monthly and semi-monthly magazines, and weekly literary papers unbound ; and tailors', milliners and mantlemakers' fashion plates.**
- Faintings, in oil or watercolours, by artists of well known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists ; and paintings in oil or water colours, the production of Canadian artists, under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.**
- Clothing and books, donations of, for charitable purposes, and photographs not exceeding three, sent by friends and not for purpose of sale.**
- Life boats and life-saving apparatus specially imported by societies established to encourage the saving of human life.**
- Coins, cabinets of, collections of medals and of other antiquities, including collection of postage stamps ; gold and silver coins, except United States silver coin ; medals of gold, silver or copper and other metallic articles actually bestowed as trophies or prizes and received and accepted as honorary distinctions, and cups or other prizes won in bona fide competitions ; and medals commemorating the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria until the thirty-first December, 1897, and dies for manufacturing such medals.**
- Locomotive and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, being the property of railway companies in the United States, running upon any line of road crossing the frontier, so long as Canadian locomotives and cars are admitted free under similar circumstances in the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.**
- Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts,—but no article or articles shall be deemed a model or models which can be fitted for use.**
- Aluminum in ingots, blocks or bars, strips, sheets or plates ; alumina and chloride of aluminum, or chloralum, sulphate of alumina and alum cake ; and alum in bulk only, ground or unground.**
- Anbergris ammonia, sulphate of sal-ammoniac and nitrate of ammonia ; arsenic ; bromine ;**
- Burgundy pitch ; cinnebar, cochineal, cyanide of potassium and cyanogen or compound of bromine and potassium for reducing metals in mining operations ; iodine crude, kryolite or cryolite, mineral ; oxalic acid ; quinine, salts of ; saltpetre ; calcareous tufa ; alizarine and artificial alizarine ; aniline oil, crude ; aniline salts and arseniate of aniline ; annato, liquid or solid ; aniline dyes and coal tar dyes in bulk or packages of not less than one pound weight.**
- Antimony salts ; antimony, or regulus of, not ground, pulverized or otherwise manufactured.**
- Asphalt or asphaltum ; bone pitch, crude only ; and resin or rosin in packages of not less than one hundred pounds ; and resin oil.**
- Anchors for vessels.**
- Bees.**
- Bells, when imported for the use of churches only.**
- Bismuth, metallic, in its natural state ; blood albumen and tannic acid.**
- Blast furnace slag.**
- Blanketing and lapping, and discs or mills for engraving copper rollers, when imported by cotton manufacturers, calico printers, and wall paper manufacturers, for use in their own factories only.**
- Bolting cloth not made up.**
- Bones, crude, not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed.**
- Bookbinders' cloth.**
- Boracic acid, and borax, ground or unground, in bulk of not less than twenty-five pounds.**
- Bristles, broom corn, and hair brush pads.**
- Brass and copper, old and scrap, or in blocks ; and brass or copper in bolts, bars and rods in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, unmanufactured ; and brass or copper in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated ; and brass or copper tubing, in lengths of not less than six feet, not polished, bent or otherwise manufactured ; and copper in ingots or pigs.**
- Britannia metal in pigs, blocks or bars.**
- Buckram, when imported for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes.**
- Bullion, gold and silver, in ingots, blocks, bars, drops, sheets or plates unmanufactured ; gold and silver sweepings ; and bullion or gold fringe.**
- Burr-stones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, not bound up or prepared for binding into mill-stones.**
- Caplins, unfinished Leghorn hats, and manilla hoods.**
- Casts as models for the use of schools of design.**
- Cane and rattans, not manufactured ; osiers or willows ; and bamboos, unmanufactured, and bamboo reeds not further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for walking sticks or canes, or for sticks for umbrellas, parasols or sunshades.**
- Cat-gut or gut cord for musical instruments ; and cat-gut or worm gut, unmanufactured, for whip and other cord.**
- Celluloid, xylonite or xyolite in sheets, and in lumps, blocks or balls in the rough.**
- Chloride of lime, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight ; cobalt, ore of ; oxide of cobalt, oxide of tin and oxide of copper, copper, precipitate of, crude ; dragon's blood ; gypsum, crude (sulphate of lime ; lava, unmanufactured ; manganese, oxide of ; phosphorous ; litharge ; saffron, saffron cake, safflower, and extract of ; sulphate of iron (copperas) ; sulphate of copper (blue vitriol) ; sulphur and brimstone, crude, or in roll or flour ; tartar emetic and gray tartar ; cream of tartar in crystals and argal or argols ; verdigris, or**

- sub-acetate of copper, dry ; zinc, salts of, and tartaric acid crystals.
- Chronometers and compasses for ships.
- Citron, lemon and orange rinds in brine.
- Clays, including China clay, fire clay and pipe clay ; gannister and sand.
- Coal, anthracite and anthracite coal dust ; coke.
- Coal and pine pitch, and coal and pine tar in packages of not less than 15 gallons.
- Coir and coir yarn ; raw cotton or cotton wool ; and cotton waste, not dyed, cleaned, bleached or otherwise manufactured ; cotton yarns, number forty and finer ; and mohair yarns.
- Communion plate, when imported for the use of churches.
- Crucibles, clay or plumbago.
- Curling stones.
- Cups, brass, being rough blanks, for the manufacture of paper shells or cartridges, when imported by manufacturers of brass and paper shells and cartridges, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.
- Diamonds, unset, diamond dust or bort and black, for borers ; and diamond drills for prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power.
- Domestic fowls, pure-bred, for the improvement of stock, homing or messenger pigeons and pheasants and quails.
- Drugs, crude, such as barks, flowers, roots, beans, berries, balsams, bulbs, fruits, insects, grains, gums and gum resins, herbs, leaves, nuts, fruit and stem seeds, which are not edible and which are in a crude state and not advanced in value by refining or grinding or any other process of manufacture and not otherwise provided for ; egg yolk ; fuller's earth, in bulk only, not prepared for toilet or other purposes ; lead, nitrate and acetate of, not ground ; litmus and all lichens, prepared or not prepared ; musk, in pods or in grain ; roots, medicinal, viz. :—alkanet, crude, crushed or ground, aconite, calumba, foliæ digitalis, gentian, ginseng, jalap, ipecacuanha, iris, orris root, liquorice, sarsaparilla, squills, taraxacum, rhubarb and valerian, unground ; vaccine and ivory vaccine points ; gum chicle or sappato gum, crude ; platinum and black oxide of copper, for use in the manufacture of chlorate ; potash, chlorate of, not further prepared than ground, and free from admixture with any other substance, and bacteriological products or serums for subcutaneous injection.
- Duck for belting and hose, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories ; and canvas or fabric, not frictionized for the manufacture of bicycle tires when imported by the manufacturer of bicycle tires for use exclusively in the manufacture of bicycle tires in their own factories.
- Dyeing or tanning articles, in a crude state, used in dyeing or tanning, n.e.s. ; berries for dyeing or used for composing dyes ; tumeric, nut galls and extracts thereof ; lac, crude, seed, button, stick and shell ; indigo, indigo paste and extract of, and indigo auxiliary or zinc dust, persis, or extract of archill and cudbear ; terra japonica ; gambier or cutch, extract of logwood, fustic, oak and oak bark ; quebracho, camwood and sumac and extract thereof, tanner's bark, hemlock bark and oak bark ; ground logwood, ground fustic, patent prepared dyes and ground oak bark ; iron liquor, solutions of acetate or nitrate of iron for dyeing and calico printing ; madder and munjeet or Indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of ; red liquor, a crude acetate of aluminum prepared from pyroligneous acid, for dyeing and calico printing.
- Emery in bulk, crushed or ground.
- Felt, adhesive for sheathing vessels.
- Fertilizers, uncompounded or unmanufactured, including phosphate rock, kainite or German potash salts, German mineral potash, bonedust, bone black or charred bone and boncask, fish offal or refuse, guano and other animal or vegetable manures.
- Fibre, Mexican, natural, and tampico or istle and vegetable fibres ; fibrilla, flax fibre and flax tow ; grass, manilla, esparto or Spanish, and other grasses, and pulp of, including fancy grasses, dried but not coloured or otherwise manufactured ; moss, Iceland, and other mosses, seagrass and seaweed, crude or in their natural state, or cleaned only ; and kelp.
- Fire bricks, for use in processes of manufacture, or for manufacturing purposes.
- Fillets of cotton and rubber not exceeding seven inches wide when imported by and for the use of manufacturers of card clothing in their own factories.
- Fish hooks, for deep sea or lake fishing, not smaller in size than No. 2·0 ; bank, cod, pollock and mackerel fish lines ; and mackerel, herring, salmon, seal, seine, mullet, net and trawl twine in hanks or coil, barked or not—in variety of sizes and threads—including gilling thread in balls and head ropes, barked marline, and net morsels of cotton, hemp or flax, and deep-sea fishing nets or seines, when used exclusively for the fisheries, and not to include hooks, lines or nets commonly used for sportsmen's purposes.
- Flint, flints and ground flint stones ; felspar, cliff, chalk, China or Cornwall stone, ground or unground ; gravels ; precious stones, in the rough.
- Florist stock, viz. : Palms, bulbs, corms, tubers, rhizomes auricula, spiroea and lily of the valley.
- Seedling stock for grafting, viz. : plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees ; seeds, viz. : annato, beet, carrot, flax, turnip, mangold, mustard, sowing rape seed and mushroom spawn ; aromatic seeds which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by grinding or refining, or by any other process of manufacture, viz. : anise, anise star, caraway, cardamon, coriander, cumin, fennel and fenugreek ; and seed pease and seed beans from Britain ; beans, viz. : tonquin, vanilla and nux vomica, crude only, locust beans and locust bean meal, and cocoa beans, not roasted, crushed or ground ; fruits, viz. : bananas, plantains, pineapples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes and shaddocks ; wild blueberries, wild strawberries and wild raspberries ; and trees, n.e.s.
- Fossils ; shells, tortise and mother of pearl, and other shells, unmanufactured.
- Foot-grease, being the refuse of cotton seed after the oil has been pressed out, but not when treated with alkalis ; and grease, rough, the refuse of animal fat, for the manufacture of soap and oils only.
- Fur skins of all kinds not dressed in any manner.
- Gold-beaters' moulds and gold-beaters' skins.
- Gums, viz. :—Amber, Arabic, Australian, copal, dammar, elemy, kaurie, mastic, sandarac, Senegal, shellac ; and white shellac in gum or flake, for manufacturing purposes ; and gum tragacanth, gum gedda and gum barberry.
- Hair, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled, dyed or otherwise manufactured ; and horse-hair not further manufactured than simply cleaned and dipped or dyed, imported by manufacturers of hair-cloth for use in the manufacture of such article in their own factories.

Mr. FIELDING.

Hatters' furs, not on the skin, and hatters' plush of silk or cotton; and hatters' bands (not cords), bindings, tips and sides, hat sweats and linings both tips and sides, when imported by hat and cap manufacturers for use in the manufacture of these articles only in their own factories.

Hemp, undressed.

Hemp paper, made on four-cylinder machines and calendered to between .006 and .008 inch thickness for the manufacture of shot shells; primers for shot shells and cartridges, and felt board sized and hydraulic pressed, and covered with paper or uncovered, for the manufacture of gun wads, when such articles are imported by manufacturers of shot shells, cartridges and gun wads, to be used for these purposes only in their own factories, until such time as the said articles are manufactured in Canada; Provided always that the said articles, when imported, shall be entered only at such port or ports as are named by the Controller of Customs, and at no other place; samples of such articles to be furnished to the collector of the said port or ports by the Customs Department for the guidance of the officers when accepting free entries of such materials.

Hides and skins, raw, whether dry, salted or pickled, and raw pelts.

Hoofs, horn strips, horn and horn tips, in the rough, not polished or otherwise manufactured than cleaned.

Hoop iron not exceeding three-eighths inch in width and being twenty-five gauge and thinner used for the manufacture of tubular rivets.

Ice.

Indian corn, not for purposes of distillation and under Customs regulations.

Ingot moulds, iron sand or globules or iron shot and dry putty for polishing glass or granite.

Iron or steel masts, or parts thereof, and iron or steel beams, angles, sheets, plates, knees and cable chain for wooden, iron, steel or composite ships and vessels; and iron, steel or brass manufactures which at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction or equipment of ships or vessels.

Ivory and ivory nuts, piano key ivories and veneers of ivory unmanufactured.

Junk, old.

Jute and jute butts; and jute cloth, as taken from the loom, not coloured, cropped, mangled, pressed, calendered nor finished in any way.

Jute, flax or hemp yarn, plain, dyed or coloured, jute canvas, not pressed or calendered, when imported by the manufacturers of carpets, rugs and mats, jute webbing or jute cloth, hammocks, twines and floor oil cloth, for use in the manufacture of any of these articles only, in their own factories.

Lamp black and ivory black.

Lastings, mohair cloth, or other manufactures of cloth, when imported by manufacturers of buttons for use in their own factories, and woven or made in patterns of such size, shape or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit for covering buttons, exclusively. These conditions to be ascertained by special examination by the proper officer of customs, and so certified on the face of each entry.

Leeches.

Lime juice, crude only.

Locomotive and car wheel tires of steel, in the rough.

Meerschaum, crude or raw.

Metal glove fasteners; papier-maché shoe buttons, eyelets, eyelet hooks, shoe lace wire fasteners and sewing machine attachments.

Mineral waters, natural, not in bottle, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Machinery imported exclusively for mining, smelting and reducing, viz.: Coal cutting machines except percussion coal cutters, coal heading machines, coal augers and rotary coal drills, core drills, miners' safety lamps, coal washing machinery, coke-making machinery, ore drying machinery, ore roasting machinery, electric or magnetic machines for separating or concentrating iron ores, blast furnace water jackets, converters for metallurgical processes in iron or copper, briquette making machines, ball and rock emery grinding machines, copper plates, plated or not, machinery for extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes, monitors, giants and elevators for hydraulic mining, amalgam safes, automatic ore samplers, automatic feeders, jigs, classifiers, separators, retorts, buddles, vanners, mercury pumps, pyrometers, bullion furnaces, amalgam cleaners, gold mining slime tables, blast furnace blowing engines, wrought iron tubing, butt or lap welded, threaded or coupled or not, not less than 2½ inches diameter, when imported for use exclusively in mining, smelting, reducing or refining.

Nickel; and ores of metal of all kinds; and silex or crystallized quartz.

Oakum.

Oils, viz.:—Cocoonut and palm, in their natural state; and carbolic or heavy oil; oil of roses and ottar or attar of roses, and olive oil for manufacturing soap or tobacco, or for canning fish.

Oil cake and oil cake meal, cotton seed cake and cotton seed meal, and palm nut cake and meal.

Oysters, seed and breeding, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.

Oleo-stearine and degrass.

Palm leaf, unmanufactured.

Plaits, plain, not to include braid or fancy trimmings, composed of chip, manilla, cotton, mohair, straw, Tuscan and grass.

Platinum wire and platinum in bars, strips, sheets or plates; platinum retorts, pans, condensers, tubing and pipe, when imported by manufacturers of sulphuric acid for use in their works in the manufacture or concentration of sulphuric acid.

Potash, muriate and bi-chromate of, crude, caustic potash, and red and yellow prussiate of potash; also pot and pearl ash, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight.

Prunella.

Pumice and pumice stone, ground or unground.

Quicksilver.

Quills in their natural state or unplumed.

Rags of cotton, linen, jute, hemp and woollen, paper waste clippings, and waste of any kind, except mineral.

Rennet, raw and prepared.

Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rings, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough, or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades for use in their factories in the manufacture of umbrellas, parasols, sunshades or walking sticks.

Rubber and gutta percha, crude, caoutchouc or india-rubber, unmanufactured; powdered rubber and rubber waste; hard rubber in sheets but not further manufactured, and recovered rubber and rubber substitute.

Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diam-

eter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in making wire in the coil, in their own factories.

Rubber thread, elastic.

Reeds, square or round, and raw-hide centres, textile leather or rubber heads, thumbs and tips, and steel, iron or nickel caps for whip ends, when imported by whip manufacturers, for use in the manufacture of whips in their own factories.

Rollers, copper, for use in calico printing, when imported by calico printers for use in their factories in the printing of calicoes and for no other purpose (such rollers not being manufactured in Canada).

Astrachan or Russian hare skins and China goat plates or rugs, wholly or partially dressed but not dyed.

Salt, imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.

Sausage skins or casings, not cleaned.

Scrap iron and scrap steel, old and fit only to be re-manufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Canada.

Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture in any way; silk cocoons and silk waste.

Silk in the gum or spun when imported by manufacturers of silk underwear to be used for such manufacture in their own factories.

Silver, nickel and German, in ingots, blocks, bars, strips, sheets or plates, unmanufactured.

Steel rails, weighing not less than forty-five pounds per lineal yard for use only in the tracks of a railway which is employed in the common carrying of goods and passengers and is operated by steam motive power only; provided that this item shall not extend to rails for tracks of a railway which is used for private purposes only, nor shall this item extend to rails for use in the tracks of any electric railway, street railway, or tramway.

Soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake, barilla or soda ash, caustic soda; silicate of soda in crystals or in solution; bichromate of soda, nitrate of soda or cubic nitre, sal soda, sulphide of sodium, nitrate of soda, arseniate, binarseniate, chloride, chlorate, bisulphite and stannate of soda.

Spurs and stiltis, used in the manufacture of earthenware.

Steel bowls for cream separators, and cream separators.

Steel for saws and straw cutters cut to shape, but not further manufactured.

(a) Crucible sheet steel, eleven to sixteen gauge, two and one-half to eighteen inches wide for the manufacture of mower and reaper knives, when imported by the manufacturer thereof for use of such purposes in their own factories.

(b) Steel of number twenty gauge and thinner, but not thinner than number thirty gauge, for the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for exclusive use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

(c) Flat steel wire, of number sixteen gauge or thinner, when imported by the manufacturers of crinoline or corset wire and dress stays, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

(d) Steel valued at two and one-half cents per pound and upwards, when imported by the manufacturers of skates, for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

Mr. FIELDING.

(e) Steel, under one-half inch in diameter, or under one-half inch square, when imported by the manufacturers of cutlery, or of knobs, or of locks, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

(f) Steel of number twelve gauge and thinner, but not thinner than thirty gauge, for the manufacture of buckle clasps, bed fasts and furniture castors and ice creepers, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles, for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

(g) Steel of number twenty-four and seventeen gauge, in sheets sixty-three inches long, and from eighteen to thirty-two inches wide, when imported by the manufacturers of tubular bow sockets for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

(h) Steel for the manufacture of bicycle chains, when imported by the manufacturers of bicycle chain for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

(i) Steel for the manufacture of files, augers, auger bits, hammers, axes, hatchets, scythes, reaping hooks, hoes, hand rakes, hay or straw knives, windmills and agriculture or harvesting forks, when imported by the manufacturers of such or any of such articles for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

(j) Steel springs for the manufacture of surgical trusses, when imported by the manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

(k) Flat spring steels, steel billets and steel axle bars, when imported by manufacturers of carriage springs and carriage axles for use exclusively in the manufacture of springs and axles for carriages or vehicles other than railway or tramway, in their own factories.

(l) Spiral spring steel for spiral springs for railways when imported by the manufacturers of railway springs for use exclusively in the manufacture of railway spiral springs in their own factories.

Steel strip and flat steel wire when imported into Canada by manufacturers of buckthorn and plain strip fencing, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories; and barbed fencing wire of iron or steel after January 1, 1898.

(a) Galvanized iron or steel wire number nine, twelve and thirteen gauge, after the 1st January, 1898.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns in any language other than French and English, and of books, and bases and matrices of copper shells for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid.

Surgical and dental instruments (not being furniture) and surgical needles, after 1st January, 1898.

Artificial limbs.

Tagging metal, plain, japanned or coated, in coils, not over one and a half inch in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoe and corset laces for use in their factories.

Tails, undressed.

Tea and green coffee imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea and green coffee purchased in bond in the United Kingdom, provided there is satisfactory proof that the tea or coffee so purchased in bond is such as might be entered for home consumption in the said United Kingdom.

**Teasels.**

Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars and sheets, tin plates, tin crystals, tin strip waste, and tin foil, tea lead.

Timber or lumber or wood, viz.:—lumber and timber planks and boards of amaranth, cocoboral, boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satin-wood and white ash, when not otherwise manufactured than rough sawn or split or creosoted, vulcanized or treated by any other preserving process; sawed or split boards, planks, deals and other lumber, when not further manufactured than dressed on one side only or creosoted, vulcanized or treated by any preserving process; pine and spruce clapboards, timber or lumber, hewn or sawed, squared or sided or creosoted; laths, pickets and palings; staves not listed or jointed, of wood of all kinds; fire wood, handle, heading stave and shingle bolts, hop poles, fence posts, railroad ties; hubs for wheels, posts, last blocks, wagon, oar, gun, heading and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only; felloes of hickory wood, rough sawn to shape only, or rough sawn and bent to shape, not planed, smoothed or otherwise manufactured; hickory billets, and hickory lumber, sawn to shape for spokes of wheels, but not further manufactured; hickory spokes, rough turned, not tenoned, mitred, throated, faced, sized, cut to length, round tenoned or polished; shingles of wood; the wood of the persimmon and dogwood trees; and logs and round unmanufactured timber, ship timber or ship planking, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act.

(D) shovel handles, wholly of wood, and Mexican saddle trees and stirrups of wood.

Corkwood, or cork bark, unmanufactured.

Sawdust of the following woods:—Amaranth, cocoboral, boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satinwood, white ash, persimmon and dogwood.

**Treenails.**

Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act, until 1st July, 1897.

Tubes, rolled iron not welded or joined, under one and one-half inches in diameter, angle iron, nine and ten gauge, not over one and one-half inch wide, iron tubing, lacquered or brass covered, not over one and one-half inch in diameter,—all of which are to be cut to lengths for the manufacture of bedsteads, and to be used for no other purpose, and brass trimmings for bedsteads, when imported by or for manufacturers of iron or brass bedsteads to be used for such purposes only in their own factories, until such time as any of the said articles are manufactured in Canada.

Turpentine, raw or crude.

**Turtles.**

Ultramarine blue, dry or in pulp.

Varnish, black and bright, for ships' purposes.

Whalebone, unmanufactured.

Whiting or whitening, paris white and gilders' whiting, blanc fixé and satin white.

Wire, crucible cast steel.

Wire rigging for ships and vessels.

Wire, of brass, zinc, iron or steel, screwed or twisted, or flattened or corrugated, for use in connection with nailing machines for the manufacture of boots and shoes, when imported by

the manufacturers of boots and shoes to be used for such purposes only in their own factories.

(a) Steel wire, Bessemer soft drawn spring, of numbers ten, twelve and thirteen gauge, respectively, and homo steel wire of numbers eleven and twelve gauge, respectively, when imported by manufacturers of wire mattresses, to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of such articles.

Wool and the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat and other like animals, not further prepared than washed, n.e.s.; noils, being the short wool which falls from the combs in worsted factories; and worsted tops, n.e.s.

Wool or worsted yarns, when genapped, dyed or finished and imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels and fringes to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.

(a) Yarn spun from the hair of the alpaca or of the angora goat, when imported by manufacturers of braids for use exclusively in their factories in the manufacture of such braids only, under such regulations as are adopted by the Controller of Customs.

Yellow metal, in bolts, bars and for sheathing.

Zinc spelter and zinc in blocks, pigs, sheets and plates; and zinc seamless drawn tubing.

Molasses, second process, or molasses derived from the manufacture of "molasses sugar," testing by polariscope less than thirty-five degrees, when imported by manufacturers of blacking, for use in their own factories, in the manufacture of blacking, conditional that the importers shall, in addition to making oath at the time of entry that such molasses is imported for such use and will not be used for any other purpose, cause such molasses to be at once mixed in a proper tank made for the purpose with at least one-fifth of the quantity thereof of cod, or other oil, whereby such molasses may be rendered unfit for any other use, such mixing to be done in the presence of a customs officer at the expense of the importer, and under such further regulations as may, from time to time, be considered necessary in the interest and for the protection of the revenue, and that until such mixing is done and duly certified on the face of the entry thereof by such customs officer the entry shall be held to be incomplete and the molasses subject to the usual rate of duty as when imported for any other purpose.

Bags, barrels, boxes, casks and other vessels exported filled with Canadian products, or exported empty and returned filled with foreign products; and articles the growth, produce and manufacture of Canada, when returned after having been exported; provided that proof of the identity of such articles and goods shall be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Controller of Customs, and that such articles and goods are returned within three years from time of exportation, without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means; provided further that this paragraph shall not apply to any article or goods upon which an allowance of drawback has been made, the re-importation of which is hereby prohibited except upon payment of duties equal to the drawback allowed; nor shall this paragraph apply to any article or goods manufactured in customs or excise bonded warehouse and exported under any provision of law.

**SCHEDULE "C."****PROHIBITED GOODS.**

Books, printed paper, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of

a treasonable or seditious, or of an immoral or indecent characters.

Reprints of Canadian copyright works, and reprints of British copyright works which have been also copyrighted in Canada.

Coin, base or counterfeit.

Oleomargarine, butterine or other similar substitute for butter.

Tea adulterated with spurious leaf or with exhausted leaves, or containing so great an admixture of chemical or other deleterious substances as to make it unfit for use.

Goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labour, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, jail or penitentiary. Also goods similar in character to those produced in such institutions, when sold or offered for sale by any person, firm or corporation having a contract for the manufacture of such articles in such institutions or by any agent of such person, firm or corporation, or when such goods were originally purchased from or transferred, by any such contractor.

#### SCHEDULE "D"—RECIPROCAL TARIFF.

On all the products of countries entitled to the benefits of this Reciprocal Tariff, under the provisions of section 16, the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" shall be reduced as follow:—

On and after the twenty-third day of April, 1897, until the thirtieth day of June, 1898, inclusive, the reduction shall in every case be one-eighth of the duty mentioned in schedule "A" and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be seven-eighths of the duty mentioned in schedule "A."

On and after the first day of July, 1898, the reduction shall in every case be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in schedule "A."

Provided, however, that these reductions shall not apply to any of the following articles, but such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in schedule "A," viz.: wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol; sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane or beet root; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 19th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

#### RETURN OF FEES.

Mr. BOSTOCK moved:—

That the fees paid on Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Columbia and Western Railway Company, and on Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company, be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, inasmuch as the

Mr. FIELDING.

Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals and Telegraph Lines, to whom the said Bills were referred, has not reported on the same.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me a strange proceeding to introduce such a resolution without it being reported or recommended by the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. There was no such report; it was not before the committee. I think it a very bad precedent to establish in this House to allow such a motion to pass without any recommendation of the committee.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. No. I think we should understand this. We have got into the habit of rushing things through. Something was rushed through yesterday which never should have been passed by this House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). What was that?

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the Printing Committee, recommending the payment of money that should never have been paid—a gross scandal, as it looks to me. I am going to bring the matter up. If we pass this motion in this fashion we go aside from the precedents. There is no recommendation of the committee, but it is proposed to rush this resolution through. Let the Railway Committee do its duty as it has done in the past, and, if it recommends that these fees be returned, the House will have the case before it in the regular way.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. While I entirely agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that this matter should have been done in the way he suggests, still, he knows as well as I do, that there is scarcely a case in which when a Bill is withdrawn or thrown out, a motion of this kind does not follow as a matter of course. I hardly ever have known a case, in fact my recollection does not extend to a single case, in which it was refused, and I think that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who was for many years prominently connected with the Railway Committee, will bear me out in saying that the return of these fees was never refused.

Mr. HAGGART. It was never refused, but it was generally granted on the recommendation of the committee.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not disputing the point, but this is really, in its nature, a formal motion, and in favour of a thing that has been done a great many times. I do not mean to say that it ought to be done, but there is no doubt that the custom has grown up. I will not press the point, of course, but I think the objection might be waived on the understanding that this is not to be drawn into a precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. All right.

Motion agreed to.

## BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House, at this sitting, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to repeal chapter 9 of 57-58 Victoria, being "An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on iron and steel manufactured from Canadian ore," and all regulations thereunder made by order of the Governor in Council.

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of the following bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, that is to say :—

On steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On pig iron manufactured from ore, a bounty of three dollars per ton on the proportion produced from Canadian ore, and two dollars per ton on the proportion produced from foreign ore.

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may make regulations in relation to the bounties hereinbefore mentioned in order to carry out the intention of these resolutions.

That it is expedient to provide that the said bounties shall only be applicable to steel ingots, puddle iron bars and pig iron made in Canada prior to the 23rd day of April, 1902.

That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing bounties shall be payable only on iron and steel for consumption in Canada, and that the Governor in Council may at any time by proclamation impose export duties on such iron and steel if the same shall be exported from Canada ; such duties to be not greater than the amount of the bounty payable on such iron and steel.

Motion agreed to.

## EXPORT DUTIES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** moved that the House, at this sitting, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to enact that if any country imposes a duty upon the articles enumerated in item 577 in Schedule "B" to this Act, or upon any of such articles when imported into such country from Canada, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the "Canada Gazette," declare the following export duties, or any of them, chargeable upon logs and pulp-wood exported from Canada to such country, that is to say : On pine, Douglas fir, spruce, fir balsam, cedar, elm and hemlock logs, and pulp-wood, an export duty not exceeding three dollars per thousand feet, board measure ; and in case of the export of any of the above mentioned logs or pulp-wood in shorter lengths than nine feet, then a rate per cord may be levied in the same way, not greater than the equivalent of the above mentioned rate per thousand feet, board measure ; and such export duty shall be chargeable accordingly after the publication of such proclamation : Provided that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in like manner, from

time to time remove and reimpose such export duty.

That it is expedient to enact that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the "Canada Gazette," impose export duties as under upon the following ores and metals, and each such duty shall be chargeable accordingly after the publication of such proclamation.

Provided always that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in like manner, from time to time remove and re-impose such export duties :—

(a) On nickle contained in matte, or in the ore, or in any crude or partially manufactured state, and upon copper contained in any matte or ore which also contains nickel—when exported from Canada—upon such nickel an export duty not exceeding ten cents per pound ; and upon such copper an export duty not exceeding two cents per pound.

(b) On ores which contain copper, or any metal other than nickel or lead, when exported from Canada, an export duty not exceeding fifteen per cent on the value of the said ores.

(c) On lead ores, and on lead and silver ores, when exported from Canada to a country which imposes an import duty on lead in bars or in the form of pig lead in excess of the import duty on lead contained in lead ores or in lead and silver ores—an export duty on the lead contained in the ores so exported from Canada to an amount per pound equivalent to such excess.

Motion agreed to.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

**Mr. MILLS.** Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call attention to the order of the House passed some weeks ago for a return of the papers in the case of the mail contracts between Annapolis and Liverpool. I put the question on the Order Paper early in the session, but, at the request of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), it was allowed to stand as a notice of motion, and I moved for the papers. But the return is not yet down.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). I will call the matter to the attention of the Postmaster General the moment he comes in.

## I. C. R.—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair) moved third reading of Bill (No. 142) to confirm certain agreements entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Have we the Bill before the House yet ? We had not a copy of it last night ; it was not even on the Order paper. Is it printed and distributed now ?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The Bill is only a copy of the resolutions.

**Mr. SPROULE.** But a copy of the resolutions is not the Bill. It seems a strange

proceeding to pass a Bill that is not even printed and distributed. This Bill commits the country to a very large expenditure, yet we have not even an opportunity of knowing its provisions.

Mr. HAGGART. Before we pass this Bill which, I suppose, is in accordance with the resolutions presented to the House, I beg to enter my protest, for one, against any such deal—for I can call it nothing else than a deal—as that intended to be perpetrated by this measure. If the Government thought it was necessary in the interests of the country that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended from Point Lévis to Montreal, there was a means of obtaining that object without any such large expenditure of money the country is committed to by this Bill. It would have been very easy for the Government to make arrangements with the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of securing that line. I think that every hon. gentleman in this House must know that the owners of the securities in reference to this road, do not consider them very valuable, and they would have been perfectly willing to part with those securities for the face value of the cash which they expended upon it. I have no doubt of this, because I had some negotiations on that subject with that railway, for the purpose of securing this entrance into Montreal; and I have not the slightest doubt that I could have secured from the possessors of those securities the control of the Drummond County Railway for the actual cash owing to the Eastern Townships Bank, and the cash which that company at present owes.

Mr. HALE. How much?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it would be in the neighbourhood of \$400,000 or \$500,000. Now, what is the condition of that railway company? How has it been constructed, and what is the amount of its indebtedness? I took a good deal of trouble to look into the affairs of this company, and according to the railway statistics of June 30th, 1896, the actual cash invested by the company, procured from various sources, was \$141,686.61; there is a floating debt of \$221,692.99, or a total of \$363,379.60. As security for part of that amount the Eastern Townships Bank have assigned to them one million dollars of bonds which have been issued by the company, of which not a single dollar has been sold; they are still in the possession of the bank. Now, that is the total amount of cash liabilities of that concern, \$363,379.60. I venture to say that any person going to the railway company and offering them the cash for the purpose of paying the amount due to the bank, and all the other debts owing by this company, could have secured control of the road, and the company would have been glad to make the bargain. To that you may add the

Mr. SPROULE.

ordinary stock alleged to be subscribed and alleged to be paid, \$400,000, and I venture to say that not one dollar of that stock has been paid in cash in the form of stock. Then the actual cash expended by this concern for the purpose of building this road, was \$363,379.60. Add the \$400,000 stock which is alleged to have been paid up, and you have \$763,379.60. Add to that the amount paid by the Dominion Government, which is \$287,936, and the provincial subsidies, which I think amount to about \$340,000. But so far as I could get returns from the Quebec blue books, the amount paid was \$300,170, which represented a payment, or a capitalization, or a conversion of the land grant to a cash subsidy, at the rate of 35 cents on the dollar. Subsequently an Act was passed by the Legislature of Quebec, in 1897, which added a further sum of 15 cents on the dollar to that amount, which would make it in the neighbourhood of \$340,170. Then the municipal bonus was \$15,000, making the total cost of the railway and rolling stock in the neighbourhood of about \$1,400,000. That includes, of course, the \$400,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then you have got 43 miles to build.

Mr. HAGGART. I will deal with that part of it. The estimated amount of cash invested by the company when the road was completed, on 30th of June, 1896, is \$363,379.60. The hon. Minister of Railways stated that there were 33 miles to complete the road. I find upon looking it over that it is about 42 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 43 miles, I said.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman stated again and again in his speech that it was from 31 to 35 miles. Upon looking over the maps, wondering in myself that the road was so short, I found he was mistaken, and that the actual distance, according to the report of the chief engineer of his department, is 42 miles. Add \$14,000 per mile for 42 miles, and you have an amount of about \$570,000 for the purpose of completing the road. Then there is a portion of the road which has to be graded up to a certain standard near where the bridge crosses, which will cost about \$50,000. So you have altogether in the neighbourhood of one million dollars as the estimated cost of the road when completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You mean two millions.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I mean actual cash. I mean that the actual cash invested in the road is \$363,379; and a rough estimate of the cost of building that 42 miles and bringing that portion of it where the bridge crosses up to the gradient, would make a

sum as nearly as possible of one million dollars in round numbers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You have given up \$1,770,000. How do you get that back?

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. gentleman is not following me closely. I am deducting the municipal grant, I am deducting the cash which the Dominion Government gave, I am deducting the provincial assistance given to it; and I am showing that of the \$400,000, not a single dollar was expended in cash. I am deducting the actual cash expenditure and the liabilities of the road, and adding the amount it will cost to put the road in complete order, and this will leave the amount that it has cost these gentlemen who own the road, one million dollars. Does the Minister of Railways ask this House to repay to the gentlemen who have built the road, all that it has cost them in its construction, including the provincial bonuses, the municipal bonuses, and the Dominion bonuses. And when you have bought the concern, it is notoriously not worth the amount of cash value of its debts? Does he ask us, when buying it, to pay over to these gentlemen again the amount of Dominion bonuses that we have given, and the provincial and municipal bonuses that they have received? I am endeavouring to show what a beautiful transaction this is. I want to show the amount of money that these gentlemen will make out of the transaction after receiving all these bonuses. They actually owe in cash on that railway \$363,379, and the balance between that and a million dollars would complete the road, and then they will have the rolling stock to sell with which they will make another bargain with the Minister of Railways. With that \$1,000,000, having the rolling stock, they will be able to complete that portion of their contract with the Minister of Railways and be able to hand over the road. This \$64,000 a year for 99 years is equal to \$2,000,000 virtually in cash which these gentlemen are receiving for a road which cost them in cash, and for which they would be glad to take, \$363,379, thus receiving a profit of \$1,000,000 to put in their pockets. Has the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals looked into this transaction? It cannot be possible for the people of this country to give their consent to a transaction of this kind. If he has not looked into this transaction, if he has not inquired into it fully, he has not done his duty to the people of this country. If he has inquired into it, and if his department has looked into this transaction, which, to say the least of it, is a most questionable one, he is consenting to give to parties who are willing to take \$363,000 in cash and would have been glad to get it, \$1,000,000.

Mr. **LAVERGNE**. How can you prove that that company would have accepted \$363,000 in cash for the road?

Mr. **HAGGART**. The Eastern Townships Bank have been trying to negotiate the claim which they have against that railway and for which they have security to the amount of \$1,000,000 in bonds. That claim is for \$221,592.99, and there are floating liabilities of \$141,686.61 more. The Eastern Townships Bank would be perfectly willing to get cash for the amount which they have advanced. Surely when a bank has been pressing for a sum of money which was due for a number of years, which was looked upon as not being a valuable asset, which the bank has been now claiming for the last four or five years, an asset which amounts to \$263,000 which the bank has been keen to get—surely the parties that own the road would have been willing to have parted with the corporate rights if we had offered a small sum over and above the liability to the bank and the floating debt. I will venture to say that this road had been offered for a less sum than the cash amount that was due to the bank and the floating liabilities, to the different large corporations in Canada, to the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway, for a less sum than \$363,000. In the face of these facts known to every business man in Montreal, known to every railway corporation in the country, the Minister of Railways coolly proposes to this House to pay to them the amount of cash which is at present due to this corporation, and to supplement that by an addition of \$1,000,000 at least. At the same time they have power to make an arrangement with the Minister for the purpose of giving over the rolling stock of the road. This is a bad enough transaction, but a worse one still is the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to which they propose to give \$150,000 a year, for rights and franchises upon their road. I was mistaken when I thought that we were getting an undivided interest in the road not only from Chaudière to Lévis, but an undivided interest from the bridge to the terminus in Montreal. I find that we are only acquiring a user of it, that we only have the right of it for whatever trains of the Intercolonial Railway may use that station, and that the absolute control and the absolute ownership outside of that user is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Our user on that portion of the road will not be one to twenty of that of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and for one-twentieth of the right of user of the terminal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in Montreal we are to pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company \$140,000 a year, or to calculate it upon the amount of user at twenty times \$140,000 it gives a sum of \$2,800,000, which is the calculated annual value of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway in Montreal. I will venture to say that I could have made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway which would have been much more advantageous.

I proposed entering into an arrangement for getting the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. I had casual conversations with the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I found that I would have had no difficulty whatever in arranging for the use of the terminals, the bridge and the line for a sum proportionate to the extent to which we used them.

Mr. GIBSON. Why did you not do it then ?

Mr. HAGGART. I did not do it because I had not fully considered it and because I had not fully determined that it was in the interest of the country then to make any arrangement of that kind. I will venture to say that an arrangement of that kind could have been made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for from \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year for the use of the terminals in Montreal to the extent to which the Intercolonial Railway would require them. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council had the power to determine upon and to take the user of this line if it were necessary. They had a perfect right to do it. The hon. gentleman says "Oh, what value is that to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Those who lend the money in the old country would not advance a single cent on a scheme such as that. We have to consider what the holders of the mortgage bonds and securities would have said in regard to it. I will venture to say that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would have found it impossible to have borrowed any sum of money for the purpose of extending any of its terminals over the bridge. The only reason that they are able to extend the bridge and the terminals is that they have entered into an arrangement with the Government of Canada which they show the capitalists in the old country and raise the money upon. Does the hon. gentleman not know, and does the House not know, what the company have to make out of this transaction and how easy it would be to get the securities that rank on the company to consent to this being a prior lien upon it. They will say to the mortgage holders, "The bridge requires to be extended; the earning powers of the company will be increased and the only way we can do it is by means of this arrangement with the Government of Canada." Will they not borrow the money on that ?

Will the Minister of Railways tell me, how it was possible that they could raise money for the purpose of extending that undertaking unless under an arrangement of this kind. There was no other way to do it. Every one knows the condition of the Grand Trunk Railway. They could not take the necessary expenditure out of the annual earnings. They could not borrow it on the security of the company, unless we give them some security which is precedent to a

Mr. HAGGART.

lot of the security that ranks above the common stock of the company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company would have to give a first class security, and that first class security would be the endorsement of the people of this country to the scheme, and promising to pay them \$140,000 a year. Then, with the consent of the bondholders and the preference shareholders—which it is their interest to give—they would give a preference to these securities and the money could be raised in the old country. I do not intend to debate this question long, because I suppose it is the intention of the House to pass the Bill and send it to the Senate. The time is too short to discuss such an important measure, but I may say that the arguments of the Minister (Mr. Blair) as to the increased traffic which would accrue to the Intercolonial on account of the building of this road, are perfectly ridiculous. Fancy the Minister of Railways stating to this House that there are 10,000 cars waiting for transportation on this road which we are to take over. Does he know the enormous amount of traffic that 10,000 cars entail ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you know it is not true.

Mr. HAGGART. I know it is absolutely ridiculous on the face of it and know that no sane man and no intelligent man in the House would believe it. Fancy on a railroad 73 miles long, the Minister of Railways gravely states to this House and to the railway men of this country that there are 10,000 cars of freight waiting to be transported upon it. Why, Sir, the statement is ridiculous and absurd.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that I was assured that there were now waiting on that railway from 8,000 to 10,000 cars of freight. That is what I think I said if my memory serves me, and my statement was more than corroborated by a gentleman who sits behind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. HAGGART. Would the Minister look and see the amount of freight that is carried on the Intercolonial Railway ; would he look and see how many car loads are carried on the Grand Trunk Railway ; would he look and see how many cars are carried on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would he look and see what the total amount of traffic on that road has been last year ? Some hon. gentleman has been telling the Minister that in the shape of standing trees and everything else there will be available in the next thousand years to come for freight upon the road, 10,000 cars to be transported ; but no person should be able to impose on the hon. gentleman to that extent, nor should he attempt to impose on the House the statement that there were 10,000 cars of material waiting to be transported on that road. The statement is so

absolutely absurd that it is not worth while discussing it. Such are the arguments used by the hon. gentleman in order to support this scheme.

The hon. Minister could have made arrangements with the Drummond County Railway, if that was the best way of getting into Montreal, for a sum of money which would equal to the cash indebtedness of that company. He would have got that willingly from the House. If this scheme were in the interests of the country he could have got power from this House to make a running arrangement over the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of using their line and their bridge and their terminals in Montreal. This House would, I believe, have no objection to such a scheme, but the proposition of giving to a bankrupt railway company the sum of one million dollars over and above the actual cash assets of the company is not one that should be entertained. We can afford to be generous to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Minister should have given a generous amount to the Grand Trunk Railway, because it is a railway which has greatly benefited this country. We are assisting them to build a bridge by giving them \$300,000, and the hon. gentleman might have made a liberal arrangement for the user of it, but to give the sum of money he did for the purpose of acquiring an extension to the Intercolonial Railway, and gravely telling this House that the extension will not cost the country one cent because the extra profit earned, according to the reports from his engineer-in-chief will more than compensate the amount which the country has to pay for it; such a statement will not be borne out by the facts. When the returns come down next year I venture to say that instead of any amount being received on account of the money which we are to give to the Drummond Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company there will be a larger deficit than there is at present on the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. Minister says that we will take the road over equal to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, but I venture to say that there will be a repetition of our experience on the Intercolonial Railway line between Point Lévis and Rivière du Loup on that piece of road of 121.5 miles we expended \$1,500,000, and it was stated to this House at the time that it was in every way equal to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. Afterwards the Minister was obliged to say to this House that in order to make it really up to that standard there was a further expenditure necessary of \$2,400,000. I will venture to say that that experience will be repeated upon the Drummond County Railway. I will venture to say that before the officers of the Intercolonial Railway can run it and get it up to the standard there will be an expenditure of over one and a half million dollars in addition to the purchase money, on that road from Point

Lévis to the connection with the Grand Trunk Railway. Here then is an expenditure capitalized at seven million dollars, a further expenditure for rolling stock for use on that section of the road, and a further expenditure which will be required for the purpose of getting it up to the standard of the Intercolonial. Sir, we are entering upon an undertaking which will cost this country, if the amount be capitalized, nearly nine million dollars a year.

Mr. GIBSON. Nine million dollars a year.

Mr. HAGGART. Nine million dollars capitalized.

Mr. GIBSON. You said nine million dollars a year.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) must have seen that was a lapsus linguæ—the amount altogether would be equal to a capital expenditure of nine million dollars for the purpose of having the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. As I have said before this extension may be in the interests of the country. I hold the same views as a good many gentlemen from the North-west and contrary to the views of my leader, that a Government railway may be worked as economically as a private railway. That is the experience of a great many countries in the world where the management of a Government railway is efficient, and where everything connected with the railway is bought cheaper than a private corporation possibly could buy it. In Germany, in Belgium and in France the Governments work railways cheaper than it is possible for corporations to do it. They work them in the interests of the community. I have long been of the opinion that a railway should be like a public highway, under the control of the people. The original idea was that it should be so, and that every one who owned a locomotive should have the right to travel on a railway. I am of the opinion as some of those gentlemen from the North-west, that it is quite possible that a railway could be operated by a department of the Government as economically and more in the interests of the country than by a private corporation. I think the day will come when all railways as well as telegraphs in this country, as well as in most countries, will be owned by the people and be under the direct control of the Government; but that is a question which is not under consideration at this time. What I complain of is not the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal; I complain of the manner in which the hon. Minister of Railways has entered into this monstrous bargain with the Drummond County Railway Company, which, to say the least of it, savours of wrong and corruption, and I complain of the extravagant bargain he has made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, at a time when the finances of the country should be husbanded

with the greatest possible care. It is an expenditure which is unjustifiable, and I must enter my protest against the third reading of the Bill and against any such arrangement as the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). I have sat in this House for some fifteen or sixteen years, and I have never before heard any member of Parliament make such a preposterous proposition as that hon. gentleman has made here to-day. He virtually declares that if the Government of this country want to become proprietors of a railway or anything else, they should find out the mortgage indebtedness on the property, and what the holders of the mortgage will take for it, and then close out the owner by taking the property for the mortgage debt. I would like to ask my hon. friend if his conscientious convictions, if he has any, would permit him to buy a mortgage on his neighbour's property, simply because he wanted the property, and to secure it in that way—finding out who was the holder of the mortgage, securing an assignment of it to himself, and then closing out the owner and taking over the property at the mortgage debt?

Mr. BENNETT. You know how it is done.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that the way the Government of Canada should acquire property?

Mr. HAGGART. I never had a mortgage on any man's property in my life.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, the hon. gentleman has not had very much experience. But still he finds fault with the Government for giving the owners of this property what they consider a fair value for it, and says that instead of that they should have gone to the Eastern Townships Bank, which holds \$1,000,000 of bonds against the property, and which would have been glad to get the money it invested \$367,000 for those bonds, that they should have bought those bonds, and then they could close out the owners of the railway and take possession of it and make it part of the Dominion line. That is what the hon. gentleman claims the Government should have done, instead of allowing the owner a fair compensation for the value of the property. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if when they had the management of the finances of this country, they ever in their whole political life acquired a piece of property in that way. When they built the Langevin Block, did they go to the registry office in this city, and find out how much mortgage debt was registered against the land, and find out who were the owners of the mortgages, and then buy the mortgages, and close out the owners of the property? Not at all. They appoint-

Mr. HAGGART.

ed commissioners, and sent them to negotiate with the original owners, and bought the property at what they considered its fair value, though we thought at the time that the price was in excess of the value of the property. I am amazed at a Minister of the Crown, with the extended experience of the hon. gentleman, daring to get up before this House and propose that a Government of this country should wrench out of the company's hands their property by buying up the mortgages on it and closing them out. In regard to the value of the property, I have no doubt the Minister of Railways took care to make an investigation. If he did not, it is a proper subject of criticism whether the value in that property is sufficient for the return we are giving for it. When the hon. gentleman, as Minister of Railways, bought a property in St. John for some \$200,000, which we considered an exorbitant price, I would like to know whether he went and inquired how much mortgage indebtedness stood against that company, and whether by buying up the mortgage he tried to freeze out the owner and get possession of the property in that way. I am amazed that the hon. gentleman would make such a proposition to this House as he has done to-day. In regard to the bonuses that were granted in aid of the construction of that railway, would it be right or fair or honest to say to the company: You shall deduct from the purchase value of the property the money that was granted to you in these bonuses? Can the hon. gentleman give an instance in the history of this country in which that was done? I defy him to point out one single instance in which, when a road has been purchased, the amount of subsidy granted by the Government to aid in its construction has been deducted, and the balance paid over as the purchase price. He cannot give one single instance. We know that the Canada Central Railway became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the time hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. That railway was granted a very large subvention towards its construction, and when Duncan McIntyre transferred that property to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was it declared that the assistance given to it by the municipalities, the provinces and the Dominion should be deducted from the amount of the purchase money? No such monstrous proposition was ever made or suggested, and it has never been suggested in this country until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has suggested it to-day. I am amazed that he would try to wrench from the owners their property on any such terms. No, Sir; the Government of this country is too honourable, the Crown is too honourable towards her subjects, to take her property in such a way. I would be ashamed to occupy a seat in Parliament and be the follower of a man who would dare to make such an absurd proposition. I give the hon. gentlemen

opposite credit for desiring an honest investigation, but let them not resort to the contemptible tactics which has been suggested by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). Let us deal honestly and honourably with one another as Canadians, and do not attempt to perpetrate such a piece of rank injustice as the hon. gentleman has proposed. I am not prepared to say what the value of the property is. It is a duty of the Opposition to investigate and I do not deprive them of any right, but let them act as honourable in such a work that they can claim credit from the people for their conduct and not advocate such contemptible sharp practice as the foreclosing of the mortgage in order that the Government may thus become owners of the property. Such procedure would not be tolerated by fair thinking individuals on the part of the Government, and except in some very exceptional circumstances is looked upon as sharp practice on the part of individuals.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). I am very much surprised to hear from a gentleman of his experience and standing, the statements he has made. According to him, the value of the road is the amount of its liabilities, and because its liabilities are \$363,000 that amount must be taken as its value. According to that reasoning the Dominion of Canada, which owes about \$350,000,000, would be only worth that amount.

The hon. gentleman, however, afterwards took another line of argument. He said that the company owned about \$400,000 of stock which has not been transferred to the Eastern Townships bank, and the whole debt is \$363,000. As federal subsidy, they have received \$287,000, and as provincial subsidy \$340,000. Adding these figures together, the total amount is \$1,390,000, to which he adds \$15,000 municipal assistance, making \$1,405,000. Then, he says, to finish the 43 miles, which are not made, will cost about \$570,000, and to finish the grading will take some \$50,000 more. This will bring the total to \$2,025,000, according to the figures of the hon. gentleman. In the face of these figures, he then tells us that this railway is only worth \$363,000. Taking the hon. gentleman's figures as correct that this road, when completed, will actually cost \$2,025,000, let us see what the Government is paying. It is paying \$64,000 per year for 99 years, at the end of which time payments will cease and the road will be completely ours. Well, \$64,000, at the rate of 4 per cent—which is a fair rate of interest to apply to a corporation—represent a capital of \$1,600,000, and that is the amount we pay for this railway, which, according to the hon. gentleman's calculations, will cost, when completed, \$2,025,000, so that the Gov-

ernment are paying interest at 4 per cent on an amount which is \$425,000 less than the cost of the road, taking the figures of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about an interest of 3 per cent, but we know the corporations cannot secure money at such a rate. Even the Dominion Government, in order to borrow at 3 per cent, has to sell its obligations at a discount. Their obligations at 3 per cent will sell perhaps at 90; but even taking the interest at 3 per cent, the capital represented by an annual interest of \$64,000 would amount to \$2,100,000, or pretty near the amount which the hon. gentleman gave us as the estimated cost of the road. Yet the hon. gentleman says that this is a scandalous transaction, and that it is a notorious fact that this road is worth nothing. Such a statement, is however, a simple statement, not borne out by the facts.

The hon. gentleman says further that the acquisition of this road, instead of diminishing the deficit which we have to meet every year on the Intercolonial Railway, will increase it, because it will have to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The other day the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) told us that the Intercolonial Railway extended to Montreal would not be in a position to compete with the Grand Trunk Railway, which has its terminal at Portland, because the distance from Montreal to Portland by the Grand Trunk Railway is 400 miles less than the distance from Montreal to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway. But he did not put the case as fairly as he should. He forgot to tell the House that the distance from Portland to Liverpool is about 500 miles longer than the distance from Halifax to Liverpool. This he never took into account. I believe that the route from Montreal to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway is just as advantageous and can compete very fairly with the Grand Trunk Railway via Portland.

As to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I repeat what I have said and what the ex-Minister of Finance thought very ridiculous. I repeat that a difference of 76 miles in a route of 1,200 or 1,400 miles is not worth mentioning, and I go further, and say that even with that difference in the route, if you make the comparison at St. Johns, another terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a difference of about 240 miles on a route of 1,200 or 1,400 miles does not prevent the Intercolonial Railway from making a profitable business, if they can secure the traffic. It has been said that the idea that 8,000 or 10,000 car loads of lumber are ready for shipment on the line of the Drummond County Railway is absurd. Well, while I am not sufficiently posted to speak with absolute knowledge, I am prepared to state from my own experience in connection with the mills which are run-

ning day and night at Forrestdale, Mitchell and Moose Park, that half that quantity is ready for shipment, including sawn lumber, pulp wood and all other sorts of lumber. I do not wish to detain the House on this matter; but I may say, in conclusion, that the assertions of the hon. gentleman are based simply on slander. He cannot prove his statements; he has no evidence whatever that the bank would be ready to foreclose that railroad if the money due to the bank were handed to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to direct the attention of the House to the irregular way in which this Bill is being discussed, and also to discuss the Bill itself. Now, according to the rules, Bills must be printed in both English and French before they are read the second time; but this Bill is not printed at all. It is not even on the Order paper. It cannot fairly be said to be before the House according to our own rule. I think this is a very bad precedent, and even though it were done by general consent, the measure is of such importance that the fact of its being dealt with in this irregular way will often be referred to in the future to justify other irregularities of a similar nature. Again, at this late stage of the session it is impossible to give this Bill the attention that its importance deserves. This Bill commits the country to a very large expenditure of money, and it commits it to the endorsement of a transaction which, so far as we can get information about it, appears to be shady in the extreme. I am surprised at the warmth with which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) defended the transaction, because in the past his voice was raised against extravagance more frequently than that of any other member of the House. He was constantly calling out for economy. But there is no economy in this measure, yet he does not say a word against it, he does not even ask for any information which will enable him to judge whether the transaction is good or bad. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that there was some impropriety in our criticising this Bill. But we have a right to inquire to what we are being committed by the Bill, and what we are getting from the Grand Trunk for what we give. For ninety-nine years we must pay them \$140,000 a year. That would represent a capital sum, calculating interest at 4 per cent, of \$3,500,000. The expenditure of this annual sum will go on many years after the youngest member of this House has passed from the stage of action. We are committing the country to this expenditure for one hundred years, with the understanding that it shall be renewed in perpetuity. Now, what do we get for that? We get what is supposed to be a half interest in a plant. We get a user's right over the track of the Grand Trunk from which they will earn \$8 for every two dollars that we earn from it. We are paying

what is supposed to be equivalent to half the price while our use of it will bring only \$2 for every \$8 that they get. Is that fair to the country? I put a case the other day, and I repeat it now: If the Minister of Railways and I, as private individuals were going in for a partnership to buy a plant out of which we expected to get a return, he \$8 and I \$2, would it be fair to ask me to pay one-half the cost of the plant. In reason I ought to pay only about one-fifth of the amount that he should pay. But the country is paying one-half of the cost and receiving a return of only about one-fifth. I contend that this is a bad bargain, and one that the hon. gentleman will find it very hard to defend in the country.

Now, what more do we give away? We give \$300,000 for the improvement of the Victoria Bridge. We are told that the Grand Trunk Railway in their own interest, must have made that expenditure if they intended to carry the traffic they hope to carry in the near future, and that not only must they make this expenditure, but they were prepared to make it. We hear hon. gentlemen decry discussion of the matter in this House. We have several times during this debate been subjected to interruptions by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). It is the right of hon. members to discuss the wisdom of this contract. And it comes with bad grace from the hon. member for Lincoln—above all men—a contractor who intends and expects to get a share of this money which he is helping to vote. How far does the fact of his connection with this contract affect his independence as a member of this House? When we vote this \$300,000, as we are going to vote it, in a short time, he has a contract that will bring a share of that money into his own pocket. He should be silent; he should hang his head in shame rather than try to interrupt members who seek to do their duty in this House. It is very unfair, it is very indelicate, and something that his constituents will call him to account for. He above all men, should hold his tongue when this subject is being discussed.

During the present session we have put a clause in every railway Bill that we have passed providing that other companies shall have the right to use the road of the company we charter on paying a fair remuneration to that company, in proportion to the number of cars run and quantity of freight carried. Why do we do that? Because the country has given large subsidies to these roads and we should not divest ourselves of our rights in them. This country has rights in the Grand Trunk; it has paid millions of dollars to that company for which it will never get a dollar in return. If we require the right for the Intercolonial Railway to go over a few miles of their road, we should be able to get it with-

out paying such an exorbitant consideration, a consideration which is equal to \$5,540,000. The country will not approve of any such bargain and when hon. gentlemen opposite go back to the people, in my opinion, they will be sternly called to account for this transaction.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. An hon. member says "carried." He is in a hurry to carry this measure. If he would carry more brains in his head or if he would carry more consideration for the interests of his constituents, it would be a great deal better.

Then we come to the arrangement with the Drummond County Railway. What is it? We have very little information about it. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), who spoke before me, got up and defended this transaction with a warmth that is not usual to him. Well, I am told that it is a current rumour which is generally believed, that the hon. gentleman is about to leave the precincts of Parliament and go upon the bench, and that he has the promise of a judgeship in his pocket, or at least, that in a few days he will be appointed a judge. Now, what right has he, with this expectation, with this promise—if it be a fact—what right has he to lecture the members of this House who are doing their duty in looking after the interests of this country?

Mr. LAVERGNE. I represent more people than you do on this question.

Mr. FOSTER. How long will the hon. gentleman represent them when he gets his seat?

Mr. SPROULE. It may be that he represents more now, but how does he represent them? If this rumour be correct, he has ceased to represent them, he is misrepresenting them, he is not representing the interests of his people, but he is representing the interests of his own pocket. When he gets on that bench, will he raise his voice—

Mr. TALBOT. Question.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this not a very important question? The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), as well as other members, will find ere long that this is an important question. What does this deal involve? Why, this payment represents a capital of \$1,750,000, which we would have to pay if we borrowed that money to-morrow, and that for a railway that might have been sold any day at sheriff's sale for less than \$400,000. I was told by a gentleman a few days ago that the railway was offered for sale within the last few months, for \$400,000, with everything belonging to it, and that the owners of it would gladly have jumped at the chance of getting that amount of money. Yet we are asked here to pay what is the equivalent to \$1,750,000.

to say nothing about rolling stock the value of which we do not know, and that may cost us \$75,000, or \$100,000, or \$200,000—it is all in the hands of the Minister of Railways, who can make a private deal with these parties who are interested. They may bring political considerations to bear upon him, they may bring him some support in the province of Quebec. It may put a large amount of money in the pockets of the private individuals who are concerned, but it will not satisfy the people. We want to know more about it, and yet we are not allowed time to make inquiry, we have not the information that we should have to enable us intelligently to judge what this means to the country. It does savour very much of the transaction that we had a few years ago connected with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I may say that if the Upper Chamber went into an inquiry into this matter, I think it would lay bare more of these things than we can do, as there are some transactions connected with it which, if I am well informed, will not bear the light of day, and that are not to the credit of the hon. gentlemen who are making that deal. Now, what is the country going to get in return for this? We are going to get the right to run the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, the right to run over a few miles of railway belonging to the Grand Trunk, that we have subsidized to the tune of millions, the right to carry the freight of the western provinces over the Intercolonial Railway from the city of Montreal. We are told that this is going to result in making this Government railway a paying railway. But I think, if we credit the statements about the amount of freight that is waiting to be moved on the Drummond County Railway, and the amount the Canadian Pacific Railway is moving, according to their own report of what it moved last year, there is nothing to justify the belief that there will be one-tenth the amount of freight to be moved on the Intercolonial Railway that has been represented to this House. Now, in my judgment, we are making a very bad deal, we are committing the country to a heavy expenditure which cannot be justified. In my opinion, the hon. gentleman will fail to justify this transaction when they go before the people again. And what is this right we are getting? We are getting the right to take this Government railway into Montreal where there are already three or four railways competing for the traffic of western Canada into the city of Montreal. Can we develop the traffic much more by that means? It is not likely. It is not likely to be a much better paying road than it is at the present time. Will the interests of the great ship-owners be benefited by it? I say it is not very likely, because they will do in the future as they have done in the past, they will always take the shortest route, because it costs less to handle freight.

They are not likely to use the Intercolonial Railway if they can use the Canadian Pacific and reach the sea-board by running a fewer number of miles. What we should have done, if we required this extension, was to build a bridge across the river at the city of Quebec, and we could have done it for one-fourth of the money this is going to cost us. Then we could have asked the Canadian Pacific Railway to give us running powers over their road, because we have given them running powers over some of our road. We have a right to ask that, and then we would not have another line competing for the trade, we would have had a better return at a smaller cost, and we would have had a bridge across the river at Quebec, which is one of the important requirements at the present time. But that bridge must be built yet. We are told it will be built, but if it is built the country will pay for it. Then we could have had all the advantages which would accrue from the deal that we are making now, at one-fourth of the cost, and with much greater benefit to the country. Then, are we justified in allowing this Bill to go through in such a hurry? Why, it is not even printed, and is not before the House for consideration. We are at the end of the session, with only a few members present, one-half of the members have gone home, having ceased to take any interest in the business. I say this conduct on the part of the Government is the most unseemly that I have ever seen in this Parliament, and I have been here for nineteen years. It is in complete disregard of the interests of the country. I say we should move that this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read this day six months hence, for that is the only way in which it can be properly dealt with in the interest of the country.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think I would have said anything in regard to this matter, which has already been so ably dealt with by the Minister of Railways and other speakers on this side of the House, were it not that insinuations have been thrown at me across the floor, led by that virtuous man, the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not an insinuation. It is a direct statement. Everybody knows that it is correct.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that as a public contractor, not getting tips from the Government, either in counting up or in counting down, I got a contract in public competition by public contractors. Men of ability were asked to tender for this work long before I knew anything about the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, or the use of the Grand Trunk Railway by the Dominion of Canada. The ex-Minister of Finance, with all the vim which he possesses, wishes to leave an impression against my

Mr. SPROULE.

personal character in connection with this matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1891, I occupied somewhat a similar position in this House when I was building the work in connection with the St. Clair Tunnel, connecting the province of Ontario with the state of Michigan. I built that work for the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and a good Tory Government was in power at that date. I was then a member of this House, when the Government, as I understand it, gave to the St. Clair Tunnel Company, \$375,000 of public money for the purposes of building that tunnel. When that was done I am bound to say that neither the ex-Minister of Finance, nor any of the other members who sit behind him, accused me of violating the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. SPROULE. The case is different now.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I must ask your protection from this vulnerable member. I cannot call him vulgar, according to the rules of the House, although he deserves the epithet. As I said before, I wish to put myself right before this House. There is no kind of warfare that is meaner than insinuations, and there is no other hon. gentleman in this House that is more capable of making insinuations of the meanest kind, than the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) must not accuse an hon. member of making mean insinuations.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I will withdraw the word mean and say that he is in the habit of making many insinuations. In fact he never gets on his feet to address the House without making insinuations against the members on the Liberal side of the House. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been very kind to make comparisons in respect to the bargain that is now before the House. I may say before I conclude my personal explanations that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House or on the other side of the House can stand up and say that my contract with the Grand Trunk Railway Company has anything whatever to do with the Government. So that so far as I am personally concerned, if the Grand Trunk were to steal the money, it would not be my business one way or the other. If they did not get anything at all from the Government I would occupy the same position that I do now. I am a public contractor and I do not think that my character should come under discussion because, forsooth, the Government has entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I have nothing to do with that any more than a man who supplies a wheelbarrow, or a man who supplies rails or ties to the company. I would not

accuse the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) with having improper motives towards the Grand Trunk Railway Company if he were to vote for this proposition because he supplies that company with ties. Having put myself right before the House on this question. I now wish to say that the Minister of Finance—

An hon. MEMBER. Ex.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, very much ex-Minister of Finance; I hope he will be a long time ex, double-ex. I wish to refer to some statements made by the ex-Minister of Finance in reference to this matter. I shall not take any notice of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because it does not matter what he says in any case. In reference to this bargain no hon. gentleman on this side of the House will admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway do not know their business. There is no abler railway management than the men who control the Canadian Pacific Railway. I want to point out that the Canadian Pacific Railway have got running powers over the Grand Trunk Railway Company's line, 39½ or 40 miles from Hamilton to Toronto, and that they pay for that privilege \$1,000 a mile per annum, and wheelage besides, in addition to its proportion of the maintenance. In this connection I may say that this lease is for fifty years, and there is to be no proprietary interest at the end of that time. The Grand Trunk Railway Company will still hold the property. What is the difference between this bargain and the bargain which has been the subject of so much discussion in this House? No hon. gentleman will dispute the right of the Canadian Pacific Railway to make a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and there is no man but will admit the advantage of bringing two rival companies to use the one road. This is subject to a rental of something like 4 or 5 per cent. The Grand Trunk Railway Company lease their road to the Canadian Pacific Railway upon terms which I have stated. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have simply running powers over the line. They cannot take up or set down a passenger between Toronto or Hamilton, and when they sell tickets from outside points to points between the two cities 85 per cent of this local traffic goes to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. What is the difference between this and the bargain before us? In consequence of the foresight of the Minister of Railways and Canals the Intercolonial Railway may, under the terms of this contract, take up and put down passengers upon the line used jointly with the Grand Trunk, showing you most clearly that this bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway is based upon much better terms than the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk so far as the traffic between the city

of Hamilton and the city of Toronto is concerned. The hon. gentlemen the ex-Minister of Finance particularly, and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) laid great stress upon the large sum of money that the Dominion was called upon to pay in respect to this bargain. The ex-Minister of Finance loomed it away up over \$7,000,000. I would ask the hon. gentleman if any business man occupying a building on a back street at a rental of \$1,000 a year, were to remove to a front street and pay a rental of \$3,000 a year, would Bradstreet write him down next morning as having assumed a debt of \$100,000. Yet, such is the proposition that the ex-Minister of Finance laid down, when he said that we had assumed a debt of \$7,000,000. The hon. gentleman is opposed to this proposal because he shall not have the disposal of the \$7,000,000. The whole trouble with the present leader of the Opposition and the party behind him, is that this Government had the business capacity to grapple with this question. We have been told by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that he had considered the matter. I hope that he has considered a matter for once because when he was Minister of Railways and Canals he was in the habit of saying: "I do not know anything about this contract; I leave that to my deputy and to the officers of my department." When he was coralled about the expenditure on the Curran Bridge he said he did not know anything about it. Strange to say, he seems to know very much about this contract now, so far as the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial Railways are concerned. He had not the business capacity to deal with this subject. He told us the other day that the Department of Railways and Canals had been carried on differently in his time from what it was carried on now. Yes, thank Heaven, it is carried on in a different manner now. People who come to Ottawa to interview the Government all testify to the manly, straightforward, businesslike way in which they are received. I may say a word with respect to the railway extension from Lévis to Montreal. No railway man would ever admit that a railway stopping short of a great city like Montreal by 176 miles would succeed very well. We know it would not be a success. We know very well that for years the Intercolonial Railway was never heard of at the meetings of the general passenger agents and general freight associations of North America. When this extension is made into the city of Montreal the Intercolonial Railway will be in a position to go to these conventions and to dictate terms to other railways as to rates and to get their proportion of the business of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Why any more now than before?

Mr. GIBSON. Because when the road is extended to Montreal they are in a position to make a freight rate with other lines.

Mr. FOSTER. What freight rate can they make now that they could not make then?

Mr. GIBSON. Then they could not make any rate at all except over the Grand Trunk. They had only one railway. Now they can make a rate either between the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk and they have competition in consequence on business west of Montreal. They did not share in that business when they stopped at Point Lévis. Now, with respect to the condition of the road—

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) allow me on that point to ask him a question. The question is as to whether before this agreement was brought about, the Intercolonial Railway, on the freight starting on the Intercolonial Railway had not the right, and did not exercise it, of making a rate through to Toronto from any point on the Grand Trunk Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Sometimes we could and sometimes we could not.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you not the right to do it, and did not you do it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we did not have the right.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you do anything more now?

Mr. GIBSON. The ex-Minister of Finance has been prompted to ask me a question, and of course I do not know anything about—

Mr. FOSTER. Then why are you talking about it?

Mr. GIBSON. Wait a minute, and you can laugh when I get through. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has been prompted by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to ask me as to the freight rates, and as to whether the Intercolonial Railway could make through freight rates on the Grand Trunk Railway west of Lévis. They could, as the Minister of Railways has said, but they were entirely at the mercy of such a rate as the Grand Trunk Railway might see fit to charge them. Now, when the Intercolonial reaches the city of Montreal, it will be in the power of the Intercolonial Railway agent to say to the Grand Trunk Railway: if you will not carry our freight to Toronto by your line at such a rate, the Canadian Pacific Railway will do it, or it can be sent by water. I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) give the Drummond County road such a high character. He knows the road and he has gone over it; but, I was astonished to hear the ex-Minister of Rail-

Mr. GIBSON.

ways (Mr. Haggart) criticise Mr. Ridout the Government engineer for his hurried inspection of the Drummond County Railway. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) not know, that every railway he and his Government approved of, was reported on by Mr. Ridout, who stated that he had examined the condition of such road and found it satisfactory, and does the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) pretend to say that Mr. Ridout walked over every tie on these railways before making his report? Not a bit of it, but for the purpose of slighting this road the hon. gentleman says, that Mr. Ridout went down one day and came back the next. Well, suppose Mr. Ridout did, is it not a proper way to examine a railroad either by riding on the front of the train on the engine or on the last car and go over the road in that way? I think it was very unfair for the ex-Minister of Railways to cast any slur on the report of Mr. Ridout, which was made under similar conditions to his reports on every other railway which was approved of by the late Government. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, that he would have built a bridge at Quebec and brought the line into Montreal by another road. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) know, that it is estimated to cost from five to six million dollars to build a bridge at Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, how much?

Mr. CASGRAIN. The deputation that came here the other day to interview the Premier, came up with a calculation showing that the bridge would cost about three million dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. And that a company would raise the most of that.

Mr. GIBSON. Then I would like to ask the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) if that money could be borrowed for less than 5 per cent interest?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. No; you would at once have to pay \$150,000 interest on the money required for the building of that bridge, and you would still be 176 miles from Montreal. To say nothing at all about the building of that 176 miles of railway, just let us take into consideration the facilities the Grand Trunk Railway give the Intercolonial Railway, and the advantage of their terminals in Montreal. Why, if the Government were obliged to-day to purchase the right of way to a central point in the city of Montreal, it would cost at least five million dollars for the right of way alone. That is the way the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would bring the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal. I am sure that if it had been left to the business management of the ex-Minister of Railways, considering his exploits in the line of Curran Bridges, it

would cost about seventeen million dollars to bring the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal.

I give the Government of the day credit for the ability they have shown in this matter, credit for the record they have made in the interest of the country in safeguarding the rights of the people, and credit for the admirable manner in which they have effected this arrangement.

Mr. POWELL. I have a very few words to say before this motion is put to the House. A few figures have suggested themselves to my mind in looking carefully into the transaction, and the question presents itself in two phases. First, the desirability of the extension to Montreal, and second, the nature of the bargain that was made by the Government with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway Company. With regard to the desirability of getting into the city of Montreal, I must confess I have always sympathized with the desire that the Intercolonial Railway should reach such a large commercial centre as Montreal. However, after looking carefully into the matter, I must say that that sympathy has been considerably weakened, if not, I fear destroyed. The traffic over this line will have to be looked at from three standpoints. First, the standpoint of local traffic, second, the standpoint of through traffic beginning and ending at Montreal, and beginning and ending at points on the present Intercolonial Railway, and third, the traffic in connection with the points along the Intercolonial Railway to and from points west of Montreal. We may immediately dismiss consideration of the local traffic as being a paying feature in connection with the matter. The running of the railroad by the Government will be so expensive, according to the experience of the past, that all the revenue derived from the local traffic will be consumed in expenses. I may say under present close management the net revenue is only \$29,000 as respects the traffic that is going to end and begin at points west of Montreal, if it is the intention of the Government—and it seems to be admitted that such is their intention—to assist in the building of a railway bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, then I claim that there is no call at all for the extension of this railway to Montreal, so far at least as through traffic to and from points beyond Montreal is concerned. I say there is no call for it, because there is nothing to be gained by having a terminus at Montreal which is not gained by having the terminus at Lévis. Reaching Montreal, the Intercolonial Railway will have the competition from freight west of that city, between the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the waterways. These are the only competitors, and those same three competing facilities will be at Quebec. Given a bridge at Quebec, we have competition between the Grand Trunk Rail-

way and the Canadian Pacific, and the water facilities for transportation to points in Canada west of Montreal. So far as the through traffic beyond Montreal, therefore, is concerned, there is no strategic value whatever in having the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at the city of Montreal. In respect to the through traffic over the Intercolonial Railway which will end at Montreal, and the through traffic which will originate at Montreal for the maritime provinces and the eastern portion of Quebec, I admit that there is a favourable aspect, but let us look carefully into it. What does it amount to? The city of Moncton, in the province of New Brunswick, is a critical point. For all traffic originating between that point and the city of St. John, this extension is of no conceivable use. The Intercolonial Railway will have to compete against a shorter mileage from 75 to 250 miles. For traffic between Moncton and Halifax it might almost be said also that this extension is of no use. The Intercolonial Railway will also have to compete against the Canadian Pacific Railway with a shorter mileage of 75 miles. I do not know why it is that those of us who live at points east of Moncton know that when coming to Montreal we always travel by the Canadian Pacific Railway, although the Intercolonial Railway is the safer road, unless it is the desire that is instinctive in us all to reach our destination by the shortest possible route. Freight and passengers, other things being equal, take the shortest route. Geography is against the Intercolonial Railway in respect to these two sources of traffic. With respect to that portion of the line extending from Rivière du Loup to Lévis, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, with their terminus at Montreal, found their portion of it to be so poor a property that they were willing to accept for 125 miles, which were in very good condition, the sum of \$1,500,000, or \$12,000 a mile. Some through traffic will come to and go from this portion but very little. There is not much in the traffic to and from those portions of the line between Moncton and Rivière du Loup. The trade is small; the country is poor and the prospects are uninviting. I was talking the other day to some leading merchants in Montreal, who deal in heavy wares, and they told me that a great proportion of their goods are shipped, not by railway to the maritime provinces, but that they take advantage of the water communication afforded by the River St. Lawrence and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. For the carriage of those goods the extension will enable the Intercolonial Railway to compete but at the most unprofitable rates. The Minister of Railways the other day, when this matter was under discussion, based his policy on the assumption that the extension to Montreal was going to help to pay the deficit on the Inter-

colonial, which under its present management has become large again, and transform that deficit into a surplus. This was the only reason he advanced. He rested the whole scheme on this assumption and this assumption alone. Apart from the desire which I share, and which I think every gentleman in the maritime province shares, that a terminus at Montreal should be got for the Intercolonial Railway, if it is a legitimate business venture and imposes no additional burdens on the country, the only thing the Minister of Railways has put forward in support of his proposition is the statement that the increased traffic on the road will transform the deficit on the Intercolonial into a surplus. To buttress this assumption what facts did he show? In the first place, he said there would be an increase in the passenger traffic amounting to 630,000 passengers a year, and an increase in the freight traffic of over 200,000 tons a year. Let us look for a moment at these figures. First of all, we must bear in mind that this railway is not going to originate any traffic; it must prey for its patronage exclusively upon the traffic of other lines. Because of this extension, there will not be one more through passenger coming from the maritime provinces on any point east of Lévis to Montreal or the west. We can only get an increase of through traffic on it to Montreal, by taking from the Canadian Pacific Railway a share of the passenger traffic which that railway now has. I have travelled dozens of times between the maritime provinces and Montreal—dozens of gentlemen in this House have done likewise—and I affirm that there are not twenty through passengers a day on the average going from the maritime provinces to Montreal; and the through passenger traffic on the Intercolonial can only be got by taking a portion of that small traffic. Are we going to get it? The largest part of this traffic is from St. John to Montreal. We shall have a mere bagatelle, if anything, of it. The Minister of Railways laid on the Table of the House a certificate from the Deputy Minister of Railways estimating that the number of additional passengers to be carried on the Intercolonial Railway would, as a result of this extension, be 630,000 a year. I do not know how the Deputy Minister of Railways ever came to give such a certificate. There must be a mistake. The Minister of Railways must have asked him how many additional passengers there would be in the whole ninety-nine years instead of one year; for taking it for the whole ninety-nine years, his estimate would probably be correct; on the basis of the present traffic. With the great respect I have for the Deputy Minister, I say it is absolutely absurd. Six hundred additional passengers per day! We will suppose that a fair percentage of the passengers travelling on this extension will be

Mr. POWELL.

allotted to the class of local passengers. On that class we will take one hundred thousand as an outside number. The present number of passengers as appears by the second report is 23,000. The balance, then, or 530,000, must be through passengers. If so, they must travel from Lévis or points east to Montreal, or from Montreal to Lévis or points east. Allowing for them \$3 per head, the return ticket rate, over the extension alone, what is the result? There will be an average of 1,700 a day through passengers between Quebec and Montreal, or thirty completed loaded passenger cars. I do not wonder the House laughed at the absurdity of the figures of the Minister of Railways. Is not the Canadian Pacific Railway going to have its full share of the through passengers from and to the maritime provinces? Certainly it will. So with the traffic to and from Quebec and Montreal, because it is the more advantageous route, owing to the fact that passengers by other routes have to cross the ferry at Quebec. Let us look further into this calculation, and see how it comes out. According to the hon. gentleman's calculation, there will be nearly 1,800 through passengers a day over this extension. A passenger car will afford room for about sixty passengers, so that means, as I have said, that we are to have thirty passenger cars filled to their utmost limit, passing, fifteen one way and fifteen the other way, between the city of Montreal and Lévis every day of every year. Why, Sir, it is nothing but an absurdity. So far from there being 2,000 passengers a day travelling backwards and forwards, I leave to any hon. gentleman who knows that route whether on the average there will be more than thirty through passengers every day of the year on the two railroads, the extension and the Grand Trunk, combined. Then, the Minister of Railways is simply out in his estimate of 1,800 passengers a day, 1,770 for every day of the year. The hon. gentleman said that they were going to transform a deficit into a surplus of \$500,000 a year. Why, he has adduced data in his calculations of the increase of freight and passenger traffic to reduce his phantom surplus of \$500,000 to a deficit of between \$750,000 and \$1,000,000, and, when the road is in operation the logic of facts and experience will show him the enormity of his prophecies and the greivous burdens that he has imposed upon the country.

It is undesirable for another reason. Why, we have already subsidized a line to be built along the southern shore of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal—a third line parallel to this line. We are bound by law to pay \$3,200 per mile for every mile of that road built along the south shore; and yet we are asked, at the same time, to purchase at an enormous cost this line which will compete with the one

we are subsidizing, and to place ourselves in the absurd position of aiding and destroying the same undertaking at the same time.

But leaving that aspect of the case, because I do not wish to take up the time of the House, let me proceed to deal with the contract itself. A more absurd contract never was submitted to an assemblage of sane men or men presumably wise for their approval and ratification. This is a strong statement, but I will lay my grounds for that statement before the House. The road will have cost, when the balance of it is built, the sum of \$851,379.60 to the company and we are giving for it the sum of \$2,000,000. When that road is completed, it will cost the company \$850,000 and we are planking down to them \$1,150,000 clear profit on that outlay. Whoever heard of such an absurd proposition in connection with an unprofitable local railway? The hon. Minister of Railways may say that is not the case. Well, I propose to work out the calculation, and leave it to the judgment of every hon. gentleman who will follow me whether the result is not what I have stated. In the first place, what are we paying them? We are paying them \$64,000 per year. What does that mean? I asked the hon. Minister, during the debate yesterday with reference to the proposal to pay interest to the Grand Trunk at 5 per cent, if the Government could not borrow the money at 3 per cent and pay it over to the Grand Trunk. He gave a very satisfactory reply indeed. He said we could not borrow at 3 and loan to the Grand Trunk Railway, for the simple reason that the security we would obtain from the Grand Trunk for advance is already hypothecated to a very large amount, and the Government would have no security, therefore, for the loan. But in respect of this road, there is no such to answer. We enter into a lease for 99 years at \$64,000 per year. In other words, we promise them an annuity of \$64,000 per year for 99 years, and the credit of Canada is pledged to that as much as it is to any bond issued by the Finance Minister. What is the significance of this annuity as a consideration for this railway? My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) said the Grand Trunk Railway Company could not take their lease and raise money upon it, it was so hedged round with conditions which rendered it valueless as a security. That may be so, but in this case the annuity is free from these depreciating conditions. The company can take that annuity and raise money on it as well as on an issue of Government bonds. I leave it to the judgment of this House if they could not take that annuity of \$64,000 into the financial market of London or Paris or Berlin and get the money at 3 per cent on the credit of Canada as it stands at present. The computation of the value of this annuity has not been exactly right as made by some hon. gentlemen on this side. It is not exactly correct to see

what principal that annuity is the interest upon, and regard that amount as the payment. We must estimate the value of that annuity as limited to 99 years, when making our computation. I acknowledge that it does not represent a capital of \$2,133,333, but what does it represent? I have not the tables showing the commuted present worth of an annuity for 99 years, but I have a table given in Whittaker's Almanac for 1897, on page 420, which I have compared with other tables, and I can vouch for its correctness. By that table, an annuity of \$100 for 99 years at 3 per cent is worth \$3,160. In that case, the net value of the annuity which we are giving this company will be \$2,022,400. The table does not give a commutation of a 99 years annuity. Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) are both expert financiers and mathematicians, and they will bear me out in saying that, and when I throw off \$22,400 for the 100th year, that I am making a generous reduction, one six or seven times more than the real one, and making that allowance, the annuity of \$64,000 for 99 years is worth \$2,000,000. They can take our lease to-morrow, if signed, and go into the English market, and there on the credit of Canada, as it stands to-day, raise \$2,000,000 on that lease. Now, what has this undertaking cost the company? They have only paid out of their own pockets \$263,379.60 as yet, but of course they have to complete the road and complete it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) estimated the cost of completing that road per mile at \$14,000. I say that that is a liberal estimate, based upon the facts before the House regarding the portion constructed. This is a fair basis as it does not appear that the construction of the balance will be more expensive than the construction of the portion already constructed. What has the road cost already? Taking the sworn statement given in the Railway Report, in the sheet just immediately before the appendices at the close of the report, we find that the total cost is \$1,366,485.60. What deductions have to be met out of that? In the first place, \$400,000 of that amount represents the paid up stock given to the promoters of the railway for having promoted it. It is a little solatium to the promoters. Then the rolling stock, which we are not purchasing under this contract, has to be subtracted. What does the rolling stock consist of? Five engines and one passenger car and about twenty-five others. Am I putting its value too high when I say that it cost \$50,000? Anybody who knows the cost of engines and cars will agree that that is a very low estimate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. How many miles are they operating?

Mr. POWELL. Ninety. There is the branch down to Nicolet which we must include. We have, as I have said, \$1,366,485.60 as the cost, according to the sworn statement of the company in the railway reports. From that you have to deduct the \$400,000 paid up stock given to the promoters and the \$50,000 value of rolling stock, or \$450,000, which leaves \$916,000 as the net balance. That is what the road cost. But who paid that cost? The company got the following subsidies:—

From the Dominion Government..... \$287,936  
From the Quebec Government—Cash subsidy ..... 300,170

And since that there has been a valuation of the land grant which the Quebec Government gave the company, but which they have bought back, and which amounts to \$50,000. Then the municipalities along the line contribute \$15,000, so that the total contributions given in aid of the construction of this line amount to \$653,106. Out of a total cost of \$916,000, they have received subsidies amounting to \$653,000. So that the net amount paid by the company for the road is \$263,379.

Mr. LAVERGNE. These are stuffed figures.

Mr. POWELL. I would reply to my hon. friend from Drummond, for whom I have very great respect personally and politically, that he must have sufficient keenness of intellect to see that if these figures in that report which the company have sworn to are stuffed, so much the worse showing for the Government in this transaction. There is no stuffing about the subsidies that were given to this company by the municipalities, there is no stuffing about the subsidies given by the province of Quebec and the Dominion, and if the figures respecting the cost of the road are stuffed, that means that the road cost less than is shown by the statement I have given and makes the case very much worse. But, Sir, I have somewhat digressed from the point that I had immediately in view and that in regard to the cost of the construction of the balance of the road. The cost of the railway that has been constructed, I have shown you, was \$916,000, and the length of road constructed is 90 miles. So the road costs an average of about \$10,000 per mile. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals intimated to this House that this road was in such magnificent condition that it was going to take very little to bring it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. I differ from him, and I will give him the advantage of my calculation, which is a great deal more in his favour. I will say that the road is not nearly up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, but that it will cost \$4,000—yes, \$5,000—per mile, or thereabouts, to bring it up to the standard, and that is equivalent to supposing that to construct the remaining 42 miles of road of the same char-

Mr. POWELL.

acter will cost \$14,000 per mile or \$588,000, irrespective of the levelling of the grades which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals referred to a few days ago, which is too trifling a matter to take into consideration. This amount of \$588,000 to complete the road together with the \$263,379.60, makes a total expenditure on the part of the company of \$851,375, when the road is finally passed over to the Government. Is the case not proved conclusively, that for this road that cost them \$851,000, the company is getting \$2,000,000, or in other words, over and above the amount expended upon the road we are to give them a present of no less than \$1,150,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What does my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) think it would cost the people of Canada to build an equally long road?

Mr. POWELL. The answer I have to make to the Minister of Trade and Commerce is this: While they might think it a desirable thing to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, as business men and as a business Government, they must count the cost, and if they find the cost would involve an unjustifiable expenditure, they have no business to construct it at all. But I do not leave the question put by the hon. gentleman there. I will satisfy the hon. gentleman fully and give a complete answer, not an evasive answer. Let us take the total cost of the road. When completed, the total expenditure on the road will have amounted to \$1,504,485. The Minister will see that only \$916,485.60 from all sources has already been expended, and \$588,000 must be expended to complete the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How do you make out \$916,000? You cannot verify that.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) had followed me he would have heard me verify these figures as I went along. If \$916,000 had been spent, and it requires \$588,000 to complete the road, the total cost will be \$1,504,000. That is what it would cost the Government to build the road, and to avoid the trouble of building a road, you are going to give an annuity representing a capital expenditure of \$2,000,000, in other words, you are going to make the company a clean donation of \$500,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. "Clean"?

Mr. POWELL. Well, it may not be clean; but I am not going into the moral features of the transaction. Now, I say that, in the face of these figures, before the third reading of the Bill is passed, we should have facts before us which will justify this measure. We should refuse to pass the third reading, until the hon. Minister shows facts and figures that are not fiction, until he shows really what traffic

we may expect, what the figures are of traffic on the Canadian Pacific Railway and how much he anticipates he is going to take away from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. GIBSON. Who can give that? Who can imagine what traffic one railway will take from another?

Mr. POWELL. Just so. Who can prophesy that? But if this cannot be done, if this is not a legitimate subject for the human mind to attempt to forecast, then this whole scheme is visionary and problematical. So the Minister of Railways and Canals has been attempting to inform us by means of figures, which, according to his own supporter (Mr. Gibson), who is a railway man and should know what he is talking about, is about a matter which no one can forecast. I am going to vote against the third reading of this Bill. That goes without saying expressly. I am not going to vote against it because the road could have been bought for an amount that business considerations would justify, and this contract is a perversion of every business principle that is involved in it. If the Government were anxious to conduct this transaction on a business basis, if they had said to these gentlemen: We propose to extend our line to the city of Montreal and we will build the line as a Government work, but if you choose to give us your road at a fair percentage over and above what it cost you, or for its fair valuation, we will take your line, they would have been able to purchase the road on terms fair and honourable. The owners of this road have no right to anything more than a return of their money and a handsome percentage—and I am willing that they should have that, there should be nothing small about such an arrangement as this—upon what the undertaking cost them, no more, because this road is not a financial success. But when it is proposed to pay \$1,150,000 over and above the expenditure upon the road, that is a transaction that cannot be justified and concerning which the wholesome sentiment of this country will be very suspicious indeed as to the motives that prompted the Government to enter into it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) has been discussing this question, I think, from an unobjectionable point of view, and I am willing to assume that he has convinced himself, from the calculations he has presented to the House that this proposal is not a proposal which can be justified or defended in its details. He has pressed his argument upon the assumption that it is a desirable thing, if it can be accomplished, upon fair terms, to continue to extend the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal and make the terminus in that city. But he has set himself to establish to the satisfaction of the House that

we have made an improvident arrangement, that we have paid more than we ought to have paid, even accepting the principle of extension into Montreal. As I say, I have no fault to find with the manner in which he has approached the question, but I have every fault to find with the calculations he has presented to the committee, and I think I can show the House how utterly fallacious, how entirely futile are the arguments he has advanced. He has put forward a claim, he has seriously and solemnly put forward a claim, that it was not for us to ascertain what this railway was worth, not what was its actual value, not what it would cost the Government of the country to duplicate it, but that the proper subject for inquiry with us was what money came out of the pockets of the builders in order to construct the work. According to the hon. gentleman we should have entered into an inquiry to find out what bonuses were paid by municipalities, we should ask the provincial governments how much subsidies they gave to the builders of the railways, and we should look into the accounts here to see what was given by way of subsidy by the Government of Canada, and having ascertained these facts, we should add these amounts together and deduct the sum from the total cost of the undertaking.

Now, I want to know if any one ever heard of such a proposition as that being seriously propounded by a responsible individual, and adopted by a responsible government? Is not this the first time within the knowledge of any gentleman present when a government was called upon to do it, and, because it did not do it, was denounced for not having deducted the aid previously given, from the value of the property which, in the public interest, it deemed it proper to acquire, before paying the price to the owner of that property? I say, it is an entirely novel proposition; I say more, it is an indefensible proposition; I say further, that the hon. gentleman will have to find somebody else to administer the Department of Railways and Canals in this Government, at all events, if, in case of a company whose property they think the Government ought to possess, they wish me to call upon that company to hand over to the Government the gifts which it has received by the bounty of municipalities and by governments, or to ask this Government, after it had generously expended a sum out of the treasury of this country for the purpose of assisting that company in promoting the undertaking, to require them to refund that money—I say, they will have to find somebody else to do it.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting what I said. I never put forward the argument the hon. gentleman has put into my mouth. What I meant was this, that when the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada granted subsidies to this line, it was because the under-

taking, from a business standpoint, would not pay its way, and it was necessary to aid it, and when the Government is buying it back on a business basis, the subsidies have no right to form a part of the contract price.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is apparent that the hon. gentleman was not correct in saying that I was misrepresenting his statements. But he is seeking to fortify a position which he has taken in this House, along with other hon. gentlemen opposite, in respect to this proposal, a position which is, in my judgment, taken for the first time in the history of this country. Take up the Subsidy Acts which have been passed from the time when subsidies were first given by Parliament, and you will not find, either directly or by implication, any declaration to the effect, that if the Government desired to resume or obtain possession of a property which it had subsidized, the Government should demand that the price should be reduced by the amount of the subsidy which the company had received. I say therefore that on principle, entirely distinct from precedents, of which there are none, the proposition is indefensible and cannot be sustained. No kind of logic-chopping, in which hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of indulging, can justify this proposition. Now, if it is not the first time in which such an idea has been put forward, I apprehend that there must have been previous cases in which it could have been put forward. I apprehend the Statute-book of this country and the Appropriation Acts of Parliament must have been full of instances, for if it were a proper thing, and these gentlemen insist that it is a proper thing, and they condemn us because we do not do it—if it was a proper thing, I apprehend that there must have been, in the lifetime of the Government of which the ex-Finance Minister was a leading member, cases when they could have applied this proper and necessary principle, and when, if there was any justification for it, they would have applied it to the cases that they were dealing with.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Can the hon. gentleman name an instance?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will name a striking instance. I will name an instance which the hon. member can take home to his friends and ex-colleagues, and which the leader of his party will recognize as having a strong application to the present case. I will not go outside the dealings of the Government with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I will carry my hon. friend back to the railway between Rivière du Loup and Lévis which was acquired by the Government, and what do we find? I find there that a railway was bought by hon. gentlemen opposite and they paid for it a million and a half of money, they paid \$12,000 a mile for every mile of that railway which they acquired.

**Mr. POWELL.**

And what kind of a railway was it? I am not going to speak from any personal knowledge of my own, but I am going to tell the House what kind of a railway it was and the condition it was in, according to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition and who, when he was asking Parliament to authorize the purchase of that road, said in effect: "There are 125 miles, and we propose to give \$1,500,000 for that railway. But I am buying simply an embankment. I am simply buying a track, I am simply buying a roadbed, I am buying it from the company because they have allowed it to run down, and it is now in an inferior condition. I am not even getting the rails, I am handing the rails over to the company from which I am buying this road. I am simply getting the roadbed, but in a demoralized condition, in an inferior condition, because it has become depreciated by reason of the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have not kept it up to the proper standard. I am taking it from them and I am giving them \$12,000 a mile for it." Now, let me give my hon. friend the benefit of the application. When they were paying \$1,500,000 for a railway which was in this inferior condition, which was only an embankment, did they propose to take back from the Grand Trunk Railway Company the \$10,000 a mile which the company had received as a bonus from the Government of Canada? Not a bit of it. You never heard a whisper of it, no man on the other side of the House ever suggested that we should exact from the Grand Trunk Railway company a refund of the aid which they had received from the Government. It was not a paltry sum, it was not this smaller sum of \$287,000 they had received from the Government that was in question, but it was one and a quarter million dollars which had been given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company on that 125 miles; and the Government were buying that back again without a hint or a suggestion that the money should be returned to them by that company. Why cannot they discuss a question of this kind in a fair way? Why can't they present us with facts instead of fancy? Why can't they deal with the conduct of the Government in this transaction in the same way that they would deal with an individual in a similar action? Why is it necessary for these gentlemen, for their political purposes, to asperse the integrity and character of the men who have made this transaction, and whose character stands infinitely higher than the character of some of their aspersers? Now, so much on this question of the refund of the amount which was given to this company. The basis of this whole question is "What was the value of this piece of property?—not who got the money, not who was benefited by the gift, not who were the ben-

ficiaries of somebody's generosity, not even who stole the money, if you wish, but, What is the value of that property? I can understand these gentlemen saying that in the position of the railway it is not wise to seek a terminus in the city of Montreal. I can understand them taking a position of that kind, and in saying that there was no reason founded on the public interest why the Intercolonial should be extended to that city. But once that principle is conceded, once the argument passes away from the question of policy and we come down to details, I take my stand on the ground that the question we have to consider is the value of the property that we are acquiring, and what means we ought to take to ascertain the value of that property. I do not know what it cost to build the railway. I do not know what the value of a private railway is, and that is not a matter for the members of the Government to inquire into. I do not know what the value of a mile of railway is and nobody expects me or the other members of this Government to know. What they do expect is that we shall look to the men who are employed by the Government who have large experience, who know what it costs for railways and who are there for the purpose of advising us in that particular. I take it that these gentlemen, who have for all these years been filling responsible positions in the service of the Government, are trustworthy and reliable men. I take it that they are men who are competent to advise us. And the Government, so far as I and my colleagues are concerned, relied upon their judgment that that road was worth \$1,600,000. If the country and hon. gentlemen opposite are going to condemn the Government for doing this it will be impossible for men in the responsible places that we occupy to discharge their duty. We have got to rely upon this information and this judgment upon questions which are of technical character and upon questions which we could not possibly be expected to have technical knowledge. Upon the assumption that the property is worth \$1,600,000 did we pay an unreasonable price? When we agreed to give them \$64,000 a year did we make an improvident arrangement? I think we did not. I think that in agreeing to pay this company \$64,000 a year we did not do any more than agree to pay them a sum which would enable them in the years to come to wipe out the principal of the debt or to extinguish the amount corresponding with the value of the property. We were not simply paying a rental in the ordinary sense; we were buying it, year by year making a payment on account of the purchase of the property which will ultimately be our own. This is not a lease under which at the end of 99 years we will have to go on paying a rental upon the property,

but when the last hour of the last day of the last year of that 99 years comes the property is the absolute, free and unencumbered property of the people of Canada. How much is it fair to take out of the \$64,000 a year towards the purchase money as payment for the property which we are buying. The hon. gentleman for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) knows how the money market would respond to the demand of the Drummond County Railway Company in case they applied to them as they would have to do. The hon. gentleman who is thoroughly informed upon that tells us that they could without difficulty have gone to the London market with this arrangement and have obtained \$2,000,000 at 3 per cent a year. That is the assurance of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman may perhaps have conducted large transactions in the money market. He may be thoroughly familiar with all the pros and cons, the possibilities and conditions, but there is the possibility that he may not, and, Mr. Speaker, if we were to have insisted upon this transaction being based on the assumption and calculations of the hon. gentleman, the railway could not have been purchased or acquired at all. These people told us that they could not go into the English market and with this rental guarantee for these years finance at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. I agreed, and my colleagues agreed, that it was absurd to expect that they could finance the property of the company upon the basis of the assumed rental even though the guarantor of that rental were no less a responsible party than the Government of Canada. We assumed that the cost would be 3½ per cent at the least, taking one thing with another the charges, &c., to enable them to recover the value of their property. If they are right—and who can show us that they are not right—upon what ground can you denounce this proposition. This 3½ per cent would be a reasonable interest. Who will contend that the Government has a right to negotiate with parties whose property they are seeking to acquire on a basis which leaves all the doubt in favour of the Government and against the other party to the contract. I do not think the ex-Minister of Finance during his Government experience found himself dealing in that manner in the transactions in which his Government were concerned. I do not think that has been a trait of the late Government and I do not know that I would complain if they had not done it. You have to deal in a spirit of fair-play with those with whom you are negotiating. They said "it will cost us 3½ per cent taking everything into account if we are to get the value of our property out of the transaction. If this is to be cut down we cannot do it. We cannot consent to any less rate than 3½ per cent upon the value of that property." Then if you take 3½ per cent which

is guaranteed to produce \$1,600,000 you have only  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent remaining out of which to pay the \$1,600,000 at the expiration of the 99 year term. I say if the hon. gentlemen were actuaries or went into a calculation with the utmost minuteness they would find that \$8,000 a year would not be more than sufficient to pay \$1,600,000 in 99 years. That is not all. Mr. Speaker, Hon. gentlemen have criticised this transaction upon a further ground. They say we pay too much rental to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the use of the privileges that we get. They say it is absurd that we should pay \$40,000 a year fixed rental, for instance for the privilege upon the bridge. What I have to say to the House in respect to that transaction will have general application to all the rest. What is the situation in regard to acquiring the right over this bridge? There are two ways in which we could have acquired this right. We could have agreed to pay a fixed rental, which we did, or we could have decided to pay so much per car for every car hauled over the bridge. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me that it was a more prudent business arrangement to agree upon a fixed rental as we have done. A charge is made for all traffic crossing the Grand Trunk bridge, varying from an ordinary freight car up to a locomotive. The charge for a locomotive is something like \$10 every time it crosses the bridge. This is the amount paid by the Central Vermont Railway for that privilege. The charges made for a first-class car, vary from \$5 to \$3 which is the lowest rate paid by any company who are allowed to use the Grand Trunk Railway bridge, so that the range is from \$3 to \$10. We found that if we only ran one train into Montreal in the morning and one in the evening, as we are now running into Lévis, and the same going out, the fixed rental for a year would amount to \$30,000. I do not carry the figures in my mind, but it is something in the neighbourhood of from \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year. Will anybody say that it is not a more prudent arrangement to have a fixed rental which cannot be exceeded no matter how many cars run over the road, than to feel that it was a question for consideration every time you picked up a passenger or had freight carried on your train, whether or not you were going to pay for the use of the bridge, and to pay the other charges incidental to carrying over the road and into the terminus. We concluded that this fixed arrangement was best, and we considered that if our expectations were anything like realized, we would be in a large amount of money within a short time, by having a well understood and permanent arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway. That was the conclusion we arrived at. We arrived at it bona fide; we arrived at it in the exercise of our best judgment, and I am convinced that we came to a prudent business conclu-

Mr. BLAIR.

sion in the matter. The hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) seems to be startled by the figures which have been presented to me by the Deputy Minister of Railways and the general manager of the Intercolonial at Moncton. To a person who does not understand the details, these figures look to be very considerable, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) is quite in error if he assumes that when Mr. Schreiber gave me that statement, he did so professing to give a statement, or even an estimate, of the number of persons who were going to travel over the whole railway from Halifax to Montreal. I did not understand it to mean any such thing.

Mr. POWELL. Neither did I.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I heard the Grand Trunk state (as I believe they do) that they carried out of Montreal down to Ste. Hyacinthe in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of a million people in the year, I would not understand it to mean that they carried those three-quarters of a million all that distance there and back. I would understand them to mean that they pick up and drop down along that line that many people. Now, with the Grand Trunk Railway Company carrying three-quarters of a million people on this section of their railway, and we are running our trains in and out on that railway, we ought to be able to pick up a portion of that traffic. I think it will not be an unreasonable conclusion to come to, that we may perhaps get one-quarter or one-third of the whole number; perhaps not so many, but that is a matter of estimate. But when you get 250,000 people that you are taking out for a part of the way, or the whole of the way, over that section from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, you are disposing of a very large percentage of the estimated increased passenger traffic which my deputy put in my hand. Then, you have got all the other portion of the road to take into account. Now, whether it is right or whether it is wrong, and whether these calculations have been exaggerated or not, I cannot say. They are the calculations which the responsible officers have given to me, and I am not influenced by any desire to misstate, misrepresent or exaggerate the probabilities with regard to it. They have been put in the possession of the House, exactly as I received them, and I think they are entitled to some weight, coming from the quarter whence they do. At all events, they are entitled to greater weight than would attach to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) who does not himself pretend to have had any very great railway experience. So much for that.

We have heard a great deal throughout this discussion about the subject of adding to the public debt, and we are told that the addition aggregates seven or eight millions. I have emphasized my con-

demnation of that argument as strongly as I could. Perhaps I am unable to see the force of the view which the hon. gentleman presents, but I confess at once that I cannot see how a gentleman who professed to give a business criticism to a proposition which is laid before Parliament, can indulge in such a class of comment as that which those gentlemen have indulged in. It is surely intended for some other atmosphere than the atmosphere of an intelligent Parliament. It is surely designed to reach the understanding of some people who are infinitely less capable of judging the weight of argument than are the members who sit around these boards. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that no one better understands than the two hon. gentlemen who have presented this argument to the House, that it is a perfect perversion of terms, and that it is an idle argument to say that we are adding to the public debt. If we are adding to the public debt, where is the evidence of it? We must owe the seven or eight millions, and if we owe it, when are we going to pay it? I would like some one to tell me when this debt of seven or eight millions which it is said we are now assuming, is going to mature? When are you going to have the bills presented? Will some one kindly tell me that? I concede it would be fair, if these gentlemen should say: You are adding to the annual charges. That is a fair way of stating the proposition, and I would at once yield to it. Let us approach the discussion of these things with some fair and reasonable idea. I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that he will gain nothing by these frivolous means which he sometimes resorts to of clouding and confusing public questions. There is nothing gained by that in the long run. He does not elevate the estimation in which he is held in this House, nor does he improve the opinion of him generally entertained in the country by such tactics. The people know that it is idle to say, that because the Government came to the conclusion that it would augment a property which cost us over 50 million dollars, to extend it to the great metropolis of Montreal, and when to do that we concluded that we would pay the rental which was necessary; the people of the country, I say, know that we are not adding to the public debt. They know that it is a business transaction. We are taking a business risk in this. You cannot, by any mathematical demonstration, establish that this undertaking is going to pay, but you can judge of the probabilities. That we have done, and we think we will be able to more than pay back the rental which we assume, and we believe that in assuming this responsibility, we are only assuming an annual charge which will be absolutely covered by the results of the transaction when it gets into full operation. We will not add to the public debt. It is a perversion of language, it is an unfair and an unwarranted attempt to

mislead the people who do not understand the question, and who will perhaps be willing to accept the wild statements of their political leaders and friends. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have about covered all the observations which have been addressed to the House, at all events this morning, on this question. I make no reference whatever to what has been said by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart). I sympathize with the indignant terms in which my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred to his conduct.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, you do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do, and I say further, that I would be ashamed of being guilty of the conduct which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) said it was my duty as a responsible Minister of the Crown to have pursued in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The hon. gentleman may not appreciate it, but as some one has suggested, the course which that gentleman (Mr. Haggart) insisted I should have taken, would have been more worthy of a card sharper than it would be of a Minister of the Crown. If the Government of this country never make any greater mistake than they have made in avoiding such a line of conduct as the hon. gentleman has advocated, I think we shall for a long time occupy the Treasury benches.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very averse to prolonging this discussion. I did intend to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) who has just taken his seat. I watched very closely from the moment he rose until he sat down to see how he would manage the argument of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I am quite willing to leave that argument, which was presented so clearly and lucidly by my hon. friend, alongside the reply of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and let the two go to the country together. I had intended to make a brief résumé of the question as a reply to the hon. Minister; but I do not think it is necessary. I merely wish to speak of one point. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to say that it was deception and worse to leave the people of Canada to think that when a fixed charge of \$210,000 per year was saddled on the country for ninety-nine years, it was equivalent to an addition to the public debt of \$7,000,000 at the rate of 3 per cent. I am willing to leave that. I do not think any person on this side of the House ever said it was an addition to the public debt of \$7,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, you said \$8,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend can point out where I said \$8,000,000—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You spoke of that side of the House. I do not know that the hon. gentleman himself said it.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Does it matter whether any one said it? Whether it was \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000, I understand that the argument of the hon. Minister was that it was deceiving the people to say that it was equivalent to an addition to the public debt of that amount. My hon. friend has added \$210,000 to the annual fixed charges of this country for ninety-nine years. My hon. friend knows that that money has to be paid. Is there any doubt about that? It is a fixed charge. It is not a charge which he may pay this year and get out of paying another year; it is a charge which he has to pay just as inevitably as the year comes round. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman tries to justify himself on this ground, that there is a possibility that more than that will come to the Government as a return from the operation of the railway. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) told him to his face that that was simply in the region of prophecy, and that no man could say whether it would be realized or not. While the fixed charge of \$210,000 is as certain as the year rolls round, the question whether you will get an equivalent in business profits, over and above maintenance and the cost of operating, is entirely experimental and unknown. So I say that by adding \$210,000 to the annual fixed charges of the country, you have done what is equivalent to going into the market and adding \$7,000,000 to the debt of the country at 3 per cent. The hon. gentleman wants to know when the bill will be presented. I will tell him when: every year in his lifetime, to the expiration of the ninety-nine years, and then probably on and on again. The bill is presented in the form of an annual demand for interest, demanded by the letter of the agreement, and is irrevocably to be paid, whether there is a dollar of revenue or a deficit upon the operating and maintenance expenses. So much with reference to that. Now, the virtuous indignation of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) this morning did me good; it was as good as a tonic. The hon. gentleman wanted to know if the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) had any conscientious convictions. Nobody will hereafter ask the hon. member for North Wellington that question, when they contrast the position he took on this side of the House, when he was always for the country, with the position he takes on that side of the House, when he is always for the company or the corporation. My hon. friend had better not raise the question of conscientious convictions. But I will tell you what the Minister of Railways and Canals had no business to do. He had no business to engage the credit of this country in order to pay for a railway

**Mr. FOSTER**.

anything more at the most than a fair profit to the gentlemen who are interested in it, over and above its actual cost of construction.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have not done so.

**Mr. FOSTER**. The sworn statement of that railway company is that the whole cost of that road, made up on their basis, was \$1,500,000 or thereabouts.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. And that was before the building of the 43 miles, which were to cost \$600,000 more.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I say the sworn statement of that company was that the cost, made up on their basis, was \$1,500,000. The Minister's statement here was that the road could be built for \$1,600,000. I say that it is as plain as can be, and my hon. friend cannot deny it, that in the making up of that cost there went not only the subsidies from the Dominion and local Governments and the municipalities, but also the promoter's stock of \$400,000, which everybody knows cost the company not one cent. I challenge my hon. friend to deny this by investigation if he can—that the three gentlemen who own the interest in that road to-day—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I will deny. I will deny that the hon. gentleman is now stating a fact which appears in any record of the Department of Railways and Canals.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What statement?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The statement that the outlay on the road includes the stock of the promoters, which is a gift of stock to the promoters. The returns do not show anything of the kind.

**Mr. FOSTER**. The return includes the stock.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The cost of the road is stated in the returns, which give the various items of cost—the money paid for the construction of the road; and under such circumstances it is remarkable to me how the hon. gentleman can imagine that the question of stock could be introduced into that side of the account at all.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Will my hon. friend give the items of the \$1,500,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I can, I presume. I have not studied them; but I venture to affirm that from one end of the account to the other, which profess to show what was laid out on this railway, there is no reference to the stock as a contribution. That would go on the credit side of their accounts if they were presenting them to the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the admission of my hon. friend is quite sufficient without my carrying it any further. I will challenge my hon. friend to make an investigation before any committee he chooses, and find out whether that company, consisting at present of three influential persons, owning I think the whole of it, put one single dollar of their own money into this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care if they stole it.

Mr. FOSTER. Or whether anything went into it except the subsidies which they got, or the proceeds of their stock measured by the amount of the advances they got upon it. My hon. friend may rest assured that if he has the mind to face an investigation with reference to this matter, it can be shown that he has paid, over and above everything they have put into the railway, a sum pretty close to \$750,000, which will be divided among these gentlemen. Now, my hon. friend tried to justify his assumption that 630,000 more passengers would be carried. If that was given to this committee for any purpose at all, it was intended to prove that by the extension of the road into Montreal that extra number of passengers would be carried, and not simply that in the course of the gradual increase of the traffic between Sussex and St. John and Moncton and St. John and Halifax and the way stations all through, there would be an increase of 630,000 passengers. It is intended to mean that that increase would be due to the road getting into Montreal, and due to that alone. The same remark applies to his expected increase of traffic. The hon. gentleman did not attempt to meet the argument of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Powell) on those points, and I leave his assertions and my hon. friend's argument to go side by side to the country, and let time test which of the two is sound. My hon. friend's argument is based upon the actual trade, but the hon. gentleman's assertions are simply given out as a prophecy which he himself has no ground to believe will ever be realized. As I have said, I am adverse to discussing the thing further, and I therefore move in amendment :

That this Bill be, not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months.

Amendment negatived on division.

Bill read third time and passed.

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

### After Recess.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The Tariff resolutions adopted in Committee of Ways and Means on the 18th inst., were reported, and read the second time.

#### CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No.

143) to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the duties of customs.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—INLAND REVENUE.

The House resolved itself into Committee on certain resolutions respecting the Inland Revenue.

(In the Committee.)

The following resolutions were adopted :—

1. Resolved,—That it is expedient to amend section 130, of chap. 34, of the Act 49 Victoria (the Inland Revenue Act), as amended by section 1, of chap. 25, of the Act 59 Victoria, by repealing such section and substituting in lieu thereof as follows :—

There shall be imposed, levied and collected on all spirits distilled the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector of inland revenue as herein provided, that is to say :—

(a.) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety per cent, by weight, of raw or unmalted grain—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety cents.

(b.) When manufactured exclusively from malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or excise has been paid, or when manufactured from raw or unmalted grain, used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribe, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or of excise has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety-two cents.

(c.) When manufactured exclusively from molasses, syrup, sugar, or other saccharine matter, taken to the distillery in bond, and on which no duty of customs has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety-three cents.

2. Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal so much of the Inland Revenue Act and amending Acts as determine the excise duty on vinegar, and to provide that the excise duties thereon and upon acetic acid, shall be as follows :—

Vinegar, manufactured in whole or in part from spirits in bond, four cents per proof gallon.

Acetic acid, produced by the destructive distillation of wood, four cents per proof gallon.

Provided, that the Governor General in Council may establish regulations exempting acetic acid from excise duty in whole or in part, when used in the mechanical arts.

3. Resolved,—That it is expedient that a license fee of \$50 be collected in each fiscal year from every manufacturer of acetic acid.

4. Resolved,—That it is expedient to so amend the said Act and the Acts in amendment thereto as to provide that the excise duty to be levied upon cigarettes shall be as follows :—

On cigarettes, made solely from domestic leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds

per thousand, one dollar and fifty cents per thousand.

On cigarettes, the product solely of foreign leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, three dollars per thousand.

On cigarettes, whether the product of foreign or of domestic leaf tobacco, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eight dollars per thousand.

5. Resolved,—That it is expedient to provide that in addition to the excise duty at present levied on manufactured tobacco, cigars, and as herein determined in respect of cigarettes, there shall be levied and collected the following excise duties, that is to say:—

(a.) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, ten cents per pound.

(b.) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, fourteen cents per pound.

The above duties on foreign raw leaf tobacco shall be exigible in respect of all such tobacco in excise warehouse on the 23rd day of April, 1897, or transferred thereto, free of customs duty prior to 1st July, 1897.

Tobacco removed from warehouse prior to the said 23rd of April, contrary to the regulations of the Inland Revenue Department, shall be subject to duty under this section.

6. Resolved,—That it is expedient to provide that a license fee of \$65.00 be collected in each fiscal year from every manufacturer of tobacco, cigars or cigarettes, licensed to use foreign and domestic leaf tobacco in combination.

7. Resolved,—That it is expedient to so amend the Inland Revenue Act, and the Acts in amendment thereof, as to empower the Governor in Council to make regulations:

(a.) For the manufacture of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, from foreign and domestic leaf in combination,—and for determining the proportion of each that shall be used and the duty that shall be payable thereon, having regard as nearly as possible to the proportion of foreign and domestic leaf used,—and for determining what proportion of such duties shall be levied upon the foreign leaf taken for use, and what proportion upon the resultant finished product provided that the aggregate duties of excise so imposed shall not exceed those fixed from time to time with respect to tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, and

(b.) To determine the time and manner of payment of the duties on foreign leaf taken for use in any tobacco or cigar manufactories.

8. Resolved,—That it is expedient to provide that the excise duties hereby fixed and determined shall be held to have come into force and effect on and after the 23rd day of April, 1897.

Resolutions reported, and read the second time.

#### INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I wish to make an amendment to  
 Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

this clause. We have discovered that a frequent source of fraud on the revenue is the abuse of the privilege which people have to make ale for their own use or for the use of their families, which the law allows them to do. But in order to begin the manufacture of ale and beer, you follow for a certain time the same process that you do in distilling spirits, that is to say, you must cook the grain and make the mash. It is only after this mash is produced that these two proceedings, that of brewing it into ale and that of converting it into spirits, begin to branch off the one from the other. Now, we find that people abuse the permission that is given them by law in making beer for themselves to convert it into spirits. At first it was proposed to abolish the privilege of malting beer for private use. As the law is now before you it would actually have deprived any one of the privilege of malting beer for himself and his family. We thought it would cause too much of a hardship to do that, and so we endeavour to provide as much as possible against any attempt to defraud the revenue. I would therefore ask that clause 8 be replaced by the following clause, which I will read. It is exactly the same clause as the one that has always existed up to this time, and which allowed the manufacture of beer for private use, but, in order to keep track of that operation we want to add the following words:—

Provided, that due notice of the possession thereof, and of his intention of using them for the above mentioned purpose, be given to the nearest collector of inland revenue, or to the Department of Inland Revenue at Ottawa.

We want to be able to keep track of this; and, under the increased taxes on the manufacture of spirits, we think the temptation of defrauding the revenue will increase, and we do not want to leave any loophole to people who, under pretense of manufacturing ale for private use, may manufacture spirits. We want to watch them in case there should be any attempt to do so, and we want them to report their names and their intention, either to the nearest collector of inland revenue or to the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you allow a private individual to malt grain for the purpose of manufacturing ale?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The law allows people to brew their own ale. We thought, at first, of abolishing it completely, because it gives rise to abuses; but we could not help thinking that there were many people who, in imitation of what they have been doing in the old country, like to brew their own beer. We thought that to abolish that privilege completely would be considered a hardship, and so we still allow them that privilege, but we surround it with precautions that have not been taken heretofore.

Mr. HAGGART. I can understand the hon. gentleman allowing people to brew

beer, but not to make malt. We do not allow any private individual to make malt. In the old country, special legislation is required to malt grain to feed the cattle.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. We do not allow them to make malt; we merely allow them to make the mash, under the law that has existed for many years. They are allowed to cook their grain and make their mash, but we have found that it gives rise to great abuse, as it is the beginning of the two operations of brewing and distilling. So, instead of abolishing the privilege, we surround it with such restrictions as will allow us to watch over the exercise of the right that has been enjoyed for many years. And to follow out the sequence of what we have done, I ask that section 9 be struck off and that the following be substituted therefor:—

Every person who, without having a license under this Act then in force brews any beer or other fermented liquor, except for the use of himself or family, as by this Act provided, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and should, for the first offence, incur a penalty of fifty dollars, and for each subsequent offence, a penalty of two hundred dollars.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS.

Mr. **FIELDING** moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved,—That it is expedient to enact that if any country imposes now or hereafter a duty upon the articles enumerated in item 577 in Schedule "B" to an Act of the present session, intituled: "An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," or upon any of such articles when imported into such country from Canada, the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the "Canada Gazette," declare the following export duties, or any of them, chargeable upon logs and pulp-wood exported from Canada to such country, that is to say: On pine, Douglas fir, spruce, fir, balsam, cedar, and hemlock logs, and pulp-wood, an export duty not exceeding three dollars per thousand feet, board measure; and in case of the export of any of the above mentioned logs or pulp-wood in shorter lengths than nine feet, then a rate per cord may be levied in the same way, not greater than the equivalent of the above mentioned rate per thousand feet, board measure; and such export duty shall be chargeable accordingly after the publication of such proclamation: Provided that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in like manner, from time to time remove and reimpose such export duty.

2. Resolved,—That it is expedient to enact that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the "Canada Gazette," impose export duties as under upon the following ores and metals, and each such duty shall be chargeable accordingly after the publication of such proclamation.

Provided always that the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in like manner,

from time to time remove and re-impose such export duties:—

(a.) On nickel contained in matte, or in the ore, or in any crude or partially manufactured state, and upon copper contained in any matte or ore which also contains nickel—when exported from Canada—upon such nickel an export duty not exceeding ten cents per pound; and upon such copper an export duty not exceeding two cents per pound.

(b.) On ores which contain copper, or any metal other than nickel or lead, when exported from Canada, an export duty not exceeding fifteen per cent on the value of the said ores.

(c.) On lead ores, and on lead and silver ores, when exported from Canada to a country which imposes an import duty on lead in bars or in the form of pig lead in excess of the import duty on lead contained in lead ores or in lead and silver ores—an export duty on the lead contained in the ores so exported from Canada to an amount per pound equivalent to such excess.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I would like to ask whether it would be possible for the House to take up the Crow's Nest Pass and put it through. My idea would be to get that matter before the Senate as quickly as possible. The matter of export duties is likely to be more of a routine one, but the Crow's Nest question may cause some discussion.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). The export duties will not take very long, and therefore we will take up that question.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the House into committee on certain resolutions respecting export duties.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this question, which has been before the House for a long time. Some eight or ten years ago I endeavoured as much as I was able, to induce the Government to put an export duty on logs. The injury that was being done to our forests in the province of Ontario who ought to have the employment which the raw material of the country afforded them, was so great, and the destruction of timber so extensive that we thought there should be an export duty on logs. I brought the subject to the attention of the Government of the day. A few members from our province supported the proposition, and one or two from the maritime provinces, but our efforts were ineffective so far as we were able to induce the Government to do anything to meet the situation. There are two ways by which we might accomplish the object sought by the imposition of export duties. One was by regulations made by the provincial government when they come to sell the timber limits of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I have always thought that the proper means to take for the protection of the labourers of our country and the protection of our forests was to impose such a condition upon the purchasers of our forests as would necessitate their cutting the lumber in the country or manufacturing it, as far

as possible, so as to give employment to the labour of our country and to preserve its assets. That could be done by the provincial government of Quebec and Ontario in neither of which provinces it was done. We were unable to press this with sufficient strength upon the Ontario Government to induce them to do it, and year by year, as the financial necessities of the Government required it, large areas of our timber were put up for sale and in almost every instance they were bought by Americans. They brought in their own labour and supplies to the disadvantage of our people. This has been going on year by year, and it is estimated that they have taken out enough logs to make 250,000,000 feet of lumber a year for several years past. A few years ago it seemed as if we were about to succeed in convincing the Government of the wisdom of reimposing the export duty, but just at that time the Wilson Bill was introduced and by the efforts of some parties we succeeded in getting the duty taken off Canadian lumber going into the United States which, before that time, was \$2 a thousand. In my opinion, although we got that duty taken off, the interest of this country in its timber demanded that an export duty should have been put on logs. We could not succeed in getting the provincial government to make such provisions in the regulations as would compel the purchasers of our timber to cut it in the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. They did it in Quebec, and it was held to be unconstitutional.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, it seems to me that it shows a greater necessity for this House availing itself of the power that it undoubtedly has to put an export duty on logs. It has gone on up to the present time, and we secured the very doubtful advantage for a few years of sending our pine lumber into the United States free of duty. There is now a new Administration in the United States, and they have framed a new tariff Bill, which reimposes the two dollars a thousand upon our white pine. I hope I will not do any injustice to any hon. member of this House when I say that it has always been the opinion of a great many people in this country that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was instrumental in inducing the members of the United States Senate to put a provision in their Tariff Bill which would bring in force a large duty on lumber imported from Canada, in the event of Canada imposing an export duty on logs. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), almost as much as admitted it on the floor of this House, when he said he was entitled to credit if he could influence them so far as to get a reduction of duties on Canadian lumber. But in getting that reduction he had it accompanied with provisions that in the event of the Government of any country

Mr. SPROULE.

imposing an export duty on logs, the import duty on lumber would be raised to a high figure. That provision is accentuated in the present United States Tariff Bill, and I do not know how far the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) has been instrumental in accomplishing it. Even in consideration of that threat from the United States, we should not be deterred from doing our duty here. We are looking after the interests of the Canadian people, and it is our duty in the best interests of the country, to conserve our forest wealth for our own people. I am glad that the day has come, even though it should be under the present Government, that the members of this House are sufficiently convinced that it is in the interests of the country that the export duties should be reimposed on logs. I congratulate the present Government upon the wisdom which they are displaying in this matter. I congratulate them that in this respect they are working in the interests of Canada, and especially in the interests of the province of Ontario, one of whose representatives I am. Year after year I have regretted that I was not able to convince our own Government when in power that it was in the interests of Canada to take this course. So far as my influence goes, I shall support the present Government as strongly as I know how in the effort they are making, and the course they are taking with regard to these export duties on logs. Now, in my judgment elm logs should not be included.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We intend to ask that the clause be amended in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. That being the case, I need not refer to it further than to say that there is a great deal of difference between the two classes of timber. I am pleased to find that the Government seriously contemplate putting an export duty on logs and pulp-wood. I believe it will do a great deal of good to the country, and that it will conserve the forests which nature has bestowed on us, and which under existing circumstances must in a short time be destroyed. The imposition of this export duty will give employment to our people at home, furnish a large home market for the consumption of the products of the farmers, and in every way be in the interests of Canada, and especially in the interests of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the export duty on logs is concerned, I shall support the proposals of the Government. The circumstances of the lumber trade and the effect of the United States duties on it are within the knowledge of this House. With reference to that export duty I have no criticism to make, but simply to say, that under the circumstances as they exist to-day, I believe it is our duty to take such a step.

But when we come to the question of ores, we approach a subject which this House ought to be very careful in dealing with, even to the extent of putting it in the power of the Government, and thereby holding out a threat if you may so call it, or a menace, or even an intimation, that at any time this Government may bring these export duties into play. I am now speaking less with reference to nickel ores. They lie here close to us, and we are pretty well acquainted with that phase of the question, and there are certain facts with reference to nickel at the present time which makes the Canadian position a pretty strong and well assured one. What I do want to call the attention of the Government to is, what they propose to do with reference to ores containing copper and silver and gold and lead. It is proposed to take power to put an export duty on all of these precious metals in the ore condition. I want to ask the House and the Government whether they have made themselves thoroughly familiar with the conditions of that matter, or whether they have not? Have they personally visited that section of the country and talked not only with the men who invest their money in smelters, but talked with the men who invest their money in mines. For one man who invests his money in a smelter, there will be 10,000 men who will invest their money in mines; and for one labourer who will be engaged in smelters there are thousands of labourers who will be engaged in mines. This is a question which must be looked at in that dual condition. I have visited that country. When I went there, I had, as naturally a Canadian should, only one idea, which was that we should do the smelting within our own country; just the same as we should do the sawing and manufacturing of this lumber within our own country. But I was not long in talking with men who knew a thousand times more about that matter than I did, until I found there was another side to that question, and that side is a very serious one. In the first place, do we know what we are doing, when we say we are going to put an export duty of 15 per cent upon all ores carrying gold and silver. Take what you call the dry ore belt, or the dry ore in that belt which covers a large extent of territory in the Slocan district, and which runs all through eastern Kootenay as well as other quarters; and what do you find? You have in the ingredients of these ores copper, gold and silver; a smaller or a larger percentage of copper, a smaller or a larger percentage of gold, and generally a pretty large percentage of silver. You have ores in the dry belt which run anywhere from \$40 or \$50 up to \$100 or \$130 in value. There is actually but one or two places in Canada where these ores can be smelted, and these about exhaust the number. They may be smelted at the

Heinze smelter, and I have heard that later they are smelting these, for custom work, at the Hall mines smelter at Nelson. But outside of this, these are the only places in the whole district where you can get this smelting done. To-day the miner, when he gets his ore out, has the range of the whole smelter market in the United States and Canada. He can have the benefits that come from competition in that which is altogether a technical business, and which requires very large capital in the first place, and in the second place is fraught with great possibilities of loss or gain to the miner, who is dependent on the smelter returns for his profits. The moment you put on this export duty, that moment you place a burden on that ore of from \$6 to \$20 or \$30 a ton. Now, I say that that \$6 or \$30 per ton, and the whole range between these figures, taking into account the transport facilities of much of that country and the cost of mining and getting to the transport depots, marks, in many cases, the profit which is to be made, and is simply the debatable ground which will make it possible for the miner to carry on his work or not. The moment you put on this export duty, you impose it upon any man who proposes to invest money in these mines for development; and I take it there is where the great gain is—not in the investing of money in smelters, but in the great mining operations of the country. I say candidly that if I were going to-day to negotiate for the purchase of a property in the dry ore belt and I had an intimation that this export duty was possibly going to be put on, it would be the one thing that would in many cases make me decide that I would not invest, or that if I did it would just take away my margin of profit and make the property unprofitable to work. Probably in the case of high-grade ores, running up to \$100 or \$150 to the ton, you could still pay the export duties and work your mine profitably. But these are ores that are extraordinary. You may find them here and there in pay streaks, but the general run of ores do not carry that value at all. I know a shipping mine, where the whole profit is founded on about \$20 a ton, and where, if you put on this export duty, you would render it almost impossible to carry on operations. So much with reference to that. But when you come to the lead ores, what do you find? You find in some cases in what is called low grade ore, the percentage of silver is small, while the percentage of lead is very large, running up sometimes to 75 or 80 per cent. Take the extreme case of a low silver value and a high lead value of say 70 per cent. That means that every ton of ore has 1,400 pounds of lead. This duty, added to the cost of mining and transport and import duties, may be just the thing that renders it impossible for you to develop your property, and you would have to shut

it down, and who would get any benefit? There is more than that. Granted that it is desirable to have as much of the smelting as well of the mining done in this country as possible. There is this difficulty. Perhaps not a single man would understand it unless it were technically explained to him. I myself did not know it, but came to the knowledge of it after talking with a man who understood the business technically. When you ask a man of that kind: Can you not establish smelters in this country, and do all this lead smelting here? Unquestionably, he would say. Can you not do it profitably? On one condition, and one condition only. What is that? On those ores which have a large percentage of lead, the thing which makes it possible is that you shall get a market for your lead. If you cannot get a market for your lead, the industry is knocked out. Where can you get the market? Is not the whole world open to you? The answer is that in the United States the price of lead is uniformly from 1 cent to 1½ cents a pound higher than it is in any other market in the world. Is it not possible to manufacture the lead into sheets and the like of that, and export it to where it is used? They say it is impossible, and for very good reason. In the first place, we could not manufacture the lead in Canada owing to the greater cost of coal and labour, and compete in England, where the cost of coal and labour is less. More than that, you could not manufacture it and send it to China and Japan, and compete in cheapness of cost there. Men who have looked into this question more than I expect to do, say that the only way to make this a successful industry is this. If you can induce Canadian capital, in connection with lead smelting in this country, to go to China and Japan and establish and carry out that industry with the cheap labour there, you may possibly export your pig lead to those countries, manufacture it there, and sell the manufactured article in competition with the lead export from England and other lead manufacturing countries. The gentleman with whom I was speaking said that he and his partners were looking into that question for two years, and the practical difficulties made it impossible to persuade capitalists to embark in that enterprise. Put on that export duty to-morrow, and compel smelting in Canada, and you make it impossible for Canadians to find a market for the heavy lead-bearing and light silver-bearing ores, simply because the lead, when marketed, would command an extremely small price in comparison with what it bears in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him whether it is not a fact that the United States tariff provides for a duty on lead in the ore equal to the amount on the lead itself?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. No, there is a difference between the two.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I think that is the case.

Mr. FOSTER. When you take the lead ore there you have to meet that duty, and it always enters into the computation of your returns. You would not only have to pay that import duty, but the export duty as well, which is equal to the difference between the duty on the lead in the ores and the duty on the pure lead.

Mr. CHARLTON. The duty is the same in both cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask the hon. Finance Minister if that is the case?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression is that there is a difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the duty on lead is to be increased from 1½ to 2 cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The duty on lead is ½ a cent higher than the duty on lead ore. In the Dingley tariff the duty proposed is 1½ cents upon the lead in ore, and the duty upon the matte, and upon lead in bullion or bars an additional ½ cent or 2 cents a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the duty on lead-bearing ore is 1 cent a pound. On the lead itself my recollection is that the duty was 1½ cents in the Dingley Bill, and that the Senate propose to raise it to 2 cents. Anyway, there is the position. Now, who will benefit by this? The man who has a smelter already built will benefit by it because, in the first place, ore will be compelled to go there, and a large source of the miner's profit which was formerly obtained will be taken away. The competition will be taken away and the whole industry of mining ores put at a disadvantage. Now, I know quite well that general sentiment here and in British Columbia as well, is that the time has come when we ought to smelt our own ores, but we have to be very careful at this stage in attempting anything which will hamper in the least degree what is the prime industry, not smelting but the developing of the mines themselves. Under present conditions, the smelters will naturally grow more numerous, and under the conditions years hence will increase all the more when coal is brought closer, as it will be by the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Smelters in that country will have great advantages naturally for transport and the like, and the smelting industry will grow inevitably, but it will grow naturally. Otherwise, if you attempt to force it in this way, you do it at the risk of impeding the more important industry.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The hon. gentleman is of course aware that this is not a proposition to put on the duty, but simply to take the power to put it on.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Yes, but the difficulty is this that when you have that power, the very fact of your having it will paralyze investments to the amount of the burden you are at liberty to impose.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The hon. gentleman will understand that I am entirely in accord with him in this, that beyond doubt it would be the duty of the Government before coming to any decision on the point to consider the case very carefully. I am far from saying that there is not a great deal of force in the argument he has advanced, but but I would like to know what is his proposition? Does he propose to withdraw the power altogether?

**Mr. FOSTER**. What I say is that the sentiment of a great number in favour of our doing our own smelting is hardly to be weighed against the technical, practical knowledge of men who have looked into the question whether this can be really done or not under present conditions. The majority may be sentimentally anxious to have it done. But if that sentiment were submitted to men of practical, technical knowledge, they might reply: Yes, we would like to have it done, but we will have to go a little slow and see our way clear before taking that step. My suggestion would be this. Let the Government leave over this part with reference to the silver, lead and copper ores. Let them, in the meantime, during the recess, have an investigation into the matter if they think it worth while. Let them take the best means to have it investigated by men of scientific and technical knowledge, and await their report before coming to any decision. My own personal opinion is this, that it would be better if the Government would drop that portion entirely and leave the future to take care of itself. I would urge on the Government as strongly as possible to be very cautious as to how they move in the matter of these ores at present, although I know that in so doing I am placing myself possibly against the sentiment of a great many. And I do it with a great deal of modesty, not pretending to any technical knowledge on the subject.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The argument of the hon. gentleman would apply equally to the nickel ore proposition and probably to the case of lumber.

**Mr. FOSTER**. With reference to nickel, I am not in a position to speak with any authority, because it is a matter which I

have not at all looked into. The other I have investigated to a certain extent.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not profess to have any knowledge at all on the subject of nickel but I do think I have some knowledge of the other ores, the lead and copper ores referred to. There is no doubt very much in what the hon. gentleman has said, and the Government will have to consider before deciding to exercise the power it is asking from Parliament, and I do not think there need be any doubt in the mind of Parliament that the Government will take every possible means to convince itself of the wisdom and necessity of exercising the power before doing so. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the mere fact of our having secured this power to Parliament is likely to operate in any prejudicial manner upon those who are either now interested or would be likely to become interested in mining enterprise in that country. I cannot see why it should have any such effect. We know very well that there is in that country—I have met it when visiting the different mining towns in southern British Columbia—a strong feeling among owners of mines and producers of ore that we ought to do our own smelting in our own country. When I was out there, a proposition was made by some gentlemen interested in the Nelson and Fort Shepherd Railway to locate a smelter at Northport, five or six miles at the outside to the south of the Canadian boundary line; and that scheme was proposed simply because they could not locate a smelter in British Columbia which could smelt to equal advantage. Their idea was to escape the payment of the import duties, which, under the United States tariff, are imposed on imports of ores smelted in British Columbia. On that account, they proposed to locate their smelter in the town of Northport, and as hon. gentlemen know the establishment of a large smelting industry in any town has the effect of largely increasing the population. Hon. gentlemen who have been in British Columbia know how the town of Trail has been built up by the establishment of the smelting industry by the Heinze Company, and how the town of Nelson has prospered by the smelting industry of the Hall Company. I think it is the general feeling among the people of British Columbia, and I do not think it is confined to those who are mineral producers, that we should take the power to prevent the locating of smelters to the south of the Canadian boundary. It is one thing, of course, to take the power and another to exercise it, but I do not think it would be wise for Parliament to cast doubt upon the probability of that power being exercised. The effect of that would be to defeat the very object we have in view. I think, therefore, it would be right to allow the power to be conferred on the Government and rely

on the Government making the necessary inquiry before exercising it. It would be likely to have a most prejudicial effect upon the smelting industry of British Columbia if it were to be known that the Government had brought in a proposition of this kind and then withdrawn it owing to the objections made. I believe that inside of three months you would find a smelter established south of the Canadian boundary in the town of Northport, as it would be generally accepted as a recognized fact that there would be no export duty placed on the ore. I entirely dissent from the opinion of the hon. gentleman that we cannot smelt in British Columbia as profitably as they can in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so. What I said is that we in Canada have not a market for the lead. We have all the facilities, but the business must be tested by the consideration whether we could get a remunerative market.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot agree in that proposition. I do not admit that there is a difference of a cent and a half between the price of lead in the English market and its price in New York. I do not think the difference exceeds three-quarters of a cent. There is a difference unquestionably because the people of the United States do not produce as much lead as they consume. They are great consumers of lead, and have to import it from the outside, and the duty they put upon the importation raises the price. I believe that the increase in price in the New York market over that in the English market is very little more than the duty. When the hon. gentleman tells us that we cannot find a market for lead in England—

Mr. FOSTER. I must again correct the hon. gentleman. I did not make any such statement. I said that you should find a market in England, but that the English market was invariably lower than the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have conceded that. I admit that it is somewhat lower, but it is the smallest possible fraction lower, if you deduct the duty which you have to pay when you send your ore into the United States. I believe that if we had smelting carried on to a great extent in Canada, a market would be found in England and a profitable market. It is not very long ago when the Government was bombarded with telegrams from the different parts of British Columbia urging us to take the power to impose a duty upon these ores. Why? Because there was at that very moment a movement on foot to locate the smelter I have spoken of. The scheme had been revived to establish a smelter at Northport for the smelting of our ores. That subject had been revived and they were

Mr. BLAIR.

on the eve of establishing a smelter at Northport for the purpose of smelting our ore, and securing to the people of that side of the line all the advantages that the United States tariff gave them. As proposed under the Dingley tariff, the intention was to put a duty of 1½ cents per pound on the lead in the ore.

Mr. FOSTER. That is worse than 1 cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the proposal when I last saw it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the way it stands now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not followed the matter closely, but I know that was the way it was at one period of the procedure in Congress. In addition to that, they say: If you venture to smelt your ore and produce your lead in bullion or in bars, we will require of you that you shall pay one-half cent per pound more; that is, you shall pay 2 cents for every pound you bring into our country. The effect of that is too transparent. It is done for the express purpose of giving to the people across the line the full benefit of the smelting industry. Now, why should not that industry belong to us, why should we not get the benefit of it? But we cannot get the benefit of it, and will not, unless we take power from Parliament to put such a duty upon lead in the ore which is exported as will correct the difference and restore the balance that there would be if things were in their natural position. I do feel that if there is one industry in Canada which has been referred to in this resolution for which a case is made which would justify Parliament in conferring this power upon the Government, it is the case of this smelting industry to which the hon. gentleman has particularly referred. All talk about sending the ores to England and smelting them is idle and beside the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) say whether he intimates to the House by that remark that I suggested that we should send the ores to England to be smelted? I never dreamed of such a thing, let alone saying it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman said we could not smelt the lead ores to compete with the English smelter.

Mr. FOSTER. I made use of no such expression. I would have been unutterably foolish to say such a thing. That we could take the ore, with all its coarse ingredients, with our methods of transport, and send it to be smelted in England, I could not say such a thing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman made a

statement which I took down immediately, and which—

**Mr. FOSTER.** There was one statement I did make—that in the manufacture of lead, for instance tea lead, we could not produce that in this country for the Chinese and Japanese market as cheaply as it could be reduced in England and sent to China or Japan.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. There is nothing gained by misunderstanding each other intentionally. What the hon. gentleman says, I do not quarrel with. There is an extent, however, to which we can, in British Columbia reduce these ores. We can reduce them into the bullion form—into bar lead or pig lead as it may be called—and we can export it in that form. It may require to be further refined, and there may be other metals contained in it, or by-products that, in England, can be taken out and realized upon, but that we cannot take out here. But we can reduce it to bars advantageously, and we ought to do the work here.

As I have already said, the House must bear in mind that we are not telling Parliament that we are determined to use this power. I concede that I, for one, am not sufficiently informed upon it to say that I would take the responsibility of exercising this power; but I am unable, for the life of me, to see how the conferring of this power upon the Government by Parliament is likely to affect, prejudicially, the industry in any shape or form. The people who are engaged in mining are not likely to take alarm and the people who are not engaged in mining are not likely to be precluded from going into the industry. Parliament may rest assured that this matter will be fully considered, that the interest of all branches of the industry will be taken into account, and, as the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, the Government will feel it its duty to hear from all quarters before exercising this power. But I would not wish it to be supposed that we do not intend to exercise this power no matter what may transpire, that we are merely putting this as a formal matter on the Statute-book—that people may locate their smelters where they please and carry on business where they please, quite confident that this power will never be exercised.

**Mr. FOSTER.** If the House will allow me, I have two things to say. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) asks what prejudicial effect there can be through taking this power. I will explain to him the prejudicial effect, particularly if the question is considered in the spirit of the speech of the hon. gentleman himself. The mining development of our country depends on the introduction of foreign capital. There is a certain amount of capital which you can

gather in this country, but what everybody who is studying the interests of mining in this country seeks, is to get British capital interested. The British market for gold, silver and lead stocks is a sensitive market. There is money there, but the moneyed men have been bitten over and over again on mining transactions. At this very moment we are at the turning point as to whether British capital shall begin to flow into this country or not. When British capital takes up a matter of this kind it goes into it very thoroughly, and every element of cost and profit is thoroughly and conscientiously looked into. The very fact that there is on the Statute-book an Act that will impose upon the margin of the profit a deduction of from \$4 to \$20 per ton will have a great deal to do in deciding the prospective British investor whether he shall go into the business or not. I had to laugh to myself to see how the relative positions of my hon. friend and myself were changed in this short debate—I, a protectionist, thinking that an import duty in the United States of 1½ cents on every pound of lead in the ore ought to be a pretty good protection for the smelter in our own country, and my hon. friend wanting to add to that another half cent in the shape of an export duty in order to make the protection doubly sure. Now, I say there is more than 1½ cents per pound protection. Take the Everett smelter, take the Kansas or Omaha smelter, very far distant from British Columbia. Our smelters can get in ore from the East Kootenay, round Fort Steel, in Slocan country, and the Lardeau district. You cannot compare the cost in transport for a smelter within fifty or a hundred miles, and the cost of transport to a smelter 1,000 or 1,200 miles away. The difference in this item of smelting cost will be still greater in a year's time when we have means to bring coal, coke and ore together. You cannot take these things into consideration without seeing that the protection of 1½ cents which the import duty gives to the home smelter is enough. You take into account the distance to the United States smelter, and you will agree with me, I think, that the conservative and careful course to take at the present time is to let this matter go for the present.

My hon. friend talks about Northport. I can tell him what the mining men are thinking about to-day. Why is the War Eagle Company not paying dividends? Well, the stockholders of that company came to this conclusion: The smelting charges generally are too high at Trail. We propose to mine our ore and to put it on the dump and keep it until—when? Until an export duty is put on ore? No, but until we see what is the policy of the Government with respect to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. And if that is assured, and we are assured that within a year's time or so, we will have access to the

immense coal resources of the eastern Kootenay that will come to our smelters. It is not as to whether there is to be an export duty or not. My hon. friend says there is a move to put a Northport smelter on. Why? Now, we cannot get rid of certain advantages in nature. The Rossland people want a smelter there, any other locality would like to have a smelter. But you take the geographical situation of Northport and its proximity to ores, dry and wet, of all kinds, silver, gold, copper and lead, both in the United States and in British Columbia, and you get a central point. There is at that point the greatest possible accretion of ore of different kinds. That is the consideration that rules. But even that consideration is not precluding the gentlemen who are looking after a smelting site, from considering smelter sites in our own territory as well. The great trouble was because of the transport of coal and of ore, but with these facilities that we are now putting into operation, that trouble will be largely taken away. My belief is that with the one and a half cents protection, and the natural proximity of the coal and the ore, the protection is all that the smelters need ask for in that country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the intention of the War Eagle people in the matter of the erection of smelters. Now, my information, obtained from one of the War Eagle people who was here in Ottawa a few days ago, is directly the reverse of that which has been furnished by the hon. gentleman. I understand from the gentleman that I refer to, that the War Eagle people are looking around to see where it would be best in their interest to locate a smelter. If there was an export duty placed on lead and ore to the amount we propose, they would place their smelters at Robson, I believe, which is a point upon the line running out of Rossland and within convenient distance. If, on the other hand, they were assured that there would be no export duty placed on ore, they would go unquestionably into the United States, and probably to Northport.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a very suitable place there for a town. They would locate there, as they would expect a city would grow up there, and they could locate there to advantage. It was not easy to find a place within easy reach of Rossland, which is large enough and well enough situated for a town. I talked that matter over with this gentleman a few days ago, and I said to him: Why are you selecting Northport, rather than any other place on the boundary line? "Well," he said, "it is the most convenient to our ores; we would depend

Mr. FOSTER.

upon British Columbia ores altogether for our natural product, and we would want to get as near as we could, on the United States side of the line, to the base of supply. Therefore, we would go to Northport, as being the most convenient and suitable locality."

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend tell us where the War Eagle's properties are?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The War Eagle's properties are in the neighbourhood of Rossland. I suppose the hon. gentleman has been there. I had the pleasure of visiting the War Eagle mines.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Northport nearer to their ores than Rossland?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think it is.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are finding a place for a smelter as far as possible away from the ore?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what this gentleman, Mr. Blackstock, told me. There is no place in Rossland for it. They would have to go away from Rossland on one of the lines of railway, either on the line leading up to Robson, which is about the first place convenient to Rossland in that direction, or go down the River by the Red Mountain road, and they would finally locate at Northport for the reason that I have stated.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to say one word on this matter of export duty on pulp wood. I trust entirely in the wisdom of the Government in using the power they take, and I am not going to oppose it. At the same time, I must say that the imposition of this duty would seriously affect my constituency. I need not say that, under certain circumstances I might deem it expedient to favour the imposition of that duty; but as a matter of protection in the ordinary sense, I would certainly oppose it with all my power. I do not wish to go into details, but I may tell the House that the quantity of pulp wood that is exported to the United States amounts to 200,000 cords, and of this immense quantity more than one-tenth comes out of the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska. Such an export duty on pulp wood would perhaps destroy the largest industry except agriculture in that constituency to-day. I may say that our position in certain sections of the country is similar to that of the ex-Finance Minister in another section. He thinks it would be more advantageous for him to send the raw material of the mines to the other side of the line, than to keep it and smelt it within our own country, and he wishes the Government to make an exception for this special article. I would have asked for the same thing in relation to pulp-wood, because I know if that duty was

imposed, it would certainly result in serious loss to my constituency. From the little study I have made of this question I am convinced that it is only the manufacturers of pulp wood who are asking for that duty, but their interest is a very small one compared with the interest of the labour which is engaged in this industry, both the labour of workingmen and of farmers. I repeat this is the most valuable industry in my county, and it furnishes one-tenth of the whole quantity which is exported to the United States. For this reason I would have been obliged, if the question had come before the House to impose that duty at once, to oppose it. But I trust that the Government, in their wisdom, will use that power with great discretion, and I hope they will not find it necessary to impose the duty.

Mr. DYMENT. I am opposed to this export duty on logs and pulp wood, and I intended to oppose it and criticise it at some length. I interviewed a great many members on both sides of the House to see what support I would have, and I found an almost unanimous feeling on both sides in favour of an export duty. Therefore, I consider that any remarks of mine would not affect the vote at all, and would only be wasting the valuable time of this House if I went into it any further than to enter my protest. As most of you know, I am in the lumber business, but I am willing to forego my own feelings and personal interest with regard to an export duty on logs, and to say, Put it on. But I represent a constituency that is probably more interested than any other county in Canada in the pulp wood industry, and I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not warn the Government of the great injustice they would be doing to thousands of settlers throughout the newer districts of Ontario, if they were to put an export duty on pulp wood. It is not like white pine lumber. White pine is the king of all soft woods, and will always take its place at the head. But spruce pulp wood is a thing that has only come into use within the past fifteen or twenty years. We have untold millions of cords of it, I believe, and I think we ought to get the benefit of it while we may. It might come to pass that something else would take its place before we would get it used up, even if the export of it increased considerably. But I will not say anything further on that point, as I know that I stand almost alone in this matter. But I will just ask the Government, before they impose a duty on pulp wood and do this injustice to thousands of settlers in my constituency, to consider the matter fully and ascertain whether it would be right to help the few manufacturers in this country engaged in the pulp wood industry, at the cost of injuring

thousands of settlers in my own constituency and in other newer parts of Ontario.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to move that the word "elm" in the 6th line of the first resolution be omitted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman perfectly sure that this resolution will enable him to impose an export duty? The section reads:

That it is expedient to enact that if any country imposes a duty upon the articles enumerated, &c.

Would the courts in interpreting this clause not hold that it would apply to countries hereafter imposing duties upon the articles mentioned. Why do you not impose the duty now. I am afraid that in a legal interpretation it might be held that you would not have power to impose a duty where foreign duties at present exist and that it would only apply in the case of duties imposed by a foreign country in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood you were to take this power by Act of Parliament. This Act will give you the power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point is that we may only be able to deal with the countries which hereafter impose a duty, that it would not enable us to deal with any country which has now such a duty.

Mr. FOSTER. It would make it clear if you said "any country which has imposed or hereafter imposed."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no objection to that. I beg to move that the section be amended to read "if any country now or hereafter imposes a duty." etc.

Mr. FOSTER. Then suppose they abolish it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You have power here to repeal the duties.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I may conclude that the Government will retain the last section.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am very much impressed with the views expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I think it would be desirable to have a provision of this character, but I would like to assure the hon. gentleman and others who share his views on that matter that before any action is taken on this provision

It will receive the most careful consideration of the Government. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the resolution to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather that the Government would not put it in force until the next session of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that the purpose of the provision might be defeated by accepting that suggestion. It may be necessary to impose these duties before the next session of Parliament, but as I have already said, no step will be taken without the fullest consideration, of what the hon. gentleman and others have said.

Resolution reported and read the second time.

### FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 145) respecting export duties.—  
(Mr. Fielding.)

#### THIRD READING.

Bill (No 131) respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the judges thereof.—  
(Mr. Davies.)

### PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 139) further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act, was read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. What is the effect of that ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have considered that the test was higher than we required, and so we reduced it by 20 ; the present test is 290 and we have reduced it to 270. The ordinary illuminating petroleum stands a test as low as 85, but this applies to signal petroleum which is used in lighthouses, and high test petroleum generally.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is certain from the information given by his officers, that he is not reducing it near to the danger point.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have been told positively that 290 was an extravagant requirement and that 270 would be enough.

On section 2,

Mr. LISTER. I propose to move that the following be added to this section :—

Provided always that the right of entry into any harbour of a tank-ship laden with petroleum, shall at all times be subject to such requirements and orders respecting such tank-ships, which shall be applicable to such steamer, as may from time to time be prescribed by the Harbour Commissioners or other authorities having power to pass such regulations.

Mr. FIELDING.

This was to have been moved by one of the members from Montreal, but he was obliged to leave by the afternoon train, and he asked me to move it for him. Under the present section, oil may be imported in tank ships into Canada at the various harbours, and the Governor in Council are empowered to make regulations which may or may not cover the proviso contained in the words which I propose to add to this section. It is well known that petroleum is at all times inflammable, and when in tank ships in enormous quantities it is much more dangerous than at other times. An accident may happen, and the result would be the burning of all the ships in the harbour. It is not only inflammable but it is explosive in the hot weather, as a gas forms, and a match or the spark from a man's pipe might cause an explosion that would destroy all the shipping in Toronto or Montreal harbours. I wish to protect by Act of Parliament these harbours, placing the regulations under which oil tank steamers shall be admitted under the control of the Harbour Commissioners who in many instances are the owners of the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it not help my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) more and give the maximum of protection to the harbour, if he would prohibit the ingress of these inflammable tank steamers. If he will do that, I will join him in it.

Mr. LISTER. I doubt the wisdom of admitting these tank ships at all.

Mr. FOSTER. So do I.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is a very doubtful Act, but it is the Act of the Government who believe that this will give cheaper transportation. If these steamers are admitted they should be surrounded by all safeguards.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. According to the present section these tank ships can only enter under such regulations as are passed by the Governor in Council, on the joint recommendation of the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue. We would be guilty of the greatest dereliction of duty if we did not recommend the framing of such regulations as would really protect the harbour. I do not see why the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the two Ministers named, should not be entrusted with the task of preparing such regulations as will give as much safety as possible. We know very well that tank ships loaded with coal oil are as dangerous, if not more so, than ships loaded with gunpowder. We appreciate the danger, and I think the matter of framing regulations may very well be left to us.

Mr. SPROULE. The proposal in the section is much better than the amendment, and the amendment would only apply to certain harbours where they have commis-

sioners, and would not apply to other places where those tank steamers might be brought in. Besides, the oil is more likely to be brought in by tank cars than tank steamers.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be an inclusive power.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask what is the policy of the Government as to the places they designate where oil can be brought in in tank ships; because it will be difficult, if you admit the principle, to prevent any harbour from availing itself of the privilege by complying with the regulations. I do not think you can say that you would let it come into some harbours and not into others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should imagine that there are only comparatively few places from which application will be made. You cannot take a tank ship into all the small harbours of the country; the business will not warrant it. I think the thing will work out very well. When the applications are made, each application will be considered on its merits; but it is well, in view of the inflammable character of the oil, that you should not make the privilege too broad, at the same time giving the Government power to meet every case that may arise.

Mr. FOSTER. The modus operandi will be this. The tank vessel will start from Boston and run into every considerable or inconsiderable port and become a regular travelling supply. I think you will find that the tank vessel will be like the tank wagon in the city, that it will visit every available port, so that the great supply of oil will be from the tank vessels of the Standard Oil Company.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. At present oil can only be delivered from tank cars at such places as are designated by the Governor in Council, and necessarily we must do the same thing with regard to oil delivered from tank ships. Moreover, we cannot allow the oil to be delivered from tank ships any more than from tank cars to enter into consumption before it is inspected, and it is impossible to have an inspector at every little fishing harbour along the coast.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just what my hon. friend wants an excuse for. Do you not see how nice it would be to multiply the officers?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend will do me the justice to say that I am doing everything I can to diminish the officers.

Mr. LISTER. While the Government have adopted the policy of allowing oil to be carried in tank ships, and therefore I

suppose it must become law, it is certainly unfair to the oil producers throughout the country. There could be no objection at all to allowing oil to be carried in tank ships if proper precautions were taken for safety, and if it were open to every oil merchant throughout the country to ship from one point to another. That is to say, if the tank ships were put on an equality with other means of transportation, and it were open to every person to use them who wished to hire them and was willing to pay the usual tolls, there would be no objection. But the difficulty is that these tank ships are in the hands of one vast corporation, who will use them to compel the railway companies to carry their oil at a lower rate than they give to the other oil refiners of the country, and in that way get an advantage over the trade, which I venture to predict will compel the trade to yield to that corporation, so that the oil interests of this country will be in the hands of one great monopoly in a short time.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask at what points in the North-west Territories oil is allowed to be delivered in tank cars.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. So far, the places are Brandon, Calgary, Lethbridge, Regina and Winnipeg. We want to avoid increasing the number of places to such a degree as not to increase the cost of oil to the people of the North-west; but I think that under the next session the Governor in Council will be able to make such regulations as will possibly relieve the difficulties under which the people of the North-west are now labouring with regard to their supply of oil.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would like the Minister to explain the meaning of the 6th line, which says that all oil, before being removed for consumption, shall be put into packages. What I want to know is, can the oil be taken in tank cars to a station and put into a stationary tank and be barrelled out of that tank, or is it necessary to barrel it out of the tank cars? Because, if placed in a stationary tank and barrelled out of that, I think it can be handled far more cheaply.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Under the regulations of the department the oil from the tank cars may be transferred to cisterns. Samuel Rogers & Co., of Toronto, have cisterns which contain 50,000 or 60,000 gallons of oil, and which are underground. The tank car arrives and the oil is pumped into these cisterns; but it cannot be delivered for consumption until after it is barrelled and inspected.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask the hon. Controller to put Edmonton and Macleod on the list of places which are entitled to receive oil in tank cars. There

are revenue officers at these places, and they are important trading points.

The **CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE**. In studying this question, I am given to understand that one of the difficulties under which the people of the North-west laboured was this, that when their oil came from the point of production to Winnipeg and was barrelled there, and again carried to Moosejaw or Medicine Hat or some other place, the freight was nearly double what it would have been if the oil had been sent direct to the place. Under the next clause we propose to appoint as many places as possible where the tank cars can deliver the oil and where the oil may be inspected, so as to save as much as possible the heavy charges for freight under which our friends in the North-west are labouring.

On section 3,

Mr. **CLANCY**. There is a class of oil made of petroleum which is used in the manufacture of binder twine. The manufacturers prefer to import it because of the greater quantity of acid in the Canadian oil. Would that oil come in free as entering into the manufacture of cordage which has been put on the free list. The hon. Minister of Finance made a statement in the early part of the session that while binder twine would come in free, all articles entering into its manufacture would be also made free.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The matter has not been dealt with since my hon. friend mentioned it, but I should think that all articles used in the manufacture of binder twine would come in free. While not expressing this as a governmental decision, I think that would be the case.

Mr. **LISTER**. Does the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) want oil used in the manufacture of binder twine to come in free?

Mr. **CLANCY**. Yes, it is only a small matter.

Mr. **LISTER**. We provide the same oil and there is a considerable quantity of it used in the manufacture of cordage.

Mr. **FRASER** (East Lambton). I am surprised to hear my hon. friend raise any question as to the quality of Canadian oil. I am advised by binder-twine manufacturers, with two of whom I discussed the point two or three days ago, that the Canadian cordage oil is just as good as that imported from the United States, and therefore the cordage men would be at no disadvantage if they continue to use the Canadian product.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I am glad the hon. gentleman has given us this assurance, and I

Mr. **OLIVER**.

would ask him to press upon the Minister of Finance the necessity of not admitting the American oil free. The hon. Minister says he believes it comes in free? I should gladly support my hon. friend if he will urge upon the Minister of Finance to have the American oil made dutiable.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

## SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 141) respecting cold storage on steamships from Canada to the United Kingdom and in certain cities in Canada (Mr. Fisher.)

## JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS

Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Act respecting judges of the provincial courts was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

2. The section substituted for section twelve of said Act by chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1891, is hereby amended by striking out the third and fourth lines and substituting the following therefor:

The local judge of the district of Quebec, \$1,000 per annum.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What is the change proposed here?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It was \$2,000, but under this new Act the salary is to be \$1,000.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is, Judge Irvine received \$2,000 and Judge Routhier is to receive \$1,000.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies). It was especially provided by Sir John Thompson, that at the death of Judge Irvine, the salary was to be reduced to \$1,000.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

## TRIAL BY JURY—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Mr. Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) respecting Trials by Jury in certain cases in the North-west Territories. He said: This is a permissive Bill to authorize an ordinance of the North-west Assembly. There was some doubts as to their power to pass it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole on the 18th June instant, respecting the construction of a line of railway from Lethbridge, in the territory of Alberta, through the Crow's Nest Pass to Nelson, in the province of British Columbia, was reported and read the second time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved first reading of Bill (No. 146) respecting the construction of a line of railway from Lethbridge, in the Territory of Alberta, through the Crow's Nest Pass to Nelson, in the province of British Columbia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wishes to hurry business through for the other House, I think it would be well that we should give this measure its stages this afternoon. For my part I would make no objection.

Mr. LISTER. I would make objection.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand that some hon. gentlemen wish to say something on this subject, and, probably, we should make no headway.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we shall take that up on Monday morning early.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

### POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Post Office Act.

(In the Committee).

On section 2.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood yesterday that this Bill was to be allowed to stand until next year. Surely the Government does not expect to pass through a contentious Bill such as this at this stage of the session. I can assure him that it will be very thoroughly debated.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Better have it debated.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well. If the Government have no wish to hurry on the end of the session, nor wish to get through the legitimate business, we can bring this matter up and debate it; but I should certainly think it would be much better if a Bill such as this, which proposes to make such a very drastic change in the Post Office Department, should not be discussed with three-quarters of the mem-

bers of the House away. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) will see that he should get an opinion from a House of Parliament that is a House of Parliament and not a mere remnant. There are generic changes proposed here, and certainly I think we ought to have a Parliament that is in a position to discuss these matters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill has been before the House for some time. Very important legislation is now going through this House, and I am not aware that the point has been taken that the House is not competent to discharge its duties, even though some hon. gentlemen may have withdrawn. The Bill is necessary, it is in the public interest, and if it requires discussion, I think it had better be discussed. I, at all events, think there is no valid reason why the Bill should not be passed, or I would not have suggested it. It is in the public interest in every respect, and I hope the hon. gentleman will so vote.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think this is not only very important legislation, but it is very radical legislation. If the hon. gentleman takes up the Post Office Act as it exists, I do not see how he can introduce a clause in this new Act which is absolutely destroying the whole principle upon which the Post Office Act is based. I refer to the clause which states that:

If in the opinion of the Postmaster General the lowest tender received, after publicly advertising for the performance of a mail contract, is excessive, he should not be compelled to accept such tender, and may in his discretion either re-advertise the said contract for further competition, or offer to any person willing to undertake the contract such lesser sum as he deems a reasonable and sufficient price for the said contract, and may enter into the contract with such person willing to accept such offer.

Sir, the principle upon which the law regulating the post office contracts is founded, is the principle of calling for tenders. Now, can any gentleman having any knowledge of the Post Office Act deny that this is the most ingenious way that could be invented to destroy the whole system of asking for tenders for contracts as provided for in the old law. The Postmaster General states that if out of 20 tenders he considers the lowest tender is too high, he can, without any appeal again to the public for a new tender, ipso motu give the contract to whomsoever he pleases, provided it be under the lowest tender.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To a lower tenderer at a lower price.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But that destroys completely every theory calling for tenders. I can understand the hon. gentleman, believing that the lowest tender is too high, wishing to set it aside, and without

calling for any new tenders, giving all the contracts to partisans or to friends of his.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** That power can only be exercised after the tenders have been called for in the first instance, and where they are excessive.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON.** I know that. But why should the right of the Postmaster General be extended beyond the point which is provided by law, that no contract should be given without tender? Here the hon. gentleman decides in his wisdom that the lowest tender is too high, that he can go out and give this contract away without any new tenders. Why, Sir, this is upsetting the whole system upon which the Post Office Act is based. I protest against it; I think it is destructive of the whole system. The hon. gentleman has said a great deal about partisanship. Well, this is the most complete system that could be devised to hand over these contracts to partisans without any tenders, or any new appeal to the public to allow honest competitors to come into the field and, in the interest of the public, to make tenders which would be according to the law which exists at the present moment. I do not see how it is possible to introduce such a revolutionary measure as this one at this period of the session, or how the hon. gentleman can expect that we should allow a Bill of this kind to be passed within a few hours of prorogation. I for one protest against it.

Mr. **SPROULE.** We have always regarded as one of the virtues of the Act the provision compelling the Postmaster General to let all contracts by tender, and the one incentive to the tenderer is that he is likely to get the contract at his offer provided it is the lowest. Now, while that might lead to abuse by sometimes compelling the department to pay more for a contract than it is worth, the Postmaster General still has in his hands the right to cancel a tender at the expiration of three months, and re-advertise for another. In my opinion that ought to be done here. If this becomes law there will be no inducement for people to tender, because there is no certainty of their getting the contract. Time after time we have been applied to by parties who tender for mail contracts, to write on their behalf, and we have always assured them that the law compels the Postmaster General to give the contract to the lowest tenderer unless, in his opinion, he is paying too much for it, then he can re-advertise for it. That has shut off the disposition of people to ask their member to intercede in their behalf. Now, that was the principal virtue of the Act, and it relieved us of a great deal of trouble and worry. I have always thought the Act a fair one, and I do not see why it should be amended in this direction. While there may be isolated cases where the Postmaster General could use it to good advantage,

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON.**

there is no denying the fact that it might lead to great abuses by the Postmaster General. I am far from saying the present Postmaster General would exercise that right to the detriment of the country, because I am inclined to think that he would not. But I think it is a right that no Postmaster General should have, it should not be embodied in the law. As to other provisions of the Bill, I think their aim is good. I think that which provides for the establishment of a branch to be called a railway mail branch, is a very good idea; although it would lead to the creation of some new offices, and possibly might be taken advantage of to make appointments that were not in the public interest. But I think the clause that we are considering is a very bad one, and the Postmaster General ought to let it drop, and see if he cannot, between now and another session, devise some other means of overcoming the present trouble.

Mr. **CLANCY.** I am sure the committee is willing to assist the Postmaster General in every way to protect the service, but before this House should assent to legislation of the kind that the hon. gentleman proposes, he should be able to point out a great public abuse; he should be able to say that people tendering for mail contracts are generally in collusion, and that it is necessary for him to take means to overcome it.

Mr. **MILLS.** This Act will lead to collusion.

Mr. **CLANCY.** I think so myself. I venture to say that not in one case out of a hundred is there any collusion in regard to these mail contracts, most of them very small, ranging from \$25 up to \$1,000. I think it may be said by every hon. gentleman in this House too much money is not being paid for this service. I know that to be the case by mere observation. I know that mail contracts are being performed in some of the western districts for infinitely less money than the persons engaged in the service can afford to do it for. They would be far better off working at 50 cents per day than engaged in carrying the mails. I am sure the hon. Postmaster General would not aim such legislation at a particular case, and if the prices are not too high as a rule, there can be no necessity for this Bill. What will follow is this: The hon. gentleman has not shown that there is collusion or that, as a rule, the prices are too high, and if that is the case he has no ground upon which to ask this committee to assent to this Bill. But let me suppose that there has been some collusion. What would follow? It is perfectly obvious that if the Postmaster General takes this matter into his own hands, and refuse every tender, as he will have a right to do, everybody will know that it will be a mere idle sham to tender. I am not going to accuse the hon. gentleman of wrong-doing in advance, but I say that he exposes himself to pressure from behind.

Whatever he may think himself, he will have all sorts of pressure applied to him from behind. Everybody seeking a mail contract in the different counties will go to the defeated candidate or to the member representing the riding, who will endeavour to secure contracts for his own friends. That will degenerate into a party squabble, and it will be a sham for anybody not in sympathy with the political party in power to put in a tender. Before the hon. gentleman asks the committee to assent to this Bill he ought to be able to show that, as a rule, there is collusion which involves a large sum of public money.

Mr. QUINN. I think we will all understand the object of the amendment which is now suggested. I do not profess the modesty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), and I think there is no room at all to doubt as to the meaning of this Bill. Section 55 of the Post Office Act provides :

When, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the lowest tender received, after public advertisement for the performance of a mail contract is excessive, he shall not be compelled to accept the said tender, but may, in his discretion, either re-advertise the said contract for further competition, or offer to the persons from whom tenders have been received, each in his turn, beginning with the lowest, such sum as he deems a reasonable and sufficient price for the said contract, and may enter into a contract with such of the said persons as will accept such offer.

I look upon that law certainly as a fair one and one which the Postmaster General might have retained. But the object of this proposal before the committee is to enable him to reject the tenders which he has received and to award the contract to any person who will do the work for such a sum as he deems reasonable. The Bill provides that he may "offer to any person willing to undertake the contract such lesser sum as he deems a reasonable and sufficient price for the said contract, and may enter into a contract with such person as will accept such offer." It seems to me that the intention of this amendment is to make tendering a mere farce. The object is to obtain as many contracts as possible for the friends of the political party that happens for the time being to control the destinies of the country and to distribute them as largely as possible through the country. If it were not for this, if it were intended to administer this fairly, to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, if it were intended to obtain this work for the lowest price the Act, as it stands, is amply sufficient. If the Minister wishes to act unfairly, but I shall not attribute to the Minister a desire to give all contracts to the friends of the party—even if he wished to act fairly the pressure from behind might be so great as to overcome his wishes. If the pressure from behind is sufficient, the Minister may refuse to recognize any of the tenderers and

award the contract to whomever he pleases at a lower price. He is not limited as to the amount which must be tendered lower. Another person may undertake to do the work for one dollar less than the lowest tenderer, and the Minister would be perfectly justified, under this Bill, in giving him the contract. What will be the effect? The Postmaster General would advertise for a service in some county. The tenders would be received from different men who could perform the service properly. The lowest tender would be known to the Minister and, in the course of time, the member for the county who, being a supporter of the Minister will say : "Do not give the work to this man." All the time he has some friends of his behind. He would say : "Do not accept this tender : I have a man who will do this work for \$5 or \$1 lower." The Minister would be perfectly justified under this Bill in giving the contract to him. We should preserve before the country the distinction of not making our laws for the purpose of serving political parties. We should preserve the appearance, at any rate, before the world that we are exercising our functions, not in the interest of a political party, but for the good of the country. Suppose a combination were entered into to prevent competitive tendering. Suppose that persons who tendered for this service combined with the object of exaggerating the price to be paid by the country, the Minister, under the present Act would say to the next lowest tender, "We will not accept the lowest tender that has been received ; but if you will perform this work for so much less you may have it." And so on through to the end. If he can find no one amongst the tenderers ready to carry out the work for the price which he considered reasonable, then he might re-advertise the contract and call for new tenders. I think that the Minister will see that it is not at all necessary in the interest of the country, or in the interest of the proper administration of public affairs that this change should be made.

Mr. MILLS. I am somewhat amazed that such legislation as this—if it is not vicious legislation, at least it has vicious tendencies—should be presented at this late time of the session, and should be put over, as it were, for a more convenient season. It was up at the last sitting of the House, and was then withdrawn, a great many thinking that it was withdrawn for the session, but as soon as some members have gone away it is brought up again. I look upon this Bill as one of the most vicious amendments that could possibly have been proposed. I will not go so far as to say that the Postmaster General is vicious in his inclinations in this regard. He may be pure and incorrupt and may have no idea of catering to the wishes of parties who are behind him in these matters, but the tendencies are in that direction. The Act we had was a good Act. I have

had some experience with reference to these contracts. Parties have been desirous in my constituency to get contracts for mail service, and when they have come to me I have always said to them: That is one of the things with reference to which I have no political influence, the man who puts in the lowest tender gets the contract, no matter whether he be white or black, or whether he is Liberal or Conservative. If this amendment should become law, the representative of the county cannot say that to his constituent. He will say to those who seek his influence: Let them put in as many tenders as they like, I will use my influence with the Postmaster General and I will say to him, that under this amendment we have the power not to accept any of these tenders, and so and so (mentioning the name of a supporter in the county) will do it for so much. Although the Postmaster General may be a perfectly honourable and high-minded man he will be influenced to a considerable extent by his supporters, and he will say to the member: Let your man have it. This Act puts these contracts entirely under political influence, and therefore I say it is one of these pieces of legislation which have the vicious tendency of bringing such matters under political influence. Not long ago, when the Prime Minister was advocating the institution of a commission in order to take the political influence out of the sphere of his Ministers, he looked around and he said: My Ministers are only men, they may be tempted to do things which they should not: and in order that they may not be placed in temptation, I will ask this commission to be instituted. Now, the Postmaster General is putting himself right in the way of temptation, and he is acting contrary to what the Premier advocated in the earlier days of this session. I say that the Liberal Conservatives in this House are not doing their duty, if they do not stop here and battle against this vicious Act until Christmas if necessary. I will be one to help them to do it.

Mr. TISDALE. I expressed my opposition to this Bill on a previous occasion, and I wish now to point out the inconsistency between the action of the Postmaster General when he was out of power and his action when in power. A clause in this Act empowers the Postmaster General to renew contracts under the terms previously arranged after advertisement, provided the inspector reported in favour of it, and that the price was not too high. Now, as soon as the Postmaster General got into office he cancelled every contract which had been renewed, and had not been advertised at the second letting. He is now going in a directly opposite direction from his action on that occasion. I have knowledge of three or four of these renewed contracts, and I say that in the public interest and in consideration of the

Mr. MILLS.

lowness in the price of these contracts, it was well to renew them. But the Postmaster General objected to certain contracts because they had not been re-advertised. He did not claim that the previous Postmaster General had exceeded his powers, and as far as I am concerned I would be willing to trust the present Postmaster General with the same powers as were exercised by the Postmaster Generals before him. But, the present Postmaster General is not content with that. Last session he announced that he was going to advertise all contracts, but this session he seeks to have a principle inserted in this statute that I venture to say was never thought of by any previous Postmaster General. In the Department of Public Works, where repairs have sometimes to be made immediately, there is a reason why the Minister should have a discretion without advertising, but there is no necessity for it in the Post Office Department, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) should ask for the power, and I am disappointed in the hon. gentleman because while he was in opposition, no man contended more sturdily against Ministers having power which would leave them at the mercy of political pressure. I oppose this provision in the Bill, not because I think the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) would not act fairly, but because I believe it is in the public interest that a Minister should not have this power. Judging by the hon. gentleman's action when in opposition, I am more than surprised that he should submit this proposition to the House.

This objectionable principle of letting public contracts without tender is one against which both political parties, in Ontario especially, have protested, and public opinion has been aroused against the practice to such an extent that it has been curtailed. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider this matter. I regret very much that at this late stage of the session I should feel it my duty to object so strongly to any measure presented by the Government; but where a public principle is involved, I feel it my duty, no matter what inconvenience it may cause, to oppose not only strongly, but at length, legislation of this kind. With regard to those clauses of the Bill referring to the management of the department, I do not feel as competent to judge of them as men like the hon. Minister himself and some of my hon. friends who have been in charge of that department. But the principle I refer to lies at the basis of proper, I was going to say decent, management. I appeal to hon. gentlemen whether they want, by legislation, to be placed in a position where they will be subject to political pressure, which will undoubtedly be brought to bear upon them, to set aside a contract which has been awarded, after having been

properly advertised and tendered for. I have found no fault with the hon. Postmaster General for cancelling certain contracts on the ground, as he informed me in a letter addressed to myself, that they had not been re-advertised and thrown open to public competition. That may be a principle well worth considering, and I would have been satisfied if he had brought in a Bill to repeal the power of the Postmaster General to renew contracts in that way. But what does he propose here? He proposes to take power, in the case of hundreds and I suppose thousands of contracts, which have been duly advertised, to make offers to tenderers, to set aside every tender and privately allot the contract as he pleases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not as he pleases.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the limitation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It must be lower.

Mr. TISDALE. Precisely; and what is lower? If it is a \$1,000 contract, he could let it to another person at \$999.99.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a remark? The clause says that where the lowest tender is regarded as excessive, the power may be exercised. Would any Minister be able, as an honourable man, to justify passing by a contract for which the lowest tender is \$1,000 on the ground that it is excessive, and awarding it another party at one cent less?

Mr. TISDALE. I am not dealing with the case of a high official who is allowed to act without political pressure. I am supposing the state of affairs which exists in all democratic countries, and particularly in this country, where party feeling runs high. I would oppose this Bill just as strongly if it were introduced by a Government whom I supported. I am not on record, and, please God, I never shall be on record, as favouring the placing of powers in the hands of a Government whom I support that I would not place in the hands of my opponents. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they would have allowed us, at such a late period of the session, to pass any such measure as this. It is a matter of principle with me, and one of those things which I never allow, if I can help it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman has made a declaration, and we are bound to accept it. I do not charge him with obstructing the Bill; but I appeal to him on the higher ground that he has taken. The Postmaster General is a trustee of the public, and as such is bound to administer the property of the public in the public interest. Suppose he were the trustee of a

private person, and called for tenders for a private trust, and suppose he received ten tenders, and found that to accept any one of them would not be dealing fairly with the estate, what would he do? He would go into the Court of Chancery and ask for power to dispose of the property to some one else, and he would get it, though he is not bound to call again necessarily. What I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to is that the only objection he can take to the section is based on the supposition that there will be a Postmaster General who will deliberately violate its spirit. If the spirit of the section is carried out, nothing but good can come to the country.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think the Postmaster General would do any such thing, but it is a vicious principle in legislation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman particularly wishes to call it six o'clock, well and good; but if he does not, I would suggest that my hon. friend move that the committee rise and report progress, and we will adjourn the House. I do not wish to inflict too much on hon. gentlemen opposite, who have certainly not subjected us to needless opposition to-day.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS.

PILOTS' BILL—REFUND OF FEES.

Mr. GUAY moved:

That as it appears from the minutes of proceedings of the Senate of the 18th June, 1897, that the Senate have adopted a resolution that no further proceedings be taken with regard to Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Pilots

serving between Quebec and Montreal, the Accountant of this House be authorized to refund the fees paid on the said Bill, less the cost of printing and translation.

Motion agreed to.

#### HENRY MUMA, OFFICIAL REFEREE.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked.

Is Henry Muma, of Drumbo, Official Referee, now in the employ of the Government? If not, has he been dismissed? Has the office been abolished? Has he been superannuated? If so, what is the amount of his superannuation allowance?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The party here mentioned is not now in the employ of the Government. He has not been dismissed, but the office has been abolished. As to the superannuation, that is a matter that is now under the consideration of the Governor in Council.

#### WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

1. Is the Government aware that a considerable trade is done by United States whalers at the mouth of the Mackenzie River without duty being paid? 2. Is it the intention of the Government to protect Canadian trade revenue by establishing a customs office here?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. The Department of Customs has been informed that illegal trading is being carried on at the mouth of the Mackenzie River by United States whalers. 2. The question of establishing a customs office there will receive consideration.

#### LOAN OF \$15,000,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by way of loan, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole the sum of fifteen million dollars, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion of Canada and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Parliament of Canada. 2. That the sums of money hereby authorized to be raised by way of loan shall be so raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt and the raising of loans authorized by Parliament; and the sums so raised shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada: Provided always, that the rate of interest to be paid on any loan to be raised hereunder shall not exceed four per cent per annum.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GUAY.

#### ADJOURNMENT—THE QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until the following Wednesday at 11 a.m.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of fifty per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression "cost" used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and upon the report of the Chief Engineer of Government railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway; the lines of railways being as follows, that is to say:—

To the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, for 53.57 miles of their railway from Cornwall to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 101 miles of their railway from Kingston to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

For a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near either Welsford or Westfield, or between the said two points, to Gagetown, in the county of Queen's, N.B., not exceeding 30 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 53 Victoria, chapter 2.

To the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, for 50 miles of their railway from Cobourg to the Ontario and Quebec Railway, in lieu of the subsidies granted by 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway from the

end of 62nd mile subsidized towards Désert, in lieu of the subsidies granted by the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (Revote.)

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 9 miles of their railway, being shortage in distance from Montcalm and St. Tite.

To the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway from St. Félix de Valois to Ste. Emélie de l'Énergie, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

To the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, for 15 miles of their railway from Chipman Station to Newcastle Coal Fields, county of Queen's, N.B., in lieu of the subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (Revote.)

To the Gulf Shore Railway Company, for 5½ miles of their railway from the end of the section subsidized to Tracadie and thence to Big Tracadie, New Brunswick.

For a railway from Campbellton, on the Intercolonial Railway, towards Grand Falls, New Brunswick, a distance of 20 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (Revote.)

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for 7½ miles of their railway from Hull to Aylmer, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 53 Victoria, chapter 2. (Revote.)

To the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway from a point on the Grand Trunk Railway between King and Newmarket to Schomberg, in the province of Ontario.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, for 3.50 miles of their railway from present terminus through Tilsonburg to Michigan Central Railway, in the province of Ontario.

To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, for 42 miles of their railway from crossing of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway to 55 miles west of Barry's Bay, and also for 14 miles of their railway across Barry Island.

To the Pembroke Southern Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway from Pembroke to Golden Lake, in the province of Ontario.

To the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway from the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway to Rainy Lake, in the province of Ontario.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for 7 miles of their railway, commencing at a point at or near Caradoc Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending to the town of Strathroy.

To the Phillipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, for 66-100ths mile of their railway from the end of the subsidized section to the Government's wharf at Phillipsburg.

To the United Counties Railway Company, for 1 mile of their railway from Johnson to St. Grégoire Station, in the province of Quebec.

To the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, for 13½ miles of their railway from Beauharnois to Caughnawaga, in the province of Quebec.

To the East Richelieu Valley Railway Company, for 24 miles of their railway from Iberville to St. Thomas, boundary of Missisquoi County, in the province of Quebec.

To the Portage du Fort and Bristol Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway to a

point at or near Shawville, in the county of Pontiac.

For a railway from a point at or near Windsor Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Upper Musquodoboit, for a distance of 40 miles.

To the St. Stephens and Milltown Railway Company, for 1.14 miles of their railway from Milltown to St. Stephen, in the province of New Brunswick.

For a railway from Sunny Brae to Country Harbour and thence to Guysborough, in the province of Nova Scotia, a distance of 65 miles.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, to Port Hood and Broad Cove, 53 miles, for 53 miles of their railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (25 miles revote.)

For a railway from a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, to the town of Liverpool, via the village of Caledonia, or to the village of Caledonia, via Liverpool, or for any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles. (35 miles revote.)

For a railway from Indian Garden on the line of the last mentioned railway to Shelbourne, Nova Scotia, a distance of 33 miles. (Revote.)

To the Coast Line Railway Company, for 61 miles of their railway from Yarmouth to Port Clyde, in the province of Nova Scotia. (35 miles revote.)

For a railway from Brookfield Station on the Intercolonial Railway to Eastville, 30 miles. (Revote.)

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the Railway Companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 67 miles of their railway between Montcalm and its junction with the Lower Laurentian Railway near St. Tite in the vicinity of the St. Maurice River. (Revote.) The balance remaining unpaid of the subsidies granted by the Act 56 Victoria, chapter 2, and 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4, between these points, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$182,400.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, for 84 miles of their railway from Aylmer to Pembroke, also for bridging the Ottawa River. (Revote.) The balance of the subsidy remaining unpaid granted by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, and 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4, not exceeding \$114,272.

To the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, for 62 miles of their railway from Hull towards Désert, in the province of Quebec. (Revote.) Balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy granted by the Act 56 Victoria, chapter 2, not exceeding in the whole \$35,872.

To the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for a subsidy towards the rebuilding and enlargement of the Victoria Bridge at Montreal over the St. Lawrence River, 15 per centum upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$300,000.

To the Montford Colonization Railway Company, for 33 miles of their railway from Montford Junction to Arundel, in the province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$2,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$66,000.

3. That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Coun-

all be granted to such companies respectively ; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively ; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, which agreement the Government is hereby empowered to make ; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

4. That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

5. That the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized—except as to subsidies with respect to which it is hereinbefore otherwise provided.

6. Any company receiving a subsidy as aforesaid, in excess of \$3,200 per mile, shall be bound to carry Her Majesty's mails for a term of ten years free of charge over the portion of railway subsidized.

Mr. FOSTER. I may suggest to my hon. friend that it would be a great convenience to the committee if the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals would inform the House, in each case, as to how much money we are expected to vote. They seem to be disposed to make us do our own calculations. It would save us a great deal of trouble, those of us who are not adepts at calculating.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend will look at the terms of the resolution he will see that in each of those cases it is a simple multiplication of the number of miles by \$3,200.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if my hon. friend will have the minimum and maximum sum placed there, it would be some guide.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That would be impossible, under the terms.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Penitentiary .....\$97,500

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Government would make a statement as to what they intend to take on the report.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friend will examine the report, and that portion of it which refers to recommendations, I will be happy to answer any questions he may ask in regard to them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Take the recommendations towards the end, page 33, you will find recommendations there in reference to discipline. I have prepared answers which refer to each paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 6, are as follows :—

1. That in order to command the services of a man fully qualified to discharge the duties of warden of the penitentiary the remuneration of that officer should not be less than \$3,000 per annum, with the official residence unfurnished, heating, lighting and water, and such portion of the prison ground and such convict labour as may be assigned to him by the department.

2. No time should be lost in revising the present prison regulations (sanctioned in 1838) and adapting them to the altered condition of things in the penitentiary.

3. The duties of every officer should be clearly and distinctly defined in the regulations, so as to prevent any possible clashing in their work.

4. Every officer of the prison should be supplied with a copy of the regulations, and required to make himself familiar with them, especially with those relating to his own duties.

5. Before any permanent rules respecting the prison of isolation and the dungeon cells are sanctioned, full information should be obtained, either by personal visit or by correspondence, from the authorities at the head of the leading prisons either in the United States or Belgium, where the cellular system has been for years in successful operation.

The answer to paragraph one is : There is no present intention of increasing the salary of the warden.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the salary now ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. \$2,500 a year.

Mr. BERGERON. And he has a house free, heated, lighted and everything.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. 2. The present regulations will be revised, and the carrying out of them will be insisted upon.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to No. 1, you say it is not the intention to increase the salary of the warden, but the recommendation is that a man who is fully qualified should be secured to discharge the duties, and presumably the present man is not qualified.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is of the opinion that a man fully qualified can be got for the salary and perquisites now paid ?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. That is our opinion at the present time.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think so, too.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. We have taken the trouble to read the evidence upon which the report is based, and we do not consider ourselves bound to any great extent to accept the findings of the commissioners. We find, ourselves on the evidence independently of the commissioners, and we give the findings of the department to the committee. It is intended that the present regulations shall be revised. The regulations we have now were established in 1884. Since that time new officers have been added and new industries created, for instance, the binder twine industry, and in consequence it is necessary that new regulations shall be made. As to these regulations I have consulted with the inspector and the intention is that the inspector shall prepare a set of rules after a full examination into the penitentiary at Kingston and the penitentiaries elsewhere. When these regulations are adopted it is the intention to see that they are properly enforced. That disposes of paragraphs 1 to 5. As to paragraphs 6 to 13 the same thing will apply. They are as follows :—

6. No officer of the prison should be allowed to purchase any articles from the prison stores, or to have any work done for him in the prison shops.

7. No officer should be allowed to keep any animals, or feed for the same, on the prison premises.

8. Married officers should not be permitted to reside within the walls of the prison.

9. Officers closely related or connected with each other by blood or marriage should not be employed in the prison at the same time.

10. In no case should firearms be used in dealing with a convict in his cell. Should it be necessary to remove from his cell a violent or refractory convict armed with a dangerous weapon, no attempt should be made to enter his cell against his will until he has been made to give up his dangerous weapon. This could be done in a short time by putting him on bread and water diet, or in a few minutes (if necessary) by turning the hose on him.

11. With a view to economy and the other advantages stated in their report, the three classes or grades of convicts should henceforth be distinguished, not by different suits of clothing, but simply by stripes upon the sleeves of their coats, in the military way, the same cloth being used for all the grades.

12. It should be a strong incentive to industry and good conduct if special privileges were secured by the convicts in the higher grades, and especially if a system were introduced, such as is now in force in the central prison, by which a convict might by good conduct and special industry earn money, to be given to him under certain conditions when leaving the prison.

13. The officers who give the convicts marks for good conduct and industry, should be most careful in performing this duty, so that the convicts should feel that their promotion from one grade to another, and the amount of remission of ser-

tence which they can earn thereby, depends entirely on themselves.

14. The organization of a Prisoners' Aid Association at Kingston, on the same lines as the Prisoners' Aid Association at Toronto, with the object, among others, of assisting by advice and otherwise convicts at the critical time when they are leaving the prison, and the appointment of a special officer at the prison for this purpose, would be the means of saving many a poor creature and preventing him from returning to his evil courses.

As to paragraph 14 we approve generally of its terms, but as to the appointment of a special officer for the purpose mentioned that will not be done until we have had an opportunity of reducing the number of employees in the penitentiary.

15. Every communication addressed to the inspector of penitentiaries on matters relating to the prison, whether from the officers of the prison or convicts, should be forwarded to that officer through the warden, who shall transmit it to the inspector with any remarks he may see fit to make.

16. The lunatics now confined in the building within the walls of the penitentiary, which is utterly unsuited for the purpose of an asylum, should be removed either to the public asylums of the different provinces, if satisfactory arrangements for that purpose can be made between the federal and provincial governments, or failing that, they should be transferred to an asylum erected outside the prison walls.

17. The female convicts now within the walls of the penitentiary (a building in nearly every way most unsuited for the purpose) should be removed to the Mercer Reformatory, at Toronto, if satisfactory arrangements for that purpose can be made between the Federal Government and the Government of Ontario.

18. The general admission of the public to the prison is objectionable and should be discouraged. It is thought that two or three hours on a fixed day in each week would be ample for the purpose. All visitors should be in charge of one of the guards, and no guard should have charge of more than six visitors at one time. The guard should take care that the visitors in his charge do not communicate with any of the prisoners.

19. For the reasons fully set forth in the foregoing report, the commissioners recommend that the services of James H. Metcalfe, warden; William Sullivan, deputy warden; Patrick O'Donnell, storekeeper, and N. P. Wood, assistant storekeeper, be dispensed with; and that James Devlin, the engineer, and James C. Weir, the steward, be summarily dismissed.

We approve of paragraph 15 in its entirety. As to 16, correspondence is now being exchanged with the provincial governments for the purpose of having criminal lunatics removed to the provincial asylums. Seventeen; there is also correspondence as to that. Paragraph 18 is approved of. Paragraph 19, that more particularly concerns hon. gentlemen on the other side, refers to retirements and dismissals. In substance this paragraph is approved of except as to the warden. I may say that we have no present intention of removing the warden, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. **BERGERON**. No present intention?

Mr. HENDERSON. When is it intended to remove him ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not intended to remove him at the present time.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose his removal depends on when the Ontario elections come off.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite sure that that was not the intention, but that is a valuable suggestion. We are dealing with this matter very seriously, and there is no reason at the present time to justify Mr. Metcalfe's removal.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Mr. Sullivan ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As to Sullivan he must go ; O'Donnell must go ; Wood must also go ; Weir also. Devlin undoubtedly must go ; he has already gone.

Mr. FOSTER. How much farther are you going to send him ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is an inquiry which I think is quite pertinent. I may say that it is quite possible that he may have to go back.

Mr. FOSTER. On salary ?

Mr. BERGERON. That is a great recommendation for a man if he wants to get work elsewhere.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is proper to say, that that requires explanation. But it is a fact that so far as Devlin is concerned the charges contained in the report are of such a serious character that we would not be justified in allowing him to remain. We give him an opportunity to explain, and we must give him that opportunity either by way of evidence to be given by him in answer to charges to be formulated or by way of a trial. It has not been decided yet, but he will have one or the other.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if the committee is to understand, that so far as the evidence contained in the report of the commissioners is concerned, the Government see no reason why Mr. Metcalfe should be dismissed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In so far as the report is concerned, I will state, now, again, that there is no intention at the present time of removing Warden Metcalfe. We will not adopt that conclusion of the report.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the explanation as to paragraphs 20 and 21 ?

20. In view of the advanced age of Dr. Strange, the present prison surgeon, the commissioners think that his retirement would be in the interest of the prison.

21. While the commissioners have reason to believe that the present chief keeper, William S. Hughes, is a zealous, active and intelligent off-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

cer, and a good disciplinarian, they think (in view of the friction which has for some time existed between him and some of the other officers of the penitentiary), that it would be in the interest of the penitentiary that he should be transferred to another prison, or to some other branch of the public service.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Twenty refers to Dr. Strange. A change may become necessary, but there is no intention at present to make the change.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the age of Dr. Strange ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He is a very old man.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Kingston, Mr. Britton, ought to know how old he is.

Mr. BRITTON. He is about 72, I think.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think he is in the vicinity of 70 years of age.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the Solicitor General would be stopped from disposing of any man's services on account of age until he reaches that fixed maximum established in the case of Mr. Gunn who has been appointed to an office at Kingston. Officials may attain to that age in the service, but does not the hon. gentleman think it a good experiment to appoint non-officials who are of advanced age ?

Mr. BRITTON. Whatever may be done in the case of Dr. Strange by the present Government, I have not the slightest doubt that had the late Government remained in power the recommendation in regard to his superannuation would have been carried out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As to 21, in reference to the transfer of Hughes, it is not probable that he will be transferred. The evidence goes to show that he is a faithful and good officer, and that he may be of great use in the penitentiary.

22. The commissioners are of opinion that the number of keepers and guards (56) now employed in the prison is unnecessarily large, being more than one to every eleven prisoners ; and they believe, for the reasons given in their separate report, that with judicious arrangements, the number might safely be reduced (even while the farm is retained) to forty-eight, or one guard to twelve prisoners, and if the farm be not retained, to one guard for fourteen prisoners.

Number 22 refers to the reduction in the officers. That certainly will be carried out as soon as it is possible to properly reorganize the penitentiary. The recommendation in paragraph 23, will, as far as possible, be carried out.

Mr. CLANCY. At what price was the binder twine sold to Mr. Hobbs ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the figures now, but I have them in my office and will give them later on. I

may say that tenders were called for in the regular course, and that one-half cent was obtained from Mr. Hobbs better than the best other tender put in.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Is it the intention of the Government to continue the manufacture of binder twine in the Kingston Penitentiary?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The whole question of the employment of prisoners is being considered with a view of ascertaining the most profitable employment they can be put to. As the binder twine plant has cost the country something in the vicinity of \$50,000, it would be very hard to expect that without very careful consideration we should set that industry aside.

**Mr. SPROULE.** In this report I find the following:—

28. All the prison industries and all branches of trade conducted by the prison should be placed under the supervision of a thoroughly competent chief trade instructor, one if possible, who has had experience in manufacturing and as a successful man of business, who should be given authority, under proper regulations, to purchase all manufacturing and engineering supplies, and to sell all prison products.

29. The storekeeper should purchase all maintenance supplies not used in the trades or industries or engineering departments; and should be selected for his established character as a competent and upright business man, having had experience in dealing in the class of goods required for prison maintenance.

Is it the intention of the Government to carry out that recommendation?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** These are parts of the general scheme of reform which we are now considering. It is intended to carry out the recommendation as regards a thoroughly competent trade instructor, but there will be no unnecessary increase in the staff so far as the balance of that recommendation is concerned.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is it the intention to invest that man with power to buy all supplies and sell all products as recommended here?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** There is no such intention at the present time. This recommendation would necessitate that for the present system of tender we should allow a man to buy in the open market at the time the goods are required. That is the system that exists at the Central Prison at Toronto, and if we consider the results obtained, that system has certainly very great advantages; but, on the other hand, it is undoubted that it has very serious disadvantages also.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The Solicitor General will bear in mind that one of the commissioners who make these recommendations is connected with the Central Prison, and his recommendation cannot be without strong

feeling of defending the system which prevails in this institution. It seems to me, the Government should go very slowly in endorsing the conclusions of that gentleman.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** I quite appreciate that. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) must bear in mind that the comparison between the Kingston Penitentiary and the Central Prison, in this respect, is based upon the actual figures of results obtained, and not upon what this gentleman may have said.

**Mr. CLANCY.** If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) depends upon the printed reports with regard to the maintenance of the Central Prison he will find himself very far afield. The same services are not taken into consideration at all in making the comparison.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) cannot apply so far as the purchase of supplies are concerned.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these goods would be purchased on the open market?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** That is the recommendation, but there is no present intention to do that. I may state that we have at the present time asked for tenders for supplies for the coming year.

**Mr. BRITTON.** The Solicitor General has stated in reference to some of these matters, that there is to be an inquiry by the Inspector. I call his attention to page 21 of the report, which refers to the present inspector, and in view of that, some care might be taken as to whether the inspection is to be under the present officer or not. Certainly, according to the report of the persons who investigated the matter, the system of inspection as it has been carried on of late years—I am not referring to particular persons—seems to be manifestly insufficient and entirely ineffectual as to preventing things that the commissioners complain of.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** Naturally, all these matters are directly under the control of the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), and especially penitentiaries, are under his exclusive control. Therefore, before I came here to answer the questions that might be put to me, I had a conference with the Minister of Justice, and which conference resulted in reducing to writing what I should say here as representing him. Dealing with the inspector of penitentiaries, there are some portions of this report that rather reflect on him, but I have also to draw the attention of the committee to this fact; the inspector has only been an officer for a year or two, and within that time it was impossible for him to bring about the reforms which really he

has recommended from time to time to the department. I must say on his behalf that since he has been in office the annual expenditure has decreased from \$468,000 in 1894-95, to \$389,000 last year. We have almost saved \$100,000 in the last two or three years so far as penitentiaries are concerned. I may say, speaking on behalf of the Minister of Justice, that the intention is, in so far as the prison regulations are concerned, to confer with the inspector of penitentiaries, and I further desire to say that if we had no confidence in the inspector of penitentiaries, of course he should not be in the position he occupies. But, we have confidence in him at the present time, and we mean to consult him and take him into our confidence for the purposes of discussing these regulations.

Mr. QUINN. Before the item passes I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the manner in which this commission has been conducted. I do not think that the officers complained of, and against whom findings have been made by the commissioners, have been given anything like a fair show or British justice in this matter at all. The commissioners, as I am informed and have reason to believe, and in fact as I know, to a certain extent conducted their investigation in a manner that outrages our ideas of justice or of investigations conducted by commissioners appointed by a Government or by a department such as the Department of Justice. Not only did they not set about their work regularly, that is, in a manner that a judge or a proper commissioner would; but they seemed to take the position rather of detectives or spies. They seemed to be there for the purpose of finding out something that was wrong, according to their idea, whether in reality it was wrong or not. They went to persons who they thought could furnish information, and who they perhaps thought could furnish this information without having any ground for believing they could; asserted that these persons were in a position to furnish the information; asserted that they had been guilty themselves of certain offences, and that the best thing for them to do would be to make a clean breast of the whole matter; and thereby save themselves and other persons implicated from prosecution or other consequences. Not only was this done, but I have reason to believe that the Department of Justice was placed in possession of certain facts concerning different members of the committee, the secretary, (I think, in particular. I think the Solicitor General will bear me out in that. Letters written by the secretary were placed in the Department of Justice, in which letters the secretary asked certain individuals to help him out in bringing home charges to different individuals in the penitentiary, who were then accused. But, stranger than all, when

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the parties who had been accused asked to be allowed to hear the evidence which was given against them, to have counsel to represent them at the investigation, to give any explanation, or to examine witnesses on their own behalf, not only were their requests refused, but they were kept in perfect ignorance of any charge that had been made against them until the report had been sent in, and until the fact of the existence of such a report had been brought out in this House. Now, it is not my intention to attempt to apologize either for the misconduct of officials or the misconduct of the commissioners. Nor is it my purpose or my duty to make any charges against these commissioners or against this secretary. I think it is sufficient simply to draw the attention of the Solicitor General to the facts which I have stated in order to have justice done to these men. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Tupper) has examined this report very carefully, and I think it was his intention to say something on this subject, had he been present. Unfortunately, he is not able to be here; but I think that in this case the same system should have been followed that had been followed in the case of commissions in other departments—for example, the system that had been followed in the case of the commission of investigation into the affairs of the penitentiary at Kingston in 1848. In that case the commissioners reported:

After the most mature deliberation, we resolved that the fairest and most satisfactory mode was to conduct the investigation in the first place in private, and, after maturing our inquiries, to draw up from the evidence formal charges against any officer who might appear to be implicated, and furnish him with a copy of such charges and the testimony to sustain them; and should such officer deny the allegations made to his prejudice, we determined that he should have the opportunity of recalling the witness for re-examination, or summoning such additional witnesses as he might think proper, for his defence.

I think that will strike any member of this committee as not only the reasonable thing to do, but as the proper and just mode of procedure. Further on, they say:

We conceived this mode of proceeding was highly advantageous to the accused; for though the preliminary evidence would thus be taken in his absence, the benefit for having the testimony in writing, with time to scan every line of it, instead of cross-examining on the moment, greatly overbalanced any slight disadvantage which might attend it. The main objection to this mode of proceeding, however, was the length of time it would occupy, and to this consideration we gave full weight; but we felt that in dealing with such an institution, it was most desirable that there should be no room for complaint that injustice was done to any one, and that the fullest opportunity for explanation should be afforded to all.

These extracts are from the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire in the

affairs of the provincial penitentiary at Kingston on June 23rd, 1848. In this case the commissioners, instead of following that procedure, sat, one might say, with closed doors. It was a star chamber investigation. One witness at a time was brought in, and was examined privately. The person whom he accused knew nothing of the evidence which was adduced against him. Incompetent stenographers were employed, I am informed, and only portions of the evidence suitable to the views or ideas of the commissioners were taken down by the stenographers, and under the direct instruction of the commissioners. That is, it was not the exact words of the witness that were taken down; but, after a statement had been made by the witness, the commissioners would instruct the stenographer to take down such and such a statement as having been made by the witness. The deposition was not read over to the witness, and the witness was given no chance to correct any mistakes or misunderstandings taken down in the course of the statement he had made. Extracts were taken from these supposed depositions and made up to form the report on which the commissioners based their report—that is, not made up by the stenographers, not made up by the witnesses, but made up by the commissioners themselves. Another thing: the persons who were accused were not allowed to be present during the examination of any of these witnesses, nor were they allowed to cross-examine any witness. Nor were they allowed to have counsel to represent them at the examination of any of these witnesses, nor even to know that there were any complaints against them. When they asked, after having been themselves examined as witnesses, if any complaint had been made against them, the commissioners replied: "You are not charged with anything, consequently we cannot allow you to be represented or have counsel to cross-examine any witnesses." So that these men found themselves in this position, that until the report of the commission was brought before this House, they actually did not know, except through public rumour in the public press, communicated no doubt by the commissioners themselves or their friends, that there was any charge against them. Not only this, but the sources of information of the commissioners were such as to condemn their course in the eyes of any unprejudiced judge. During this commission, the members of it, particularly the secretary,—and I base this statement, not upon mere casual information, but on the sworn testimony of those who have been examined and whose depositions are now in the hands of the Minister of Justice—were in constant communication with one of the convicts, a man of undeniably bad character, who had been punished by this very officer against whom complaints were made. On the evidence of this bad character, these men are about to

be or have been dismissed. With this man, the secretary of the commission was in constant communication and frequently closeted. This prisoner was the confidant of the secretary of the commission, and as a reward for the services which he rendered in that capacity, I am informed, he has since been pardoned. If I am incorrect in that statement, the Solicitor General will probably set me right. He will probably tell us if this man named Mathewson, who figures very prominently as witness in this place has since been pardoned, and in that connection, I would ask my hon. friend also to give us the prison record of Mathewson. Not only was this convict a man notably of bad character in the penitentiary, the principal informant and agitator, but other means were adopted to obtain information which, I think, will not meet with the approval of the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. Here, for example, is a letter written by the secretary of this commission in order to obtain evidence, and I read it to show that the object was not to obtain evidence in the public interest, but to ferret out, by fair or foul means, evidence which would support the charge which, in the secretary's own mind, had already been substantiated against the accused. The letter is paper J of the record and is headed "private":

Kingston, January 29th, 1897.

Dear Dave,—Some years ago, when you were traveller for our oil company, you told me it was absolutely necessary to pay the engineer in the penitentiary a commission in order to be able to do business with him. You can help me out by telling me how much commission, and how to go about it. If so, put me on the way. Are you doing anything in British Columbia mines?

Yours truly,

R. J. EILBECK,  
British North American Hotel.

Hon. gentlemen will remark this phrase: "You can help me out by telling me how much commission and how to go about it." Help him out. This is the secretary of the commission appointed by the Department of Justice to investigate the affairs of the Kingston penitentiary regarding its administration. Why should he ask anybody to help him out? He occupied a judicial position, and why should he ask any one to help him to convict a criminal. Is it the duty of a person occupying a judicial position to convict the prisoner brought before him? How is this man to help him out? You can help me out, he says, by telling me how much commission you paid and how you went about it.

Mr. BRITTON. Eilbeck was not one of the commissioners.

Mr. QUINN. He was the secretary of the commission, and that makes the case infinitely worse, that he should, while secretary, occupy the position of detective as well. What confidence can be placed upon

the report or the minutes he will make of any of the meetings or the report he may make of the evidence taken if we find him making a matter of personal interest to himself that this man to whom he wrote should furnish the means of convicting the accused of accepting bribes or commission.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was this man?

Mr. QUINN. His name is Eilbeck and I will tell you in a moment who he was. The point I want to make in this connection is that no reliance can be placed on his action either as secretary or reporter of that commission, because by that letter he shows he had a personal interest in obtaining information in every possible way for the purpose of ruining this man whom he intended afterwards to judge. What happened afterwards? The gentleman to whom this letter was addressed came before the commission and made the following declaration:—

I, David John Roy, in the city of Toronto, county of York, do solemnly declare, that the only business I ever did with the penitentiary was the sale of two barrels of lubricating oil, and one barrel of seal oil, some years ago, and that the order for the same was given me by the warden, no other person being mentioned, nor do I remember having mentioned to Mr. Eilbeck, that to do any business with the penitentiary, some one had to be paid.

And I make this declaration, solemnly believing the same to be true, by virtue of the Act respecting Judicial Oaths.

Here is the man to whom the letter was addressed, swearing that he never gave Mr. Eilbeck to understand that he had to pay any bribe or commission to any employee of the penitentiary before he could do business with them. We do not know how many of these letters were sent out by this industrious secretary, but we find this letter and we have every reason to believe it was not the only one. An hon. gentleman has asked who that Mr. Eilbeck is. I do not know the gentleman personally, but I have a little information concerning him here. I will read a statement about Mr. Eilbeck, which, I think, will interest the committee and may give hon. members some idea of who he is. This is taken from the "Catholic Record," of February 13th, 1897, in which they speak with approval of the appointment of Mr. Fraser as one of the commissioners—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Who are "they;" who speaks of Mr. Fraser in that way?

Mr. QUINN. He is spoken of in that way in the "Catholic Record."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Give the signature of the letter you are going to read from.

Mr. QUINN. I am going to give all—

Mr. QUINN.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before you read the statement from the newspaper give the authority on which it makes that statement.

Mr. QUINN. I will give all the authority in proper form.

Mr. BRITTON. That is not on the authority of the "Record" but of—

Mr. QUINN. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) are deeply interested in defending the character of Mr. Eilbeck. I can understand that in the case of the hon. member for Kingston, but why the Solicitor General should display such anxiety to defend Mr. Eilbeck, I do not know. I shall give my authority; I shall give everything in connection with the matter. It is not my desire to hide or cover up this matter in any way. What I want is a proper investigation and the truth. I have no desire to vilify Mr. Eilbeck before this committee. I do not know him; and, if what I hear about him is true, I shall take very good care not to know him unless I have a chance to prosecute him in a court of justice. Now, I say I will read from the "Catholic Record" of February 13th, 1897, an article in which, while the appointment of Mr. Fraser is commended, the following expressions occur:—

The presence of Mr. Fraser would, very probably, have had the effect of preventing one, at least, of the commissioners from acting the role of a detective and resorting to means which no man of honour or fine feeling would stoop to in order to gratify his own anti-Catholic feeling and that of the Kingston bigots by whom he is influenced. Mr. Fraser would have, however, been a check upon Mr. "Bob" Eilbeck, the secretary of the commission, whose conduct during the prolonged absence of Messrs. Noxon and Meredith, at Toronto, has been as unprecedented as it was unwarrantable and illegal. This person, from his bucket-shop experience, is an adept in all those low tricks and expedients so familiar to "smart" men of his type. Eilbeck played a mean part for his masters by collecting, inside and outside the prison walls, for their information, all manner of falsehoods, slanders and exaggerations from the most questionable sources. His chief confidant, companion and informant was a convict named Mathewson, who has served at least three terms in Kingston, the Central Prison and St. Vincent de Paul, and who was recently released from the former place. Eilbeck violated the law by taking this convict from his allotted work without the warden's knowledge or consent, and by being closeted with him for hours together. Never before, in the history or traditions of the Kingston or any other penitentiary in Canada, have proceedings so flagrantly disgraceful been tolerated. A convict betimes had been accepted as a sworn witness to corroborate the evidence of an officer; but it has been a standing rule, observed by all concerned in penitentiary administration, not to interview convicts in private, or receive their very questionable and unsupported statements against any member of the staff. In fact, "Bob"—

This is this Mr. Eilbeck, I understand.

—has been exercising plenipotentiary powers far greater, indeed, than the commissioners could lawfully relegate to him. He is the tool—so far as they can use him—of the extreme bigots of both political parties in Kingston. While "Bob" has proved himself a thoroughbred sleuth-hound in hunting down Catholic employees, it is rather a singular fact that he has failed to bring to light the peccadilloes of any of the oath-bound "brethren" who have been levying a little blackmail; and there are such! Is this the result of mere oversight, or sympathy, or what?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Is that an editorial of the "Catholic Record"?

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) must not allow his anxiety to overleap itself. I will tell him in a moment.

It can be hardly possible that the Minister of Justice—if cognizant of the mode of acting carried out by the commissioners and their clerk—would or could approve of such exceptional proceedings. No character, however pure and clean, could escape being smirched and injured by means of the dark, underhand and star-chamber machinations and plots which have, thus far, characterized the inquiry. By the way, the commissioners are bent on making the best of their opportunity to do a little quiet business on their own behalf. They are about three months ostensibly engaged in searching for "mares' nests" at Kingston, being paid at the rate of \$10 a day each, and expenses. This is a nice little bon-bon to dally with and hold in grasp. Our octogenarian friend, "E. A."—

I think that refers to Mr. Meredith.

Mr. BRITTON. Who is a good Conservative.

Mr. QUINN. But surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) does not think this is a matter of politics. Surely he does not think that I am speaking of this case as a matter of politics.

Mr. BRITTON. By no means, but the hon. gentleman's friends on the other side are.

Mr. QUINN. I do not care whether he is a Conservative or a Liberal, whether he has any politics or whether he has not. I want to know whether he is an honest man and whether he has conducted this investigation honestly and disinterestedly. I do not say that there could not be such a thing as a dishonest commissioner a Conservative, but if he be dishonest as a commissioner, I am glad to have an opportunity of saying what I have to say about his conduct.

—is fond of such precious windfalls, and will not soon or readily abandon the crib so well supplied with golden pap. It is quite likely Mr. Noxon has no squeamish qualms about following the example of a senior colleague, and enjoys "a good thing," when it "falls in his fish." Two things may be safely said of the commissioners: first, that they have not performed a fair month's work since the inquiry opened; secondly, that the result of their very trying and "pecoliar"

task will go a short way in reimbursing the treasury for their pay and pickings.

Now, this article is dated February 6th, 1897, and is a communication addressed to the "Huron Expositor" the 29th January. It seems.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And signed by—?

Mr. QUINN. Signed by "An onlooker."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, an "onlooker." I do not know who the gentleman is. Probably the hon. gentleman for Kingston is acquainted with "Onlooker."

Mr. BRITTON. No, and I do not know anybody who is acquainted with him.

Mr. QUINN. At any rate, two respectable newspapers in Ontario have taken the responsibility of publishing this, the "Huron Expositor" and the "Catholic Record," and I have not heard of any proceedings having been taken against either of them. Both these newspapers published this. The hon. member for Kingston evidently knew about this before, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General knew that they were not editorial notices, and knew that they were published by "Onlooker." I do not know that he has displayed his knowledge or his interest in the matter by taking warning from what has been said there, or investigating to see if these things are true. For example, there is one statement made there which I think is very important, and which might have been inquired into by the Solicitor General and the truth ascertained as to whether this man Eilbeck violated the law by taking this convict from his allotted work without the warden's knowledge or consent, and by being closeted with this man for hours together.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I did not verify that, but it was done. He had the consent of the warden.

Mr. QUINN. It was only true, then, in so far as his having been closeted with him for hours together?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is quite true.

Mr. QUINN. Now, I may say here, by way of parenthesis, that my only acquaintance with Mr. Noxon was derived from an interview that I had with a client of mine concerning this investigation, at the time that Mr. Noxon was interested in finding out evidence about this penitentiary; and I am informed by this gentleman, a gentleman of standing in Montreal, that in course of conversation with Mr. Noxon, the latter asked him if it was not a fact that he had been paying commissions to different officers of the penitentiaries. This man said: Well, Mr. Noxon, from what you tell me, you are the official connected with the department of prisons, I think, one of the inspectors in Ontario, and you know how these things are

done. Now, you purchase large quantities of stuff for the penitentiaries yourself? Yes. Well, you understand how it is with people who buy these large quantities. Of course, if you came down here to buy from me you know I would be glad to treat you personally very well, and I think if you are in good company here you will find it to your advantage, I will treat you personally very well. Mr. Noxon did not resent it, but he said, "Very well, I will see about it, I think I will be able to buy from you." This, Sir, is the man who was sent to investigate the honesty of other people. Now, without reading any more extracts from these papers many of which would be very interesting, let us take the report as it stands, and let me say one or two things in connection with it. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, we find the commission was appointed for—what purpose? We find in the first sentence of their report that the object was "to investigate and inquire into the affairs of the Kingston penitentiary with special reference to matters relating or pertaining to economy in the management thereof." Now, that is the first object of the commission—"and into all such other matters and questions as may from time to time be authorized or directed by the order of His Excellency the Governor General in Council or by the Minister of Justice, and to report the result of their investigation to the Minister of Justice, at his office at Ottawa." Now, this would not indicate a judicial position at all. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) reminded me that this commission did not occupy the position of judges, that it was simply what would have been called, and what has been called in Great Britain, a smelling commission. They were there for the purpose of ferreting out anything that might be wrong. They were not endowed, possibly, with the powers or with the dignity of judges. They were there for the work they had to do, and were selected from the population for their fitness, possibly, in smelling things out, and in acting as detectives in their investigation that was to be conducted by them. But they were appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the affairs of the Kingston penitentiary, with special reference to matter relating or pertaining to economy in the management of the penitentiary. Now, what is the first thing they do? The first thing they do is to send in six or seven reports, not concerning the economical management of the affairs of the penitentiary, or anything of that kind; but evidently on questions which were subsequently submitted to them by the Department of Justice, after they had received this general commission. Now, in this report what do they do? They arrogate to themselves, as I maintain, the position of judges. They do not take the position of investigators, because we do not find in this report the evidence upon which they based their conclusions. They arro-

Mr. QUINN.

gate to themselves the position of judges, and virtually decide as to the official life or death of several of the officials of the penitentiary. They do not give any grounds for it. They do not say, Here is the evidence, and such and such a thing is sworn to; they do not send to the Department of Justice a copy of the depositions which have been taken and sworn to by these men, and say, We ask you now to render judgment. But they take upon themselves the responsibility of judges, putting aside altogether the evidence that had been taken by them, as I am informed and have reason to believe—because I have sworn testimony to prove that they did not take all the evidence that had been given, but took such portions of it as they deemed proper and right for their own purposes; and on that they based a judgment which they, as judges, afterwards rendered. Now, is this a proper position for these men to occupy before this House? Let me here ask the Solicitor General if it would not be well to let this committee have the benefit of the other reports which have been sent in by these men. There are very important matters that were submitted to this commission to inquire into. For example, the Solicitor General, and probably the member for Kingston might think it of greater importance to find out whether a particular article was bought at one shop or another, they might consider it of greater importance to find that out, and might not think it of any importance, for example, to know anything about the shooting of Convict Hewell by Chief Hughes, on the 9th of October, 1896. Evidently the Solicitor General did not think much about it, because there is no report of the kind before the House. We have reports against other individuals, but none concerning the shooting of the prisoner Hewell. But other things have been inquired into by these gentlemen, for example the escape of the convicts, Morris and Macdonald from the penitentiary, but no report concerning them is brought down. But we have this report here, which, I presume, is the great work of the commission, the work for which they were appointed, to find out some individuals against whom they could establish something upon which to hang a charge, in order that the official lives of these men might be sacrificed to make way for some of their own friends.

Mr. BRITTON. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I had no such desire.

Mr. QUINN. I would not charge my hon. friend with that, certainly; but it is evidently the intention of the commission. Now, let us see what they say. They are very anxious to get little jobs for themselves, and, of course, they do not lose an opportunity of any kind in order to find out. They recommend certain improvements in the penitentiary; they recommend that certain things be done, but I cannot lay my

hands upon the clause at the moment. I remember it so well ; it struck me as peculiar at the time. It struck me that this course would not have been advised if it had not given an opportunity for an inspector, or somebody else appointed by the Government, to visit the penitentiaries of the United States, Germany, and possibly Russia, to find out what was the custom in the institutions in these countries. The object, of course, was to provide an occupation extending over a year or two for somebody who is possibly very much in need of it. The commissioners in their report state :

At the present time there are a number of officers who are closely connected by family ties, and, as might be expected, the members of this family compact are naturally regarded with suspicion and dislike by the other officers. That a number of relations or connections should hold office simultaneously in any prison seems, on general grounds, most objectionable.

I have nothing to say about that, but the commissioners, after having smelt out this fact, ought to have put the Minister of Justice in a position to show to the satisfaction of the committee that this statement is so. I mention it as a general principle that these gentlemen ought to have put before this committee, and ought to have put in the hands of the Minister of Justice the evidence upon which they have arrived at the conclusions they have arrived at in the report, and if such evidence was put in the hands of the Minister of Justice it ought to have been brought down and placed before this committee. It is not my desire to defend any persons who have done wrong in the penitentiary ; I have no desire to shield those who have robbed the public and the Government by receiving commissions from persons selling articles to the penitentiary, but I have a desire to see justice done in matters of this kind. I have a desire to see fair, British justice meted out to everybody whether he be a public official or whether he occupies the humblest position in society when his conduct is being investigated by the Department of Justice. What do I find ? The engineer, against whom charges have been made, has, I understand from the Solicitor General, either been dismissed or is about to be dismissed, and he is going to be brought before the courts, I understand. I am very glad to hear this, because I think it will furnish an opportunity of having the truth proven in this case. The engineer put before the Department of Justice a statement of what he believed to be the truth, of what he believed to be the conditions and circumstances connected with his administration of his department, and this statement was supported not only by his own affidavit, but by the affidavits of many officers of the penitentiary. These are on record in the Department of Justice. I only ask the Department of Justice, before any action is taken, to remember that to these men, although occupying humble positions

in the community, and to their children, their reputations are as dear to them as the reputation of the Solicitor General is to him. They are entitled to an investigation. It is not a right or proper condition that they should be condemned until they have been condemned on legal evidence. Such a thing would not be tolerated before any court in this country ; why, then, should it be tolerated before the highest court in the country, by the Parliament of Canada. I ask then, Mr. Chairman, that the Solicitor General shall take no step in this matter until he has been furnished and can furnish this committee with evidence of such a conclusive character as will leave no doubt of the guilt of these men who are charged by these commissioners. I ask him to give his personal attention to this matter and that he will act fairly and justly by these men. I ask him to do justice in this case in the interests of justice, in the interest of the House, in the interest of the public officials of this country, and in the interest of the Department of Justice.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has thought it necessary, for what possible purpose I cannot say, to make an attack upon the personal character of the commissioners appointed to investigate the affairs of all the penitentiaries of Canada with the exception of the one at Dorchester. He has called them spies and detectives, and he has said that they were a smelling commission. He has applied these words to men of the reputation of Mr. E. A. Meredith and Mr. G. K. Fraser, not to say anything about Mr. Noxon, who is known to the majority of those present. He has thought proper to employ these expressions upon what evidence it has not pleased him to make known to this committee. I shall not say anything in answer to that, but the hon. gentleman referred the committee to a letter of Mr. Eilbeck, which he read a moment ago. This letter purports to have been written by him to a gentleman in Toronto, and refers to a previous conversation he had had with this gentleman, and asking him whether he correctly remembered that previous conversation, and whether he remembered what he then stated was true. Mr. Eilbeck was appointed secretary of the commission and, in the course of the investigation, he was reminded of a conversation which he had had, and which, in my opinion, would go far to justify a charge against one of the employees. Upon such evidence as this, the charge we have listened to for the last half hour has been made. It is not necessary at all for me to characterize such action or such conduct as that. Every right-minded man in this House will know how to appreciate such a charge as that. As to the system which was followed in this investigation, I may say that we have in the penitentiaries of Canada some 1,373 inmates each year. There is expended the sum of \$400,000 for the maintenance of these in-

mates. We have discovered that within the last year or two the expenditure connected with our penitentiaries was reduced by \$100,000. We put to ourselves this question: Is it not possible by an investigation to ascertain how this decrease was made so as to come to a conclusion whether or not a further reduction may be possible. That investigation was held by three commissioners. We not only have their reports, but every bit of evidence that was produced before them. We have also every document upon the subject, and these are filed in the Department of Justice. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) took the position that this evidence should have been before this committee. This committee asked for the production of the report, and it asked for nothing else. A request was made that the report be produced and it was printed at the request of the House. That was the course that was followed, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) desired to get further information he should have asked to have the evidence produced. He never asked for it, and now he seeks to make an argument on such a ground as that. We have the evidence of the commissioners in this matter. They filed their report, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) before getting up and attacking it and the commissioners, had condescended to come into the House and hear what took place he would have heard what I previously stated, that the report of the commissioners was considered by the Department of Justice and that we only adopted the conclusions as far as we thought they were tenable and based on the evidence. In regard to the persons against whom charges have been made by the commissioners we have to adopt either one of two courses, either formulate charges against the parties incriminated where they are of such a character as to necessitate an explanation, so as to give the man opportunity of explaining, or else prosecute them on a criminal charge. I am going to do one or the other in reference to one man who has been attacked. As to the employees of the department that we simply intend to remove without depriving them of any advantages to which they would be fairly entitled, in the way of a retiring allowance; that is a matter over which we must exercise our own control. If we think, in the interests of the public, and in the interests of the administration of the penitentiaries, one man should be removed, and we simply remove him, that is our business and we take the responsibility for it. But, if we dismiss a man, charging him with dishonesty, then we are in duty bound to do one of two things: either to give him an opportunity of explaining the charges made against him before the commissioners or before the Department of Justice, and give him an opportunity to explain so that the House may be informed of the explanation; or it is our duty

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

to prosecute him as a criminal, and we will, as I have said, do one of the two things.

What was the condition of things existing in the Kingston penitentiary? And here it is proper to say that these charges made against the commissioners, based upon the statement that they have meted one measure of justice to a Protestant and another measure of justice to a Catholic; these charges should not have been made upon the authority of the anonymous scribbler in the paper to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) refers. I do not wish to make any trade of my religion, I do not wish to make any trade of my nationality; I do not wish to use either one or the other as a stepping-stone on which to reach power; but no matter what the position of a man may be, if he does not do honest and faithful service to the state, he must pay the penalty, no matter what religion he belongs to. Let us see how the management of the Kingston penitentiary was conducted from the point of view of economy. Take, for instance, the purchases that were made for the last seven or eight years. We find that the purchases for the Kingston penitentiary were made at a figure varying from 16 to 205 per cent above the market value. We find that to have been the general result in so far as purchases were concerned.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) find, from one end of the evidence to the other, anything to substantiate that charge, beyond the bald statement contained in that report?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I will give you that. Take the invoices. They were submitted to a witness that was examined before the commissioners, a gentleman from Kingston named McKelvey.

Mr. CLANCY. A good Liberal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. None the less truthful for that.

Mr. FOSTER. An exception to the general rule.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must decide for himself. This gentleman was examined as a witness, the invoices were submitted to him—

Mr. CLANCY. What invoices?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Invoices of purchases made from Garth & Co., of Montreal, Clendenning & Sons, James Markum, Chanteloupe, Parker & Evans, James Wilson & Co., the Hamilton Packing Company, and Frank Gormley.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that these are invoices of his own, compared with the same class of goods precisely, purchased for the penitentiary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I state it and I repeat it now, he took the invoices, he took the market prices at the time; the invoices of purchases that were made, and comparing them with the market prices this is the result.

Mr. CLANCY. Has he compared two sets of invoices, one of his own as the purchaser, with the invoice of a similar class of goods that were purchased for the penitentiary? Is that the kind of invoice now before the committee?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not discussing the question of invoices before the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. The Solicitor General will see that it is important to do so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I stated that he took the market prices at the time, and it is indifferent to me what the market prices were.

Mr. QUINN. He has a competitor in business with these men. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has no evidence of the market prices at all. They were simply in this gentleman's head, and he took up the invoices and looked at them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He took, for instance, the price lists of the very establishments that furnished these goods, and what more do we want than that? The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I will take the invoices if he likes that were supplied to the customs upon which the entry was made of these goods, and in one case an invoice was supplied to customs for \$908, and these same goods were sold to the penitentiary for \$2,100.

Mr. QUINN. Does the hon. gentleman now refer to the purchase of the pump?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When you are quite done I will go on with my speech.

Mr. QUINN. I now wish to state before this committee, to show the ignorance of these commissioners, that in estimating the cost of that pump, they took only one portion of the pump that is charged for, and they only took the customs entry on that, amounting to \$908. As a matter of fact, the actual cost of the pump that was supplied was over \$1,600.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why do they charge \$2,000?

Mr. QUINN. It was sold for \$2,000, and I suppose people must make a profit on what they sell. This man actually paid nearly \$1,700 for the pump, and sold it to the penitentiary for \$2,000. \$1,700 was the wholesale price of the pump, and that shows how the Solicitor General is mistaken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, yes, it will show very much how I was mistaken. That invoice that the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Quinn) now refers to was for goods purchased from Frank Gormley.

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then how does it come to pass that that invoice was made out in the name of John A Rafter & Company?

Mr. QUINN. What has that to do with it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where is the fraud there?

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will probably tell us where the fraud is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At Kingston, inside of three months we will hear where the fraud is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me explain that a little. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn), in answer to this charge, says, that the invoice having reference to this pump does not include the whole of the invoiced article that was sold to the penitentiary. I have in my possession here, accessible to the committee, the invoice on which these goods were entered at the custom-house, and I have the invoice which was made out to the penitentiary. It is easy to make a comparison and to establish before this committee immediately the question of veracity. At the time these goods were entered at the custom-house it was found that they were undervalued. There was then a report made to the Controller of Customs—not the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), but his predecessor—that the goods were undervalued to the extent of \$100. The goods were seized for undervaluation, an examination was made of them, and they were assessed with \$100 added to the valuation. They were valued at the custom-house at \$908, and the same goods were turned over to the penitentiary at \$2,100.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement made by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) was that the whole of the goods were not included in that invoice.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My answer is that they are included.

Mr. QUINN. The point I make is that the item of one pump was not all that was supplied by Mr. Gormley to the penitentiary, but that there were several other articles supplied, the names of which I do not remember. I am informed, however, that this pump, which was invoiced simply as one pump, had with it several valuable attachments the cost of which amounted in the aggregate to nearly \$1,700, while the invoice which was furnished to the penitentiary simply mentioned one pump; and, of

course, when the investigators asked the price of this particular pump, they were given the list price, \$908, but not the prices of the attachments. I would ask the Solicitor General to say whether there are not attached to this pump several valuable attachments, which would bring the price up to \$1,600 or \$1,700. This is not a matter of trying to shield any one; it is simply a matter of getting at the truth.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My answer to the hon. gentleman is this. According to the invoice in our possession, the actual cost of pump, condenser, governor, and revolution counter, is, per invoice, \$908; duty at 27½ per cent, \$249; freight, \$42.30; in all, \$1,200. The invoice to the penitentiary is: bought of John A. Rafter, the same things, \$2,260.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they the same articles?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was not there at the time. The description agrees.

Mr. QUINN. I would ask the Solicitor General to let us see the invoices.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I will not.

Mr. QUINN. Is the hon. gentleman afraid to let us see the invoices?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am naturally very much afraid of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. That will not do. The hon. gentleman comes down as a Minister of the Crown with evidence which he has not given to the House, but which he uses to destroy an argument made by an hon. member of this House; and when an hon. member asks for that evidence, it must be given to this House, and given immediately.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the slightest objection to communicate it to the hon. member. In fact, I intended to hand it to him.

Mr. QUINN. Then, what was the object of the hon. gentleman's remark?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, the hon. leader of the Opposition will understand that it is impossible for me to proceed if I am constantly interrupted.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has a right to object to interruptions, but having used that pump invoice as evidence, he has a right to send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to know what the hon. member means when he says he would be naturally afraid to send it to me?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I did not say I would naturally be afraid to send it to the hon. gentleman. He asked what I would be afraid of, and I said that naturally I would be afraid of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. QUINN. I asked the hon. gentleman to send me the invoice, and he said: "I am naturally afraid to send it to the hon. gentleman." I would like to know why he is afraid. I think we can proceed in this matter without a show of such strong personal feeling on the part of the Solicitor General. I am asking for a proper investigation, and that justice should be done to the men who are accused; and in that it is the duty of the Solicitor General to assist me. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make this prosecution a personal matter, he is welcome to do so; but for all the glory he will get out of it or all the benefit he will do to the country, it will be very little indeed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know that I am after glory; I am endeavouring to satisfy the committee. The hon. leader of the Opposition says he would like to see the papers. I am willing to hand them to him. Of course, I would like to have them all returned.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not put any in my pocket.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let us look at another item—the transactions in Montreal. For instance, it was intended to substitute six-inch pipe for eight-inch pipe, and the engineer of the penitentiary thought he would notify his friends, Messrs. Garth & Company, of the intention to make the substitution. He asked what would be allowed in the exchange for the pipe he was handing over, and what charge would be made for the six-inch pipe that was to be substituted. Messrs. Garth & Company wrote a letter in which they said that they would furnish to the penitentiary six-inch pipe at 66 cents a foot. They sent in an estimate, and undertook to supply it at that price. This is but a small matter, but only one of a dozen. Mr. Devlin wrote to them in reply, saying that the department would give 69 cents a foot. The invoice was furnished at that rate by Messrs. Garth & Company and was certified to by Mr. Devlin, and the Government were made to pay 3 cents a foot more for this particular item.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a fair case.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is clear, no question about it, and there are others equally clear. We have worse than that. I have in my possession a letter written by Mr. Devlin to Mr. Garth & Co., telling them of the intention of the Government to adopt the electric system of lighting for the penitentiary in substitution for the gas, and in which he tells them what the amount of the estimate is to meet the cost of this scheme. In the concluding paragraph of this letter he says:

I may be of some assistance to help the profits, if you get the work, and shall most willingly do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Who signs the letter?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Devlin.

Mr. QUINN. To whom is that letter written?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. T. Garth & Co., and it is written to them by a man who was supposed to look after our interest, who was supposed to watch the contractors and see that we got the best value for our money. There are other charges, and I may say this to the committee. The condition of things there, not only from the standpoint of public interest, but of what is absolutely fair and honest, requires a thorough investigation. Let me give another instance of what has occurred. The plant for lighting the penitentiary with gas was purchased in 1887, at a cost of \$34,346. Of that amount we paid \$21,552 for material. Mind you, this was in 1888, and in 1894 that gas plant was disposed of for \$675. It cost \$21,000, and six years later was sold for \$675. It seems to me that when I state, one fact of that sort, I have said all that is required to justify the investigation. And more—there is the pump I mentioned which was paid for at a cost of \$2,100, which was bought at the time I mentioned, and is still lying unused in the yard of the penitentiary—not even taken out of its case.

An hon. MEMBER. How long ago was that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 1894-95. Those things show clearly that an investigation was required and that something has to be done. It is with the greatest reluctance that I make these statements before the House, because I know they must go to the country, without this man being given the opportunity of replying to them. I never said a word of these things when first questioned; but in self-defence, in defence of the department, in defence of the commissioners, I think I am bound to mention them, though I had intended keeping them in reserve until an investigation was held and an opportunity given this officer to defend himself.

There is one item contained in that report which, I think, I ought to explain, and that is the charge made, in connection with the purchase from Messrs. Chanteloup & Co., that a post office order was sent to Mr. Devlin which was not accounted for and of which it was supposed he got the benefit. I made a thorough investigation, and so far as that particular charge is concerned, I must withdraw it unqualifiedly, because I traced the order in the Post Office Department and I found that Messrs. Chanteloup & Co. got it back and I now absolve Mr. Devlin from the charge of having appropriated it to his own use.

I do not want to go into details. I have taken all the care possible to have a

thorough investigation. I did not want to accuse this man, and kept him where he was, although we have had the report over two months, I kept him in the employ of the Government in the penitentiary until Saturday when he was suspended but not dismissed, so that every opportunity might be given him to explain those charges. I do not think, under the circumstances, that the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) or myself ought to be blamed for harsh or precipitated action. I think we have dealt very leniently with this man, but we had a duty to perform, and it must be performed, let the consequences be what they may.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

MONDAY, 21st June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLY—MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a number of revotes of railway subsidies are proposed, but I notice that the subsidy granted in 1894 to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company has not been put in the Estimates this year. Now, this is a railway of great importance to the people in my constituency. In 1882, this company secured a charter from this House to build and operate a road from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert, in Saskatchewan, and received a land grant of 6,200 acres a mile. Under this charter the company was bound to build fifty miles of the road each year. In 1893 the company came back to Parliament and received a new charter. The fifty-mile-a-year clause was not re-enacted, but a clause was inserted in the charter providing that the company shall build 20 miles a year, and they were to have nine years to complete

the road. In 1896 they had not built any more of the road, and I am not aware that they have commenced, so far, in 1897.

Now, I said before that this was a very important question to the people of Saskatchewan. Hundreds of families went into that country and settled there, on the strength of the fifty-mile clause of the previous charter, believing that the road would be built through and that they would be settled on a line of railway. But the company has received a new charter under which they are compelled to build 20 miles a year, but they are not building even at that rate. The people are anxiously waiting for the Government to do something in reference to this matter so that they may have railway communication. This projected road runs through one of the most fertile portions of the North-west Territories—from Portage la Prairie to the Saskatchewan River is the garden of the North-west Territories; no question about that. I may say that out of 15,000 head of cattle shipped out of the province of Manitoba 8,000 came from that short line of railway only 230 miles long. That goes to show that the country is very fertile. There is everything there required for an agricultural community—good land, plenty of timber, plenty of hay and any amount of water. There are from 600 to 700 families settled along that extension. The road is built to Yorkton, but the country is settled 50 miles ahead of the road. It is also settled from Prince Albert for 100 miles in this direction, so that there is only a small district in the centre where there is no settlement. This line follows the original survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway as adopted by the Mackenzie Administration. A great many people went in at that time on the strength of the announcement that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be built into that country, and they have been there ever since—for about 20 years. They are anxious now to have the benefit of railway communication in order to get their produce to market. If something is not done for these people, unquestionably a great many of them will leave the country. The Government is expending large sums to get immigrants into this country, and I think it is only reasonable that they should do something to keep the people that we already have, especially those who have been with us and settled in that country for from five to twenty years. It would be a deplorable thing if these people were to leave the country. In 1894 the Government granted the sum of \$3,200 a mile for 100 miles to carry the road into the Stony Creek country, this being in place of 3,200 acres of land a mile, which was to revert to the Government. I am sorry to say that the Government have left that out this year. The Manitoba and North-western Railway Company have come to this House this session and secured a charter to build a line

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan).

of railway from Langenburg into the Lake Dauphin country, 170 miles. If, in place of getting this charter, these people were obliged to continue the road for which they already have a charter, I think it would be a proper thing; the Government should not give them concessions under a new charter until they have fulfilled the conditions of the old one. It is a very serious matter when a company gets a charter to build a line in a certain direction, with a provision that 50 miles a year is to be built, and are not compelled to carry out their agreement, as a number of people flock into the country on the strength of the agreement being carried out. This company got a charter to build from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert; they built from Portage la Prairie to Yorkton, which is as far as the line was thickly settled where it was likely to be a paying institution, and they dropped it there. I think that all the Government can do is to cancel the balance of their charter but that would not be wise as nobody else would be likely to take up the enterprise, because the present company have got the best part of the road, and no other company could get an outlet—it would not be likely to take up the balance because it might not be a good paying concern for some time, especially as they would have no outlet to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or Northern Pacific. Now I think that the Government in granting concessions to these people in 1893 and also this year in giving the new charter, have not taken into consideration the rights of the settlers along that road. These people settled there on the strength of the fifty-mile-a-year clause, which was allowed to remain in the charter for six or seven years. They think that they were entitled to some consideration when this charter was given from Langenburg to the Dauphin country, and also when the question was up of revoting this subsidy of \$3,200 a mile. I might say in connection with this matter that there is no difference of opinion, I think, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories about the Manitoba and the North-western Railway. At a meeting of the business men of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, held in Winnipeg last winter, a resolution was passed favouring the extension of that road. These business men came from all portions of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, they knew all about the matter, and they would not have passed a resolution of this kind did they not think that it was in the interest of the country. I may say also that I think all the North-west members are a unit on this question. I would therefore ask the Minister of Railways to take this matter into his consideration and see if this bonus cannot be restored, and some assistance be given to this company to build at least 100 miles into the Stony Creek country, and to give these settlers relief.

### CLOSE SEASON FOR LOBSTERS.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I wish to say a word or two with regard to a matter that was brought before the House some weeks ago, namely, the urgency of extending the open season for the fishing of lobsters around the Island of Cape Breton. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is aware that there is a regulation providing for two weeks difference in the open season between the Atlantic border of the province of Nova Scotia and the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, owing to the fact that the drift ice lingers so much longer around the coast of Cape Breton and on the shore of the Northumberland Straits. It may be asked, Why make a special difference between the Island of Cape Breton and the balance of the coast along the Northumberland Straits? This question I will answer in this way:

The geographical position of the island, lying as it does in the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, accounts for this, by the fact of the north-eastwardly drifting ice in spring coming direct against the coast of that island, remaining until late into the spring, and has frequently been known to float in fields around the whole island, destroying any fishing gear lying in its way—this, together with the consequent icy coldness of the water, preventing the fish moving around, as in more favourable conditions, cause the great drawbacks to our fishermen to which I have referred. The fishermen on the west coast are undoubtedly the most handicapped in this connection.

This matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in preceding Governments, by the officers of that department; and the Minister considered it necessary from year to year, in order to meet this disparity in the conditions existing in the fisheries, to order his officials to give an extension of at least ten days to the lobster fishers to pursue their avocations around the Island of Cape Breton, as compared with the great portion the balance of the coast of the maritime provinces. Now, I say that these circumstances have not changed, they are exactly the same now as when they were reported in past years by the officials in that department. Therefore, I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give the matter his most serious consideration; and I do so for the reasons given, and on the present occasion in view of the fact that the open season for fishing lobsters is about to expire. I may say that while this industry is not a very extensive one it is a very important one. During the past year no less amount than \$2,500,000 worth of lobsters has been exported from this country, outside of home consumption. There are 70 packing establishments around the Island of Cape Breton which, in round numbers, furnish employment to about 2,500 fishermen; so there is a population depending upon this fishery of something between

11,000 and 12,000; and to deprive these people of a fair measure of time within which to pursue this industry, would be to them indeed a hardship. I may remark that two or three weeks ago mention was made of a petition very largely signed that was presented by the people of Cape Breton, asking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give an extension of time to the people pursuing this industry around that island. While the fishermen of the county I have the honour to represent have not been able to send a petition or a delegation here, as other industries have done, directly to interview the Minister, they feel that, having a representative here, they should rely upon him to bring their case before the Government. I therefore most respectfully urge upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the justice and the necessity of acceding to the most modest and reasonable request of these people. While acknowledging that it is most commendable in the Minister to wish to protect that fishery and to preserve it against undue and illegal fishing, I say that the fact of the lobsters being more plentiful around that island this season than for many seasons past, would go to show that the usual extension has not at all diminished the amount of fish that is usually caught around these shores. I may say also that when other industries called for assistance from the Government, these people never grumbled in paying their share of such assistance. I need not make any apology then for calling attention to the modest request of these people in view of the fact that they ask nothing at the hands of this Government except that they be let alone for a period of seven or eight weeks while they provide a means of subsistence for themselves and their families during the balance of the year. When this matter was last brought to the attention of the Minister he declared that he would call to his assistance in considering it, the gentleman who was at the head of that department with the late Government. While I know that this gentleman is well posted in the habits of and theories regarding the various tribes of fish, yet I must submit that when last fall he made a tour of inspection to those fishing grounds, the people I represent regret that he did not see fit to visit our coast at all. Therefore, while he may be versed as to certain theories, I regret to say that he has not taken the trouble to investigate what the conditions really are to found a theory on. I can only hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give his favourable consideration to this matter, and give these people the opportunity in this particular that they desire.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) While this matter is before the House, I might be allowed, coming from a province in which this industry has been carried on so long, to add a few words to what the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan)

has said with respect to an extension of the season for lobster fishing. This industry has been carried on along the coast of the province which I represent for a longer period than upon any part of the coast of Nova Scotia. While the hon. gentleman is to be commended for saying a word in favour of the large number of people who are interested in the undertaking in his county, I may tell him that from my experience of our coast, which is similarly situated to that of the hon. gentleman with respect to the ice on the coast, that if they continue to fish their coast as we have been fishing ours, in a very few years there will be very few fish to catch. I am aware that, time and again, several Ministers who have preceded the hon. gentleman in the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries have been asked to extend the fishing season since it was cut down to its present limit. I may state in the interest of the industry, if it is to be continued and in the interest of the people who are engaged in it, that not only will the season not have to be lengthened, but that it will require to be shortened. I know myself that our coast is similarly situated to that of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The ice floes around our coast remain so long in the season as to prevent the early prosecution of the industry, but the lobster packers who are most interested, realize that if the business is to be kept up at all, the season must be shortened or else the supply will be entirely exhausted. Each year has added to the number of factories, and to the thousands of traps that surround our coast, with the result that the lobsters are yearly becoming smaller and smaller, so small indeed that in many instances they are scarcely fit to can. The impression in my part of the province is that it would be a great mistake in the interest of the industry if means were taken to put pressure upon the Minister to extend the season in any manner whatever. I trust, for my part, that pressure will not be brought to bear on the Minister such as will lead him to extend the season, because the result would be that the industry would in a short time be wiped out.

Mr. YEO. Whilst it is quite true, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) has said, that in many parts of Prince Edward Island they do not wish for an extension of the season, still there is a small portion where it is absolutely necessary. It has been found necessary to do so in former years, and it applies with greater force this year. It has been a very unfavourable season on the west part of Prince Edward Island, and it is almost imperatively necessary that an extension should be given this year. Up to the present time they have done absolutely nothing, and it will be simply ruinous to these people if something is not done in their behalf. I hope the Minister

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)

will consider this matter and will grant some extension in the interest of these people. On the north side of the island they commence fishing early and they are quite prepared to close at the proper time, but it is quite different on this other portion of the island. I hope the Minister will give this matter his attention.

#### IMPEDIMENTS IN BEAR RIVER.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to call the attention of the Government again to a matter I spoke about at an earlier period of the session, and that is in reference to the impediments to navigation in the stream of Bear River. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries at that time said there were some doubts as to the responsibility of the parties concerned. Now, I would press upon the Government emphatically, that I approach this matter by no means in a partisan way, but entirely as representing the public. There are in the stream of Bear River impediments which are dangerous not only to property but to life. They have been there for these last two or three years. One vessel was partly wrecked upon them, and the Ministry are unable to find out who the parties are who are responsible. The Government is directly responsible to see that these impediments are removed; they can settle who shall pay for the removal afterwards. I press strongly and firmly upon the minds of the Government the necessity of seeing that life and property are not endangered. These impediments are the remains of the old piers of the bridge that was rebuilt by the local government. It may be in doubt, but I have no doubt whatever, and have looked into the matter very closely, that the local government are responsible for the cost of the removal of these piers. But the Dominion Government is charged by the British North America Act with all the navigable waters in Canada, and having charge of all the navigable waters in Canada, it is for them to see that these navigable waters are free from obstruction. They should not wait to see who is directly responsible, but should pay for the removal and then settle afterwards who is to bear the cost. Therefore, I press very strongly and emphatically upon the Government to see that this matter is attended to now, and find out afterwards who is responsible. It is a matter of detail entirely as to who finally pays. I have been called upon, not by the Liberal-Conservatives, but by prominent Liberals in the town of Bear River to present this matter, and the town of Bear River is not by any means a Liberal-Conservative town. It gives a majority against me every time. I shall not approach this in a partisan way, and I emphatically urge upon the Government to see that these impediments are removed at once.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I have not lost

sight of the question of that bridge which was put at an earlier period of the session. There is a dispute as to whether the municipality, the local government or the Dominion Government should remove this obstruction. It does seem, at first sight, extraordinary that the local government should abandon an existing bridge, build a new one, and then call upon us to remove the old bridge. I do not believe that I should be disposed to incur that expense until I am satisfied in regard to the point in dispute. I acknowledge what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) says, that we have charge of navigable waters, and that it is our duty to remove obstructions. I have communicated with the local government and pointed out what my opinion is as to the duty in this regard. I am in hopes that before long I shall have their reply.

#### CLOSE SEASON FOR LOBSTERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When we speak of the larger and more important question which was brought to the attention of the Government by my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) and commented upon by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Macdonald) and my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Yeo); I may say that the matter has given me a very great deal of thought. The interest of the lobster fishery is very large, and my present inclination is very strongly against any further extension. I am convinced in my own mind, that if these extensions are continued from year to year the entire lobster fishery will be destroyed. I quite see the force of the remarks of my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Yeo), that you cannot lay down a general rule to which there may not be some seeming exception, and there are parts of the province possibly that have stronger reasons to give for the extension than others. But the difficulty arises here: if you give an extension in one place where are you going to stop? The department is inundated with applications for extension, and as I am at present advised—both by the inspector of fisheries and by the commissioner of fisheries in the department—it would not be in the general interest of the industry itself; although it might be in the interest of one or two individuals to grant the extension.

I think the time has come when we must put down our foot on these extensions. Having already determined that the 15th of July is the date for the open season, we should either alter that by statute and keep to the altered date, or determine that the 15th of July is the proper date and have the moral courage to enforce it. I regret much to have to say to my friends, that so far as I see at present, I am not inclined to extend the existing season, although I know from personal knowledge that it will be a very great loss

indeed to a large number of individuals. But, the national loss, the loss of the industry itself, the danger of the destruction of the entire industry if these extensions are granted, control my mind, and induce me very strongly to come to the conclusion which I have almost reached: that in the public interest no extension ought to be granted this year.

Mr. MARTIN. There is very great objection to these hard and fast rules which extend the same season to every part of the lower provinces. It is well known to the Minister of Marine, that the season which will suit one section will not suit another, and to make a universal rule will inflict a great deal of injury on certain sections of Prince Edward Island. I refer especially to the southern section of my province. The season for lobster fishing now in force is entirely unsuitable to that section, from St. Peter's Island eastwards towards High Bank, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo), if I heard him aright. I can say to the Minister that he will have to adopt such regulations as will suit the different localities. That may entail a little more trouble on the department, but he has his officers all over the province, and it is my opinion that the different sections should be partitioned off and rules and regulations made for such sections as are found suitable for the fishing season there. The close season on the north side of the island is not at all suitable to the south side. If the Minister adopts this hard and fast rule, he will do a great deal of injury to people in Prince Edward Island. While a longer season on the whole, may not be judicious, yet certain regulations should be made to provide for different seasons in different sections as the circumstances may require.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Did I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that he will not further consider this question?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say that. I said the question in my mind was strongly against the extension at the present time. I have taken very careful note of what my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) has said, and I will see whether it is possible, in the general interest of this industry, to give an extension in the locality he asks for. I am dealing frankly with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) when I say, that at present the inclination in my mind is strongly against it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Penitentiary ..... \$167,300 00

Mr. QUINN. I have just a few words to say in answer to the hon. the Solicitor

General, and I can assure the committee that it is a matter of sincere regret to me, that the Solicitor General should consider this a personal question at all. My interest in this is neither to represent any of the accused, nor to criticise from a political standpoint what has been done in this matter, nor in any way to impede strict justice in dealing with men who have done wrong in any public department. My desire is simply to preserve in the country that respect for justice which is the only security we have for the proper administration of our laws. I say, Sir, that if the course of justice is perverted, either by a Minister of the Crown or by one occupying an official position under him; if a commissioner prostitutes his office for any purpose whatever, he does a most serious wrong, inasmuch as he degrades public justice, and belittles it in the eye of the people. This is my only object in criticising the report of the penitentiary commissioners, which is now in the hands of the House.

The Solicitor General has said, that the letter which was written by Secretary Eilbeck was written to this gentleman asking him to reassure Eilbeck, whether or not his recollection of a certain conversation was correct. I have taken the trouble to read that letter to the committee. It appears in "Hansard" and I am prepared to leave my interpretation of that letter to the consideration of the committee, who will decide if it bears in any way the construction that the hon. the Solicitor General has put upon it. I shall say nothing more on that point. The Solicitor General has also told us, that he has every bit of evidence and every exhibit that was obtained by the commissioners. I believe he has, but it is most unfortunate that he did not think fit to put that before the House when this report was brought down, so that members might be better able to discuss this matter. He has given us but one portion of the record, a portion relating to this pump of which he has made such a lot, but I believe we will discover on referring to the record, how valuable it would be, if we had had all the papers before us. The Solicitor General told the committee that this pump was sold for \$2,260, and that it actually cost the vender \$908. If I am not correctly stating what the hon. gentleman said, I would like him to put me right now, because it is on the assumption that he stated that, that I am going to read the documents which appear in the record. The Solicitor General told this committee that this pump cost \$908, and that it was charged to the department at \$2,260. Now, what do we find in this record?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In order to avoid mistake, and as my hon. friend evidently did not understand what I said, I will state that the pump cost \$650, and the receiver \$170. All the goods furnished to

Mr. QUINN.

the penitentiary cost \$908, and the amount paid was \$2,260.

Mr. QUINN. I wish to show, by the documents which the hon. gentleman has submitted, that there was not one pump only, but that there were two pumps, and that the price given by the manufacturers of those pumps to the customs authorities was \$1,600 on board at Dayton, Ohio. The Solicitor General knows, and the record he has presented proves, that the duty on these pumps is 25 per cent, and 27½ per cent on certain parts. If you add the duty at these rates, the freight charges from Dayton, Ohio, to Montreal and Kingston, and a reasonable profit on the machines, how far are you short of \$2,260? Does anybody doubt that these machines were delivered? Here are the records which the hon. gentleman has produced, showing that the two pumps were asked for, that they were supplied, that they were valued at \$1,600, and that duty was paid on that value, bringing the amount up to over \$2,000. This is the great charge made against one of the officers of the penitentiary, and what are the facts in connection with it? The facts, as I find them here, are these, and I do not know them from any other source than the documents handed to me by the Solicitor General. I find that a report has been made by the engineer recommending that two pumps be purchased; this report is made to the warden of the penitentiary; in turn it is forwarded by the warden to the Department of Justice; it is approved by the inspector of penitentiaries; under instructions received from the Department of Justice, the order is given by the warden for these two pumps; permission is given to the engineer to examine different pumps which are in working order in different parts of the country, notably one at Ingersoll, Ont.; he goes there; he reports on the pump; an order is given by the warden of the penitentiary; and the two pumps are purchased for \$2,260. A letter is here from the people who made the pumps. A seizure is made by the Customs Department at Kingston, and it is withdrawn by the letter of the appraiser, Mr. Driver, which analyses the charge made against the importer. The explanation was considered satisfactory, and the goods were delivered to the warden of the penitentiary without any further trouble. But Mr. Driver had made an investigation as to the price of these pumps, and what does he say in his letter of September 22nd, 1894, when he makes his complaint about the pump? In that portion which forms the basis of his complaint, he says that "the list price of the large pump is \$1,600." This was long before any charge was made to the Department of Customs and before any investigation occurred. We have in the telegrams, letters and invoices of the manufacturers statements showing the prices charged by

them and actually paid for these pumps in Dayton, Ohio, and establishing beyond any question of doubt that the two pumps actually cost in Dayton, Ohio, \$1,600, to which must be added the freight charges and the duty charges. So that, so far as this charge is concerned, a little care on the part of the commissioners, that care which I think an investigation ought to take before it assumes the responsibility of charging any respectable citizen with fraud, would have shown them that instead of there having been a gigantic fraud in this pump business, only a reasonable profit had been charged. I am not here to defend these pump manufacturers. I do not know the Stillwell-Bierce Co., I do know the firm of John A. Rafter & Co., and I know Mr. Gormley. But the question is not whether these men have been guilty of fraud or not whether they charged exorbitant prices. The question is the liability of an officer of the Government in connection with these alleged frauds—whether he is or has been connected with them. The Solicitor General has ventured to say from his place in the House of Commons that officers of the penitentiary have participated in these frauds, and he gives this as the principal foundation for the charges of the commissioners against them. If all the charges of the commissioners have as poor a basis as this charge in connection with the pump, we are obliged to attach the same importance to them—for example, to the serious charge they made in connection with Chanteloup's \$40. The Solicitor General says he himself has investigated each one of these charges, notably the charge of Chanteloup. If you will turn to the report of the commissioners, you will see it stated there that there is ample proof to satisfy these commissioners that an officer of the penitentiary received from Chanteloup \$40. They do not hesitate to say so, and yet the hon. Solicitor General stands up and tells us that he has investigated that charge and finds it untrue. If this charge, which the commissioners are so positive about, be untrue, what reliance can we put on their reports in any particular? These gentlemen do not hesitate to say that the proof is ample that one of the officers of the penitentiary received from Chanteloup & Co. \$40, but the Solicitor General has investigated the matter and he feels bound to acquit him of having received anything at all.

My hon. friend the Solicitor General seems to take it as a personal matter that I should have interested myself in this question at all, and some of his supporters, with that small wit peculiar to some of them at any rate, wish to put me in the position of acting as counsel for the defence after having so long acted as Crown Prosecutor. I am not acting as counsel for the defence. I do not think I could occupy in this House a more honourable position than I did when

I represented the Crown as public prosecutor, but my duty as public prosecutor never led me to be unfair to a man charged with a crime, and I would consider myself unworthy of a seat in this House if I did not occupy here the same position as I did there and stand between the prisoner and injustice, if I did not stand simply for justice and seek only that justice be done, even if the accused were charged with a most serious crime. That position I took then, and I am proud to take it now. The hon. gentleman says he does not make his religion or his nationality a stepping-stone to power. What does he mean by that? Does he mean to insinuate that I have tried to do so? Why, no better example of his very words could be found than the hon. gentleman himself, who sits in this House by virtue of a pledge which he gave affecting his religion and nationality, and which, he says, was never carried out by either party. Yet he stands up, when not attacked at all on the ground of religion or nationality, and makes an insinuation against myself who am simply pleading for justice. It would be better that these things should be kept out of this House altogether; and when I exercise the privilege to which I am entitled of criticising the conduct of any public officer I do so, not because I happen to belong to a particular religion or nationality, but because I want to see justice done, and I do not think that my conduct justifies the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that I am using either my religion or nationality for the purpose of either political or other advancement.

Now, the hon. gentleman compared the prices of a Mr. McElvey of Kingston with those of the price list, but he forgot to tell the committee that Mr. McElvey is a competitor of these gentlemen who have been supplying goods to the penitentiary, that he has been trying to obtain contracts from the penitentiary for many years, and has not in that respect been a signal success, and of course is all the more glad of an opportunity of criticising more successful competitors. I am informed that Mr. McElvey has had the good luck to furnish supplies to some of the local institutions, for example, the lunatic asylum, and I am perfectly satisfied that if his accounts for supplies to that institution were put alongside the accounts for supplies to the Kingston penitentiary, we would see a vast difference between the two, largely in favour of the latter. There is another item which struck me in going over that report, and that is the charge made in connection with a man named Markum. It is charged that a man named Markum paid \$50 to one of the officers of the penitentiary, and the only proof in support of that charge is a cash book, as I understand it, in which an item appears with the name of the official and \$50 at the end of it. If I am correctly informed, there is no date to this.

but it appears within a period covered by three months. Now, Mr. Markum did not hesitate to say, under oath, that at the time this entry appears to have been made in his books, he was not altogether responsible for what he did. He did not keep a regular set of books, he did not keep a book-keeper, he was addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors, and when questioned on his affidavit, he said he did not remember ever having paid this \$50, that he had no recollection of doing any business with the official implicated which would warrant him in paying this \$50, that he did not believe he ever did, and did not know how that entry came there. This is the statement he made in the portion of the defence which, I understand, was submitted to the Minister of Justice after this report appeared. But these commissioners, basing their statements solely upon this entry in the book, and possibly upon some ex parte statements on examination of Mr. Markum, of which examination they put down what they liked and left out what they liked, say it was clearly proven that this official had received the sum of \$50 in payment of some orders for goods which the official had given this man. Now, it will be found that this particular official did not have the power of ordering anything, did not have the power even to initial the accounts acknowledging the receipt of any of the articles, but it appears that these accounts were initialed by the storekeeper, who received them, and the orders were given by the warden over his own signature, after the matter had been previously submitted to the Department of Justice. So that, so far as Markum was concerned, he received these orders without having had any assistance at all from the official in question and without this official having been instrumental at all in obtaining them.

It is not my intention to criticise this matter from a political standpoint at all. I would be sorry to think that in this country party politics should be so prostituted as to be made a political engine for the purpose of maligning and destroying a man's character in order to obtain a paltry position in the public service. I hope I can rise above any such consideration, and I simply make a plea to the House and the Solicitor General for justice. This is not a political question. It happens to be the case of some Conservative officials to-day. To-morrow it may be the case of some Liberal officials. If injustice be done to-day to these men who occupy these positions, what guarantee have we that similar injustice may not be perpetrated later on when it comes to the turn of a Liberal official to stand his trial before a commission. But whether the commission be Conservative or Liberal, I hold it is the duty of every honest man in this House to see that the investigation is con-

Mr. QUINN.

ducted in the proper manner. I hold that no member of Parliament can fulfil his duty more honourably or creditably to himself and his country than by insisting on a most rigorous investigation being given in these cases and the accused being given a fair chance of defending himself as he would before the criminal courts. When such a course of action is not followed, injustice must necessarily result, but when it is, then the ends of justice are best served and the interests of the Dominion and public departments best protected. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, to continue the discussion any further. I simply wish to emphasize once more the remarks with which I started. I only ask that this investigation be made a proper investigation. It is not my intention or my desire in any way to shield from punishment any man who has done wrong; it is my desire that all who have done wrong should be punished, it is my desire that all who have done wrong should have visited upon them the severest condemnation of this House and of the law. It is not my desire, I say, to protect any wrong-doer, but simply to see that we do not fall into the error of condemning any man before he has had a proper chance of defence before the country.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps the committee would like to hear a few facts now.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that was what you were at the last time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me first deal with the Chanteloup matter. The facts are these: It appears by a letter, which was produced and filed, that Chanteloup sent Devlin a post office order for \$40 at the time that Devlin had given an order to Chanteloup. When Devlin was questioned about this, he said he did not receive the amount of the order. He was asked to go to the post office and find some proof of the fact that he had never received it, and he said he would. This statement that he would go and inquire into this matter was repeated for several days, but he never went. On these facts, the report of the commissioners is based. That is the whole story. As to the Markum case, it appears that Markum had a contract with the Kingston penitentiary. The whole amount of this business annually amounted to \$1,600. One portion of this was an order of \$750 worth of goods, said to have been supplied to the penitentiary. At the time he made this sale of \$750, \$50 was said to have been paid to Devlin. The commissioners went into the matter, and Markum gave his affidavit that he had paid this amount; and he produced his book, and in the book the item is entered as having been paid to Devlin. After that, Devlin goes to Markum and gets him to make an affidavit that he has been drunk—that is practically

his statement—for ten years, and cannot recollect whether he made the payment or not; he was too drunk to know whether he made the payment or whether he had entered it in the book. That is the defence. Now, I would like to be done with this Donnybrook Fair business as soon as possible, but I must deal with the question of pumps. According to my information, there were not two pumps. The order for the pump in question was dated 9th June, 1894. A telegram was sent Mr. Gormley by the Stillwell-Bierce Company in reply to a letter from him of the 6th June. The Stillwell-Bierce Company said they would furnish a pump 12 by 18 by 12 for \$650, and that they would add to that a receiver, which would cost \$170. The list price of the same pump is \$1,600. I submitted the paper to the collector of customs Mr. Wallace. He took the papers up and examined them. I cannot say that I know very much about these matters myself, but I know it will be a satisfaction to the hon. member for St. Ann's (Mr. Quinn) to know that we paid \$2,600 for a thing which, as it went through the customs, appeared to be worth \$900, and which this Stillwell Company offered to deliver at \$650. And when the hon. member referred to the evidence of Driver, one thing he forgot to mention, if he read it, was that when Driver went to ask information from Devlin, Devlin said: There is the list price, but we will get a large discount. And there was such a large discount that the collector of customs at Kingston was ordered to increase the price stated in the invoice by \$100. The list price was \$1,600, but duty was paid on it at \$908.

Mr. QUINN. I know the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) does not wish to misrepresent this matter; I would not accuse him of that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is not a question of misrepresentation, the facts are there.

Mr. QUINN. I would ask him to refer to the first paper which appears in the record which he sent me, in which he will find a quotation for two pumps. I will ask him also to refer to the report of the engineer, in which he asks that two pumps be ordered. Then take the report of the warden, in which he asks that two pumps be ordered. Then, take the note of Mr. Moylan, in which he consents that two pumps shall be ordered. Then take the report of Driver, in which he says that two pumps had come in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The committee will remember that mention has been made of a pump and receiver. The invoice to which the hon. gentleman has referred reads:

One duplex pumping-engine and one automatic pumping receiver.

The hon. gentleman calls this two pumps.

Mr. QUINN. I took your official papers as authority.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) asked me for some information about the binder twine. If he will repeat his question—I have forgotten what it was—I have now the information before me which, I think, will enable me to answer.

Mr. CLANCY. The question I asked was: At what price was the binder twine sold to Mr. Hobbs, of London, and what quantity was sold him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I inquired in the department as to the usual practice in giving figures of this sort, and I am told that it is not considered quite fair to Mr. Hobbs that the price should be given until he has put his twine on the market, but I may say that it is better than we got from Coll Brothers, which was  $4\frac{1}{2}$  cents for beaver.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the quantity?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. One thousand tons.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not think I do my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) any injustice when I suggest that I do not think the object of his address, or addresses, this afternoon, was so much to vindicate one particular official in reference to a charge that has been found against him, as it is to discredit the work of the commissioners, to discredit all the work they have done in investigating penitentiary matters and as to what they have discovered. I think it will be admitted by all who have thought about this matter and have looked into it that an investigation was perfectly proper, that it was required, not only because of the importance of our penitentiary administration, but because of the suspicion attached to it, because of the feeling of insecurity that was in the public mind in reference to it. I say there was that feeling, not in Kingston alone, but all over the country, in reference to penitentiary matters. Now, we have the report of these commissioners, and can any one say, on reading it, that the investigation was not fully justified? Here is a report covering a great many pages, and dealing in part with this one officer, against whom charges were made, and who is now under suspension. A very great deal is said about him, and my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) takes two or three of these items that are mentioned, and he says that there is, in regard to these items, a perfect defence so far as Mr. Devlin is concerned. Now, I do not say whether there is a defence in regard to these items or not; I do not know; I have not seen the papers that the Solicitor General handed over to the hon. member for St. Ann's (Mr. Quinn). It may be that in regard to these items there is another side to the question; but these, after all, are

only two or three of the charges that are made against him. Now, at the bottom of page 27 the commissioners say this in regard to him :

Attention has been drawn elsewhere to the enormous prices paid for the ordinary staple goods used in connection with his department ; and it is not surprising that this state of affairs existed, when we find the engineer boldly declaring on his examination that he did not know, and did not care, what prices were charged, that it was no part of his business to see that the affairs of his department were managed economically, that he never attempted to get lower prices ; but in fact did what he could in favour of the seller, being of opinion, as he said, that every one dealing with the Government was justified in getting the highest price they could.

That is the statement he makes before the commissioners as his own statement. He says that never but once did he object to the prison paying too high a price for an article, and on that occasion he asserts that the then Minister of Public Works threatened him with dismissal if the offence was repeated. This is the statement of the gentleman who is being defended here, and who has been suspended, and blame is sought to be put upon the Government because of his suspension. He says that never but once was he guilty of that offence after he had been threatened, and he was careful afterwards so to act that no similar accusation should be made against him. That is the starting point in reference to Mr. Devlin. Then follows the four pages dealing with specific matters about which nothing has been said, and any one of which, if true, would be in the minds of the commissioners, or of any other disinterested persons who were making that inquiry, sufficient cause for Mr. Devlin's dismissal. Now the character of the commissioners ought to be sufficient to justify the belief, at all events, that they made the inquiry in a careful and an honourable way. I cannot say much as to one particular instance that was alluded to, showing the manner of these commissioners getting evidence, but I take it for granted that men of the standing and character of these commissioners, would without doubt go about the inquiry in a way that ought to satisfy reasonable persons, even if, in some particular instance, a mistake was made. It seems that the Government, in selecting the commissioners, had regard to the knowledge they would naturally have in reference to the inquiry they were entering into. Mr. Meredith was once inspector of this penitentiary under a former Government. He has been out of office for some time, but he is a Conservative in politics, and a man against whose record nothing can be said. Mr. Noxon is inspector of prisons in the province of Ontario, and I have never heard anybody say that he did not know his business. I never heard any one say that he was not honourable, except a charge may have been made against him on political grounds. As for Mr. O. K. Fraser, I

Mr. BRITTON.

do not know what can be said against him beyond that he was a clever and painstaking lawyer who would be supposed to give everybody fair-play in the investigation, and who would know the rules of law and evidence applicable to the case he had to investigate. So far as to the character of the commissioners themselves. Then as to the secretary. Now my hon. friend from Montreal hardly did himself justice, it would seem to me, in attacking Mr. Eilbeck on the ground of some anonymous letter that was first published in a paper in Huron, and which was afterwards copied into the "Catholic Record." But what does this letter say, after all ? What is the particular thing said against Mr. Eilbeck ? Well, it is said that he is called "Bob." That is one charge made against him.

Mr. FOSTER. That is enough to condemn him.

Mr. BRITTON. Perhaps so. In that case I am afraid a good many hon. members of this House would come under the ban, because while this discussion was going on I heard an hon. gentleman who sits in front of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) call across to this side of the House "Jim" ; and if to be called "Bob" is something derogatory to a man, then "Jim," and "George," and "Tom," whom we have here, would perhaps come into the same list. Now, I do not think that that is sufficient to make out a case against even the fairness or the judgment of Mr. Eilbeck.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member will recollect that one of the papers says that he keeps a bucket shop.

Mr. BRITTON. My hon. friend perhaps knows that there is something particularly wrong about bucket shops ; I do not know.

Mr. QUINN. I only know it is against the law ; it is a criminal offence.

Mr. BRITTON. I beg to say that he does not keep a bucket shop, possibly he may have done so. Possibly he may once have been connected with a bucket shop and perhaps then it was not against the law. Perhaps the term bucket shop may have been applied at one time in a way that my hon. friend would not apply it now, and no one who understood what a bucket shop was, would apply it to Mr. Eilbeck now. We know that a charge of that kind, or something like it may be made against a man who is not really either keeping a bucket shop now, or doing anything connected with it. Mr. Eilbeck is a respectable man.

Mr. QUINN. If my hon. friend will permit me—it is a peculiarity of his friends not to allow matters of this kind derogatory to their character to appear in public prints without taking out a public prosecution for it, even if they do not push it in the courts.

Mr. BRITTON. I think there are persons just as good as those of us who are in this House, who are quite willing to live down anything that a newspaper may say about them, instead of attempting to punish the author of every little slander that gets currency in the prints of the day. Men who have a character that they are able to vindicate by their lives, are not so anxious to rush into court to prosecute a libellous statement; although there are occasions when, of course, a man owes it to himself, or to the position he occupies in the community in whose interest perhaps he is working, to vindicate himself by a prosecution of that kind. But it is not everybody who can afford, from a money point of view, to go into the courts and to enjoy the luxury of a libel suit. Mr. Eilbeck, so far as I know, is a respectable man, and he is the last man—and that is what I rose to say in reference to him—and those who know him know that at all events he is the last man to act as a sleuth hound, or as a person who would ferret out information to the injury of any one, because that person was of an opposite religious belief to his own. He is the very last man who would do anything of that kind, it is not in him. His friends know that whatever else there may be against him, he would not attempt to be unfair to any one else on the ground of religion. Now, these are the only charges that are made against him in connection with that commission. Even if, as secretary of the commission, he wrote a letter for the purpose of getting information, I do not think everybody will agree that there is anything particularly wrong in his doing so; I do not think the commissioners are responsible for it, if it was perhaps a little outside of the kind of a letter that ought to have been written. Then the only other thing that is said against this gentleman is that, without the consent of the warden, he had a prisoner under examination for some time. Well, now this commission was not a commission sitting for fun; it was a commission for taking evidence and for obtaining the facts in reference to the management of this penitentiary. They could only gain those facts from the persons who knew them, and some of the persons who knew them were convicts in the penitentiary. The result of this commission is the bringing to light of transactions which though some of them may not be fully justified by the evidence, at all events justifies the statement that the affairs of the penitentiary during many years prior to the incoming of the present Government were managed in such a way as to be characterized by no other word than disgraceful. If you leave out every case where there is any doubt, if you remove every case where it is only suspicion, if you cast aside these charges that are not strictly proved there are enough of undisputed facts to warrant the work and the expense of the commission. Now,

I have only one other word to say in reference to the political aspect of this matter. My hon. friend the member from Montreal, St. Ann's (Mr. Quinn) may disclaim all desire to make political capital out of this investigation, but the very fact that he was prompted by an hon. gentleman sitting behind him to mention the name of Mr. McKelvey as one man who does work for the provincial government and the fact of bringing his name in, in the way which he did and casting a slur upon the name of a person who has a record for being competent, reliable and honest in his business transactions, so far as anybody ever heard, because he gave prices and information in regard to the affairs that were made the subject of investigation, shows that there is a desire to introduce politics into this matter. Further it was said by the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and it was not said by him alone because it was said in the papers—we have seen it mentioned three or four times in the Ottawa papers—that the Government intended to retain the present warden until after the provincial elections when he would get his dismissal. There is an attempt to make political capital out of a matter of this kind. I ought to have some knowledge of the political feeling in the city of Kingston which I represent—and of the feeling towards the warden of the penitentiary and I say that there is no fear of Mr. Metcalfe, and that politics do not influence the Government in my opinion one iota in reference to the course that they either have taken or intend to take in regard to his dismissal. They have no reason to fear for him, and I do know this further fact that when the commissioners commenced their investigation the present warden had only been in his position a comparatively short time. According to the evidence produced before the commissioners he was surrounded by men who were at daggers drawn with each other. His environment was not favourable to his doing the best that the warden ought to do or could be expected to do in that position, and some said: "It is hardly fair to judge of a man for the short time which he has been there." I do not pretend to know what influenced the Government in disregarding that part of the commissioners report, if they have disregarded it, by allowing the present warden to continue for a short time or a longer time as the case may be in his present position, but I do know that this question of a political consideration in his remaining is absolutely without foundation in fact and absolutely unreliable. I know that they were influenced in no way by politics, first in the matter of this investigation; secondly, that the report urging the dismissal or retention of any officers and of the warden were from first to last discussed as a matter affecting the public interest. A large amount of money has been spent

every year in the maintenance of this institution, and it is of the greatest possible interest to every member of this House and to the community that its affairs should be administered as economically as possible and as much in the interest of the community as possible, that, for that purpose all the facts should be ascertained, and that upon the facts the Government should act with that impartiality which they have adopted.

Mr. QUINN. The cool presumption with which the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) assumes that nobody on this side of the House can discuss a question except from a political standpoint compels me to answer some of the remarks he has made. He says it is quite evident from the manner in which I have discussed this matter that politics are at the bottom of it, notwithstanding, I think, that my public record will show that in matters of this kind I would rather that a political party or a political individual should sink, that public justice should prevail, notwithstanding this the hon. member does not hesitate to say that it is impossible for us to discuss this question except from a political standpoint. The hon. gentleman has overlooked altogether what has been said about Mr. Eilbeck, the secretary, to which I am obliged to refer because of the blind political prejudice in the minds of hon. gentlemen, which prevents them from seeing a case of this kind in its proper light. I will read some of the affidavits that have been sent to the Minister of Justice, and ask them whether this is a man who should occupy the position of secretary of a commission of this kind. Here is the affidavit of Neil McNeill, assistant blacksmith instructor in the penitentiary, which is as follows:—

I, Neil McNeil, of the city of Kingston, assistant blacksmith instructor in the penitentiary, do solemnly declare, that in the month of December last I was summoned by Mr. Eilbeck, secretary of the commission, and examined as to certain work on a large tank for new water-works being constructed, which was under the engineer's supervision. During said examination, convict Mathewson, a convict in the penitentiary, was present, sitting at the same table with Secretary Eilbeck, and when I was about to leave, after answering the secretary's questions, I was stopped by Mathewson and submitted to the humiliation of being interrogated by the convict.

That is the discipline in the penitentiary. One of the officers is subjected to the humiliation of being examined in the presence of the secretary of the commission by a convict.

In the month of March, Mr. G. L. Foster, acting for secretary of commission, came to me and presented a statement of stoppages of steam. I found said entries were made by a convict, and I refused to sign said statement. In fact, I know that for about fifteen months I was in the blacksmith and machine shop, there were no stoppages of steam which caused any delay of the work, or which would not have reasonably occurred in a similar shop outside.

Mr. BRITTON.

Well, this is one of the charges made against the engineer on information given by a convict which was sought to be supported by the instructor in the blacksmith shop. He refused to certify, yet this is reported to be a fact by this secretary of this commission. Here is an affidavit by Thomas Reid:

I, Thos. Reid, guard at Kingston Penitentiary, do solemnly declare, that on or about the 7th December, 1896, Mr. Eilbeck, secretary to the commission, sent for me from my post of duty and asked me (himself alone being seated in the office) with convict Mathewson, "Have you been speaking to Devlin, the engineer?" I answered, "Yes." He asked me what was the conversation about, and I replied, "About the work." He (Eilbeck) asked did he (Devlin) make any remark about me? and I replied, "He did not."

Here was this man pursuing an inquiry, and because it was reported to him that this officer was speaking with the engineer in the ordinary course of duty, he immediately summons the officer from his post of duty to know if Devlin dared to make a remark about Eilbeck. There he was seated in his office, with his guide, philosopher and friend, the convict Mathewson, and summoning those officials before him. Here is another:

I, Wm. Coffey, stoker in the penitentiary, solemnly declare, that I have never had any serious trouble with Mr. Devlin, engineer. Any trouble we may have had was trifling, and was about the work. I know that Mr. Devlin effected very important improvements to the plant, and I have no reason whatever to complain of his conduct towards me. I further declare, that, during recent investigation, I was called before the secretary, who was alone with convict Mathewson in the office, and examined respecting boilers, &c.

And still another:

I, Thomas Moore, of the village of Portsmouth, guard, Kingston Penitentiary, do solemnly declare, that on or about the 7th December, 1896, Mr. Eilbeck, secretary to commission, sent for me from my post of duty and asked me (himself alone being seated in the office with convict Mathewson), "Have you been speaking to Devlin, the engineer?" I answered, "Yes." He asked, "What about?" I told him, "About my work of laying water-pipes." He (Eilbeck) replied, "Did he say anything about me?" I answered, "He did not." Eilbeck said, "It is well for him he did not," or words to that effect. He (Eilbeck) then told me to send to him Guard Reid, which I did.

"It is well for him he didn't." That is the remark of the man who was sent as secretary of a commission to investigate into the conduct of these officers, and that is the man who spies on the officer to know if the officer had dared to mention his name. Is Eilbeck a man to occupy the position of judge, which he has assumed to himself? Is he a man that should be placed in that position?

Mr. BRITTON. Had the secretary anything to do with judging?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. No.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend (Mr. Britton) says no, but here we have Eilbeck doing the investigating in company with his friend the convict Mathewson. It was on Eilbeck's report of the evidence he collected that the commissioners made this report; that is the sort of evidence they rendered judgment on. I say that Eilbeck's conduct in this matter of the letter shows that he is not worthy of occupying a position of this kind. I do not say that his motives were political, or that they were even personally inimical to any of the officers, but I do say that his conduct stamps him as a man who has been actuated by some other motives than that of rendering justice to these officials. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that probably Eilbeck should not have written this letter. Because we are members of Parliament is no reason why we should not have ordinary common sense or intelligence, and if as men of intelligence we read this letter, we must come to the conclusion that this man Eilbeck was trying to ferret out and to bolster up in some way a charge against these officials. The writing of that letter was not only a mistake; it was a crime for a man occupying such a position. Now, I will again read this letter for the benefit of the hon. gentleman; the letter which was sent by Eilbeck to this man. He writes:

Dear Dave,—Some years ago, when you were travelling for our oil company, you told me it was absolutely necessary to pay the engineer in the penitentiary a commission in order to do any business with him.

There is a clear misstatement of fact. He continues:

You can help me out by telling me how much commission, and how to get about it.

Here is a man who is about to occupy the position of judge, or what he assumed to be the position of judge, a man who was the collector of the evidence. Here he is writing these words, "you can help me out." Help him out of what? Help him out in his design of making a charge against this official; help him out in trying to remove this man from his position; help him out in trying to ruin this man's reputation. What do these words mean:

You can help me out by telling me how much commission, and how to get about it. I presume the same gentleman is approachable on other matters than oil. If so, put me on the way.

What was the object of this man Eilbeck if it were not to get some other person to approach this official in order to offer him a commission, and furnish thereby the evidence of a crime against him. Sir, such conduct should not be tolerated. I need not refer to the opinion of one of the most learned judges in the province of Ontario as to the methods that should be adopted

by persons who are investigating matters of this kind. In the famous investigation held in the province of Ontario into a charge of corruption against certain members of the legislature, one of the judges spoke about the manner in which persons occupying responsible positions should conduct the investigation, and he said in effect: There are some men who will descend to the commission of crime even to convict another person of crime, but if they do so they must suffer the consequence of not being believed upon oath when they come before the courts. Here we have this man Eilbeck showing by his letter that he is prepared to descend to the commission of crime even in order to convict Devlin. We find him ready to descend to the commission of a crime in order to dismiss this man from office, and to ruin the reputation of himself and his family throughout the whole Dominion.

I cannot conclude without referring to another matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) refers to the remark of Devlin: That it was none of his business what prices were paid. Devlin may have said that, but I doubt that he has ever said so in the words of the report of the commission. In fact, I do not believe any of the statements made in this report. I think the attack made upon it by the Solicitor General himself disproves this statement of the commissioners, as set forth in their report:

An examination of Chanteloup's books and papers showed, that even while Devlin was engineer at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, he received goods for which he did not pay; and that after he came to Kingston he received a post office order from Chanteloup for \$40, of which he can give no satisfactory account.

Here is a clear and bald statement of crime against Devlin, made by these commissioners who were sworn to do their duty, and yet the Solicitor General, from his place in the House says that their statement is not true. How can we place any confidence in a report which contains such a misstatement of fact, and which carries with it, if it were true, such terrible consequences in regard to the one against whom it is made. The Solicitor General has declared that there is no intention of removing Mr. Metcalfe from the penitentiary. It would be most regrettable if the report of this commission should be taken for the purpose of removing an officer like Mr. Metcalfe; but in refusing to remove him, the hon. gentleman casts aside, and discredits altogether the report, because that report recommends Mr. Metcalfe's dismissal or his removal to another penitentiary. It shows that the hon. gentleman has not any confidence in the report. Now, it is of course useless for the Solicitor General and myself to discuss whether there is one pump or two pumps. But I ask the Solicitor General, deliberately and calmly, and at the same time with all the fervor which it is possible for one man who desires to see justice done to ask it from

another man from whom he has a right to expect justice, to investigate this matter; and at the next session of this Parliament, if I appear here, I will ask him to state whether two pumps have been furnished or only one. I am so confident that two pumps have been furnished, it is so clear to me from the report which the Solicitor General has submitted, that I will ask him the question next session after he has made the investigation of which I speak. One word more. It is regrettable that members on the other side of the House, when any objection is taken by members on this side always see in it some deep political scheme, some grand purpose to defeat the ideas of the present superlatively clever Government. But, Mr. Chairman, I challenge the members on the other side of the House who are not interested in this matter, to say on whose side the political bitterness has appeared in this discussion. What have we called for on this side but a fair rendering of justice in the premises? What has been called for on the other side but the heads of the Conservative officers? My hon. friend talks about Mr. Meredith. I have not the honour of Mr. Meredith's acquaintance, but I understand from public rumour that he is an octogenarian. I know that he was engaged in 1848 in an investigation into the same institution, half a century ago; so that I think his term of usefulness is pretty nearly exhausted, at any rate. But I would call attention to one of the peculiarities of the old gentleman in clinging to a representation which he made many years ago, when he was inspector of penitentiaries, regarding the classifying and grading of convicts. This will give an idea of the way in which the investigation has been carried on. It has been carried on for the purpose of bolstering up the peculiar ideas of each member of the commission, particularly those of the worthy secretary. But in this case it appears to be Mr. Meredith's back which is to be scratched:

The system of classifying and grading the convicts was introduced into the penitentiary in 1860, by the board of inspectors, of which Mr. Commissioner Meredith was a member. It was borrowed from the system of progressive classification with badges and gratuities then recently adopted by Sir Walter Crofton in the Irish convict prisons, and which has ever since worked there successfully. The different grades, when first established, were distinguished by the simple and easily understood method of fixing coloured stripes on the sleeves of the convicts' jackets. This answered the purpose admirably. But for some reason which the commissioners have not been able to learn, after Mr. Meredith had ceased to be an inspector, this method of marking the different grades of prisoners was abandoned, and the grades were distinguished by giving each a special suit of clothing. The necessary consequence has been that there are now kept in stock on an average nearly three suits of clothing for every convict, whereas under the former plan not half that quantity was required. Besides the

Mr. QUINN.

extra cost incurred in the present system, there is also the trouble and risk involved in storing away such a mass of clothing and preserving it from moths; and from this cause serious losses have already been incurred. The commissioners would, therefore, recommend that henceforward the same kind of cloth should be used for all the convicts and that the three grades should be distinguished by stripes upon the sleeves of the coat or jacket, as formerly. There is good reason to believe that the proposed system would not only be much more economical than the present one, but also much more appreciated by the convicts. The suits now worn by the three grades are so much alike that no stranger going into the prison would be likely to distinguish one from the other, and certainly could not possibly know which was the lowest and which the highest grade. Whereas the stripes on the arm would be a mark which every one could understand, and one which from its semi-military character would be particularly appreciated by the convicts themselves. Under a recent arrangement in the state prison of New York the convicts are divided into four different groups or classes. Those classes or groups are kept quite apart and are each under special regulations, but the groups are not as yet distinguished by any difference of dress or distinctive badge; though this matter is now under consideration there.

So that, thirty-seven years after this system was first suggested by Mr. Meredith, the commissioner, and twenty-five years after it has been discarded by the authorities in the prison, the reverend commissioner or the revered commissioner, or the superannuated or ought-to-be superannuated commissioner, returns to the attack, and wishes to have stripes instead of suits. This is simply a sample page which I take out of the whole report, in order to show you that it is not so much an investigation to find out whether the penitentiary has been economically or honestly administered as it is an investigation to carry out the particular ideas of each one of the commissioners. I presume that Mr. Meredith, for his little scratch on the back in this case, was pledged to some other portion of the report in which Mr. Noxon was interested, and that Mr. Noxon, for his little scratch on the back, whitewashed Mr. Eilbeck's conduct in the whole investigation. This is what we complain of. It is not for the purpose of defending any particular person or persons who have been accused, but it is for the purpose of establishing either the truth or the falsity of this report, that I ask the Government to institute a proper inquiry, and, if necessary to do that, to prosecute some of the persons charged in order that the truth may come out, and that justice may be done in the premises.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want to prolong the discussion in regard to the Kingston Penitentiary, because I think we have heard enough to be convinced that the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Montreal Centre will not agree, they are so far apart. I rise for the purpose of asking the Solicitor General how far the investi-

gation into the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary has gone, how many witnesses have been examined and how long the investigation is expected to last. I will tell him why I put this question. The other day, when I was in Montreal, I heard that the commissioners were taking their time, that they were doing the work at a very convenient rate, and that, to the great scandal of the people of St. Vincent, they were promenading with the vehicles of the penitentiary. A gentleman asked one of them, I believe Mr. LaFortune, how long the investigation was going to last, and Mr. LaFortune said that it would last all summer and part of the fall. I believe that the system followed in our penitentiaries is entirely bad. We take too much care of the prisoners. They are better fed and better taken care of than 75 per cent of the population who toil in the Dominion. I have been told by some of the officers of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary that there is not a farmer in that district who has on his table every day as much good food as is supplied to the prisoners, and no doubt the same remark will apply to the other penitentiaries. Until this year we have been paying nearly half a million dollars annually for the support of the prisoners, and I am very glad to see that the Government have reduced that item by some \$64,000. I hope the reduction will not impair the efficiency of the service. There is no doubt that the majority of the prisoners released from our penitentiaries desire to go back. You will find that ten out of twelve of those released commit again some crime which subjects them to imprisonment, because they are attracted back by the lazy life they lead there. All that they are deprived of is liberty, which they do not appear to value very much, and in every other respect they are better off than the majority of the working people outside. We might take a lesson from some of the countries of Europe. In this country, I believe, we have the worst roads to be found anywhere, and in that respect the province of Quebec carries off the palm. It seems to me that it would be a very desirable reform to make our convicts work upon the roads in the different provinces. That is done in France and Belgium, and I do not see why it should not be done in Canada. We have in our penitentiaries strong able-bodied men who are doing nothing. A few of them work in the making of binder twine, but I do not think that we ought to bring prison labour in competition with that of free men.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** What would you do with them?

**Mr. BERGERON.** I would have them out macadamizing our roads. Let them go in gangs, chained, if you like, and in that way they would be doing very valuable work,

and not interfering with the free labour of the country, and at the end of twenty years our roads would be simply perfect. I throw this simply out as a broad suggestion, without attempting to go into any of the working details. Any one who has seen any of these men, as they are freed from their prison term, must acknowledge that they have been excellently treated. They are all fleshy, in good health, and have all the appearance of having led a life of ease. And then see what must inevitably follow the lazy habits inculcated in them. A man leaves the penitentiary where he has been for five years doing scarcely anything, and living on the fat of the land, and when he gets out he finds himself unfit for the hard work of life. He is given a small amount of money which is supposed to last him until he can find some means of earning an honest living, but he has been so long doing nothing except eating and sleeping that he is actually unfit to work, and is driven to commit some other crime which lands him back into the penitentiary again. This result would be avoided if we had these men employed on our roads. At the beginning of the session I moved for a return of the convicts' pardons. I find that sixty-one were set free before their term expired.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Whom do you blame?

**Mr. BERGERON.** I do not blame anybody. I do not know why they were set free, but the Government should bear in mind that a pardon should not be granted except after a great deal of inquiry and care. The granting of pardons has a bad effect on public opinion. The public are apt to think that interested motives, or weak sentimentality were at the bottom of such release. Of four men who were condemned to be hanged for murder, after a fair trial, the sentences were commuted to imprisonment for life. I do not say that these sentences should not have been commuted, but I would again call attention to a case which I brought up during the last Parliament, the case of Shortis, which bears out the view which I am now presenting to the House. I expressed the opinion then that in commuting the sentence of Shortis the Government had not acted wisely; and the fact that such commutations are apt to have a bad influence on public opinion is shown by the discussion which took place among the public over this particular case and the public feeling that was aroused. It was even discussed on the hustings, and we had even the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) declaring that an Englishman from the other side could come out and kill French Canadians in this country without running any danger of being hanged. We can all understand the effect of such language as that. Well, we have the cases of four other men, Canadians, who committed murder deliberately in this country, who were as guilty of murder as Shortis was, and instead of these men

being hanged, we find their sentences commuted to imprisonment for life, and we have besides sixty-one others who were sentenced for certain terms and who have been set free before the expiry of their terms. It seems to me that this is carrying the quality of mercy altogether too far.

I would ask my hon. friend the Solicitor General to give me the information I asked for with reference to the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary commission—how long they have sat, how long they are to sit, and if they had made any report?

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman say that the hon. First Minister stated somewhere that an Englishman could come out to this country and kill people and get free?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. TALBOT. Where?

Mr. BERGERON. At Valleyfield.

Mr. TALBOT. Did the hon. gentleman hear him?

Mr. BERGERON. I did not, but it was published in the newspapers, and was freely spoken of by every one in Valleyfield.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friend will look into the matter he will find that the proportion of releases has not been greater under the existing regime than it was before. There has been a good deal of comment on the release of a man from Toronto who had been convicted of throwing vitrol, and the charge has been freely made that his release was, to say the least, a very injudicious exercise of the clemency of the Crown. I explained the case a few days ago, but, nevertheless, the charge has been persisted in, and as to some extent it is apt to be detrimental to the reputation of the hon. Minister of Justice, I think it but right that I should again explain the circumstances under which the release was granted, and it seems to me that when I state the fact that that man has been detained illegally for ten years, and that at any time, had an application been made for a writ of habeas corpus, he would have been released, I think I have said everything, and that this should set the matter at rest, once for all.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) allow me one word. It seems to me I have seen it stated in the papers that Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, had refused to release this man.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is perfectly true; Sir John Thompson did refuse to release him. I presume—and I am quite willing to make the statement—I presume that in the hurry, the same order would have been given to the last application had not the fact of the unlawful detention been brought to the attention of the Minister by one of the gentlemen who acted

Mr. BERGERON.

for the defence, who discovered it at this late period. But the Minister referred the matter to the magistrate by whom the man had been sentenced, and all concerned perceived that it was a mistake, and that the man ought to be discharged.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the mistake?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The mistake was that the magistrate who sentenced him had no jurisdiction over the case. Sir John Thompson's attention was not drawn to that fact.

Mr. WALLACE. Would that mean another trial?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would mean that if a writ of habeas corpus had been applied for, the man would have been discharged at any time.

Mr. WALLACE. But could he be tried again?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was never tried at all, so if he were tried, he would not be tried "again." I have been asked a question as to when the commissioners sat. They began to sit at the beginning of May. They have made no interim report, but I may say that, so far as St. Vincent de Paul is concerned, there is absolutely no ground of complaint worth speaking of as to the discipline, but there is serious ground of complaint as to the expenditure. That may be the result of the high feeding that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) speaks of, and good treatment meted out to the prisoners.

Mr. BERGERON. How long will the St. Vincent de Paul commission sit?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know; but I do not think they should sit beyond the coming month, because the Kingston penitentiary investigation, which should have taken equally long, took eighty-three days.

Now, as to the employment of prisoners that is a very serious matter, and a matter that has been engaging the attention of the department for some time past. I do not think I could do my hon. friend a greater service than to refer him to the inspector's report, which is included in the report of the Minister of Justice and in which this matter is exhaustively dealt with. The inspector suggests that the prisoners might be employed in manufacturing articles used in the different departments. That is regarded as a kind of employment that would minimize, at all events, the interference with the ordinary labour of the country. As to the question of employing convicts on the public roads, if my hon. friend will permit me, I would draw his attention to an article published in the "North American Review," the current (June) number, in which this question is very exhaustively discussed by the inspector of penitentiaries for the state

of New York, I think. The author deals especially with the question of employment of convicts on the roads, and my hon. friend will find that there are very serious disadvantages in that system pointed out in the article I have referred to. However, that is a question that ought to be considered, and I may say that it is engaging the attention of the inspector and, possibly, next session we may be in a position to make some suggestions.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I would like to know why Mr. Ouimet, the warden of the St. Vincent de Paul was suspended.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** He has not been suspended, according to the sense in which we ordinarily use that term. It is thought proper, in order to enable us thoroughly to investigate the penitentiary, in order that the employees may speak with the utmost freedom, we thought rather than suspend him, to give him leave of absence. But I may say that, while he has been relieved, temporarily, of his functions, he is in receipt of his salary.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** Has any report been made against him so far?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** There is an interim report—I was mistaken a moment ago in saying that there was not. It is not a report against the warden, but a recommendation that he should be dealt with in the manner I have indicated.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I wish to say that, whether or not the course of the commissioners was a correct one in their investigation, and whether or not they have given those gentlemen against whom charges were made an opportunity to prove their innocence, I think that the country generally will rejoice that an investigation has been held, and will feel regret that it has disclosed a state of corruption and dishonesty among the officials of the Kingston penitentiary which, however, it is well should have been discovered and which, I hope, will put an end to. There is no doubt, from the report of the commissioners, that dishonesty existed throughout the departments in the Kingston penitentiary, and that the officials did not seem to have an idea that the money of the people of Canada should be carefully husbanded and judiciously spent; but it appears by the evidence that some of the prominent, leading officials of the penitentiary plainly stated that they would be open to censure if they did not spend all the money that had been appropriated for certain services. This state of affairs was one that could not be stopped too soon. I think that the Government having decided to dispense with the service of this man—and very properly so, in my opinion—will see to it that men having the confidence of the country be placed in these responsible positions, and that persons who are discharging their duty honestly and faithfully as well as

economically will be commended. For the money expended in the penitentiaries is money that the people do not give willingly. It is given grudgingly, and very properly so, and when it is given, I think that the greatest care should be taken that there is no extravagance, no corruption, no misappropriation of the funds.

Penitentiaries--Penitentiaries Commission.  
Payments may be made from this vote, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$10,000

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is that for? I want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in the first place, what is the necessity there of the clause with regard to the Civil Service Act.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** We have employed, at the present time, as assistant to the commissioners, an accountant connected with the penitentiaries branch of the Department of Justice.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Who is the accountant?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** Mr. G. L. Foster. He has rendered good service.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How much was voted this year for the commissioners?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** Three thousand dollars.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Has the hon. gentleman any recollection of telling the House last year that he thought that \$3,000 was all that would be necessary to pay for the cost of this commission.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** Yes.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It might be a little more, but he thought he was well within the mark in saying that it would be very closely in the region of \$3,000. Does not my hon. friend think that he owes a very explicit explanation as to why he was so far out as to think \$3,000 would do this work when now we are on the road to at least \$13,000?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** It will certainly reach \$13,000, because the intention of the Government now is, in consequence of the revelations in Kingston, to make a thorough investigation into all the penitentiaries. I may say that so far as the Kingston investigation is concerned, we had no anticipation at the time that it would take so long, nor of the revelations that would be made.

**Mr. FOSTER.** How many men were on that commission?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** There were three men on the commission at the Kingston penitentiary. Messrs. Meredith, Noxon and Fraser, with Mr. Ellbeck as secretary. The commissioners, during the Kingston penitentiary investigation, were drawing \$10 a day and expenses, and the secretary

\$6.50 per day without expenses. At St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary they are drawing \$10 and expenses. The commissioners are the same with the exception of Mr. Meredith, who is replaced by Mr. Lafortune; and the secretary there also gets \$6.50 per day without expenses. It is the same secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason why, if you have three business men, they cannot go through that penitentiary in Kingston from top to bottom, from cellar to garret, from the outside limit to the inside, in less than 83 days?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I can give a fair explanation of that. Even up to the present time it has been impossible for us to get invoices for the goods furnished. There are absolutely no books kept at the Kingston penitentiary. I may say. It was necessary for the commission to go to places where the purchases were made, to Montreal and to Toronto, and to come to Ottawa for the purpose of examining the accounts in the Public Works Department. I think in order to get some information they had to come to the Department of Justice; in fact they had to travel all about the country in their endeavours to get information. I think my hon. friend will understand in some measure the reason of this enormous expense when I tell him that there was absolutely no books kept at the penitentiary, nothing but the very imperfect statement kept by the accountant.

Mr. FOSTER. These three commissioners, old Mr. Meredith and the others, don't run around looking up these accounts when they have a secretary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am speaking now of what was done last year, I cannot say much of what has been done at St. Vincent de Paul. Take, for instance, some of the hardware firms in Montreal, Garth & Company, Chanteloup, Gormley, Clendenning & Sons, and Markum, who furnished goods to the penitentiary. When they went there for the purpose of getting access to the books of these manufacturers they found some valuable letters in their hands that we may use as evidence hereafter. Further than that, for instance, I may mention that letter-books were supposed to be kept in the penitentiary, but when the commissioners came to examine them they found them mutilated, some of the pages had been torn out from the time after the commissioners first came there, and during the time they were absent for a fortnight or three weeks. These things show that the commissioners were absolutely handicapped.

Mr. FOSTER. It would seem that under these circumstances there is a great waste of time on the part of the majority of the commission while some of the subordinate officials are looking up these questions, and

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

all the time the pay of these commissioners is going on. Does not my hon. friend think that it would be to the public interest if he were to send some of his own officers? Surely he has officers that he can trust, responsible officers. You have no better officer in your department than G. L. Foster.

An hon. MEMBER. A good name.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but no relation of mine, I am sorry to say. You have officers that you can trust that are honest as the day, and just as capable as any man you can import from anywhere. What is the reason, then, that officers in the department might not travel round and get these reports, and when they have got them they could lay them before the commissioners instead of allowing these latter gentlemen to go around at \$10 a day and all expenses? You have had these men on pay all the time. You could take one of your departmental officers and send him down to Garth's to look up these accounts, and during this time the pay of the commissioners would be stopped. It surely did not take, under any proper business management, four men all this time under pay, to carry these things out. Now, if my hon. friend is going to carry out this investigation through all the penitentiaries I do not say that he may not be right. If there is anything wrong in these penitentiaries, bring it out, and if some of these men have been mutilating accounts and all that sort of thing, they ought to be put in a solitary cell themselves, and if it is found to be a fact, I hope they will be. But can't you find out some method by which you can keep expenses down? Put on your technical men, accountants, men who are clerks in a way, and let them get all these facts and accounts and ferret them out themselves. Then when you come to your investigation and the taking of evidence where you must have all your commissioners, these things will be ready for them. This looks like a very long job and a very fat job for a number of these gentlemen, \$13,000 already, and he is not able to tell us that he can keep it within that limit. I see they are at St. Vincent de Paul having a fine old time, taking it easy. Commissioners never will work any faster than they are expected to work. The best of them will take their time. It is only now and then that you get people who work any faster than they can help.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You are judging by the experience of the temperance commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and the other. I think one commission is very much the same as another. But I just make this suggestion in order that you may avoid what is really an extraordinary expenditure on the part of these commissioners. I am sorry my hon. friend did not give a more satisfactory explanation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, and I am endeavouring to cut down the expense as much as possible. When I got an estimate of what all these investigations would cost, it rather startled me.

Mr. FOSTER. What is my hon. friend's opinion of what it will take to do it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It will take about \$14,000. I certainly realize it to be an enormous sum I shall be called upon to expend, and I shall endeavour, so far as it lies in my power, to bring this within reasonable limits.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these commissioners under pay from the time of their appointment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, only the time they are actually employed.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you count a day's employment only when they are within the precincts of the penitentiary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think men of the standing of these commissioners can be trusted to make an honest charge for their services.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand this investigation commenced at St. Vincent de Paul on the 1st of May?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Some time before the beginning of May.

Mr. BERGERON. At that time I suppose they were at work at St. Vincent de Paul?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I could not say.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask that, because Mr. Lafortune was working very hard during the local election at St. Vincent de Paul, and threatening the guards right and left that if they did not vote Liberal they would be kicked out, because he was one of the commissioners, and he was there for that purpose.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is aware that the ex-Attorney General of the province of Quebec passed a law that would put Mr. Lafortune in jail if it was found that he had been doing that kind of thing.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What special qualification has Mr. Lafortune to act on this commission? I understand he is a lawyer of a few years standing. He cannot be much of a lawyer if he works at \$10 a day. I would like to know what other qualification he has.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend ought not to make that suggestion, or they will all be asking \$20.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to get an answer to my question—what other qualification has he?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Lafortune, but I understand he is a very able lawyer in Montreal. I think it is a good thing for us to have men of that sort in making the investigation, to see that the rules of evidence are properly observed.

Mr. QUINN. I am very glad to see that Mr. Lafortune and Mr. Fraser are on this St. Vincent de Paul commission, because I do not think that we will be treated to the same kind of evidence in this case, at least I hope not, that we had in the Kingston investigation, which was conducted almost wholly by Mr. Meredith and Mr. Noxon. At the same time I would like the Solicitor General to take into consideration the statements which have been made in regard to this report in the discussion we have had to-day, so that the St. Vincent de Paul investigation will not be disgraced by such conduct as that which has disgraced the Kingston investigation. I do not think there is much danger of it with Mr. Lafortune and Mr. Fraser on the commission, but I think that a little more care should be taken, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will not overlook it.

Royal Military College of Canada..... \$65,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sorry that circumstances have compelled the hon. leader of the Opposition to be absent from his place because if he were here I would like to have said a word or two to him on the subject of his remarks in reference to the Royal Military College. Unfortunately I will have to address them to his deputy to whom I cannot speak with the same freedom.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that the hon. gentleman defer his remarks until next session when my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will be here to reply to them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In other words that the hon. gentleman's remarks should be unanswered; I am not disposed to agree to that. In respect to the Royal Military College at Kingston those hon. gentlemen who have paid any attention to the subject are perfectly well aware that I have always from my place on the Opposition side of the House pointed out that it was an extremely serious mistake ever to have placed an officer in charge of the college who was on the retired list. There is no doubt whatever that if you desire to keep this college up to a proper and efficient standard you must have an officer in active service who is not only known to military men but who is

known to the students themselves and those of them who have graduated from the college and entered the military service. A first-class mistake therefore was committed when Major General Cameron, after he had left the active service, was placed in the position of commandant of the college. I do not in the least desire to say anything harsh of that gentleman, but I am bound to say, and it was the opinion of all with whom I ever came in contact who were acquainted with the working of that institution that Major General Cameron was not a person who was qualified to command the respect of the cadets under his charge. As everybody knows it is not by any manner of means an easy thing to find a gentleman who is able to govern properly a body of that description, and it is quite notorious that Major General Cameron did not have these qualities. He may have been a good officer in the service but he had no experience to fit him for the task that he was assigned, and in his hands the college went gradually down until it had no more than eight students per annum. It was perfectly obvious that that state of things must be put a stop to or else the college must be abolished. As regards the present commandant Col. Kittson, he was recommended to us by the Imperial Military authorities. He is a soldier in the prime of life; he is in possession of those qualities which Major General Cameron did not have, and he is likely to obtain the confidence, respect and admiration of the students under his charge. As to the changes which have been made on the recommendation of that officer we believe that they are likely to eventuate successfully. We have made an experiment and we must trust to time to see whether it will justify our expectations or not, but this I may say that whereas a year ago the total number of applicants for examination for entrance into the college, was, I am informed, scarcely more than eight or ten, on this present occasion something like forty have applied, and I believe some more have been refused on the ground that there are more applying than we have vacancies for. This is a very important matter because, as everybody knows, when you have fewer vacancies the candidates examination becomes a competitive one of necessity and the standard of matriculation is likely to be considerably raised. That particularly when you are reducing the term from four to three years is an important matter. I may add that while it is perfectly true that our graduates have sustained a high reputation in England, within the last two or three years, the reports from the horse guards were not so satisfactory as they had been before, and there was even a thought of considerably reducing the number of commissions granted by the English Government from time to time. I would be loathe to make any reflection on him on my own authority, but it is well that the House

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.**

should understand, that as far as Major General Cameron's efficiency is concerned he was condemned by three separate parties all more or less qualified to pass judgment upon him. In the first place the commissioners appointed by the late Government to examine into the affairs of this college, reported very adversely to the discipline of the college and reported very strongly against allowing an officer in Major General Cameron's position to be appointed or to continue to manage the college for more than a limited terms of years. It is perfectly well known that Major General Gascoigne, the officer commanding our forces, shared and endorsed that opinion expressly reporting that in his judgment it was extremely desirable that the commandant should be an officer in the active service. The commission appointed by the late Government reported:

The drill is not up to date, and, according to evidence brought before the board, there is a slackness in discipline. With a view to correcting these defects, the board is of opinion that the college should be brought more than at present under the supervision of higher military authority.

This board considers that the education of the cadets who attend the Military College, should be continuous, be thorough, so far as the means within reach will permit, and of a modern type, and that, in order to secure this desirable result, the commandant should be changed at short intervals of, say, five or seven years, as may be found expedient or necessary; also, that as long as it is necessary to employ the services of a military officer from Great Britain as commandant, he be required to be an officer of not higher rank than Lieutenant-colonel on the active list of the Imperial regular army. By following such a plan, new blood, so to speak, will be constantly infused, and the system will be prevented from running into a groove, by carrying with it instruction in respect of those changes in army administration that experience may suggest as conducive to the public good.

Now, it is not necessary to refer again to the opinion expressed by Major General Gascoigne, but I will add that in addition to that there were the views of graduates of the Royal Military College several of whom are men holding positions in the English service as well as in our own. We had a report to the late Government, in which it was expressly declared that with regard to the points noticed by the board as being unsatisfactory, as also with regard to the recommendations made by the board, and most particularly with regard to the recommendations having reference to the rank and appointment of commandants, the meeting desired to express its fullest concurrence. That is not a matter of small importance, because these men, very many of them turned of thirty years old and in active employment themselves, would not put themselves on record as they have done in the report to which I have alluded, unless they felt that the interests of the college imperatively required that they should speak

out. I had an opportunity myself of conversing on the subject with three or four of these gentlemen who had entered the Imperial service, and who are at present of considerable rank in the corps to which they are attached; and the universal opinion of these gentlemen was this: that while a matter of ten years ago or thereabouts, the college was fully abreast the military requirements of that day, yet, when they returned after an absence of ten years they found the college just exactly where they had left it; in other words, the college was ten years behind the present requirements. Under these circumstances, I think there can be no doubt whatever—in spite of the opinion naturally held by the hon. the leader of the Opposition—that the Government did well in insisting upon General Cameron's retirement; and I think there can be no doubt whatever that they have done well also in placing the college under the command of a soldier in active service and a man with a career and a future before him. There is no doubt whatever that such an officer is far more likely to inspire the cadets with a military spirit, and far more likely to command their respect and ready obedience than any gentleman, no matter how distinguished his past service may have been, who is known to have no longer a future career. I do not desire at this time, and in view of the fact that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not here, to say more than this: That I am bound to say that his stricture of General Gascoigne was entirely unfair and uncalled for. General Gascoigne, in the discharge of his duty, forwarded a confidential report, as he was bound to do, and it was part of his duty to express plainly his opinion with respect to the commandant. In all other regards General Gascoigne's conduct was in no way open to censure. He did nothing that he was not required to do, nor did he display at any time the slightest animus in dealing with General Cameron. As to the interesting point raised by the leader of the Opposition, whether the rank of Major General Cameron was higher than that of Major General Gascoigne, I do not pretend to be in a position to speak, but this I do know, that General Gascoigne was president ex-officio of the Royal Military College, and therefore a superior officer to General Cameron as regards his position in that college. I am perfectly certain that, in what General Gascoigne reported, he had only an eye to the benefit of the Kingston Military College, and I think that if the House will wait, they will find that in all respects the college is likely to benefit by the change. In one respect, which is of vital importance to the best interests of the College in the future, that of attracting a large number of young men to it, the plan has been an unqualified success, and I think that all that is required to make it perfect will be to raise somewhat the standard of

matriculation, which will be done with very little trouble to ourselves, by reason of the fact that there will be now, I hope, an active competition for places in the Royal Military College.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not intend to offer but one criticism and, very shortly, in regard to the change in the Royal Military College. I have before me the explanation of the Minister of Militia in Mr. Mackenzie's Government when this college was founded. The intention of the college as regards the education to be given is very plainly pointed out, and that education was to cover two things. First, to turn out young men up to the military standard, so that they would do credit to Canada in any army they might enter, and second—and I think in this country, the most important of the two—to give a scientific education of a high standard which would fit young men to occupy high positions such as engineers and like scientific professions. We have not sufficient military employment in Canada for these young men, nor are the commissions opened in the Imperial army of sufficient number to anything like absorb the graduates from that college. I am afraid that these changes now made, which reduce the course from four years to three years, and as the Orders in Council set forth reduce the number and the time to be devoted to the different scientific subjects: I am afraid that these changes will work injury to the college. It seems to me strange that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) should contend that the college had not improved in ten years, in view of the fact that the changes now proposed to lower the standard. It is needless to say that no young man can acquire in three years as much scientific knowledge as he could in four years, and I am afraid that even under a capable commandant the standard of our graduates under such a system can hardly be maintained. The leader of the Opposition dealt very fully with the question of the commandant of the college, and the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) very fairly and temperately showed the other side of the question, so that it is unnecessary for me to refer to that phase. I repeat that I believe it will be impossible to keep up the standard under the present regulations, even with a first-class man at the head. I strongly endorse every word that was said in this House at the time the Mackenzie Government established this college, and I believe that it is of the utmost importance that the standard shall be upheld, or else the usefulness of the college will be gone. If we cannot afford to go to the necessary expense to maintain the very highest standard, and if these young gentlemen cannot afford the time and expenditure necessary for that, then by all means let us do away with the Military College. I want that college second to none in the world, and I want the graduates

turned out qualified to take the highest rank in either the military or civil employment. In engineering pursuits and especially in the development of our mining resources, we know that the graduates of the Kingston College have taken and can take high places. I regret that this new Government in the commencement of its administration should run the risk of reducing the standard of that college. As one member of Parliament, I am prepared to take the responsibility of voting whatever money is needed to have the standard of the Kingston College as high as that of West Point in the United States, or any military college in England. The great point to be borne in mind is that according to the new regulations of the Order in Council, the standard shall only be such as shall enable the graduates to enter the Imperial service. I want to see a higher standard, for this reason. We know that young men who receive a military education in England all go into the military service, and there they get the additional scientific training necessary for their profession. This opportunity is open to the graduates of our military school who go to England. If my memory serves me, the Imperial Government have allowed us five commissions per year. According to the hon. gentleman's statement, there are forty students. Then, the other thirty-five will not, in my opinion, have the scientific education to enable them to do anything but enter the Imperial army. In making this criticism, I have no desire to disparage the institution in any way. On the contrary, I am prepared to support an increase in the expenditure on the college rather than to take any chance of depreciating the standard of education either in a civil or a military respect. With regard to the gentleman now at the head of the college, I am quite content to accept the representation of the hon. gentleman, the responsible Minister and the Major General, that they have a good and proper commandant. I hope he will turn out well, and I have every reason to believe he will. It is well enough to have the expenditure on the college reduced, provided efficiency is maintained; but, if necessary, to encourage the young men of the class who attend the college, I would rather increase the number by increasing the expenditure in order to keep up the standard. So that the qualifications of the college maintained by the party who inaugurated it, and continued by the party who succeeded them, shall still hold good by the party who inaugurated the institution doing nothing to lower its standard of efficiency.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** My hon. friend did not appreciate the point I made. The college had run down to an extremely low ebb. Last year, I believe, there were only eight in the graduates class, and scarcely any more matricu-

**Mr TISDALE.**

lants. What I say is that you are more likely to get five distinguished graduates out of a class of thirty or forty than you are out of a class of eight. While I do not lay too much stress upon it, the fact is that the English authorities were complaining of the class of graduates sent over to them in the last few years. I am sorry to have to make that statement, but, nevertheless, it is so. This question depends largely on the standard of matriculation. If you have a high class of matriculants, you can do as much with them in three years as you can with a lower grade of matriculants in four years; and it is upon that principle that the commandant believes that he can afford to reduce the term from four years to three years. I do not think we could hope to get a large class if we maintained the former standard of expense. When this college was originally instituted by Mr. Mackenzie and his Government, the expenses to the parents and cadets was vastly less than it afterwards became. I think the annual expenditure of a student for the first few years was scarcely more than \$100 or \$150 a year. Subsequently, it swelled to \$350 or \$400. The hon. gentleman can easily see that in a country like ours the effect of that increased expenditure was to lessen enormously the number of persons from whom the cadets could be drawn. Many of the best of our cadets were drawn from the farm and, in some cases, from the workshop, and they have distinguished themselves. I am glad to say, in the English service since. But that class was completely eliminated by the great increase in the annual expense. I know something of Colonel Kittson's career, and he is most desirous of making the college a success. In fact, he regards his whole future career as being largely bound in its success.

**Mr. TISDALE.** I did not understand that it was proposed to raise the standard of matriculation.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It is not proposed to raise it, but it will be raised ipso facto. Where there are forty competitors, the annual number of places being thirty, it stands to reason that there will be a much higher standard attained than where you have only eight. That is one reason why that change was made to which the hon. leader of the Opposition objected. Colonel Kittson thought it better that the examination should be conducted by the gentlemen who are to educate the men afterwards than by examiners who do not care particularly whether the matriculants come up to a particular standard or not.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I have always entertained the opinion that this is one of the institutions which we could do very well without. Some years ago I opposed the vote for this college, and my opinion has certainly

not changed in regard to it, and I have watched its course since that time.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend is just starting with his criticism, I think we had better call it six o'clock.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. Before you left the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I was about to make some reference to the Royal Military College. It has been my opinion for a long time that this is a supererogatory, and comparatively useless and yet expensive institution of this country—an institution which costs us a great deal and gives us very little in return. The expenditure on it amounts to \$65,000, and the revenue only to \$19,881, thus leaving a very considerable deficit. It has lost its hold of public favour since the number of pupils is growing less and less every year. Whether the standard of education is getting higher or not does not appear in the report, but what certainly is evident is that it is becoming more and more unpopular, and what the reasons for this unpopularity are we have yet to discover. The education given there appears to be of two characters. There is first the general education, and then the military education. Now, the general education is inferior to what is given at any of the universities or colleges in this country. In our universities and colleges the staffs of teachers are, in my opinion, composed of much abler men, much better fitted for their work than the staff of the Military College, so that that branch of education in the Military College is not necessary. The other branch is the military education. I have always held the opinion that our military schools can give all, or nearly all, the military education which the pupils acquire at the Military College, so that I fail to see the necessity for the continued existence of this very expensive institution. As I have said, it is undoubtedly becoming more and more unpopular every year, and one of the reasons must certainly be that after we have educated these young men at such great expense, they are thrust on the country, and cannot find employment. Every year applications are made to this House on their behalf, for positions in the Government, and several hon. members, with a penchant for military display, have animadverted very strongly on the Government for not giving positions in the civil service to all these graduates of the Military College. These hon. gentlemen claim that the civil service is the natural place for them. What does that mean? It means that after we have educated these young men at great expense to the country, we must then go further still and find positions for them. In other words, they

must take precedence over the large class of young men who, through industry and economy, have educated themselves in our colleges and schools. It seems to me that that it is a serious reflection on the large number of graduates from the other colleges and universities of our country, and I for my part do not see why the Military College graduates should be entitled to more consideration in the battle of life than these young men for whose education the country has not paid anything. It is stated that if we do not provide positions in the civil service for these military graduates, they will drift away from the country, and as a matter of fact a great many of them do. If we trace back records after they leave the Military College, we will find that almost without exception they have emigrated to a foreign country. It is true that we provide appointments for two of them every year in the militia, but in practice even that number do not find places in our militia, because we bring out men from the old country to fill the positions which, in the opinion of some, these young men ought to fill. There are a few in the civil service who, no doubt, are very valuable in these positions, but I do not believe that they are one whit more valuable than would be the graduates of our other colleges and universities. A few of them have gone to the mother country. We are told, from time to time, that the Imperial Government provides commissions for our Military College graduates. Well, I have here the report, and it shows that in 1888 thirty-seven military commissions were provided for those graduates by the Imperial Government, but that was only during one year. Since then only two Imperial commissions have fallen to them every year. These two commissions in the Imperial army are the only ones that are provided per year for those graduates, and the balance of them drift off to the United States and elsewhere, so that just when we have educated them to the point when they might become of some use to this country, they are obliged to seek employment in other countries. That being the case, I do not see what justification there is for our expending this large amount of money on this college. It is said by the acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the Government have reduced the expenses to the young men who join that institution from about \$1,400 to \$700 each year, and that they have reduced the term from four years to three years, and he has expressed the opinion that the reduction in the length of the term and the reduction in the cost will create a larger competition for entrance to the college and give us a better grade of men. I do not think that can be fairly demonstrated. It seems to me you must have some standard for matriculation, and we will have to choose amongst those who come up to that standard.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The men who get the highest marks go in, and those who get the lowest stay out. It is a competitive examination.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Suppose you have seventy-five above the average?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The highest thirty will go in.

**Mr. SPROULE**. But your standard is not raised any higher.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is of necessity. When you have a great many competing that necessarily makes the standard higher. My hon. friend will see that if we have a larger number of men competing for entrance than there are places for, of course those who pass the best examinations only are admitted, and the ordinary pass standard is completely lost sight of. That has happened before in cases where there were a number competing. The men who get in were far and away above the pass standard, and that probably will happen again.

**Mr. SPROULE**. That may be to a limited extent, but I am inclined to the opinion that while a great number may come up to the standard, you will have to make a selection out of that greater number. It is not reasonable to suppose that you can turn out a higher grade of men in three years' tuition than in four, and I do not think that the high standard at which they may come in will make up for the loss of that year. Therefore, I do not think that the class of men turned out by the college will be any better than those turned out formerly. Then, if you reduce the cost to these young men, you must increase the cost to the country, because the income of the college consists of the fees paid by the pupils and money paid by the country. If the fees paid in the past were \$1,400 and you reduce them to \$700, you will require twice as many pupils to obtain the same return. I understand there is accommodation for about forty.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. More than that, there is accommodation for 100, I think. The college was planned to accommodate 120, but I am not prepared to say it can accommodate that number. I know, however, that it can accommodate about 100.

**Mr. SPROULE**. How many had it last year?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The number was much reduced. The total number had gone down from eight to twelve per class, and there are four classes, which makes a reduction of about forty-eight.

**Mr. SPROULE**. By increasing the number that way, no doubt the return would be very much the same, unless you increase

**Mr. SPROULE**.

the expense and that would not necessarily follow. But it seems to me that we are paying too much for what we get. These men, if they remained in the country, would be of some value to us; but they do not remain, unless we find places for them. Therefore, I think we are scarcely justified in spending the large amount we do for the purpose of keeping up this institution. There is no doubt that it may, in case it need, give us some military experts who would be valuable to the country, and, so far as that goes, the institution would result in good. But if we could retain the services of these young men so as to have them in time of need, there would be a stronger argument in favour of keeping up this expense.

**Mr. KAULBACH**. I do not propose to enter into a discussion on the subject of dismissals of certain members of the staff of professors from the Royal Military College of Canada, after the statement so replete with information on the subject as that given to this House by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and other hon. members who followed him, but I cannot refrain from expressing my disapproval of the action the Government have taken in dismissing these gentlemen without assigning a reason, or giving them some opportunity or chance of placing themselves properly before the public in order to avoid wrong interpretations that might arise as to incompetency or otherwise.

I may say that Captain Wurtele, professor of mathematics in the college, and one of the decapitated, was the first young man as an applicant for admission as a cadet to the Royal Military College, and that as early as the latter part of 1874, or the early part of 1875, or immediately after the Act establishing the college was passed. In the beginning of 1876 he (Captain Wurtele) passed the first entrance examination that was held, and entered the college in June 1st of the same year—the day it was first opened. In the entrance examination he stood first in a class of eighteen by such a large proportion of marks that the circumstances was referred to in Parliament. This leading position he maintained for the first year and a half, taking Lord Dufferin's prize medal at the end of the first year. This gentleman continued in college till 1880, and shortly after that he took the rank of captain preferring to follow the wishes of his father, rather than his own inclination and accepted the position in the college as one of the staff of professors, rather than enter the regular service of Her Majesty's army, believing at the time that his position on the staff would be a permanency during good behaviour.

I will stop just here, and allow this House to judge, and the country to judge, of the action of the Government toward this gentleman, after his spending the best part

of his life in the service of the institution, as to whether he has been dealt with fairly, and in such a manner as would be creditable to the college and those having the supervision of it.

I have a nephew there now as a cadet who has made excellent marks in his studies for the short time he has been there; a young man of promise, but I would be sorry to see him after completing his studies accept a situation at any time on the staff of professors of that institution, to be subject to summary treatment such as has been dealt out to the staff referred to. I hope the Government will reconsider their action and under the circumstances thus briefly detailed continue the services of Professor Wurtele.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not wish to detain the committee for more than a few moments in the discussion of this subject. The technical side of the question was gone into so thoroughly by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) before he left this House to sail for England, that I think it would be useless to take up the time of the House in going over the same ground. I think we must all agree upon one point, and that is that in the establishment of the Royal Military College the late Hon. Alex. Mackenzie who was then Prime Minister of Canada, built a monument for himself which, to use an expression of the leader of the Opposition, is an evidence of his patriotic feeling towards Canada, and also of the interest which he took in Imperial matters. Sir, it must be remembered that the Royal Military College regulations and curriculum were prepared by one of the greatest experts in military educational matters in the whole British army, the late General—then Lt.-Col. Hewitt. He presided over the destinies of that college long enough to see it achieve a brilliant success. It is not very long ago that he died, having attained the rank of general, and holding a very important command in the Imperial service. Now, it must be remembered that under the regulations as laid down by Col. Hewitt, the Royal Military College of Canada has been an unqualified success. The cadets of that institution have left Canada and have taken their position side by side with the most eminently qualified of those they had to meet in the Imperial service. I must say that I agree with what was stated by the leader of the Opposition, that we must not compare or judge of the usefulness of the Royal Military College from the standard of Imperial institutions which are organized with a different object in view. Woolwich and Sandhurst are institutions in which men carry on preliminary studies to permit them to go into the Imperial service; and those who have taken an interest in military matters in England will know, that after these men who enter the service are qualified in

Sandhurst or Woolwich they must go through the staff college so as to be able to qualify for the promotions which are open to those who go through these examinations. As I understand it, the idea which presided over the foundation of this Royal Military College was that we were preparing men who in an emergency might be called out fully qualified after that four years' course to take a prominent and most important part in the defence of their country. Otherwise, if that were not the idea which presided over the foundation of that college, it would not have been necessary to have established a college merely for educational purposes, because the large universities of the province of Ontario, the universities of the province of Quebec, the universities in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, were quite sufficient to meet that requirement. But we wished to qualify men who, with a thorough military education, if their services were not required for the defence of the country, could occupy positions in civil life; but if required for the defence of the country, would be properly qualified to do so. That is a distinction which I think is of considerable importance. That whereas in England, in Woolwich, and in Sandhurst, and the other military institutions, a man may be qualified to take up a military life in the regiment, or the battery, or the troop of cavalry, if he wishes to qualify for a higher position, he has got to go through a different training in a higher institution, which is the staff college. Now, it has been said here that we qualify men who leave Canada to take positions in the Imperial Service, or to serve in the engineering profession on railways and elsewhere. Let me recall to the memory of hon. members of this House that in 1885 when we had the unfortunate trouble which is now part of the history of this country, cadets who were dispersed all over the United States, and some who were abroad, immediately they heard that their services could be of any use to Canada, applied to the then Minister of Militia—I happened to occupy that position at the time—for service in Canada. Now, I do not consider it was any disadvantage at all for these gentlemen, or for Canada, after the training which they had received in the Royal Military College, that after acquiring new experience in other countries, and in the Imperial service of England, they were fit to come back with their military training fully qualified to take the position which Canada expected them to take, when there was an occasion for them to take part in her defence. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has reduced the course from four to three years. Is that an advantage? I fail to see it. That curriculum was laid down by Colonel Hewitt who has qualified for service men who have distinguished themselves in the Imperial service, in Africa, in the Soudan, among them being at this moment the son of Judge Girouard, who is in charge of the construction of a railway on

the route to Khartoum, and other cadets from the Royal Military College who have been entrusted with most important positions of responsibility, and have shown that the Imperial service considers that from their training in the Royal Military College they were qualified, young men as they were, to occupy these positions of trust and of responsibility. Sir, I do not believe it will be an advantage to the college. England knows the cadets from the qualification which they have received under the old regime. The Imperial service has known that these men, coming fresh from the Royal Military College were thoroughly qualified, where they had gained the highest possible attainments in military education which could be expected from any man, serving in the Imperial service. Sir, if you want a test of that you can see it from the number of points which, in competitive examinations with men in England who had gone through the various colleges and institutions of Great Britain, the cadets of the Royal Military College have obtained. It is quite evident from that test alone that the education was as good as it could possibly be. Now, the course is reduced from four to three years, and I fear very much that the effect will not be good. According to my experience when I was Minister of Militia it is quite impossible to put in any more hours of training and study in the Royal Military College than what existed at the time when Colonel Hewett and General Cameron presided over that college. If it be so, it is impossible to suppose that the same amount of educational training can be got through in three years instead of four. I see also that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who is looking after the Department of Militia at the present time, has reduced the number of professors, and I see that Professor Duval, who taught the French language in the Military College is being dismissed. I was quite certain that the hon. gentleman would not overlook the necessity of placing the French educational part of the training in the Royal Military College, in the hands of a French-Canadian professor or a French professor. I was quite certain the hon. gentleman would not commit that mistake. But, Sir, I think a great mistake has been committed, if I may say so in the fact that not only the number of years' training should be reduced from four to three years, but moreover you have reduced the training in the French language and French literature as it existed when I was Minister of Militia, from three to two years. Now, let me say that in Canada we are better qualified to understand the importance of French and English, probably, than any other people on the face of the earth. Those who have travelled, who have had an opportunity of visiting the old country and the continent of Europe, will admit that one knowing French and English can travel all over the world. Possibly there may be

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.**

difficulties in acquiring the French language which the hon. gentleman referred to when the discussion first took place. He stated that Englishmen were not quite as quick at picking up French as Frenchmen could speak English who had been trained in that language from early youth. But I admit there are difficulties in the French language which possibly do not occur in the English language.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I think yours is much easier, perhaps not to speak, but certainly much easier to learn to read.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** The French language?

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Yes.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I do not think so.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** But it is much more difficult to write it. Our grammar, even to a Frenchman, offers some little difficulties occasionally which make us ponder why they should exist. But I am quite prepared to admit what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says, that one can read it more easily. It is very pretty to read and has so many attractions that every one is anxious to get over the grammatical difficulties just to find out what the literature is. If there are difficulties in the French language it should be considered more especially in a country like ours.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** It is just fair to Col. Kittson to say that he has given me to understand that he proposes to exact a higher standard in French than has been exacted before. The majority of the students in the college knew no French when they went in and very little when they were in.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** He is perhaps undertaking more than he can carry out. He says that he will teach more French in two years to the cadets than we have been able to teach in four years.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** They taught no French at all.

**Mr. BERGERON:** I do not know whether they taught any or not, but they did not learn any.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I had several opportunities of being at the examinations, and I heard very good French being spoken.

**Mr. BERGERON.** By French Canadians?

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Some French was spoken very well in the Royal Military College when I was Minister. Any attempt to reduce the number of years, any attempt to teach in two years at the Royal Military College the amount of French which we previously taught in four years I am afraid will not be a success. From an

economical standpoint the whole thing only means the saving of \$5,000 a year. While the Government can only say that they have saved \$5,000 a year there are reasons why it is possible that the changes which have been made in the institution, in the regulation and in the curriculum, will destroy the confidence which up to the present has existed in the college. The Royal Military College men have been selected during the troubles that England had in the Soudan, over and above the four commissions which were granted by Her Majesty to Royal Military College cadets, they gave to Canada several additional commissions and they stipulated that these commissions should be given to Royal Military College cadets because they knew from their training, the military education which they received that without any long training in England they could be entrusted with the important commission which would be confided to them and which they fulfilled to the credit of Canada and to the credit of the institution established by the late Alexander Mackenzie when Premier of Canada. I say more. I say that that college has done very much indeed to make Canada better known and more appreciated in England. There was a time, I remember well, when Canada did not stand in the proud position which she occupies to-day in Great Britain. Our present position is due to the fact that our Royal Military College cadets were able to take their places side by side with the men who had been trained in the military service. It was also due to the fact that some of our men belonging to the teams which were sent to England showed not only that loyalty existed in Canada but that Great Britain in her Canadian subjects found men whose physique prepared to take their share in fighting her battles and who were able to fight these battles side by side with the best men that England could send to the front. I believe that Canada has been going ahead step by step, from one progress to another, and I am sorry to see her taking a retrograde step in regard to one of the best institutions we have ever had in Canada. As to the changes in the educational programme which have been made, it would be taking up the time of the committee if I were to go into them, but I believe in leaving well alone. I believe that the Royal Military College as it existed before the changes took place was as perfect as it could be made. The training took the whole of the four years. I must say that we have had the advantage in that institution of having the best men that we could borrow from the Imperial service to look after the education of the cadets. General Hewitt, who died not long ago, was an expert in military educational matters. Major General Cameron was a man distinguished not only as a military expert, but also as a great scholar, and he has been entrusted with some of the most important duties that could be assigned to

any man, and which required not only military training, but great mathematical knowledge. I think the leader of the Government should have thought twice before he made any changes. I know what a deep interest he has taken in the institution, and I am sure that if he had been fully in charge of the department, if unfortunately the Minister of Militia had not been taken away from his duties by the accident which we all deplore—I am quite certain if the leader of the Government had gone into the matter himself that these changes would not have taken place. Although I do believe and assert that these changes will not do any good to the institution, let us hope that it will not destroy its usefulness.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I only wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to one matter. I entirely agree as to the importance of these cadets being instructed in French. Here is the confidential report made last year by the Major General commanding the forces, and I will just call the hon. gentleman's attention to this :

I attended the class under instruction in French, every member of which had been over two years at the college, and the ignorance displayed was astounding, especially in Canada, where French is so much spoken, and where, I should say, it is of so much importance. In any English college, civil or military, a far higher proficiency would be found.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Might I ask if the Major General is familiar with the dual language ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend is a better judge of that than I am. I will send for the Major General and you may have a conversation, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. BRITTON. I must crave the indulgence of the committee to make a few remarks on this, as it seems to me, most important subject. I am aware that the dying hour of the session is not the most opportune time for any lengthened remarks, and so, at another session, if I am here, I shall take an early opportunity of calling the attention of this House, not only to the work this Royal Military College was intended to do, but to the work it is doing. My anxiety during this debate has been that a prejudice may be excited against the Royal Military College, which may do it harm. We know how these words of disapproval spoken in the House do have that effect, and unless the discussion is full and exhaustive, unless all the facts are presented, sometimes harm is done. I am glad to be relieved from any serious apprehension on that point, in view of what has been said by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) and by the Acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright) in defence of this college. The hon.

gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) said it was as good an institution as it possibly could be made, and that was true at one time; but from whatever cause, we must admit that up to last year the college was running down, and we have only to look at the last report of the late commandant to be satisfied of that. I am not blaming Major General Cameron. I said last session what I had to say in reference to his dismissal. I am not putting all the blame on him, because I think he had to work against operating causes over which he had no control, and which militated against the college, but even taking his last report, a change was absolutely necessary and the Government have been fortunate enough, as it seems to me, to secure the services of the gentleman who is now at the head of that institution. Colonel Kittson comes to us in the prime of life, and I have taken the liberty of ascertaining what his record is. In 1884-85 he was Aide-de-Camp to the Brigadier General at Aldershot. 1885-86, Aide-de-Camp to the general commanding the western district. In 1890, district staff officer of Bengal. In 1891, he was in India and served in the Manipur campaign as Deputy Assistant Adjutant General to the force. He was mentioned in despatches, and is entitled to wear the Manipur medal, "with clasp." It will be seen that Colonel Kittson, the new commandant, has a good deal of staff, and some war experience. He comes to us as a scholarly man, with a clean record, and with a desire to make this institution as perfect as it possibly can be made. And, being in the prime of life, and with a love for the profession he has chosen, and with his ability, I am satisfied that the institution can now be made what all hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this House desire it should be, in the interest of Canada. The leader of the Opposition intimated that Major General Gascoigne wanted to get rid of an officer superior to him, but, as the Acting Minister of Militia said, whatever may be General Cameron's standing in the army, as to the military college, he was under Major General Gascoigne. The remarks of the leader of the Opposition are hardly borne out by what we see in the last report of Major General Gascoigne. I find on page 18 of that report a word or two which I will read:

A new commandant having been appointed, I do not propose to hamper him with any recommendations of mine. Suffice it to say, that, from conversation with him, I am satisfied that all his views are in the right direction for the general improvement of the college.

All that shows that the Major General desires to give the new commandant an opportunity of dealing with the college. Satisfied of his ability he is not desirous to interfere by any directions of his own. I find that Major General Cameron was not satisfied with the results of the college. In his report on the 12th March, 1896, after giving

Mr. BRITTON.

pretty full statistics in reference to the Canadian militia, he says this:

From these considerations, I conclude that the college, in order to meet the defensive requirements of Canada, should pass out not less than 40 cadets a year. This would involve, at the very least, 160 students, to deal with which number the existing instructional equipment, &c., and staff is approximately fitted.

He admits that with the present equipment of the college they were prepared to turn out 160 cadets in the four years, or forty cadets in the year, while, as a matter of fact, the number was reduced far below that. That is something that had to be remedied, or otherwise we would ruin the military college altogether. As I have said, I am not prepared to lay all the blame upon Major General Cameron, but I do say that we should have had better results from the Royal Military College. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the course ought to be reduced to three years, and as to the course of instruction to be followed. On that point, it will be remembered that the visitors to the college made a majority and a minority report. Mr. Sanford Fleming presented his minority report, and although that perhaps recommends a much greater reduction than the present commandant would be willing to have take place, it is in the line, to some extent, of what is now proposed. There is no intention whatever of having the Royal Military College give merely what knowledge can be obtained in the ordinary colleges, but it is intended, so far as I can understand the Order in Council, to be what it was originally intended to be; and as we have the minority report of the visitors together with Major General Cameron's own statement, it will be seen that a trial must be given on some other lines than that which has been pursued. The objection made to the Royal Military College, is that its usefulness is gone, and that it costs a great deal too much to maintain it. What is the fact in regard to that? If we admit that an expenditure of \$2,647,000 was necessary for all the purposes of militia and defence in 1896-97, as we have admitted by passing the Estimates, or that \$1,887,056 is necessary for the same purposes for 1897-98, then what, I ask, in comparison is \$65,000, if the whole amount were asked—but the Minister of Militia is reducing it to some extent—for the maintenance of this Royal Military College? The Government have the buildings there, and a situation that cannot be surpassed; and, in order to make the militia system complete, by maintaining this college for the training of officers, this expenditure is a mere bagatelle, considering the advantage such an institution is to Canada. If in no other particular than that mentioned by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), the advertising it gives to Canada, and to have trained men, who if the emergency arises

will come here and do their part in the defence of the country. It is well worth the money it costs to maintain it. When we are ready, as we always are, to spend money cheerfully on such occasions as the present, and when we spend so much money as we do every year for immigration agents in all parts of the world, when we are doing so much to advertise the country, no one who considers the matter properly would for one moment object to an expenditure of \$60,000 or \$65,000 for such an institution as the Royal Military College. There are men in all parts of the world today who have graduated from the Military College, and wherever they are they stand as firm friends of Canada, advocating it within the sphere of their influence. We can hardly limit the value of this to Canada; and while they are doing this, they are ready and willing at any time to come to Canada if Canada should need their services.

Mr. TISDALE. I want to ask a couple of questions of the acting Minister of Militia. I understood the hon. gentleman to say the other day, in reply to a question of the hon. member for Toronto West, in connection with the item of \$30,800 for gratuities to officers to be retired, that Lieut.-Col. John Gray, lately inspector of stores, was not to get a gratuity because the office was to be abolished. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that though Colonel Gray had only been a short time in that position, he had previously been director of stores, previously to that of Brigade Major, and previously to that in some other position; so that he has been actually fifteen or twenty years in the service in different positions. Therefore I cannot understand his case not being favourably considered when these gratuities were being considered. I would ask the Minister to look into the matter.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These facts certainly were not brought to my attention. Prima facie it would appear somewhat hard if under the circumstances stated Colonel Gray got nothing. I will cause inquiry to be made. Of course, as the hon. gentleman is aware, these arrangements were made under the supervision of Dr. Borden, who is unfortunately detained from being present here. I am quite sure that when the matter is brought to his attention, he will consider it with a desire to do full justice to the officer in question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I had opportunity as Minister of Militia to know the services which Colonel Gray rendered to the force. He was one of the most efficient officers we had in the service. He took part in the troubles of 1885. In any position he was entrusted with, he fulfilled his duties in a manner perfectly satisfac-

tory to the department. It is not a question of the length of time he has been in the position he now occupies. He has been prominently connected with the organization of battalions, he commanded an artillery battery, and was one of its most prominent officers; he has also been Brigade Major, as my hon. friend has stated; and, since I left the department, I know that he has continued to fulfil the duties of the office entrusted to him in a manner perfectly satisfactory to the department. It was because of his efficiency that he was selected for the position he occupied up to the time he was removed. If these pensions are to be distributed among the members of the force who are to be retired, I think it would not be doing justice to a faithful servant of the public and to one who has filled his various positions always with credit to himself and with satisfaction to the department, if he were to be left out; and when the hon. Minister who is now in charge of the department looks into the case, I think he will agree with me that Colonel Gray should not be overlooked.

Mr. TISDALE. I have one more question to ask the hon. Minister. It is about the Oliver equipment. Last year I brought the matter up. The Minister then had it under his consideration. I do not know whether my hon. friend as acting Minister of Militia has had it brought to his attention, so that he can come to a decision with regard to it; but it is getting somewhat stale, and if we are going to adopt it, it should be done soon. I understood from the Minister of Militia last year that he desired to have some test made before he finally decided. Could my hon. friend tell me anything about it? I notice it is not in the Estimates. It is a matter of \$5,000. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government for a patent right over the whole Dominion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman will understand that in matters of that kind, owing to the unfortunate illness of Dr. Borden, things have necessarily been left over. I believe a number of sets had been provided and sent up here to trial, and a number of the sets are now being actually distributed to the permanent corps.

Mr. WALLACE. On behalf of Colonel Gray, who was one of the volunteers in 1866, the time of the Fenian raid, and who has been an active member of the force ever since, I ask that some recognition of his services be made by the Government. For many years he was the commanding officer of the Toronto Field Battery and was a very faithful and efficient officer. He brought that battery up to the highest standard, and I certainly think that the Government ought to recognize his services

by allowing him fair and reasonable recognition and compensation.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I shall bear this matter in mind. It has been brought to my attention for the first time, and I am afraid the gratuities on hand will not go for enough to enable us to pay Colonel Gray at present, but I shall not lose sight of the matter.

Mr. **TISDALE**. If there are no other supplementaries this year, I would ask that if it be found that Colonel Gray is entitled to compensation, that his case will stand as well as if it had been brought up this year.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I shall draw Mr. Borden's special attention to the case.

Resolution agreed to.

Lachine Canal Enlargement..... \$216,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before this item is disposed of, I wish to ask about certain returns which have been pending for a long while, but have not yet been brought down. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals promised to give us, when we were last on these Estimates, a list of the dismissals on the different canals and the persons appointed in the places of those dismissed. Apart from that, I also asked for a return with reference to the commissioners appointed for trying these offensive partisans. I have had a great deal of trouble getting anywhere near that return, and when it was brought down I found that it was incomplete, and that the information I specially needed with reference to the commissioners who were conducting investigations along the Intercolonial Railway was not contained in it. I gave notice in due time, it was ordered by the House and was over and over again promised by the hon. First Minister, yet we are still without it, and I propose at this stage to object to the present estimates going through until I have a satisfactory answer why it is that this return, which was ordered by the House a month ago and which was promised over and over again by the First Minister, is not brought down. If the delay be due to deliberate intent or to carelessness, neither is a sufficient excuse.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I can only tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as the return connected with my department is concerned I have not once but repeatedly called on the officers in the department to hurry up with the preparation of these returns. I have had the officers of the different canals written to, and some of the returns have not yet come to hand. The return ordered with reference to the examinations on the Intercolonial Railway is very voluminous indeed. There is a very great mass of documents and evidence, and I could not undertake to do more than get in the re-

Mr. **WALLACE**.

port with the staff at my disposition. It will be impossible for me to have the returns laid on the table this session with the staff available. I regret that as much as the hon. gentleman, but there is a limit to the capabilities of the department, and that limit has been reached. There is not the slightest disposition on the part of the officers to delay, they have no encouragement from me to delay, and I cannot do better than I have done in this regard. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with the delay, but it is quite inevitable I can assure him.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not think that is satisfactory in the least. Mr. Williams, to my knowledge, was appointed commissioner to travel up and down the Intercolonial Railway and has been holding investigations for the last three months. I have not even yet got Mr. Williams's commission, and not one word of testimony, which has been for the last three months before him. If the Minister of the department cannot get a return from his officers in three or four days, there must be some reason for it outside the capabilities of the department. I have no disposition to refuse to take any reasonable excuse, but I leave it to the House and the present leader of the Government if the excuse given by the hon. gentleman is one which can be accepted. Any one knows that these returns could be got in in 24 hours if they were wanted.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I understand that the information is in the hands of the hon. Minister at present. He says the pay-rolls of all the canals coming to the office with the reports of the dismissals and of the new appointments, and the department has to pass on these pay-rolls and reports before paying the men, and I am certain that if the hon. gentleman were to ask a return from Mr. Pottinger of the dismissals on that road he could get it in at least five days.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I also asked some questions about the dismissals on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal when the estimates last were before the House, but the hon. gentleman did not seem to know anything about them. That does suggest that there is something wrong with the hon. Minister or his employees, because there is no reason why this information might not be got inside of a few hours, and we are naturally led to the conclusion that there is not an urgent disposition to give the information to the House. This reluctance is very unfair to the House, because we have now very little time to discuss these questions. The hon. gentleman cannot plead ignorance, because his attention was drawn to these matters several times. Now, if I understood him correctly, he says he is not prepared to give that. Surely he could have asked his officers to furnish that information, or if he did, and they have

not furnished it, he has dismissed men for more trifling causes than disobedience. I think he ought to have the information for the House. It seems to me very unreasonable that any information we have is so reluctantly given and so little given not even enough to enable us to judge intelligently whether we should or should not vote these estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I make a suggestion which I think will help business; and that is that we should let all items connected with railways and canals stand and go on with the others. For I assure the House, without any wish to be obstinate or anything of that kind, that we must have that information before these Estimates are passed. Time will be saved, certainly, by allowing us to go on with the other items and let the Minister exercise his ingenuity and power to get that information for us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not the slightest objection to the item standing, and I can remain here as long as the hon. gentleman can. I am willing that the discussion of the item should continue as long as it is deemed necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well. Take the challenge then, and we will remain.

Trent Valley Canal ..... \$650,000

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask in respect of what contracts it is proposed to send the \$650,000 that stands in the Main Estimates on the Trent Valley Canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been no new contracts entered into on the Trent Valley Canal. The contracts in respect to which these sums are to be paid were running during the last session of Parliament. I can give the hon. gentleman the items if he so desires.

Mr. BENNETT. In connection with the Trent Valley Canal, I wish to make a few remarks. I do not propose to go into details of the work or to speak about the greatness of the enterprise either locally or from a national point of view, because, that has been dealt with on previous occasions. But I do propose to say a word on the breach of faith committed by the Ministers in respect to this great work. There has been spent on this canal system a large amount of money, and the Estimates show that this year it is proposed to appropriate \$650,000 in respect of the uncompleted contracts. The Minister of Railways and Canals last year did a very creditable thing in going over the route of the canal, and inspecting it personally; and, though I am free to admit that, at a banquet in his honour in Peterborough, he said he was not prepared to say he would advise his colleagues to go on with the work, still, he held out fair hopes and to those who heard him that he was fairly impressed with the enterprise. But

I do not see anything on the Main Estimates to show that supporters of the Government representing constituencies along the route of this canal have interested themselves to secure further appropriations for the work. The Supplementary Estimates are down and the hon. members for North Ontario (Mr. Graham), South Victoria (Mr. McHugh), East Peterborough (Mr. Lang), East Hastings (Mr. Hurley), North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and last, but not least, the hon. member for North York, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), have evidently not been able to prevail upon the Government to expend a dollar beyond what had already been before decided upon. Against the Postmaster General we have special cause of complaint in this regard. The hon. gentleman came into the riding of East Simcoe in February last, conducting, on behalf of the Government, a campaign against my humble self as the Opposition candidate; and if there was one thing above another that the Postmaster General was enthusiastic about, it was in depicting the greatness of the Trent Valley Canal. He pointed out that for years and years this great national undertaking, despite the protests of the Liberal party had remained in abeyance; but now that the Liberal party were in power and now that he held the responsible position of a Crown Minister, the people could rest assured that the work would be proceeded with with most commendable vigour and would be proceeded with even more commendable vigour if the Government candidate was elected in East Simcoe. I cannot help thinking that it is the defeat of the Government candidate in that riding that has caused the Government to neglect the work as they have done on this occasion. I can only say as I have said before, that this is a work that deserves the attention of the Government. I regret that the supporters of the Government are so deaf to the entreaties of the electors they represent and so lukewarm to the interests of the work that none of the members appear in their places to say a word in its support. This failure to make further appropriations must be due to one of two things—either these gentlemen have appealed to the Minister and failed, or else that they have not appealed at all. I hope, for their own sake, that they have not appealed to the Minister at all, because, if they have appealed and failed, if the Minister has turned a deaf ear to them, these gentlemen must be driven to the painful conclusion that they have no influence at all with the Ministry. This is the only public work of general interest and great importance now being carried on in the province of Ontario. While millions are going into the province of British Columbia and the province of Quebec, surely the great milch cow, Ontario, should have some little regard paid to it in respect of public works. I can only express the hope that the supporters

of the Government along the route of the canal have not asked the support of the Government at all, rather than that they have appealed to the Government in vain. If there is a constituency that is particularly interested in this work equal to that of the riding of East Simcoe, which I have the honour to represent, it is the riding of North York which is represented by the Postmaster General, and I cannot help thinking that when the Postmaster General is doing such a great work in attempting to fill up the depleted exchequer by saving small sums on mail contracts while immense sums are being spent in other provinces, the hon. gentleman should have been rewarded by his colleagues by having some appropriations made for this great work which is of such great interest to the province of Ontario and the riding which he represents. I presume that at this late hour of the session it would be useless for me to address any remarks to the hon. Minister or his colleagues to ask them to make any further grant in this regard, and I can only express my regret that the Government has disregarded the wishes of the people along the route of the canal and have not undertaken substantial contracts this year. If the Government supporters along the route of the canal are satisfied with the Government turning a deaf ear to them, they are not expressing the wishes of their constituencies. More particularly is the word of the Postmaster General pledged to the people of East Simcoe that this work would be undertaken and pushed on with more commendable vigour than was shown by the Conservative Government and that it would not be kept as a bait for electioneering purposes, but that it would be carried on with despatch.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like, if possible, to have an answer from the Government as to whether they think it is well to refuse information to the House, information which this House has every right to ask, information which every member of the House has a right to have given to him. Every one who knows what constitutional government means, every one who knows how it has been carried on in this country, knows that the meanest member in this House has the right to stand in front of the Ministers and ask each one of them, every reasonable question, and have from each of them all reasonable information in respect to his department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said he would allow this item to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. If the item stands, of course it will save time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister said just now that it would stand.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I cannot make the good constitutional speech I was about to make.

Amount required for salaries of examiners and other expenses under the Civil Service Act, including \$250 for the secretary and \$100 for a clerk, which sums may be paid to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$2,450

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase of \$150 owing to the fact of an inequality existing between the salaries paid to the civil examiners. They are to receive \$400 each, but for some reason which I have not been able to ascertain, one of the examiners has only been paid \$250; and this puts them all on an equal footing.

Department of Indian Affairs—

To provide for payment of allowance to private secretary of the hon. the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, from 1st January to 30th June, 1897.....	\$100 00
To provide for payment of amount due to Edward R. McNeill for services rendered as stenographer and typewriter, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.....	25 00
To provide a further amount for clerical and other assistance.....	504 74

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the first item, no provision was made to pay the salary of the private secretary during the current year, and as in previous years it has been customary, the money is now asked for to remunerate Mr. McKenna for services rendered by him in that capacity. For the item of \$504.74 the explanation is this: The amount voted for this service in the main Estimates for the current year was \$1,300. That was found insufficient owing to the necessity of employing additional typewriters; and two clerks being absent on sick leave, necessitated a larger expenditure for extra clerical service than would have been the case had the services of these clerks been available. After the 30th of June the expenditure in this branch will be considerably reduced. Mr. Edward R. McNeill, owing to a pressure of work, was engaged for a month on the authority of the Deputy Superintendent General.

Mr. SPROULE. How much salary does he get in his regular position?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell. He gets this extra.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the Minister of the Interior? Is the school question not settled yet?

Mr. SPROULE. We have had no explanation of this. This man may be getting \$1,000 or \$2,000, and we have no explanation but the fact that he is employed and paid

in one department, and we vote him an extra sum of money in another. Perhaps he is being paid a sufficient amount in the other department to which he belongs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will read the hon. gentleman the explanation given by the department. Mr. McNeill's services were engaged for a month on the authority of the Deputy Superintendent General. The funds provided by Parliament for extra services became exhausted. He would have been paid out of that in the ordinary way, and when funds became available he was refused, because he had not passed the preliminary examination required by the Civil Service Act until after he had performed the services for which he claimed payment.

Mr. SPROULE. He could not legally claim a dollar.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Therefore, Parliament is asked to vote it.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that because the funds were exhausted he could not be paid, and had the funds not been exhausted he could not have been paid, or if he had been paid, he would have been paid illegally.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman sees the explanation—he was employed by the late Deputy Superintendent General, by whom he was paid out of the funds voted for this service generally, without coming to Parliament. Then an Act was passed providing that nobody should be employed unless he passed the preliminary examination. Then the Auditor General, of course, could not pay this gentleman who had been employed and had done work as stenographer and type-writer.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Act passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and he was paid before the Act passed, out of the general vote. Then when he performed a month's work after the Act passed, the Auditor General would not pay him, and therefore we ask Parliament to vote him the sum of money we owe him.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the use of these words, "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the Civil Service Act prohibits the payment of an account of that kind, and we have to come here and get a special vote from Parliament for it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know it is not in the department of my hon. friend. It shows once more that if that school question had been settled properly, we would have had the Minister of the Interior here.

Privy Council—To provide for salary of extra messenger, other than those who have passed the civil service examination, anything in the Civil Service Act notwithstanding..... \$303

Mr. FOSTER. This seems to be becoming a regular abuse to provide for the salary of an extra messenger over those who have passed the civil service examination.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is for one of your old friends who has been there all along.

Mr. FOSTER. How many thousands have passed the civil service examination?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he a good messenger?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has been there all along.

Department of Railways and Canals—  
Contingencies..... \$ 800  
To pay arrears of subscriptions for newspapers and other publications..... 1,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are these contingencies?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are all Tory newspapers that you ordered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was represented to me by the deputy head of the department that \$1,000 would be required to pay arrears in respect to a number of newspapers.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you stopped all these Tory papers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. These are arrears to subscriptions for newspapers which have been running from three to ten years. It has been ascertained that these papers have been coming to the department, and I suppose it was difficult to stop them. At all events the bills have been received in the department, and they are unpaid.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be too much to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give a list of the papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can get you a list if you give me time.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister says that he has stopped all these papers; will he now say whether or not he is going to have others put in their places?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have started a few others.

Department of Printing and Stationery—  
To provide for the payment of G. S. Hutchison for three months from 31st March, 1897, and M. P. Mungovan for two months from 12th April, 1897, each

at the rate of \$400 per annum, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$106 66

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. These two men employed by the Queen's Printer who have not passed the preliminary examination, and we have to vote them the money.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Why do you not go to the list?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. These are men with technical knowledge.

Department of Militia and Defence—

To pay G. S. Maunsell, 3rd class clerk, allowance while filling the position of the chief architect, from 1st October, 1896, to 31st March, 1897, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$ 200

To provide for the salary of P. Weatherbe, appointed architect, Department of Militia and Defence, O.C., 22nd February, 1897—Salary as a 1st class clerk from 1st April to 30th June, 1897, at \$1,400..... 350

To provide for departmental contingencies, 1st April to 30th June, 1897—

Clerical and other assistance.... \$ 600  
Printing and stationery..... 1,200  
Sundries ..... 750

2,550

Mr. **SPROULE**. How much does G. S. Maunsell get and where is he employed?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. He was a third class clerk, but a man who has, I am informed, very much more capacity than the average third class clerk, and on the retirement of Mr. White who was the architect in the department this gentleman did the work that had formerly been discharged by him for a period of six months. This allowance is made to compensate him for the work that he did. His salary was very small, only \$400 or \$500 a year, and he received a gratuity of \$200 for the extra work. The others explain themselves. Mr. Weatherbe was appointed to the vacant position and his salary begins on the 1st of April.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is Mr. White entirely out of the service?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am informed that he has been dismissed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce intend to recognize the principle that any clerk who for a temporary period in the absence of a higher class clerk, performs the duties of the higher class clerk shall have to be paid the difference in salary?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I am not giving him the difference in salary. The salary in one case was \$1,400, and in the other \$400. The differ-

Mr. **BLAIR**.

ence in salary would have amounted to \$500 and I am allowing him \$200 only.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But it is acknowledging the principle that if for the time being a third class clerk chances to do the work of a clerk higher than himself he is entitled to the salary. That used to be pretty generally allowed, but in the last eight or ten years the circumstances have been very exceptional where it has been allowed. We followed out the rule laid down by Sir John Macdonald that it was not a healthy practice that any clerk in that position should get the difference between the salaries or even an allowance. It is regarded as a proof of confidence and adds to the prospects of a clerk for promotion when he is singled out to do the work.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This gentleman had been brought in at an extremely low rate. He was not one of our appointments I think.

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, he was one of our appointments.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. He was brought in at a very low salary, I think far below his proper qualities, and Dr. Borden promoted him to a second class clerkship.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am not saying anything about his efficiency.

Department of Agriculture—

Salary omitted in main Estimates..... \$ 175  
Further amount required to pay for contingencies to 30th June, 1897..... 2,150

Mr. **FOSTER**. What are these amounts for?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The first item is in consequence of a change. When we were arranging the Estimates it was expected that one of the clerks would have been promoted to be a first class clerk, but there was no room for him in consequence of my predecessor not having superannuated one of the clerks whose superannuation he had intended to provide for, and I had to keep him in the list of second class clerks. In doing this my deputy had made out the minimum rate of second class clerks, but in consequence of the statutory increase in former years, the salary was \$175 more than the amount which my deputy at that time thought it to be.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This is only a readjustment.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Yes. The second item is owing to the fact that last year I asked for \$7,500 to pay for extra clerical assistance. I did so coming into the department as I did at the end of the last fiscal year, and expecting that the ordinary estimates, as prepared by my predecessors would do for the ensuing year. When I came to investigate I found

that there had always been Supplementary Estimates, sometimes to the extent of \$3,000, and that those supplementaries would make a much larger sum than \$7,500. We found that the sum was insufficient. Out of this \$2,100, \$600 is to give to my secretary as an allowance over and above the usual provision of \$600. In some departments this paid out of the extraordinary ordinary vote, but in my department perhaps by error, my department paid out of the ordinary contingencies. Therefore, this amount would not have been more than \$1,500 had this not been the case. When I took charge of the department that amount was necessary to pay some extra clerks there. I have reduced the number very considerably, but have not been able to get them down below that point.

Department of Justice—

To pay F. H. Gisborne for extra service rendered during first session of 1896, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$150

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am not going to find fault with giving this money to Mr. Gisborne for extra services, because he is a very good lawyer and a very good officer; but I wish to call the attention of the Government to the injustice done in this department to the French lawyers and to the province of Quebec. I may say that the present Government is not responsible for that; I had occasion to draw the attention of the late Government to it, and without success. I must ask my hon. friends to do justice to the French element, and to the Quebec lawyers, and to the Quebec people at large in this department. We do not find in the department one employee who can write or read French sufficiently well to read a letter sent there, and you do not find in the department an employee who knows the civil law of Quebec. That state of things should not be allowed to continue. I ask this Government to remedy this injustice which was done by the late Government, and I ask them to remedy it at once. I will add this further, to show the injustice there was done to the province of Quebec; last year there was a French assistant law clerk, Mr. Mignault, who served under Mr. McCord.

An hon. MEMBER Who knew no law

Mr CHOQUETTE He knew the law, though he was a Tory. He resigned, and he was replaced by a man from Ontario named Mr. O'Brien; he may be a very good man, but I think it was an injustice to Quebec to appoint him. I mention this to show that we are not treated as we ought to be, and I ask this Government to remedy this injustice. I say that we must have in the Department of Justice a French Canadian lawyer who can read and write French, and we all know that the French Canadian lawyers can

read and write English too. I say that we should have an officer in the Justice Department who knows the civil law of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) mean to say that the Solicitor General does not know any French law, and that he cannot read and write French.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I was referring to the officials and not to the Ministers. Mr. Newcombe and Mr. Gisborne are good men, but they cannot read and write French, and they do not know the law of Quebec. We have a right to have a French Canadian lawyer there and we must have him.

Mr. QUINN. Does not Mr. Power understand the Quebec law.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon member (Mr. Choquette) has referred to the late assistant law clerk of the House. I may say that Mr. O'Brien was appointed by my predecessor.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I know.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that Mr. McCord is as perfectly familiar with French as he is with English, so that the remark of Mr Choquette would not apply in his case.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I say that when a French Canadian lawyer resigned he ought to have been replaced by another French lawyer from Quebec. I know the present Speaker is not responsible, but I say the late Government was responsible.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Mignault was appointed at a salary of \$1,800, with the understanding that his work would be during the session, as the work of the law clerk finishes at the end of the session or a few days afterwards. He was here during one session and did his work to the satisfaction of everybody. Mr. Mignault is a very good lawyer, well up in both civil and constitutional law. He is one of our most clever young men in Quebec. The late Speaker issued an order that Mr. Mignault should stay here all the year round, and as he practised law in Quebec and was secretary of the law reports, he resigned. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) that he should have been replaced by a lawyer from Quebec, but the late Speaker replaced him by a gentleman of the name of O'Brien from Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not a sound principle to lay down that because a Frenchman or an Englishman occupied a position which became vacant, it ought to be filled by one of the same nationality. It is only the fitness of the man that should be taken into consideration and not whether he is French or English. There are some positions in the service where it is necessary

to employ an official familiar with the French language, but this is not one of them, and there is no urgent need for demanding that a French Canadian should be appointed. The Government should only take into consideration the qualifications of the man for the office.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I cannot agree with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). I agree with him that it should not be laid down as a rule that one nationality should be perpetually represented in a certain position within the gift of the House of Commons or the Government, but as we have two systems of law in this country, it is very important that the civil law of Lower Canada should be represented in the officers of this House. I know, as every lawyer in Montreal and Quebec knows that Mr. Mignault occupies a prominent position, and is one of the rising men at the bar of Quebec. He is not only a civil lawyer, but he is of high standing, as a constitutional lawyer, and has published works on that subject. I have not a word to say against Mr. O'Brien, who replaced him, but the fact that Mr. Mignault was here representing the civil law of Quebec should be considered when one was appointed to his place. His successor should have been replaced by a man who had the same requirements and qualifications which he possessed.

**Mr. MILLS.** Is not Mr. McCord a Quebec lawyer?

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Yes.

**Mr. MILLS.** And he wanted an Ontario lawyer as an assistant?

**Mr. SPROULE.** Evidently the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) has misunderstood me. I do not contend for a moment that there were not positions around this House where a French lawyer or a Frenchman was necessary, because there are many of them; but I objected to the principle that because a Frenchman was in a position which might be as well filled by an Englishman, or vice versa, the same nationality should always be represented in that position.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) speaking as he has done, but I am very sorry he did not make that nice little speech to the ex-Speaker, and try to prevent that injustice.

**Mr. WALLACE.** When these gentlemen are laying down this principle, it is just as well that we should know whom Mr. Mignault succeeded. He succeeded Dr. Wicksteed, an Englishman. I know that Mr. McCord, the law clerk, is a Quebec lawyer. I do not know whether he is a French Canadian or not, as there are many French Canadians with Scotch or Irish names. But he is a Quebec

**Mr. SPROULE.**

lawyer, and he fulfils the requirements which these gentlemen say are essential to the proper performance of the duties of that office. I know further that there were a number of applications for the position which Mr. O'Brien occupies. Among the essentials in the applicant was an accurate and exact knowledge of the French language, and I know that Mr. O'Brien fulfils that requirement. If the rule was to apply that a Frenchman was to succeed a Frenchman, and an English-speaking man an English-speaking man, Mr. Mignault would not have been in that position at all.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Does Mr. O'Brien stay here all the year round? I suppose, Mr. Speaker would know.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The Clerk informs me that he does. The reason Mr. Mignault retired was that he was not willing to do so.

**Mr. QUINN.** If the facts were in favour of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), there would be a good deal to be said on this side of the case, considering the necessity of having some one in our legal departments here who understands our Quebec law thoroughly. But I think the facts are not in favour of the position taken by the hon. gentleman, because we have in the Department of Justice a Quebec barrister in the person of Mr. Power, who is probably better versed in the civil law of Lower Canada and in constitutional practice than any other man of my acquaintance in the province of Quebec. Besides, he speaks French fluently and writes it perfectly.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** He is only for the criminal cases.

**Mr. QUINN.** Oh, no. Any business that I have had to do with the Department of Justice in the last fifteen years I have always transacted it with Mr. Power, in both civil and criminal matters. In the law department of the House here, Mr. McCord is a Lower Canadian barrister, understanding and writing and speaking both English and French perfectly.

**Mr. BRITTON.** I would like to ask what Mr. Gisborne's salary is. It seems to me that if a man is paid a reasonably good salary, there is no necessity for the Government paying him an additional sum.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** We are in this position, that these services were rendered, and the understanding was made to pay him before we came into office.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What about the contingencies?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** In nearly all the departments arrangements had to be made to get the bills paid for these newspapers, which had been running for years. Some of these

newspapers had been discontinued years ago, but their publishers continued to send them, despite the orders of the department, and claimed that the law was on their side.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It seems to me that the proposition laid down by my hon. friend is not correct. If the papers were refused, surely their publishers have no claim against the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is right as a matter of law, but the papers were continued to be sent, and I believe they were continued to be received.

Department of the Interior—

Amount required to pay salary of T. W. Hodgins from 1st January, 1897, to 30th June, 1897, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	\$197 50
Amount required to pay Beresford H. Scott, salary from 13th July, 1896, to 11th November, 1896, inclusive, at \$400 per annum, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	132 75
Amount required to provide for the salary of Mrs. Theresa A. Richardson from 1st March to 30th June, 1897, at \$400 per annum, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	133 33

Mr. SPROULE. I think we ought to have an explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first vote of \$197.50 to Mr. Hodgins arises in this way. The Civil Service Act of 1895, which came into operation on the first of January, 1896, provided for the continuous employment of the clerks in the Service at the time, but by some hiatus did not provide for the continued employment of the messengers who were in the Service. This person has been employed as a temporary messenger in the department since 1887, but, not having passed the preliminary examination, his case was not covered by the Act, and consequently the House has to vote the special amount. Mr. Scott came into the department on the 13th of July, and worked till November, 1896, but could not be paid owing to the fact that he had not passed the Civil Service examination. This is to ask the House to pay him for the work he has done.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did you employ him if he had not passed the examination? You did it in violation of the Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He passed the necessary examination afterwards. The examinations take place only at certain periods of the year. This gentleman worked a little before he passed. He has passed since.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been repeatedly refused employment for young men in the

past on the ground that it was an imperative necessity to pass the examination.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is quite right. He came into the department at that period and was paid his monthly pay, and this is asked to cover it. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I know that in my department it cannot be done. It was done in this case, and he went up for examination and passed, and is now regularly in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish we could have the assurance that that sort of thing is not going to continue.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am with the hon. gentleman perfectly, and I think all my colleagues are. This happened before the Act was well understood by the incoming Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was well understood. It is a short act, and I am sure my hon. friend, whom I am happy to congratulate on the new honour which has been so deservedly given him, is familiar with it. If my hon. friend, who wears so worthily the honour he has so well deserved, would only now signalize this new honour by giving us a promise to have no more of this irregular business done, we will be well pleased.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I can give that assurance.

Mr. BERGERON. It is but a continuation of what we have had in the past. For the past eighteen years the Supplementary Estimates have been filled up with additional salaries to employees. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) used to spend all his time ventilating these matters and I am sorry we do not see him here to-night, but the vigilance of hon. gentlemen opposite seems to have departed with their change of sides.

Mr. SPROULE. We might just as well repeal the Act altogether. For if you look at the remaining items, you will find that they are nearly all parallel with this. The exception is where we find the Act properly applied, and the rule is to violate it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will explain the case of Mrs. Richardson. She had passed the preliminary but not the qualifying examination, and it was thought that inasmuch as she had passed the preliminary examination she was entitled to go on and get paid. On closer inspection, it was found that that was not the case, and that she had to pass the qualifying examination as well. She has been in the service many years. She was employed in the post office at Montreal from 1893 to 1896.

Department of Inland Revenue—Amount required for contingencies to meet expenditure for the remainder of the year. \$1,000

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). \$200 of this is for the clerical help, and the remainder is to pay accounts of the late Government due in 1896 for stationery, printing and parliamentary publications.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to ask the Controller for further information with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Doheny.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I told my hon. friend the other day that Mr. Doheny had not been dismissed, but that we were under the necessity of dispensing with his services along with the services of several others who were temporarily employed because we had not funds to pay them. We had to dispense with a certain number of temporary employees, and we dismissed those who had given the least satisfaction. There were three in the department at Montreal whom I decided to dispense with because their record was not of such a nature as to entitle them to be kept on, and Mr. Doheny was one of them. If the hon. gentleman insists on my going further into this case, I hope it will not interfere in any way with Mr. Doheny's future prospects, but I must say that while he bore an excellent character for sobriety and integrity he had the lowest marks possible for industry, reliability and efficiency.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he means by reliability and efficiency as distinguished from integrity.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. You can understand that a man may be perfectly sober and honest and at the same time so neglectful of his duty and so wanting in energy as to be utterly unreliable. The late Government had to suspend him for neglect of duty on the 18th of February, 1896.

Mr. QUINN. I do not wish to charge the hon. gentleman, whose goodness of heart we all know, with having dismissed this man without being forced really to do so. I fully appreciate the pressure which is brought upon him from the back benches to dismiss this man and fill up his position by somebody else.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not filled up his position.

Mr. QUINN. I am glad to know it has not been filled although that is not much consolation to Mr. Doheny, but I find that he has the highest marks for sobriety and integrity. And I cannot distinguish between integrity as distinguished from industry. I must confess it requires close reasoning to which I am not equal at the first bluff, to distinguish between reliability and integrity as explained by the hon. Minister and between integ-

Mr. DAVIES.

rity and industry as explained by him. I am afraid I would not like to make a charge against the officer who is so efficient as to make this report, but I am afraid also that there has been some hot firing on the part of the gentlemen who has made the report to the hon. Minister, for which the Minister is responsible, and that these words have been used merely for the purpose of finding an excuse for making away with some officers who were not as popular with the superior officers as they might have been. How can a man be called a man of integrity who neglects his duty? How can he be called efficient in the service? Yet this man has the very highest mark for integrity, while, at the same time it is charged that he is unreliable and inefficient. Now, I must confess again that I do not see how the two conditions could exist—first class character for integrity, and the very lowest possible class of character for reliability and efficiency.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think it most comical that we should have to defend arrangements made by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power, and that have remained for so many years. This is the way the report is made up, with classifications under five heads—industry, sobriety, reliability, integrity, and efficiency. It is not my fault if that was the classification; this report is prepared for me by the officer who is at the head of that branch of the department at Montreal, who was appointed years ago by hon. gentlemen opposite and whom I consider an efficient officer. As to pressure from the back benches, of which the hon. gentleman speaks, I may say that no hon. member has spoken to me in any way about the suspension I have been obliged to make. I kept these officers as long as possible. It might have been wiser for me to not keep them a day longer after I took charge of the department; but I thought I would keep them as long as possible, and, ultimately, when I was obliged to choose, I chose three officers whom the reports shows not to be satisfactory servants.

Mr. QUINN. I notice some of the ex-Conservatives in the House; probably they could give us some idea what this classification means.

Mr. WALLACE. The Department of Customs, under my administration, knew nothing of that classification.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—

To provide for deficiency in salary for J. F. Fraser, technical officer, as authorized by Order in Council..... \$ 18 75

To provide further amount required for civil government contingencies—

Clerical and other assistance..\$ 800  
Sundries..... 1,500

2,300 00  
\$2,318 75

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This is covered by the explanation I gave before. The item of sundries is to pay a balance due on account of newspapers. The item of clerical and other assistance includes \$200 for a type-writer for Mr. Venning, the clerk who has charge of the Behring Sea matter, the remainder \$600 being to pay for the private secretary of the Minister, the regular allowance. The item of \$18.75 for Mr. Fraser is to be voted because Mr. Fraser was allowed an increase, which was only 25 was voted. The balance is to make it up.

Administration of Justice—

Amount required for the travelling expenses for the Right Honourable the Chief Justice of Canada, appointed a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.....	\$1,000
Expenses of Judge Forin in travelling to Vancouver to be sworn in.....	117
Further amount required for judges' circuit allowance, British Columbia.....	1,000
Further amount required for expenditure in connection with the administration of justice.....	7,000
	\$9,117

Mr. **FOSTER**. With reference to this first item is it to be understood that the Right Hon. Chief Justice of Canada is to have this allowance yearly for travelling expenses.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How does it come to be given this year?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The Right Hon. Chief Justice was appointed to the Privy Council and was going home for the first time to take his place, and it was thought fitting and proper that he should be paid a reasonable sum for travelling expenses. He is to be sworn in and we thought it proper to make him this allowance for this occasion.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is the Chief Justice to attend the Privy Council or is the appointment simply honorary?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. By no means. He intends to be sworn in and take his seat at the Privy Council and hear cases.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Will he go over in other years?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. He may not go. But there may be occasions when he will go, but not so as to interfere with his duties as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He will go over, no doubt, when his services are sought or are deemed desirable.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Are his expenses to be paid?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no understanding that we should pay them, but it was thought fitting to allow him a reasonable sum on this occasion.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. I do not see how he can sit in the Privy Council without interfering with his duties as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and then he can hardly hear cases that have been heard in the Supreme Court—he can hardly hear appeals from the decisions of his own court.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The same point struck me. But my hon. friend will see that the Privy Council sits in the months of July and August, I believe, and during those months the Supreme Court does not sit, that being the time for vacation. He can sit in the Privy Council in July and August without interfering with his duties here.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. But he can hardly try an appeal in a case which he has tried as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court here.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He will be in the same position as the Chief Justice from Australia.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. He can only sit in other cases than those coming from Canada and that may not be of much service to us.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You have many cases going from Quebec, do you not?

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Yes, from the court of review.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I do not understand that there would be any technical objection to the Right Hon. Chief Justice sitting in the Privy Council in appeal upon cases he had heard in the Supreme Court.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I am not aware what the practice is.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). There would be no practice to the contrary unless there were some special rule or regulation. Of course the expediency of such a course would be one consideration and the right to sit in such cases would be another. I do not know whether the Government have taken the matter into their consideration—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, the matter was canvassed a good deal.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What additional salary does the Chief Justice get for these duties?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. None.

Mr. **SPROULE**. There surely can be no objection to his travelling expenses being paid.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that item of \$7,000 required for expenditure in connection with the administration of justice ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what it says. We cannot give the details of that.

Mr. BERGERON. I think we are entitled to have some explanation about this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will give you the information on concurrence.

Legislation—House of Commons—

To pay sessional indemnity to Hon. Dr. Borden, who has been prevented from attending in his place in Parliament by reason of personal injuries incurred by him from an accident on the Intercolonial Railway while travelling in the discharge of his public duties.	\$ 1,000
Salary of the Deputy Speaker for session of 1897.....	2,000
Additional amount for publishing Debates.....	25,000
Additional amount required for sessional clerks, including 2 extra clerks for Whip's rooms at \$300 each per session of 1897.....	7,500
French translators during session of 1897.....	1,568
Additional amount required to cover expenditure during recess for French translation.....	1,400
Contingencies, including clerical assistance to leader of Opposition for session of 1897, \$300.....	1,000
Session messengers.....	6,300
Pages.....	1,761
Allowance to restaurant steward at \$2.50 per day.....	245
Servants—Bath rooms.....	381
Sessional charwomen.....	475
Contingencies—Housekeeper .....	250
Gasman, during session.....	60
To pay E. St. O. Chapleau in full of all claims in connection with his patent poll-book, in use since 1891.....	1,000
To provide for the payment of deductions which may be made from the sessional indemnity of Hon. Messrs. Laurier and Prior, and of Messrs. Domville, Tucker and Tyrwhitt, owing to their absence from the House of Commons in consequence of their attendance at the celebration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee.....	1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one omission in this vote, Colonel Boulton's name, of the Senate, should be in there. It is a pure omission, which will, of course, be corrected.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly Colonel Boulton should have his as well as the others, if they be paid at all. But I would like to have a full explanation of the item to pay E. St. O. Chapleau \$1,000 for his patented poll-book.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The present Clerk of the Crown in Chancery invented a patent for a poll-book to be used by deputy returning officers in polls at the general elections.

Mr. SPROULE.

That poll-book was used in the elections of 1891 and 1896, all through the country, by the Government. I believe and know of my own personal knowledge, that it contributed very largely to the accuracy of the returns, and to the convenience with which returns could be made up of the reports of the polls. The Government made use of this without any definite arrangement with Mr. Chapleau. But in the Patent Act there is a clause by which the Government may use a patent obtained from the Commissioner of Patents, by paying a proper return for it. Mr. Chapleau's claim had been before the Government for some little time. We investigated it, and believed that it was just and fair, and that some payment should be made to him ; and after considerable discussion, the amount of \$1,000 was agreed upon. I may say that in the payment of this claim all further claims with regard to the use of this poll-book are done away with, and the Government is to have free use of it in future.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Has my hon. friend investigated this himself ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend be surprised to learn that it was not used at all in the election of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the papers under my hand but, speaking from memory, I certainly understood that it was used in the elections of 1891. I may say that I was personally present in the polls in the election of 1891 where it was used in my county.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend tell me what is the device ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The device is that instead of as heretofore has been the case, all sheets, returns, and everything that is used in the polls being loose and free, they are bound together in the shape of a book and they are put in the order in which they are used, so that there can be no mistake ; and the returning officers have to make their returns and file them up page by page as they go through the books.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend aware that that was reported against both by the Minister of Agriculture and the Acting Minister of Agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am aware that there is a report from three members of the last Government, who investigated the matter and who recommended that payment should be made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the Government in placing that item in the estimates. I was one of the commission who investigated that matter. We called in the Auditor General and it was

really upon his evidence that the commission decided that the claim should be paid. I think it should have been paid long before the present moment. The Auditor General stated before the commission that the book in question, however simple the device may be, saved \$5,000 to the Government in every general election which took place. Upon the evidence which the Auditor General gave before the commission, a report was made, as the Minister of Agriculture has said. That report was or should have been passed. When the matter had been submitted to the committee for investigation, I think the report having been made, should have been adopted. However, for some reason or other it was not. I think that the evidence upon which the commission based their conclusion was the evidence of the Auditor General, who is better able to judge than probably anybody else as to the saving which this invention made to the Government. I think the item is a small amount compared to the saving which the invention has effected, and which simplifies considerably the work of the returning officers all over the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend bring down the whole papers, and the poll-book, and all the data, so to speak?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If my hon. friend wishes to have it all, I can do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. In reference to the first item in this vote, I do not presume that there is a member on this side of the House or the other that objects to it. We all regret very sincerely the accident which befel the Minister of Militia, but there are two cases of injustice that have been done to members of this House to which I wish to draw attention. I refer to the cases of the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) and the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingstone). I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to this matter. The hon. member for West Hastings, in the session of 1895, was taken ill, and after being at Bermuda, returned to the House within four days of the close of the session. Had he been here for the four days at the beginning of the session and then gone away, he would have been entitled to his full sessional indemnity, but on account of only being here four days at the end of the session he only got paid for four days. I think that is a case that should be considered, and that he should be granted his indemnity. The session that year was seventy days in length. There were twelve days' allowance which reduces it to 58, and he was present four days, which will leave 54 days at \$8 a day reduction, making \$641 that he ought to be paid at least. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingstone) broke his leg and could not come to the House until the end of the session. I men-

tioned these cases last year and thought there would be a supplementary vote for them this year. I am satisfied that the Minister will put them in the Estimates for next year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with what the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has said. I remember bringing up the case of the member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingstone). I am also aware that the hon. member for West Hastings was ill and was obliged to leave the House, and if other members are paid I do not see why these gentlemen should not be paid. At the same time that the hon. member for South Waterloo had broken his leg another member was absent for a whole session and was paid in full. Why should we have these cases of discrimination?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Go for the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I go for what is right in this matter and as I support the Government I generally go for what is right. I hope the Government will consider this matter and see that these two hon. members are treated in the ordinary manner. I think there is time enough yet to see that these hon. gentlemen are paid. The Government will find in the Auditor General's Report the number of days that they were absent by reason of their illness, and it can be put in the Estimates this year. Of course it is a debt that belongs to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but after a few years we will have them all wiped out.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government what state of health the Minister of Militia is in now, and whether we may expect to see him back soon?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I had very great hopes that the Minister of Militia would have been able to join us before the end of the session, but he has been obliged to return to the sanitarium in New Jersey, and, although, of course, he is making satisfactory progress, he will require a considerable period of rest before he can return to his duties.

Mr. BERGERON. In reference to this item "French translators during the session of 1897, \$1,568," I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to give me the names of these translators.

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to these general items for legislation a general remark may be made. We have had two sessions during the fiscal year 1896-97. During the last session a vote for legislation was taken which would cover an ordinary session of about 100 days. It was a shorter session than the session of the ordinary length, and what is being done now is to put in to the Supplementary Estimates the amount that

is required additional to what was voted last session to cover the two sessions, and it has been calculated very closely indeed. That is what these Supplementary Estimates really include. These, together with the large vote of last year cover the two sessions. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Bergeron, asked me the names of the four translators. They are Mr. Gelinas, Mr. Moffet, Mr. McMahon, Mr. Prieur.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of \$1,400: "Additional amount required to cover expenditures during recess for French translation"? Cannot the ordinary translators do the work after recess?

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the ordinary translation that always has to be done during recess, and this year it amounted to \$1,400. In 1894-95 it amounted to \$1,830, and in 1895-96 to \$2,240. So that it is considerably less this year than during the two years before.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there has been a large accession to the number of sessional messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there has not.

Mr. FOSTER. Or sessional clerks?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there has not.

Mr. FOSTER. They stand as before?

Mr. SPEAKER. The sessional clerks stand as before.

Mr. WALLACE. Then why do you want \$6,300 for sessional messengers? I think there used to be 25 messengers.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, there used to be 45; now there are 49. There are 25 sessional clerks now. Taking the item of sessional messengers we assume that this session will last 98 days, and the amount required to pay the sessional messengers this session would be \$12,005, but we have an unexpended balance on hand from last session of \$5,717, and that leaves the difference of \$6,288 that we ask for.

Mr. BERGERON. Then I understand that this is for salaries?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, they are paid \$2.50 a day.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to congratulate Mr. Speaker on the uniforms which have been given the messengers around here. I think it is an improvement. I would like to know how much this clothing costs, and whether the messengers are expected to pay a part of it themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is paid out of the Sergeant-at-Arme's contingencies. The suits cost \$18 each. They are worn only by the door-keepers and those who appear in public.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has a suit to last?

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole Parliament.

Mr. POWELL. What are the duties of these sessional clerks? There is great doubt prevailing among new members respecting what the duties of these officials are. As to myself, I have been here three sessions and I do not know what rights I have in them.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are 25 sessional clerks. That is the number established, and the number which has been kept, and they are practically permanent clerks. No dismissals have been made except for cause, and very few of these. That question we have discussed before. The duty of these sessional clerks is to do all the writing that may be required during the session of the House, by the officers of the House, or special work concerning the House from the members. I feel in the same position as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I was in the House a good many sessions and I never got the slightest assistance, or asked it, from any of these clerks. I never asked them even to direct an envelope or anything of that kind, but I learn this session, that while the clerks have not been busy in the earlier part of the session, in doing the regular official work and the work directed by the Clerk of the House, some members have occasionally asked their assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

Mr. SPEAKER. In making up voters' lists, I think, and directing envelopes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not at all sure that this is quite right for members to do; but I would not have said anything about it had not the question been asked in the House. I do not want to mention any names, but several hon. members have done it, and no harm came of it because it was only done while the sessional clerks were not doing the public business of the House. We perhaps ought to come to an understanding that these clerks are not for the use of members, and any how, there are not enough of them for all the members to use.

Mr. POWELL. I was very credibly informed that one of those gentlemen acts as private secretary for one of my confreres from the province of New Brunswick. Is that the case?

Mr. SPEAKER. No clerk is permitted to act as private secretary for any member.

Mr. POWELL. But it is done as a matter of fact, whether it is legally allowable or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. As a matter of fact, I think an attempt has been made to have that done, but it was at once stopped. I may say that there are seven or eight sessional clerks in the post office doing the work there.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that some of these old and experienced members who have been around for so long have really got a cinch on these clerks, and younger members like myself have not caught on to it. Seriously speaking, I think it ought not to be allowed.

Mr. POWELL. It is a trivial matter, but I would like to understand it. I have no objection at all, but during the last two years I have employed a stenographer and type-writer at my own expense. I much prefer to do so and feel more independent. But one does not feel exactly right, when some hon. gentlemen have the advantage of getting this work done by officials of the House, as I know to be the case during the present session. I never saw these clerks nor do I know anything about them, but would it not be better that members should pay for their own private secretaries, and if all these extra clerks are not necessary to transact the public business, let some of them be dispensed with.

Mr. SPEAKER. I entirely agree with the hon. member (Mr. Powell). If it is found that some of the 25 sessional clerks have leisure enough to do private service for hon. members, the number should be reduced down to what is really necessary for the business of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what rule does he follow in apportioning the rooms in this House. I have noticed that during the last two sessions, nearly all the rooms seems to have been gobbled up by the supporters of the Government, and that very few are left for the members of the Opposition. Even the old locks have been taken off and new ones put on for fear any one would get in. A number of these hon. gentlemen seem to forget that any member of Parliament has a right to go into any room in this House, and if not open to kick it open.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Where do you get that law?

Mr. SPROULE. It has been done before. The allotment of rooms between members on one side of the House, and members on the other is entirely out of proportion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned that. When I was chosen to occupy the Speaker's Chair, I found that some new disposition of these rooms should be made and I had to take some responsibility about it. I got a list of all the rooms that had been used both by Ministers and by members on both sides. I found that a certain set of rooms had been used by the Ministers and their supporters, and that another set of rooms had been used by the Opposition. I thought that the fairest possible thing to do was to reverse that order, as the country had re-

versed the places of the Government and the Opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. You should have carried out the same principle that the Government did with regard to their pledges.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know whether the former arrangement was strictly fair or not, but I followed that arrangement. The Ministers of to-day have the rooms that the Ministers of former days occupied, and the Opposition of to-day have the rooms that the former Opposition occupied. I think there were a few trifling changes made to suit individual cases. I asked the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) to arrange the rooms allotted to the Opposition, and I asked some gentlemen on this side of the House to do the same with regard to rooms allotted to Government supporters. There are many hon. members of this House who undoubtedly would like to have some private rooms, but I cannot make the room.

Mr. BRITTON. I suppose the leader of the third party continues to occupy the same room as he did under the late Government. We have obtained some information to-night about these sessional clerks that we did not know before, and so far as I am concerned, I have neither had a typewriter nor a secretary from the employees of the House. If the Opposition, when on the Government side did wrong, we have followed their example, and we have done right. That is about the size of it. I do not think they were justified in taking all the rooms, if they did so. When our friends were in power, I do not think they took all the rooms, because I understand that they were then better divided than they are to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. They were divided in exactly the same way.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is the case, I would like the Speaker to make a more equitable division of them, according to the numbers on both sides of the House. If the present condition of things continues, I think some of us will be inclined to assert our rights before many sessions pass, because there is not a place about this House where we have a room, small or large, in which we can write a letter or do business, with the exception of room No. 6 in the corner, which is very small.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And that is a very comfortable room, and I hope you will enjoy it a long time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I made a suggestion to the Minister of Public Works a few days ago. He came to look over the matter with me, with the view of speaking to the architects, and seeing whether it was possible to provide a little more accommodation. It struck me that in the tower above the tower

room, and between that and the clock, there is a space for three or four large committee rooms. A stair might be put up or an elevator put in from the ground floor to the top. I hope that if the Minister of Public Works recommends an expenditure for some such improvement, the House will approve of it, so that we may get some more accommodation for the members and the officers of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. We have some very nice rooms down stairs, and since we have all become prohibitionists, and do not see any more of those spirits which were distributed down there under the late Government, I do not see why those rooms should not be divided into offices for the use of members.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not been down there since the change has been made, but I am assured that those rooms are used.

Mr. BERGERON. I have passed there, and seen them empty.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like, as chairman of the Debates Committee, to draw the attention of the Speaker to the fact that I have received several complaints from the "Hansard" reporters, which I think are quite justified, to the effect that their quarters are not such as they should be expected to occupy any longer. I had occasion to call on the Speaker in regard to the matter, and I hope that during the recess he will be able to provide better quarters for these gentlemen, who work very hard, and are not accommodated as they ought to be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would move to insert the name of Colonel Boulton in this resolution, and to change the words, "House of Commons" to the words "Houses of Parliament."

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) With regard to this question of rooms, I am in entire ignorance how many rooms are available for the use of members other than members of the Cabinet; and perhaps it might be desirable, in the interest of young members of the House, that some information should be afforded on that point. Last session it struck me to a certain extent that as there were then from the province of Nova Scotia ten Conservative members and ten Liberal members, it did not seem quite right, although possibly it might have been unavoidable, that the ten gentlemen belonging to the Liberal party, or some of them at least, should be accommodated with a room, while those of us on this side of the House had no such accommodation whatever. I recognize what the Speaker has said in regard to that; but at the same time I do not know that the number of members from Nova Scotia representing each party in the previous Parliaments would justify a reversal of the arrangement during the pre-

Mr. SPEAKER.

sent Parliament, because, I think, that the numbers formerly stood about sixteen to five or seventeen to four, whereas during last session, they stood exactly equal, and now they stand, I think, eleven to nine. I understand that the Speaker is doing the very best he possibly can under the circumstances, with the rooms at his disposal. I am not making these observations in any spirit of finding fault, but merely to direct his attention to that particular incident, and to say that I am sure the Conservative members from the province of Nova Scotia would be very glad if they could have some limited accommodation of that kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I have heard it stated that the members have been paid their full sessional allowance, and have been permitted to go home on condition that they secured pairs. If that is so, it is unusual so long before the end of the session. Ministers tell us that their estimate is for ninety-eight days; I think this is the eighty-ninth day, so that there are ten days more that the session is to last, according to the Ministerial estimate. Two or three days ago pairs were made, and members were paid in full and were permitted to go away. That would be two weeks before the end of the session.

Mr. SPEAKER. No members have been paid in full.

Mr. WALLACE. I had this statement from the accountant to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. He made quite a different statement to me to-day. He had deducted two weeks allowance, and I told him to hold back in future three weeks.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker tells us that to-day he told the accountant to hold back three weeks when more than half the members have been settled with. The arrangement was that a member could have a pair, and if he had not lost any time he could then be paid in full.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not repeat that. No member has been paid in full. The leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government informed me on Friday last that they expected the session to be prorogued this week. That being the case, I followed the practice that has been in vogue the last eight or ten years of allowing members, when pairs had been arranged for, to draw to a certain amount, leaving an ample margin for the days to come, and that margin was fixed at two weeks. To-day it looked as if the session were to last a little longer than the middle of this week. I spoke to the leaders on both sides and they could not give me any assurance that the session would finish this week, so that I refused to sanction any more payments unless the accountant held back enough to cover three weeks ahead.

Mr. WALLACE. The arrangement which Mr. Speaker mentions is something which I never heard of before. The practice, as I understood it, has been to allow members to be paid off a day before business was concluded. A different state of affairs appears to prevail now, and a majority of the members have left and apparently will not return this session. That could only have been done because the pairs were recorded in the accountant's room, a thing I never heard of before, and I should like to know by what authority the Speaker allowed this. To my knowledge that has never been done before.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members on both sides are here who know what practice was followed in former years.

Mr. WALLACE. If this has been done before, it has been done without my knowledge. I have been here quite a number of years and have never known of any such arrangement in any previous Parliament. I do not think that the Whips have any right to make any such arrangement. The effect of it is that members who ought to be in attendance while the House is sitting have been practically invited to go away, and a very generous invitation like that having been given by the Government or the Speaker, many of the members have availed themselves of the privilege, and more than half are absent when most important business has yet to come before it. We have votes of millions of dollars for scores of railways throughout this country and liberal votes for other purposes yet to pass, and there are besides important measures on the Order paper which the Government may endeavour to push through, and all these matters have to come before us after the members have been invited to take their departure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might state what has been the practice for many years. When the Government thought they saw the end of the session and came to an agreement with the leader of the Opposition, and the Speaker gave his consent, the rule has been to allow members to pair, particularly the members from a distance. These were generally given the first consideration and allowed to start two or three days in advance of the others, but always on condition that they secured pairs and that the pairs were signed by the Whips and approved of by the Speaker. They then were paid by the accountant and allowed to go. This rule has been in vogue several years.

Mr. SPROULE. I never knew such a rule to obtain except during two days before the close. Two days is the longest time I have known the privilege granted to members to leave. This is the first time that the privilege has been given them so early, and it is an abuse that should be stopped. There is no denying the fact that a number of the

members went home before the Supplementary Estimates came down, and there are yet some millions of dollars to be voted before the work of the session is through. I think I am safe in saying that half the members have gone home. I cannot understand why the Whips should have authority jointly with the Speaker to break the law. They are just as amenable to law as other members of the House. Law makers should never be law breakers. The hon. gentleman has not replied to my question about the Senate.

Mr. INGRAM. It seems to me there is considerable misunderstanding in this matter. Last Friday and Saturday there was an impression among many members that the session was about to close, and when they applied for their pay they were told by the accountant that if they had lost only five or six days they would be entitled to their full indemnity. I applied for a pair, and was told by the accountant that when the Speaker certified to it, I could draw my indemnity. I applied to the Speaker and he refused to certify, having changed his opinion about the length of the session. He has been charged in an indirect way with inviting members to leave the House. I must say he did not invite me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Having been called on, I wish to endorse what has been said by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The Whips have assumed no authority and have no desire to violate any law. During the eleven sessions I have been a member of this Parliament, the practice mentioned by my hon. friend has prevailed, and it is very strange that hon. gentleman occupying the position of the ex-Controller should not be aware of it. When the Government were satisfied they saw the end of the session an arrangement was made, after consultation with the leader of the Opposition, by which members, especially those living for a long distance or who for some particular reason were anxious to leave, were paired, the pair was initialed by the Speaker, and in many cases they were paid off. That has not been the case, I understand, this time, and the same procedure has been allowed on this occasion. The Government thought that the session was to close in a few days and many members were anxious to go. It was not only as a matter of accommodation and convenience to the members that the pairs were made on both sides. After consultation with the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who personally spoke with the Speaker and whips, it was agreed that pairs would be made. So far as drawing money they were not entitled to is concerned, no such thing took place. It was merely a convenience to members on both sides who wish to leave. Probably in this case it may be, the leaders of the House on both sides were somewhat mistaken as to the number of days the

House would be still in session. But as to any irregularity or breach of the law, I understand—I do not know of my own knowledge—that the accountant calculated as near as he could the number of days that the House would probably be in session and deducted enough to cover that. I think it was somewhat unfortunate, probably, that through the press and through members themselves, the conclusion should be come to that business of the House should be closed earlier than it will be found possible to close it. There seems to be a consensus of opinion on the both sides that the House would prorogue on Saturday last or to-day. That feeling became unanimous and many of the members made business appointments which made it necessary for them to leave Ottawa. It became a great convenience, I understand, for members on both sides to carry this out. If one was mistaken, all were mistaken in regard to this matter, but so far as custom can guide us, it has been the custom in the past to do as they have done. And not only that, but in the past when the day was fixed, members were paid without any deduction, because it was assumed that the business of the House was practically over; and if the convenience of the members made it desirable that that arrangement should be carried out they would pay them in full. I do not think there is any irregularity or difference this year as compared with previous years, except that members have been generally mistaken as to the time of closing.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with that. I have been too long a member of the House to accept it. I have seen application made year after year for members to go home a few days before the session ended, and it was refused. What was the situation here? The hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) says that the business was over. But this commenced last Thursday, I think—

Mr. TAYLOR. Friday.

Mr. SPROULE. Thursday or Friday. And since then we have had Supplementary Estimates for \$1,200,000. And laid on the Table on Saturday night, only in fact, in time to be before hon. members to-day, we had railway resolutions for \$3,863,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are revotes principally.

Mr. SPROULE. But they have all got to be voted, and the propriety or otherwise of voting each subsidies must be considered by the House. In these two items alone we have an amount of nearly \$5,000,000. And nearly half the members of the House have gone home thinking that the session was nearly ended. It must have been very bad judgment that led them to the conclusion that the session was coming to an end two or three days before the railway subsidies were brought down and before the Supplementary Estimates were laid on the Table.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very glad that this discussion has taken place and that two old and experienced members of the House, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) object to anything of this kind. I shall certainly not put myself out of the way to do what they seem to consider this an irregularity. I am sure I do not want to miss the faces of hon. members on either side until the end of the session, and if it is supposed by hon. members to be in the public interest that this arrangement should not be arrived at, I shall certainly not be a party to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood from the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that some one had made the statement that members were drawing money that they were not entitled to. I did not hear any hon. gentleman make that statement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Some members stated that they would be paid in full; and if so, they would receive money that they would have to refund.

Mr. WALLACE. Not at all. If a member has attended here during the session and has lost no time and goes away two weeks before the end of the session, he has not to refund the money, because he would be only 12 days away, the resolution passed by the House authorizes that. So he would not have to refund any money. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has told us that the same procedure was followed this year as has been followed in previous years. Does he mean to tell us that in any of the eighteen sessions he has been in Parliament, the House was asked to vote sums of money such as have been brought before us at this late stage of the session—\$3,600,000 for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, about \$7,000,000 of railway subsidies, and over \$1,000,000 of Supplementary Estimates, every one of these Bills presented to the House after these hon. gentlemen had been authorized to leave? And the hon. gentleman for North Oxford tells us that the business of the House is practically over.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. WALLACE. Why, "Hansard" will record that he used these words, almost the last words that he did use.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I never said anything of the kind. I said that this course was followed on previous occasions when the leaders of the House thought the business practically over. I did not say it was over this session.

Mr. WALLACE. The words I took down were to the effect that this arrangement was arrived at because the business was practically over.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** If the hon. member understood me to say that, he misunderstood me.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I understand him to say that he used the words that the business was practically over, but that he used them in the sense that when the business is practically over, that is the custom followed. I accept his explanation. But the question remains the same. The arrangement was made, and the members have their pairs and had arranged to leave and draw their money, as they could properly draw it if the session ends two weeks from last Friday. The business practically over? Why, the business of the House is, apparently, practically commencing. We have been marking time for a good portion of the last three months. We have been discussing abstract questions and practical question, but the Government have withdrawn the practical questions from the consideration of the House altogether, or at any rate, for the session of Parliament. And we still have to vote the Supplementary Estimates of \$1,000,000 and over, railway resolutions amounting to \$3,600,000, which, by the terms of the resolution, may be multiplied by two, making about \$7,250,000. We have in addition to that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; we have some absurd Bills by the Postmaster General to give him unlimited power in letting contracts. Those members who went away were told—surely they would not have gone away unless they were told that the business was practically over, and that they might return to their homes. The leader of the Opposition, it is true, has gone away, but that does not dissolve the House. If the leader of the Opposition had made such an arrangement as that, I for one am not bound by such an understanding, more particularly as the important business of the House is still up for consideration. I am surprised that such an arrangement should have been made. Of course, I do not want to censure the Speaker, because I know that he is speaking with perfect candour when he says that he will be delighted to see us all remain here while the session of Parliament lasts. But they have already left, many of them, and these important matters are now coming up, they are being rushed in and rushed through in the last days of the session. I repeat that I think that the course of the Government is censurable in leaving over until the end of the session these important measures, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, measures that they should have announced at the beginning of the session, in order that they should have been maturely considered.

**Mr. LISTER.** That is the way you used to do.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I never had any responsibility in these matters; if I had, I would not have done that way. But I don't think the hon. gentleman can even

make out a case against the preceding Governments, because whatever might have been their fault in that respect, there never was in the history of the Parliament of Canada such a disregard of the necessities of the situation as we have before us to-day. I know it has been claimed in the past that the Government brought down important measures during the last hours of the session, and I know that sometimes that was the case. But can any hon. gentleman on the Government side point out in the history of the past an instance to be compared with this where all these important matters, matters which should have the fullest explanation and time for consideration were crowded into what was considered to be the last few hours of the session. I think the hon. member for Lambton himself realized the importance of that when he got up on Saturday and objected to a further reading, because the rules of the House did not permit of two stages to be gone through in one day. Now, if that be the case with regard to one of these questions, it is the case with regard to the whole of them. Perhaps the Government will find it their duty to summon back all those members who have gone away expecting that the business was concluded.

**Mr. LISTER.** For fifteen sessions the practice that has been pursued this session has been always followed. When members could get pairs the accountant paid and let them go.

**Mr. WALLACE.** That was an arrangement made within only twenty-four or twenty-six hours of the close of the session.

**Mr. LISTER.** Not at all, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The facts are as stated by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the whip of the Liberal party. I have no doubt that if he took the trouble to look up "Hansard" he will find that it was when the House was nearly empty that hon. gentlemen opposite brought down their railway resolutions and passed them.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Let us get on.

**Mr. FLINT.** It strikes me that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is scolding the wrong people; he is scolding the congregation for being small when those who are deserving of censure are not here to hear him. The absence of hon. members is a matter between their own consciences and their constituents. We have no right to censure hon. gentlemen who are absent, and who are best qualified to judge of their own circumstances.

**Mr. HENDERSON.** It appears to me in looking over the Government benches that possibly a good many of those who are now absent and have gone home were kickers anyway. It may be just as well for the Government that that arrangement was made.

To pay William Stoker for statistical services rendered..... \$281 11

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a claim ten or eleven years old, standing down in Halifax. There were some vital statistics required, of which a Protestant obtained the Protestant statistics and a Catholic obtained the Catholic statistics. There was some dispute in regard to the payment and one individual was paid after the case had been carried into court. The other gentleman whose name is here mentioned has not been paid, but in due justice to him as the other similar claim was paid, I thought he ought to be paid, and so we ask for this item.

Stockholm Exhibition..... \$1,300

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the expense you have incurred?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. Is that an exhibition that has taken place?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is an exhibition that is taking place this summer. We had intended exhibiting there, but lately it was found that very few foreign countries had prepared exhibits. We have not sent forward our exhibit yet. The exhibit is prepared, and a gentleman has gone over to see whether we should send it forward or not.

Mr. FOSTER. This gentleman will cost more than the exhibit.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the gentleman?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is one of the immigration agents who has gone.

Mr. BERGERON. What is his name?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His name is Jones.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the celebrated Jones who used to be around the Parliament buildings here?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I never saw him until I saw him this summer.

N.W.T. Exhibition of 1894—To pay unsettled accounts for labour, materials and supplies ordered by officials under authority of Lt.-Gov. Mackintosh.... \$13,537 63

Mr. WALLACE. Before the item is passed, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture as to when it is intended when accounts shall be in. A gentleman wrote to me to-day from the North-west stating that Parliament was going to vote an amount and that he desired to send in an account. I do not know whether that account has been presented or not. If accounts have not been presented will they be paid out of this fund?

Mr. HENDERSON.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not asking Parliament to give me any money to pay accounts I do not know anything about. It is some three years since that exhibition was held, and I presume that all the accounts have been submitted.

Mr. WALLACE. The accounts were presented no doubt to Governor Mackintosh, and the people did not know that it was intended that they should present them to the Minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are the accounts which Governor Mackintosh has supplied to the department. I have personally made an examination into all these accounts.

Mr. WALLACE. The accounts were sent to the one who incurred the indebtedness, Governor Mackintosh, and they did not know that they were going to be sent to the Minister.

Mr. BERGERON. How are they going to be paid, by cheque personally?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the whole amount be sent to Governor Mackintosh to pay it himself?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Cattle Quarantine—To cover Governor General's warrant..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is to cover the Governor General's warrant which was issued last fall in consequence of an epidemic of swine plague which occurred in Ontario.

Miscellaneous—To pay the widow of the late Dr. H. B. Macpherson, gratuity equal to two month's salary..... \$166 66

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to this matter there was the case of the late Serjeant-at-Arms. He was for forty years in the service of the House. He was superannuated and at the end of a year he died. If a gratuity is to be granted in the case under consideration, I do not see why it should not be granted in the case of the widow of the late Serjeant-at-Arms. He had been a contributor to the superannuation fund, and had paid in a large amount of money to that fund, and it was only for one or two years that he received superannuation allowance. In view of the amount which he had paid in, it would not occasion the country any loss to pay a gratuity to his widow. I think she is entitled to it by reason of the eminent services which he rendered to his country.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you think that we dare work on Jubilee Day? I am afraid we will get into an unseemly wrangle.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will see what you have to say.

Monuments—Battlefields of Canada..... \$1,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This vote, as I understand it, is for the building of a monument. One has already been erected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is for a monument at Lundy's Lane.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think one has been erected as far as I can understand.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am informed that both have been erected.

Her Majesty the Queen's Jubilee—Further amount required to provide for the pay and allowances, transport and general expenses of the militia contingent to be sent to England to represent Canada in June, 1897 (O.C., 15th April, 1897)..... \$4,000

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Before that item is carried, I want to know when the Queen's Jubilee commences.

The FINANCE MINISTER. Now.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Well, then, let us observe it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better adjourn.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman's loyal feelings will not allow him to give to Her Majesty a little money I suppose we cannot proceed. We are doing a most loyal act when we vote this money to Her Majesty, when she asks for it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is too much filthy lucre about this.

Amount required to recoup the Department of the Interior for expenditure incurred in connection with the repatriation of distressed Canadians from Brazil, and paid from the immigration appropriation..... \$3,776 37

Mr. BERGERON. I stated the other night that I had heard that some of this money was used to bring back persons who are not really Canadians; but who had come out to Canada, and gone on right to Brazil, and whose expenses back were paid by the Canadian Government. I am sorry the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not here, because he promised to give me some information on the subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am authorized by the Minister of the Interior to state, that the money was all used for bringing back Canadians.

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with this matter I wish to read a letter which I received to-day. I am sorry the Minister of the Interior is not in his place, but I will

send the letter over to the hon. the leader of the House. The letter is as follows:—

Kenton Station, Ohio, June 14th, 1897.

Geo. Taylor, Esq., M.P.,  
Gananoque, Leeds County, Ont.

Dear Sir,—What inducements will Dominion Government give a loyal, thrifty class of Canadians to return to their native country? I notice a very liberal offer extended to Canadian French in New England States. There are thousands of a better class who would gladly return, who have for years proved truly loyal to their country. Shall be glad to hear from you.

Yours respectfully,

E. EMERY,  
Agent Erie Ry., Kenton, Ohio.

Mr. BERGERON. That fellow is too good to come back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Better keep him away, or he will make trouble if he comes over here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for. It is all contained in a report to Council made by the Minister of the Interior on the 28th of April last:

The undersigned has the honour to bring to Your Excellency's recollection, that, in the month of August, 1896, information reached this Government of the operations of certain agents from Brazil, who were endeavouring to entice Canadians to emigrate to that country, and that about the same time a communication was received from the British Consul General at Rio de Janeiro, inclosing a copy of a letter of inquiry which he had received from a resident of Montreal, and taking occasion to warn the Government of Canada of the entire unsuitability of the climate and general condition prevailing in Brazil to people from more northerly regions. Copies of the Consul General's letter, and of its inclosure, were printed in both the French and English languages and were widely circulated by the officials of the Department of the Interior in those parts of the province of Quebec where the Brazilian agents were at work, chiefly in the city of Montreal. Although it was found that about 700 persons had been influenced by the Brazil agents to such an extent that they had determined on going, the note of warning thus sounded had the effect of deterring over 300, some of whom left the ship after having gone on board with their families and effects; but about 400 persons actually embarked on the expedition, with the deplorable results foreseen by the Consul General, and which have since become matter of public notoriety.

The people concerned were soon reduced to a very pitiable condition, and it became evident that, in the interests of humanity, a great many of them would have to be assisted to return to Canada.

On being convinced of this, Your Excellency's advisers authorized Her Majesty's diplomatic and consular authorities in Brazil to take such action as the circumstances required, and to draw upon this Government for any expense incurred thereby.

Your Excellency in Council has already authorized the expenditure in this connection of \$720.60, in addition to which it has been found necessary to make the following payments:—

1. Draft, paid by immigration cheque, dated 22nd January 1897, for.....	\$ 670 57
2. Draft, paid by immigration cheque, dated 16th February, 1897, for.....	72 11
3. Immigration cheque, dated 29th March, 1897, in favour of H. & A. Allan, for.....	31 94
4. Immigration cheque, dated 15th March, 1897, in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for.....	61 99
5. Draft, paid by cheque, dated 14th April, 1897, for.....	1,737 30
6. Immigration cheque, in favour of Beaver Steamship Line, dated 20th April, 1897, for.....	283 48
7. Draft, paid by cheque, dated 14th April, 1897, for.....	184 21
8. A. W. Reynolds, cheque 12,835, dated 25th January, 1897.....	4 87
9. Royal Mail Steamship Co., cheque No. 12,886, dated 5th February, 1897, for.....	9 30

Total not covered by Order in Council..... \$3,055 77

These payments, as well as those made under Order in Council referred to above, have been made by cheque drawn upon the immigration appropriation. As, however, it would not be proper that the expenditure in question should remain a permanent charge upon the immigration appropriation, the undersigned recommends that an item under the heading "Miscellaneous" be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to be laid before Parliament at its present session, to cover the whole of this expenditure, namely \$3,776.37, and that, when the item is voted, the whole expenditure paid out of the immigration appropriation be transferred to this special vote.

**Mr. BERGERON.** What was the number brought back?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I do not know the number. Instructions were sent to the Consul General in Rio Janeiro to do the best he could to get the 400 who went, and were in pitifully reduced circumstances, to pay their passage back, and to draw on us. We had to trust the Consul General in that matter. They were shipped back to us, and the drafts were sent to us and duly honoured. It is impossible for us to give any more information than that.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Were these people all returned to Canada, or were their passages paid to other countries?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Only to Canada.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Where is the proof of that?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I have talked the matter over time and again with the Minister of the Interior, and he told me the fact.

**Mr. BERGERON.** The information I have had in Montreal from the Canadians themselves is that most of those who have come back have paid their own passages out of money sent to them by their friends, while most of the money paid by the Gov-

**Mr. DAVIES.**

ernment went to pay the passage of foreigners.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** No. Some in my neighbourhood came back and their passages were paid by the Government. There was a man named Tremblay, with a family of thirteen.

**Mr. BERGERON.** That does not prove that the information given to me is not correct.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I do not deny that there may have been a few foreigners among them, but there was nothing for us to do but to place confidence in the Consul General, whom we had advised, and pay the drafts.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I do not want to be understood as casting any blame on the Government or on the department. My object was to have the Government see that in the future the money was paid properly.

Customs—Further amount required for preventive service..... \$5,000

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** This is for a new cruiser which is necessary in the preventive service for the lower St. Lawrence.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Are you going to have two vessels in the St. Lawrence?

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** The "Constance" is there as well, further up.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** What is the name of this new cruiser, and where has it been built?

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** I do not remember the name. I think it was built at Shelburne, N.S.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** It is well known that the "Constance," which was built somewhere in Ontario, is not at all suitable for the service.

Culling Timber—To enable the department to increase James Patton's salary from \$1,800 to \$2,100, from 1st July, 1896..... \$300

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is this salary increased for?

**The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE.** He has been supervisor of cullers, and his salary was \$2,400. A couple of years ago, without any cause that could be ascertained, his salary was reduced to \$1,800 without an Order in Council or anything of the kind. That was when the great reduction was made in the culler's offices. The whole amount is not returned, but only half the amount.

Resolutions to be reported.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

## SUPPLY.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—River St. Lawrence—Improvement of Ship Channel between Quebec and Montreal..... \$35,000  
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel—To pay estate of late D. J. McCarthy, balance due for rent of ship yard and buildings, at St. Joseph de Sorel, for period from August 4th to December 31st, 1892, inclusive..... \$653 15

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to give us an explanation of what he proposes to do with this \$35,000, and how much is to be voted in the Estimates for this current year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Last year we had an amount of \$78,000, which is quite inadequate. It is out of the question to try to employ our dredges all the time for such an amount, and it has been found necessary, after a careful study of the question by the chief engineer, to have an additional amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. What work is being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work of dredging the St. Lawrence, which has been going on for some years.

Mr. FOSTER. There was an understanding that when we brought down the St. Lawrence to a 27½-foot channel our large expenses would cease. Does my hon. friend mean that any of this money voted for the current year is for dredging the 27½ foot channel, or is that work finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not yet completed.

Mr. FOSTER. That portion remains to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may give the hon. gentleman the points where the St. Lawrence is not yet 27½ feet deep. As my hon. friend knows the work has been going on for years, and we have to-day reached the stage where the channel is 27½ feet deep as a rule. The channel is 500 feet wide where there are curves, and 300 feet wide in a straight line. Now, there are a few points where we want to deepen the river so as to give 27½ feet at low tide. One of these points is Ste. Croix, where we now have 22 feet, and another is St. Augustin, where it is 22 feet at low tide. At Lotbinière and Cap Santé the work is being

completed. It will take some additional money to complete the channel to make it safe for high speed navigation, but if that item of \$35,000 had not been spent we would have been obliged to stop the work of our dredges this year, which would have caused a great loss. I think both sides of this House will agree that we should go on as quickly as possible with the work.

Mr. FOSTER. When this \$35,000 is expended, what will remain to be done ; what is the estimated cost of making the channel 27½ feet straight through ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will remember that this House adopted a vote in the main Estimates of \$200,000. I suppose about \$80,000 will go for dredging work, while the balance will go for dredging plant. The chief engineer tells me, and I may say he has had a long and large experience on that work, that to obtain a channel of 27½ feet with a sufficient width will require an additional amount of \$500,000. Personally, I do not know anything about it. I have given the figures of the amount which has been spent. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), I am sure, knows that this work is of a very difficult character indeed. We have to dredge in the solid rock, which is a very expensive undertaking. My hon. friend will understand in view of the fact that we are going to have a fast line of steamships, that the duty of Canada is to complete that work which was begun long ago. Five dredges are now employed continuing the work which was begun years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not, unfortunately, time to go into this subject, but it ought to be gone into. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works surprised me, and I think he surprised the House, when he said half a million of dollars was necessary in order to complete the 27½ foot channel. My impression was, when I was a member of the Government, that we had pretty nearly completed the 27½ foot navigation, and I would like to have further detailed information to know that that was not so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that my engineers tell me that \$500,000 more than we have asked for is going to be employed. I say that with the amount that has already been voted, that is, the \$200,000, an additional amount of \$300,000 is required.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include the \$250,000 for dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say to my hon. friend that he is getting through his estimate with the very minimum of information, but next year, if it takes all summer, we are bound to have good information, and plenty of it, on these large and extraordinary ex-

penditures. The hon. gentleman owes that to himself, to his party and to the country; and I hope that during the interim he will have his officers, who are well able to do it, prepare a report with reference to the St. Lawrence, showing what has been done, and what remains to be done, so that next year we may face the final expenditure on what you may call the capital undertaking, that is, the getting of the channel down to the required depth and width. After that I quite understand that maintenance must go on. I was much surprised to learn that \$500,000 more had to be spent to get the depth of 27½ feet.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I thought I had given all the information asked of me. I quite understand what my hon. friend says. I was myself surprised when my engineer told me that such an amount would be required, and I shall be very glad to bring down every possible information.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The Minister must also remember that about two years ago the Minister then at the head of the department stated in this House, and I think he was only voicing the opinion of the Chamber itself, that the expenditure for the deepening of the St. Lawrence was about completed, and that we would have at our disposal for work in other parts of the Dominion the dredges that were being used in that work. The Minister had better give us an explanation of that. It seems extraordinary that after such a statement as that we should be called upon to build a new dredge at a cost of over \$100,000, and to incur a further expenditure, beyond what was estimated of \$500,000.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** How much has the deepening of this channel cost up to date?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** About \$3,500,000.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** Is that exclusive of the loan to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Yes, excluding that.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** What is the amount of that loan?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** \$2,000,000, out of which \$1,000,000 was given to them last year before I took office to pay floating debts. When I came into office there was due \$100,000 for work on the Montreal harbour, which I paid, and since then an additional amount of about \$90,000 has been called for and has been granted by me for the same work—the Windmill Basin in the Montreal harbour itself.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright).** There is one thing which we must bear in mind—that the water level of the St. Lawrence

**Mr. FOSTER.**

within the last two years have been lower, judging by the records of the upper lakes, than it has ever been known to be before.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** Is it not a fact that in places where the channel has been dredged to a depth of 27 or 27½ feet, re-dredging has had to be done again, because as the dredging went on the level of the river went down? Is it not a fact that the more you dug out, the lower the water got all the time?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I do not think the dredging we are doing now can have any influence at all upon the upper waters. But my engineers, and the engineers of the Marine and Fisheries Department, as a matter of fact all the engineers, agree that it is quite an easy thing to have a depth of 27½ feet of water. The work has never been completed, and my chief engineer tells me that it will take about three years to complete that work and have a straight channel of 27½ feet. More than that I cannot say. The work was begun before I took office, and I suppose we are bound to complete it. It is a very necessary work; nobody will deny that, I am sure.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I have been led to believe that the engineers of the department believed that it was a very easy thing to get 23 or 25 feet of channel; but it appears now that when you have that depth you have not the amount of water you anticipated, owing to the fact that when you deepen the channel it drains off the river, you lower the level of the water in the river, and you have lower water in the channel. The question in my mind is whether that will continue. Is it not a fact that in the opinion of scientific men the waters of the great lakes lower for a number of years and then rise for a number of years? I would like to ask the Minister if he anticipates that this lowering of the waters of the great lakes will continue?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I cannot, of course, give any guarantee of that; but the dredging we are doing cannot have any influence on the general depth of water in the St. Lawrence, because we are only working at local points, just removing obstacles.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I do not think that is in accord with what the hon. gentleman said just now. In answer to a question which I put, whether certain parts of the river that had been dredged would be dredged again, he answered, yes. This would go to show that as he goes on dredging, the river does not get any deeper, because the flow of water is always the same. I would like to call his attention to the fact that in his report, at page 128, he says that at Pointe aux Trembles they are deepening the channel 28 feet 6 inches. What is the

use of deepening the channel there if the uniform depth is not maintained all along?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The datum was that we should have a uniform depth of water of 27½ feet. The datum has been changed, and we have simply said 28½ feet, which would give in fact a depth of 27½ feet.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend says that he could not give a guarantee that the river would remain at the same level. The department has not succeeded in giving more depth to the river, that is clear. They dredged to a depth of 27½ feet and found that this would not give enough water, and now they are going to 28½ feet. But who is to tell us that the river may not drop so that when they get through, they may have only 25 or 26 feet of water?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is still in the future.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But it is a question which should be gone into before this enormous expenditure is continued. I understand perfectly that it is of national importance that the ship channel between Quebec and Montreal should be deepened—everybody recognizes that, even the Quebecers. But it is our business to see that the country in general shall get advantages commensurate with the expenditure that we have made together with those we are called upon to vote. If this work is going to cost the country as much as a canal from Quebec to Montreal, it would be better to build a canal; or, if there are any points at which you cannot get the necessary depth of water by dredging the channel, build a canal at those points. But it seems to me that the results obtained on the deepening of the channel are not in proportion to the amount of money spent for what some people call a "mud channel." Let me call the hon. Minister's attention to this fact—and if I am not well informed, my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who is well versed in these matters and who has had a great deal of experience, can correct me—it is not only because the channel is not deep enough that large ships like the "Canada" cannot go from Quebec to Montreal, but principally on account of the curves in the river, that is, because the channel is not wide enough. I do not know whether I am right in saying this, but I am informed that the "Canada" of the Dominion Line was constructed for the purpose of the trade from Liverpool to Montreal, that she was sent here on purpose to do that trade; she came over here, and, if my information is correct, notwithstanding that this channel is, almost all through, 27½ feet deep, and at high water the same depth is maintained at Ste. Croix and St. Augustin, she was never brought back to the St. Lawrence because her owners were afraid to send her; and she was taken off that route

and put on the route between Boston and London—

Mr. DOBELL. Perhaps I may be allowed to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) to say that that was not the reason the "Canada" did not return to the St. Lawrence. The reason was simply this—that the owners made an offer to the Government to let her become a regular steamer on this line to Montreal, but they wanted so much a year extra subsidy for the service, and we would not extend the subsidy we were then granting, nor would we promise to renew the subsidy after the first twelve months.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am glad to have this statement from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell), because he knows, as other hon. members from Quebec know, that it has been stated freely this season, and ever since the last trip the "Canada" made to Montreal, that her owners would take her off that line because they would not trust her in the channel between Montreal and Quebec. But not only is this said about the "Canada," which was built for the purpose of this trade, but the same is said about all the large vessels that go from Quebec to Montreal. Among shipping men the impression prevails that no ship of the size of the "Canada" could go from Quebec to Montreal with perfect safety under existing circumstances. I say that if that is true, that the channel is only 27½ feet deep even at high water, at the points where it is not dredged up to that depth, as it is at Ste. Croix and St. Augustin, we shall be obliged—and I call the attention of the House to this point—to expend a much larger sum even than the hon. Minister intimates, not only for deepening the channel but for widening it, making it 500 feet wide possibly, so that large ships can come in from Quebec to Montreal and not touch bottom or get wrecked on the rocks on the side of the channel. I want it to be understood that I am not advocating the claims of Quebec as against those of Montreal; I am not saying that the ship channel should not be deepened or that the work done upon it is not useful to the Dominion of Canada at large, but I may call attention to the fact that a much larger sum than already estimated will have to be spent on this channel to render it practicable to the large ships coming up the St. Lawrence and the still larger ships we shall have in a short time coming to the port of Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the depth of water between the Island of Montreal and the point on the St. Lawrence opposite Three Rivers, which, I believe, is the limit of the tide?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry that my officers are not in a position to give me that information at this moment. Of course I will be ready to answer the hon. gentleman's question this

afternoon. No careful survey, I am sorry to say, has been made so far. I have instructed my officers to make a complete survey, and that is now being done. While I am on my feet I may say I am sorry that my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has thought fit to speak as he has done. There should be no rivalry between Quebec and Montreal. The trade that will not come through the St. Lawrence will go through American channels, and so, it seems to me, the work of deepening the channel from Quebec to Montreal is of national importance. I am free to admit that the work should be conducted as carefully and economically as possible; but, at the same time, I think the House will agree with me when I say that, Montreal being the most important distributing centre in the Dominion, we should not be too sparing in our expenditure in this work. I am quite prepared to listen to all advice that may be given to me with a view to having the work effected with all possible economy, I wish the House would assist me in completing the work. It is not fair to assume that the channel between Montreal and Quebec is not a safe channel. Of the whole distance of 160 miles, 30 miles covers the distance where dredging has now been completed, and except for the 30 miles, the channel is 27½ feet deep all the way. When we have the dredging over this comparatively short distance completed, we shall have a channel of 27½ feet deep at least from Quebec to Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think that it is right for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to impute to me the motives he has imputed. I say there is no rivalry between Quebec and Montreal in regard to this channel. I speak here as a member of the Parliament of the Dominion, and representing a Canadian constituency, and not merely as the representative of a constituency near Quebec, or as a resident of that city.

This is my proposition, and I think it cannot be controverted, that although this work is of national importance, the first question this House must ask itself is: are corresponding advantages given to the country for the enormous outlay of money which is being made upon this ship channel? Before we go any further, it seems to me that the Minister should answer the question as to whether or not, even when he dredges 27½ feet, there will be any more water than there is now. There is evidence in the report of the hon. gentleman that opposite Pointe aux Trembles he had to dredge 28½ feet to get 27½ feet of water. There is nothing to show that when he gets the 27½ feet all over, he will have more than 26 feet. The hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) has taken a great interest in this matter, and I am sure he could enlighten the House on this very important subject. My hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) is

Mr. TARTE.

a member of the commission upon the great waterways, and as he has given the matter attention and attended several conferences, he could probably tell us whether it is not a fact that the level of the water is all the time decreasing in the River St. Lawrence, and whether or not this constant deepening of the channel will give in certain points more water than actually is there now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the House would like to have some more information, as this is a very important question. Out of the 160 miles between Montreal and Quebec, the channel for about thirty miles has a depth of 27½ feet. For 110 miles the channel has thirty feet or more. The minimum width of the channel is 300 feet in straight portions, and 450 feet in the curves. There are 110 miles where we have thirty feet of water and more, and there are thirty miles where we have 27½ feet. What I am asking for is to complete the depth of water to 27½ feet and to straighten out the curves.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you expect that you will have 27½ feet all over when the work is completed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, and otherwise Parliament would not have been asked by the late Government to go on with the work.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not see any items in the Estimates with reference to the harbour at Montreal. Have you done anything with reference to it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) asked that question. A request has been strongly urged upon me and the Government for an additional amount of money. The position of affairs is this: In 1896, Parliament voted \$2,000,000 to be loaned to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to complete their works and pay the floating indebtedness. These works have to be approved in future by the Department of Public Works. The work at the Windmill Basin has been commenced. Whatever may be the usefulness of these works, they have now been begun, and I have made up my mind that they are to be completed. Then I found myself face to face with the great problem, as to what we are to do for future action. I gave every possible attention to that grave question, and I may say that I have made up my mind that the plans which were approved in the past are not altogether what is necessary now. On different occasions, and especially in 1894, strong representations were made to the late Government to the effect that additional work had to be done, and that the work known as plan No. 6 was not sufficient. After consultation with the representatives of the Board of Trade in Montreal and with the Harbour Commissioners,

we have practically agreed to a plan by which three additional wharfs will be built in the centre of the harbour, but not of the same length as those approved in the past. When I say "approved," I want to be well understood. When, for the first time, in 1889, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal came to the Government for the approval of their plans, the Harbour Commissioners were their own masters. The Government was not then giving them any money, and their plans were approved as a matter of course, although I might say a commission of engineers from both the Marine Department and the Public Works Department did not approve of the plans even then. I do not know how it occurred, but at all events, Mr. Perley, the chief engineer of the Public Works Department at that time, approved of the plan. I am sorry I have not the plans here because a study of them would be very interesting. If these plans were carried out to-day, they would simply block the port of Montreal. The wharfs there were going to be 1,500 feet long; the channel is only 450 feet wide, and outside of that you have banks of mud and you would simply block the harbour. I made up my mind that it was not a proper thing to do, and having consulted with the interested parties in Montreal, the members of the Board of Trade and the representatives of the navigation companies, we agreed that some other plans had to be decided upon. I am just going to give my approval to plans by which three additional wharfs, supplied with every possible accommodation for railways will be erected. Even this will not be sufficient.

Mr. WALLACE. Where are these wharfs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those wharfs are going to be built in the centre of the harbour. They will start opposite Bonsecours Market and run west towards Lachine Canal. We will start from the east, and the reason is because the city of Montreal has voted one million dollars to build a revetment wall, and in order to allow the city of Montreal to go on with that work we must begin at the eastern end. We must take first from the St. Lawrence an additional width of forty feet for the wharfs, because if we had simply complied with the provisions of that famous plan No. 6, you would have had 14,000 feet of wharfs on a street less than forty feet wide. That would have been out of the question, and we could not at all have accommodated the trade.

Mr. POUPORE. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that the wharf is to start from Bonsecours Market and run west?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. QUINN. There will be three wharfs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, three wharfs to be built and the revetment wall which is to be built by the city itself, and that will give to the centre of the city all the accommodation it can hope for. As to the larger plan, it has attracted the attention of men more experienced than I, but I have read a good deal and have seen a good many harbours and ports, and in my opinion the harbour of Montreal is one of the worst equipped of any I know of. The cattle trade cannot be accommodated and the bulky trade cannot be accommodated—

Mr. CASGRAIN. Send them to Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quebec will have its share. When the St. Lawrence route is given all the improvement it requires to accommodate trade, Quebec will have its share. As to the other plan, if I were to reveal the secrets of Council, I would say that I have urged, as all those who know the harbour have urged, that an additional sum be placed in the Estimates so that we might complete that great port. But hon. gentlemen know our financial position, we have spent a good deal of money, and it is thought that a few months delay would not endanger the future of that big enterprise, and I shall tell why. We are going to build first the three wharfs we have mentioned. Montreal city will go on with the work of building the revetment wall, and then I have no doubt whatever that the strong recommendations of the commercial community, not only of Montreal, but of Canada, will be taken into serious consideration. We have been asked to extend the harbour of Montreal east because the centre is already congested.

Mr. WALLACE. Make a basin in the east.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I see that my hon. friend is laughing. The basin is not a thing of my invention. Under the late Government, strong representations were made by the Boards of Trade and the Harbour Commission.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a strong deputation from the Harbour Commissioners themselves, headed by Messrs. Bulmer and Ogilvy and Richard White, came to Ottawa and urged the great importance of those basins. I have the minutes of the meeting, and there can be no doubt about it, but, as I have said, my intention is to go to England and France and Belgium and examine, while on other business, into the great modern improvements that have taken place in the principal harbours of the world.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you had better send a good engineer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My intention was to have a good engineer

with me. My intention is to avail myself of the advice of the best engineering talent that can be had. The House will agree with me that the completion of the harbour of Montreal is a most important matter and that I should take every possible means to improve it as quickly as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the circumstances, can the hon. gentleman state that nothing will be done with the eastern harbour scheme until after we meet again?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can give the hon. gentleman that assurance.

Mr. HAGGART. I agree with the hon. gentleman to a great extent. I think it is possible that sufficient harbour accommodation can be accomplished by utilizing the plan proposed by the commissioners; but to have a complete harbour you will have to adopt an entirely different scheme. The plans came before the department, and I hope the hon. gentleman will see that Montreal will have the accommodation to which it is entitled and which it is impossible for it to have with the plans prepared.

Mr. QUINN. It is a matter of gratification to me, indeed, to find the hon. member is in such good humour and expressing himself the way he does this morning.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am always in good humour.

Mr. QUINN. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the hon. gentleman in that respect because he usually is, but he is particularly bright and appreciative of the interest of Montreal this morning. Whatever may be said either for or against plan No. 6, there is no doubt that the idea is the best that can be suggested if the harbour of Montreal is to become what it should be. I do not mean to say that an exact adherence to that plan is absolutely necessary, but that the improvements suggested by the officers of the department—which I have had through the courtesy of the hon. Ministers the pleasure of seeing—will afford sufficient accommodation for the present. I understand it is the intention to construct three wharfs in front of the city.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. QUINN. At a point between the custom-house on the one hand, and Bonsecours Market on the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. From the information I have had from different representative bodies and business men in Montreal—and I have had the pleasure of waiting on the hon. Minister several times in connection with these deputations—they seem thor-

Mr. TARTE.

oughly satisfied with that work but want to see it done at once.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work will start immediately.

Mr. QUINN. A loan for that purpose is to be made by the Harbour Commissioners. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman and the committee to this fact, that a loan made in that way will have the effect of compelling the commissioners to exact from the ships coming into the port of Montreal a toll, in some way or other, to meet the interest. The hon. member says that the money has been loaned by the Government to the commissioners. I think it is only fair to have it definitely understood throughout the country that every cent of interest on the money loaned has been paid by the Harbour Board. In other words, it has been paid by the shippers of Montreal, and I desire to emphasize that fact and see if some means cannot be adopted to relieve the port of Montreal from the necessity of taxing shipping for the purpose of meeting interest and other charges which are imposed upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. QUINN. It has been very well said by the hon. Minister that the port of Montreal is a national port. There is no reason why the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and myself—and I do not think that it is the intention of my hon. friend—should join issue on the question of improving that port. I do not think it is the intention of my hon. friend to discuss adversely or criticise in any way the expenditure on the port of Montreal. Any money expended to increase its facilities, any money expended to enable vessels of large tonnage to reach that port is money expended for the benefit of Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. QUINN. It is an expenditure which will not only benefit the port of Montreal but the port of Quebec and other ports.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). You draw the line at granting Montreal railway facilities.

Mr. QUINN. The Minister is not quite accurate in saying that; and as that is not under discussion at the moment, it would probably be just as well not to refer to it. I wish to confine myself for the moment to the money that is to be expended on the improvements of the harbour of Montreal and on the improvements in the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec; and I heartily endorse what the Minister has said when he expressed the opinion that if the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, is placed in such a condition that it

will attract the attention of shippers the world over and to the St. Lawrence route, it will not be necessary for either the harbour of Montreal or the harbour of Quebec to come to this House for assistance; they will be well known throughout the world, and will have all the traffic that they can manage in those two ports. Not only that, but it will attract shipping to the River St. Lawrence, which will benefit the two ports of Montreal and Quebec; and I would not be surprised to see rival ports starting up at points on the river between Montreal and Quebec which will be to the general advantage of Canada. Now that I have received the assurance of the Minister that this work will be carried on immediately, I would ask him to see if some means cannot be adopted by which the port of Montreal will be relieved of the heavy charge that is now imposed upon it by being obliged to pay interest on what is known as the harbour commissioners' bonds, for the improvements in Montreal and in Lake St. Peter. Bonds have been floated by the harbour commissioners, which are, to a certain extent, endorsed by the Government, but the port of Montreal is obliged to pay that interest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
We take their bonds.

Mr. QUINN. With the understanding that they will pay interest. Now, this is a very heavy tax on the city of Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. On the shipping of Montreal and of the country.

Mr. DOBELL. Did the hon. gentleman say that Montreal was paying interest on the expenditure of the deepening of Lake St. Peter? If so, I rise to correct him.

Mr. QUINN. I did not say that. If I did say that, it was simply, of course, a lapsus linguae.

Mr. DOBELL. You stated the Harbour Commission was paying interest on the expenditure of deepening Lake St. Peter.

Mr. QUINN. If I did, I made a mistake; or if I stated that the city of Montreal was paying this interest. I intended to say that the interest on these bonds was a tax upon the shipping of Montreal, as the ex-Minister of Railways says, and a tax upon the shipping of the country; and a tax which affects the most important port in the Dominion of Canada, naturally affects the whole shipping interest of the Dominion. Now, following out that line of argument, I say that anything that will relieve us of that tax, anything that will make Montreal a free port, will benefit the shipping interests of the whole Dominion of Canada; and I would ask the Minister once more to interest himself in such a way as to devise some means by which that port and the shipping of the country will be relieved of that tax.

Mr. DOBELL. I would like to say a few words to strengthen the hands of my colleague in reference to deepening Lake St. Peter. I have no hesitation in stating that Lake St. Peter can be deepened to 27½ feet from Quebec to Montreal and kept at that depth, without any difficulty whatever. I believe that it would promote the best interests of the country to make that channel at such a depth, because we are about undertaking a work that I believe of greater importance to this country than any other works we have undertaken for many years. I refer to the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. For years our western canals have been deepened to a depth of fourteen feet, and we lately constructed a canal at Sault Ste. Marie to a depth of twenty-two feet, and for what purpose? We brought through that canal, I believe, during the last twelve months, four million tons of American shipping free of charge, and I believe that not more than 7 per cent of the whole of that western trade has ever found its way down the St. Lawrence. Now, I believe that the deepening of our St. Lawrence canals is going to make a change, and instead of our only getting 7 per cent, we shall be able, by striving for it, to get something nearer 50 per cent of that trade, and that will make the St. Lawrence the route that it ought to have been years ago. When I had the honour of entering this Cabinet, I was aware that the promise had been made from time to time that these canals would be finished within two years. When I had the privilege of examining more closely into the matter, I was told that at the then rate of progress possibly these canals might be completed in ten years, possibly it would be twenty years before they would be completed. We then decided, at a considerable increase in cost, to go to work and complete them in two years, and I believe that in two years that work will be finished; therefore, it is desirable to have not only the harbour of Montreal prepared to receive the trade. But I go further than my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) and I say that it is desirable not only to relieve Montreal of the burden, but Quebec, Sorel and Three Rivers. I may say further that I do not see why Montreal, Sorel and Three Rivers should be made free, and not extend the same freedom to Halifax and to St. John. I claim that exactly the same argument applies to the maritime ports. The member for Montreal asks us to lighten the burdens upon that city. Well, what will be the consequence? It naturally follows that if you make Montreal a free harbour, and you put the burden of the improvements on Quebec, your ships will leave Quebec and go up to Montreal. We must have freedom of trade in Quebec as well as in Montreal, and also in every other port.

Mr. QUINN. I understand that the ports of Halifax and St. John are practically free;

or, if not free, at any rate they do not bear anything like the same burden of taxation that the port of Montreal has to bear. Owing to the very costly works that have been carried on in Montreal in order to put that port in anything like proper condition, the burden is very much heavier in Montreal.

Mr. DOBELL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the proceedings of the Dominion Boards of Trade in 1872, 1873 and 1874 to 1878, he will find mention made of this work of deepening the canals, and a resolution was offered that the Government should consider whether, at much less cost, the harbour of Quebec could not be made suitable for the transshipment of products to and from Europe than the deepening of Lake St. Peter. The representatives from Montreal, and I mention particularly the name of Mr. Hugh McLennan, than whom Montreal has no more able or representative man, stated distinctly that Quebec should go on with the improvements in her harbour, they in Montreal intended to improve their own and they also intended deepening Lake St. Peter without asking the Government for a dollar. Since then the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have petitioned the Government to relieve them of this outlay. It has been granted, and they now ask for back interest on the money expended, the capital of which has been repaid to them. I am not complaining, but I do state that I think there might be more consideration on the part of the representatives of our great sister city, which is regarded to-day as the great commercial metropolis of this Dominion and upon which the Government have expended five million of dollars in making a channel way up to reach it, and towards which Quebec has contributed something in common with other portions of this country. And when the Government is petitioned to make Montreal a free port and to assume the obligation of improving her harbour, there should be more generosity extended to Quebec by the representative of Montreal (Mr. Quinn) and they should not forget Quebec, Sorel and Three Rivers. At least give them the crumbs that may fall from Montreal's table. The port of Quebec has advantages, and for a small outlay she can be made the great transshipping port of North America to the advantage of the whole of this Dominion.

Mr. QUINN. If I omitted saying anything at all in favour of Quebec it was simply because I thought that Quebec had such able advocates of her own here that it did not require my poor voice and assistance for her at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason of this old bill of \$653.15, due the estate of C. J. McCarthy in 1892, being left until this time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Because you did not pay it.

Mr. QUINN.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When this bill was presented I did not know what it was at all. My officers told me that there was a lease for a term of three years commencing August 4th, 1889, at the rate of \$600 per annum. The payments were made every February and August. The last of such payments on record being one of \$800 on August 18th, 1892, to cover the rent due to August, 1892. This account has been running on since without being paid. My officers have testified to the fact that it was due and I thought it was proper to pay it.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the claim not made before?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes, it has been a long time in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the departmental reasons for not paying it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that. My officers told me that there was no reason why it should not be paid. The account was due and it was not paid.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was listening to my hon. friend the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) who says that he only expects the crumbs that fall from the master's table for the city of Quebec. I would say to the hon. gentleman that it is the impression that he sacrifices a good deal for the crumbs.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Western Departmental Block—To cover expenditure in connection with disastrous conflagration of 11th February, 1897. (Governor General's Warrant, \$25,000)... .. \$37,000

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation of this \$37,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every one knows what has taken place. A disastrous fire destroyed the building, and we had to repair it. I first applied for a special warrant for \$25,000, my officers having estimated that that amount would be sufficient. It was found quite inadequate, and I was obliged to spend more.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers of the department not having taken the political exigencies into account in their estimate, believed that \$25,000 would be sufficient, but the Minister found that he needed \$12,000 more for the work; this was the time of the Hull election. How did he spend that \$37,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the Hull election, my hon. friend does not like the result of it, but it was not my fault. I did not do anything; what I did was this—

Mr. FOSTER. Never mind. Tell us how you spent the \$37,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend is altogether mistaken about that. I know he thinks that we employed men that should not have been employed. As to the roof then, this was one of the items of expenditure. We could not ask for tenders for the roof, as it had to be put on immediately and was of a temporary character.

Mr. FOSTER. What was it made of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Boards.

Mr. FOSTER. So many feet of boards to cover the top.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the exact figures under my hand, but I will be able to give them to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend should have them under his hand. He has had all session to get them under his hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have them. The total area of the roof covers 29,000 square feet. I made the following arrangement : I called in the chief architect of my department and asked him to make an estimate of the cost of a temporary roof. He estimated the cost at \$4,500. Then I called in Mr. Bourque, the well known contractor. It is not a crime for him to live in Hull. I asked him if he would do the work for the amount that my chief architect had estimated, for the 29,000 feet, I gave him the work for that amount, and not one dollar extra. The work was satisfactorily done as anybody can see. As to the other items they are very easily explained. The whole building was gutted. I engaged as superintendent of the work, a man who had already been employed in the department, Mr. Sutherland. I gave him supervision of the work because he was recommended to me by my officers as being a capable man.

Mr. FOSTER. \$4,500 for boards for the roof. What is the rest ?

Mr. POWELL. How many thousands ?

Mr. FOSTER. 29,000 square feet.

Mr. POWELL. It would take more boards than that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure incurred as found necessary under the direction of the officers of the department was as per detailed statement—

Mr. FOSTER. It takes the Minister of Public Works all the time to tell us that he is going to give us the expenditure, but he does not do it. Go on and do it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here is a detailed statement of the \$25,000 for which a special warrant was issued :

Pay-list of workmen, certified by the clerk of works, \$20,047.72.

Mr. FOSTER. How much were the workmen paid a day ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Labourers from \$1 to \$1.25 ; carpenters, \$2 ; painters, \$2.

Mr. QUINN. Did the Minister say "labourers" or "Liberals."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not rewarded as I should be, because I employed a lot of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. The superintendent of the work, Mr. Sutherland, has been a Conservative all his lifetime.

Mr. TALBOT. That is where you did wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Put him out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not put him out.

Mr. WALLACE. I know Mr. Sutherland well and I know him to be a Liberal all his life, and a very strong one too.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is he, indeed? Upon my word I thought he was a Conservative, because I never thought the late Government would employ a Liberal.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, was he in the employ of the late Government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I made a mistake about that.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister's defence has then slipped away from him. In the first place, he contended that he had a strong Conservative as a foreman, and in the second place that this man had been employed by the late Government. Now we find that Mr. Sutherland is a Grit, and that he never was employed by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will allow me to make a better case. Mr. Sutherland was represented to me as being an able man, and I employed him, and I really thought he belonged to the other side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Able men generally do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that Mr. Sutherland belongs to our side. The three men who have most to do with the employment of men are Sutherland, Breton, who has been twenty years in the employ of the Public Works Department, and Adams, who has also been a long time in their employment. I did not engage the men myself ; these three men did. Then the other items are : removal of furniture and carpets, \$697 ; furniture, \$429 ; removal of books, cartage,

\$102.25 ; lumber, \$572.06 ; stone, \$46 ; glass, &c., \$8 ; hardware, \$12.98 ; asbestos for plaster and cartage, \$934 ; electric wiring, \$35 ; chemicals, \$6.60 ; insurance on furniture, \$56.55 ; sundries, \$225.39 ; stationery, \$882.80, which makes a total expenditure of \$25,468.41. Outside of that, we have placed iron laths all over the building, and built to a large extent on the fire-proof system.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the style of architecture of the building to be the same as before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After having carefully considered that question, and especially consulted Mr. Fuller, who although not able to work has the same bright eye as ever, and after consulting other architects, I came to the conclusion to rebuild on the same plan as before. I believe that otherwise it would have disfigured the whole block. The plans are not quite ready but tenders will be asked for in a week or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the balance of the \$12,000 come in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is for wages from the 26th April to 28th May, \$868.55. For services, not yet paid, \$1,500 ; materials and supplies, \$2,715.18 ; other small supplies, \$201.11. The agreement with Mr. Bourque, \$4,562.75 ; iron laths, \$1,683 ; making up the total of \$37,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a wonderful amount of work done. The wages were \$1.25 and \$2 a day and it is fair to say that there were more ordinary labourers than skilled labourers. It was really a wonderful sight. I remember on one or two occasions passing along there about the hour of 12 o'clock, and I never saw such a sight in my life.

Mr. LISTER. Was that when you were attending to the lawns in front and taking the flowers ?

Mr. FOSTER. It was in Mr. Mackenzie's time that was done, and not in ours. It was a wonderful sight around that building. It was like the outpouring of, what shall I say ?

Mr. TALBOT. Beehives.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. TALBOT. Ant-hills.

Mr. FOSTER. That might do a little better. There was not that amount of buzz in it, that there would be in a beehive. It was really like the outpouring of a certain great mass of people as Vergil sang of in olden times, which I read a long time ago, and have an indistinct memory of now. Suppose the whole of this labour averaged \$1.50 a day, 13,000 days labour were put in on that building.

Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use saying that the men have been paid only \$1.50 a day ; for we had to import plasterers at high rates from Montreal, there not being enough in Ottawa. Of course, I could not supervise the work myself the whole time, but I may say that I have gone to the building as often as I have been able to do ; I do not say that there has not been some time lost, but really I do not think there has been much time wasted. The chief architect of my department is a capable man, and he superintended the work himself. If I cannot have confidence in him, in whom can I have confidence ? I instructed him to go on with the work with all possible speed and economy, and more than that I could not do.

Mr. POUPORE. It is well known that work of that kind, when it has to be forced, costs more than it does under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. If it only had been forced, we would have nothing to say against it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When this matter came up under the ordinary Estimates, I asked the hon. gentlemen whether, in making the repairs which were necessary in consequence of the fire, he had considered the advisability of using wood which has been rendered incombustible, and which is being used in the high buildings of Chicago and New York instead of iron. I am told that this incombustible lumber is just as good for all purposes as iron and in some cases preferable, not being so much affected by heat. I am told that it is today accepted by the Government of the United States for all public buildings, and I am also informed that the most prominent firms of architects in the city of New York have made it a condition in all their contracts that it shall be used in buildings constructed under their direction. Unless there is some objection to it which I am not aware of, I consider that it is a matter of importance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite aware of what my hon. friend refers to. I will have a careful test made of the wood, and if it is found as good as I think it is, I will certainly employ it, because I think the desire of the House is that we should endeavour to make the buildings as fireproof as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the Minister made an estimate of the total loss to the country caused by this fire—that is, the cost of the work already done, the rents which the Government have had to pay, and the probable cost of putting the building in as good a state of repair as it was before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect of my department thinks that the part of the building for which we are going to ask tenders will cost about

\$140,000. My hon. friend sees what we have spent already on repairs. More than that I cannot say.

Mr. TAYLOR. That does not include the item for rent for the premises we have been occupying. I want to inquire of the Minister whether he has ever had an investigation as to the cause of the fire?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I instructed the officers of my department to make a careful inquiry. The Government also charged the chief of police, Mr. Sherwood, to investigate the matter. As I have already stated, the fire was discovered in a room over the Department of Railways and Canals. The origin of the fire has not been discovered, and nobody can say what was the cause of it. The general consensus of opinion seems to be that it was caused by the heating apparatus.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Moving public departments into new or renovated permanent quarters in departmental buildings, inclusive of fitting up of offices, &c., in model room, Langevin Block, in Eastern Block and in Slater Block, and repairs, furniture and other supplies found to be necessary in connection with said transfers..... \$22,500

Mr. FOSTER. What part of this is for repairs, furniture and supplies?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that after the fire took place, several departments made changes. The Department of the Interior, which was located in the Eastern Block, was removed to the Langevin Block. That involved a pretty large expenditure. Repairs to furniture and fittings cost \$9,500. New furniture and fittings cost \$5,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the balance, \$7,500, goes to the moving?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The items are: Fitting up offices in model room, Langevin Block, for Interior Department: to cover payments for workmen employed, \$415.30; to cover salaries of Foreman Maguire from 16th February to 5th May, 1897, \$284; to pay J. Parr for lumber supplies, putting up partitions, &c., \$1,350; G. C. Howe, painting, \$240.15; W. J. Murphy, painting, \$134.90; to provide for settlement of accounts for materials and telephones not yet paid, \$1,700; putting up iron and asbestos partitions, \$250.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—Repairs, renewals, improvements, furniture and maintenance, \$4,107.80 having been paid out of appropriation for 1896-97 to pay for linen, &c., purchased in 1895-96 (Nov., 1895, to Jan., 1896)..... \$9,000

Mr. TAYLOR. When the main Estimates were brought down, they called for an expenditure of \$18,000 on Rideau Hall, I then ventured the prophesy that when the supple-

mentaries came down there would be an additional amount of \$8,000 or \$9,000 required to pay for the building of the dancing hall. The vote asked for in the preceding year was \$14,000, and that was the estimate prepared by the late Government, as the hon. gentleman told us. When the hon. gentleman was asking for \$18,000, he said that he would require the increased amount to meet a debt not paid by the late Government for linen, and so forth. He said this, as will appear by reference to the report of the debate. He is now asking \$27,000, when the late Government only asked for \$14,000; and allowing the claim made by the hon. Minister, \$4,000 for linen ordered by the late Government, we have still an increase in the expenditure of a considerable amount which is a fit subject for criticism by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). These gentlemen ought to be here to denounce this increased extravagance by the present Government in a matter with respect to which they were always denouncing the extravagance of the late Government. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) surely ought to be here, for this was one of the planks in the Patrons platform during the late election.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is not fair. He should remember that I did not ask for the \$18,000 in my estimates for this year but for the year from July, 1897, to July, 1898. Now, I am asking \$9,000 to cover expenditure during this year. Out of that \$9,000, there is an amount of \$4,107.88 which was really spent when I took office. The bill was due and I was bound to pay it. I frankly admit that I spent \$5,000 in repairs on Rideau Hall, but I never said that that money would be taken out of the appropriation for next year. In answer to the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), I stated distinctly that this \$18,000 was for the coming year and that I would have to ask for an additional sum to pay for past expenditure. I frankly admit having spent \$5,000 on repairs. After going over the buildings with my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), we found that the buildings and the house itself were in a very bad condition, and I thought that this country had the means of giving decent treatment to the occupants of Rideau Hall.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Postmaster General in entire accord with the Minister of Public Works on that point?

Mr. COCHRANE. I have been here many years listening to the Opposition year after year, condemning the extravagance of the Government I was supporting in connection with the expenditure of Rideau Hall. A good many hon. gentlemen opposite owe their elections to-day to the charge that the

Conservative party were extravagant, and now we have the Minister of Public Works telling us that although the late Government spent more money on Rideau Hall than they should have done, he and his colleagues went over the Hall and found it in a most dilapidated condition, and he spent \$4,000 or \$5,000 on it without even going through the formality of asking the House to vote the money. When we challenge hon. gentlemen opposite, they invariably reply: You are another. No sooner did they get into office than all their previous professions of economy and prudence were forgotten; and we are witnessing the results every day.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. Minister is entirely mistaken as to the conversation we had across the House when this item came up before. I had called the attention of the hon. Minister to the large expenditure and he replied that a portion of it had been incurred by the late Government in the preceding year. I drew his attention to the fact that the proper way was to bring down an item in the Supplementary Estimates. Now, I find that the whole expenditure of \$18,000 is for next year and does not include the amount that was spent last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite true.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is mistaken then in his statement of the conversation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will allow me, I do not think that I will be bound to spend more than is necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of that.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the amount of the bill for linen?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just \$4,107.80. It was bought before I took office.

Mr. WALLACE. All for linen?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is what my officers tell me..

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this \$4,000 for linen was to pay a debt of last year for which no amount has been voted. I always understood that if money was not voted, it could not be paid. I should like to know by what right the hon. Minister paid for linen ordered the year before, when he had no vote out of which to pay it. Then he tells us that he found the building out of repair and that he ordered repairs to be done, and after the money is spent, he asks the House for a vote. Well, we have at Gananoque a drill shed which the Government was bound, by written agreement

Mr. COCHRANE.

with the corporation, to have removed some time ago. I put a question on the paper, and the answer was: It cannot be done until the money is voted. How then did the hon. Minister come to expend this money on Rideau Hill before there was any vote? No doubt he relied on the support of his friends behind him, who used formerly to criticise very severely the expenditure on Rideau Hall, but who will now swallow anything. Now, the hon. gentleman asks \$18,000 for next year, where the late Government asked only \$14,000 for the last year they were in office.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask who the linen belongs to after the hon. Minister pays for it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do not be in such a hurry; I will make the question plain so that you can understand it. This country pays \$4,000 for goods; the country wants to know who the goods belong to, do they belong to this country or do they belong to the occupant of the House for the time being?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Everything that we pay for belongs to us; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course these goods came in free of duty, and in order to find the value here you must add the duty to the English price. I would like to know by whose authority that order was given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The authority to buy that linen was given by the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Ouimet.

Mr. WALLACE. Without any appropriation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that no appropriation was made. As a matter of fact, I may say, I am informed by the officers of my department that accounts have always been kept behind, from year to year, and that is the reason why I thought it right to come straightforward, and say I think it is necessary for me to spend \$18,000. I have paid now all the back accounts, and will try not to incur any expenditure which is not authorized.

Mr. WALLACE. The whole matter is like this: When the members and supporters of the present Government were in Opposition, they condemned this large expenditure on Rideau Hall, and especially said that too much money was spent in repairs. But now the hon. Minister of Public Works says that that is a mistake, and that not enough was spent on repairs, that Rideau Hall was going to decay for want of such expenditure. I have observed that when the hon. Minister wants to spend money on

wharfs and other public works, he tells us that they have been sadly neglected by the late Government and that he had to spend money on them in order to maintain them properly and avoid serious loss. The Minister of Public Works tells us the same tale now in regard to Rideau Hall, notwithstanding that, year after year, large sums have been expended for maintenance and repairs to keep this building in proper order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we must have a balance on expenditures upon Rideau Hall in some way. If the hon. Minister feels that the house must be kept up, the only way to keep the balance is to have the Governor General's salary reduced by the amount of the excess. I hope that the hon. gentleman will prevail upon the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to see to that.

Dredging—

Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.....	\$8,000
Ontario and Quebec.....	\$8,000

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask where, in Prince Edward Island, this dredging is proposed to be done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge is now at Charlottetown. I am given to understand by my chief officer that it is to be employed at Summerside shortly.

Mr. MARTIN. In the early part of the session I asked a question in regard to dredging some harbours on the south side of the island, the hon. Minister who has the patronage of Prince Edward Island told me that I should get my answer when the Supplementary Estimates came down. The Supplementary Estimates are now down, and I naturally supposed that the information would be given. Though we are very well pleased that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) should be made a belted knight, and though we all hope that he will long wear his honour, I hope we are not expected to take the honours conferred upon him and so upon his province in lieu of necessary public works in Prince Edward Island. I may say that for the past year the dredge was sent to Crapaud in his own constituency—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is not in my constituency.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, it is in the constituency of the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Yeo). I do not know what the object is in sending it to Crapaud unless it be to make room for the "Petrel," which has been laid up there all winter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The "Petrel" never was at Crapaud at all.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like if the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) would see to it that the southern part of the province is not

neglected. I have called the matter to his attention several times and have always received the same answer—that nothing could be done at present. I may say that these harbours on the south side to which I am calling attention are the very harbours spoken of by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a number of years, and for alleged neglect of which he challenged and condemned the Government. Now that he is honoured with a portfolio in the Cabinet, I hope that we shall see him carry into effect those improvements that he made so much noise about when in Opposition.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is to be hoped that out of this large amount of money that is to be expended in Nova Scotia, some portion of it will be applied to works that I brought prominently before the Government a short time ago, that is to say, the harbours of Lunenburg, LaHave and Mahone Bay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will certainly consider the representations of my hon. friend.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think that consideration is certainly due to these harbours. They deserve the attention of the Government more than any other harbours in Nova Scotia.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock p.m.

## Second Sitting.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To provide for salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks, chief architect's office..... \$2,100

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that the committee will remember that last year I stated that Mr. Fuller, then chief architect, would be superannuated. I found out later that Mr. Fuller's services could be utilized for one year more. To be frank, I found that as I could not give him

the superannuation that I thought he was entitled to, I kept him one year more, and that is the reason I ask for this amount of money to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason my hon. friend could not give him what he thought he was entitled to?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fuller was formerly in the employ of this Government, and he left our service to go to the United States. He came back to Canada in 1880, when his time of service began. I thought that perhaps we could add some years to his term for superannuation, but I found that Council had adopted the rule not to do anything of this kind; and, in face of that rule, I made up my mind that Mr. Fuller should be kept for one year more. I think the committee will sympathize with me and with him.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to give my hon. friend any advice, but I think that as a member of the Government he had better take the Government's decision as his own, and not tell the House that he wanted such and such a thing but his colleagues would not let him do it, because that is a way of getting sympathy at the expense of his colleagues.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no great difficulty about it, but I thought, in view of that rule that we could not add any number of years to his term of service, and, thinking the House would sympathize with Mr. Fuller under the circumstances, I decided to keep him another year.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend could not do it one way, he took a roundabout way to do it. It is hard to head off my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am only asking the committee to do what it has a perfect right to do, in order to do justice to an old and faithful servant.

To provide for temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were employed after 1st July, 1882, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... \$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is smashing the law again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say frankly that I am short of \$1,500. The grant when I took the office was \$30,000; I cut it down to \$23,000, and now find myself short by \$1,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we pass away from the Estimates for public works, I desire to ask my hon. friend some explanation about a contract which I think has been given to the foundry in Beauharnois. I desire to say at first that I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman has found him-

Mr. TARTE.

self in a position to have some work done at the Beauharnois foundry. I have seen that in the newspapers, and there is a great deal of jubilation over the work that is being given there and over the large amount of money that is being thrown into that place. I would ask the Minister what amount of work was given, whether tenders were asked for, if it was given to the lowest tenderer and how it is being done. I am not at all criticising, but simply asking for information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I remember rightly I gave the work to the Star Company. I have ordered from them two boilers, one to be put into the Richmond court house and the other into the Prince Albert jail. We asked for prices from some companies and we found that the Star Company could supply us with all the material needed, and we have given them the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the Minister of Public Works be kind enough to tell me the amount of the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the exact amount. It amounts to \$1,000, I think. I will be very glad to give every information to my hon. friend privately if he likes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Did I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works to say that he gave a contract for a boiler to be put into the jail at Richmond.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the Richmond Post Office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You said the jail.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I made a mistake.

Lachine Canal Enlargement..... \$216,000

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to know now whether the information has been brought down, or is ready to be brought down on which we have been asking so long.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have gathered all the information that it is possible for me to get. That has gone to the Secretary of State, and I presume it will be back inside of an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that you might better let that item stand until it comes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will include the report of Mr. Wilson and other papers, but it will not include all the evidence. I cannot get all the evidence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will go on with my Supplementary Estimates if you will permit me.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Am I right when I say that the repairs which are being made to some of the walls in Quebec are under the direction of the Militia Department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. They are not under my direction.

Department of Public Works—To pay Mr. William Keys in full for insertion of a sketch with illustrations concerning history, jurisdiction, transactions, &c., of the Department of Public Works of Canada, in the book published by him under the title of "Capital and Labour;" order given prior to 30th June, 1896..... \$245

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1894 Mr. Keys requested the then Minister of Public Works to authorize him to publish a sketch of the history of our public works. At that time it does not seem that Mr. Keys got any written authorization. He published a sketch all the same. Later on he got a letter from Mr. Ouimet to the effect that he had been authorized, and in the presence of this we cannot decline to pay it because the then Minister had given his authorization.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Towards reconstruction of Western Departmental Block, destroyed by fire, 11th February, 1897..... \$100,000  
Public Buildings, Ottawa—Fire protection, electric lighting and power generating plants, &c..... 75,000

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Public Works if this is a new building, and if so, what is the contemplated cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stated this morning that the estimated cost is about \$140,000 for the building. It is not for a new building, but for rebuilding the old block.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have some idea as to this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the item of \$75,000 the idea is to change the system of lighting which we have to-day. Part of the buildings are lighted by electricity and the balance by gas. The bills so far have amounted to from \$1,000 to \$23,000 a year for gas alone. The idea in my mind is this. We would change the whole thing and build a new plant at the foot of the hill where we now have a plant, increasing the strength and capacity of that plant and using electricity for fire appliances. We are not now protected. After the fire in the West Block, we went all over the buildings and found that we were in no way protected. My intention is to add to the plant we have now, to do away with lighting by gas, which costs us a great amount of money, and to utilize our electric power not only for lighting but for

appliances against fire. We propose to put electric pumps in every building. I have no definite plan yet, although I have given a great deal of attention to the subject, and my intention is to have the best possible means to protect these buildings against fire. My proposal is to change the mixed system into one system, and I am sure that it will effect a great saving.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will go over the Estimates—I do not know whether he has done that or not—he will find that we are entrusting a very large amount of money into his hands this year. I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars for these buildings in around and about Ottawa, and in connection with other things, but it is an immense amount of money. Before he takes a sum of money like this and undertakes a complete change in reference to the system of fire protection and lighting, he should do more than give us a little generality in a few words. He ought to tell us what he proposes to do, but instead of doing that he says he has no plan at all. He says he has a general idea of what he wants to do. He proposes to change everything, but he has not given any information as to what they have decided upon. I think it would be well for the hon. gentleman, to put a plan before this committee. While we have unlimited faith in him as Minister of Public Works and in his knowledge of electric lighting, fire protection and the different merits of gas and electricity, I think we must exercise our reason or else our mental capacities will grow dull. We must know something as to the hon. gentleman's plan, something as to what he proposes to do, whether it is imperative that this year when expenditures are swelling up to an enormous amount that the plan should be changed. For a great many years we had a dual system of lighting, gas partly and electricity partly, and there has been a very large diminution in the cost of gas. Theoretically, I am in favour of electric lighting rather than lighting by gas, on account of the less danger to the buildings. We are going to have a system of fire protection and we are going to change the system of lighting entirely. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tartte) ought to give us the plan upon which he is about to proceed, and to give us the cost, and ought not to ask \$75,000 for himself and employees to go to work and conjure up a plan. They might get the best plan, but the House is entitled to know what that plan is. We have unlimited faith in hon. gentlemen opposite, under certain conditions, but we must make a mild protest, and ask that at least in these large expenditures, plans should be laid before the House; otherwise, we might as well have government by committee with the Minister of Public Works at the head of the committee for spending money.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Last year I asked for a pretty large sum of money, and I quite remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) reproached me and prophesied that I would spend more than I was asking for. Well, out of the money I asked from Parliament last year there is today a sum of \$800,000 that I have not spent. I am all right so far, and I believe that my friend (Mr. Foster) should trust me for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I must dissent.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I am very sorry, indeed, that my hon. friend dissents. Under the same circumstances, I would certainly trust him.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I am sorry he has not the same confidence in me that I might have in him. We are now spending for gas a sum varying from \$18,000 to \$22,000 or \$23,000 a year, and our electric system costs us about \$10,000 a year. It is admitted that it is dangerous to use gas in these buildings, and a few days ago a committee of the House properly suggested that gas should no longer be used. Some means ought to be taken to guard against the great disaster we have experienced. I consulted with the engineers of my department, and with engineers and architects outside and they suggested to me that it would be better, in the public interest, that a system of electric lighting and electric protection against fire should be adopted. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants a detailed plan; will he permit me to say that it would not be wise to give it, as I intend asking for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. Tenders for what?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Tenders for putting in all this apparatus.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) mean to say that whenever a Minister proposes to call for tenders for a work, he is not, because of that, bound to give to the House what he thinks about the cost of it?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I do not mean that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we want to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do, and what is the estimated cost; that has nothing to do with the tenderers.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The House has a right to know, in a general way what I am asking for. Calculations have been given to me, but of course I do not say that they are correct, or that I will adopt them, but they are to the effect that we will require, in the eastern block, 1,200 incandescent lights.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much will be saved in that building on account of lighting by electricity instead of gas?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. TALBOT. Thirteen thousand dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not asking you, I am asking the Minister. You don't know anything more about it than I do.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Will my hon. friend allow me to go on with this statement first. We will require in the western, 1,600 incandescent lights; in the Langevin block, 750; in the Supreme Court building, 250; in the Museum building, 250; in the Post Office building, 300; and in the Printing Bureau, 600 incandescent lights, all of 16 candle power. It is estimated that the probable minimum number of lamps burning at one time would be 2,000, and that the probable maximum would be 5,000 or 6,000. To meet the requirements, we want a generating plant consisting of boilers, engines and generators sufficient to meet these needs. I cannot give any definite figures now as to the cost of these generators and boilers. I have here suggestions for wiring the buildings, for providing the necessary power, for placing electrical pumps in every building, and I hope that the whole thing will not cost more than the sum of money I am now asking. Suppose I spend \$75,000 in replacing the mixed system of gas and electric light which costs us, in round numbers, from \$32,000 to \$33,000 a year; we can borrow money cheap enough to make a large economy; and, at the same time, the House will agree with me that we are better providing for the safety of the building.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost of the plant?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I am asking this sum of money after having taken information generally on the subject. My intention is not to enter into any contract whatever, until I have received the best possible information and asked for tenders, so that we will have the work done as cheaply as possible. I cannot offer more guarantee than this.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand the Minister to say that for that amount of \$75,000 we will do away with all the gas used in the buildings?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I hope to be able to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. And there will be no more gas fixtures, but electricity all over.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Quite so. I hope we will be able to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister has not given to the House any information which would enable it to come to a conclusion on this question. It seems to me that we should have the following information: First, the cost of the plant which is necessary to meet the maximum lighting of the buildings; second, to have the estimated cost of maintenance; then, a description of this system

of electrical protection against fire. That I do not understand, and I do not know that the House does, and we ought to have a little information on that. My hon. friend will see that after travelling around the ring, he has got to where he started, and we have no more information than we had before.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** It seems to me that I should not be asked for more, after I have stated that I intend to ask for tenders. The question is whether the House, knowing that we are expending about \$23,000 a year for lighting by gas, and knowing that we want a better fire system, can trust this Government to carry out the change, when we say that we intend to ask for tenders for the work. It is not possible for any Minister to give detailed information.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What is the proposed saving?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The proposed saving should be very large, as my hon. friend can see himself.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The hon. Minister says that the cost of gas and the electric light is \$33,000 a year. What does he contend that the lighting will cost under the new system?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** It seems to me that under the new system it should not cost more than \$15,000 a year to operate the works; but I cannot pledge myself to that.

**Mr. FOSTER.** On what basis does my hon. friend make that statement?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** We shall use the plant we have now, and it will not require a very large increase in the number of men.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Is this the only building that has the electric light in it?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The electric light is in the Council Chamber, in the Post Office and in the Printing Bureau. I may say that there is a very large expenditure on gas that we cannot control.

**Mr. WALLACE.** There is no electric light in the East Block or in the West Block?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** There is none in the West Block.

**Mr. LISTER.** It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are deliberately heckling the Minister.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I do not think so.

**Mr. LISTER.** All I can say is that if the Minister does not think so, he must be very obtuse. What is the fact? Part

of the buildings at Ottawa are lighted by gas, and part of them by electricity. It is admitted by everybody, I think, that that system is somewhat dangerous. Suppose that the works cost \$100,000 or \$150,000 and that there will be greater safety in having them all lighted by electricity. Surely the House will grant whatever sum is necessary to properly protect the public buildings of this country. As appears by the Public Accounts, we are paying the gas company a large sum of money for the lighting of these buildings, and we are also paying for the electric works for lighting this building. Suppose the necessary works cost \$100,000, this at 3 or 3½ per cent would mean an annual expenditure of \$3,000 or \$3,500. To that you would have to add the cost of operating the works, which would surely not amount to anything like what we are paying to-day for gas. If that expense can be cut down to a great extent, the Government will be entitled to the thanks of the country. If, in addition, the lighting by electricity will reduce the danger of fire, surely no one here will raise an objection.

**Mr. QUINN.** I am sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I look at this as a very serious matter. I am asked to vote not only \$75,000 for fire protection, electric lighting and power-generating plant, but I am asked to approve of a new system without knowing what the system is. I can understand that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, with that perfect confidence that he has in the Government, will assume that because this is proposed by a Minister, it is a safer system of lighting.

**Mr. LISTER.** I said nothing of the kind.

**Mr. QUINN.** The hon. gentleman said that electricity was generally admitted to be a safer system of lighting. I do not know that it is generally admitted. As a matter of fact, in London, England, there are very few buildings lighted by electricity, and the reason is that that system was tried and did not prove successful; in fact, it alarmed the public mind there to such an extent that it was discarded. I do not know much about it myself, but I do know many instances in Montreal in which fires have been caused by the electric wires. I also know that the system of gas lighting has been used in these buildings for the last thirty or thirty-five years, and I do not know that it has been proved that any fire has occurred here from that fact. Because a fire has occurred in a public building, which has not been traced to gas, we are asked to vote \$75,000 to change the system, without knowing what it is going to cost either to establish or to maintain the new system, without even knowing whether the company that is in existence in Ottawa will not supply the electric light in

the building where it is now more cheaply than it has been managed by the Government. I think we will all admit that the Government of Canada is not generally regarded as an institution that can manage works of this kind as economically as a private company. Without having made any of these inquiries, the hon. gentleman asks us to vote \$75,000, and possibly there will be a Governor General's warrant for another \$75,000 before the end of the year, which we will be asked to provide for afterwards. Some better explanation should be given. Some report of a responsible engineer, such as the Chief Engineer of Public Works should be before us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry not to be in a position to say much more. Our intention is to change the building we have for a larger one, and to obtain larger plant. We will use the old plant and supplement it with new machinery.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I just put it to the hon. gentleman, as a business man, whether if he were going to build a house for himself, he would not require some estimates of the cost and some report from an engineer or architect, with plan showing each part and the cost of each? Surely the hon. gentleman can tell us how much the change in the building is going to cost, and how much it will cost to light the building after the plant and the building are changed. With the very capable officers he has in his department, he should be able to give these details, so that we may know what we are doing. When the Minister rose, I thought he was going to suggest that the building should be lighted with coal oil.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) thought we were taking a little pleasure, in this early part of the session, in hectoring the Minister. I can assure him we are not. Take the case which my hon. friend stated. Here is the owner of a large mansion who has an agent, and his agent comes to him and says: You have been lighting your house with gas, I think it better to have it lit with electricity. What is the first question the owner will ask? He will want to know what the plant will cost and what it would cost to run it afterwards. But the hon. gentleman cannot tell us what the proposed saving is. He cannot tell us what the plant will cost and what the running of it will cost, but asks us to trust him with \$75,000. That is a large draft, and we should know the conditions on which the hon. gentleman proposes to make the change. My hon. friend has capable officers who could supply him with the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My expectations are that we will save at least \$10,000 a year and provide, at the same time, a better system. I am not in a

Mr. QUINN.

position yet to give the details because I have made up my mind to adopt the best possible system after asking for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to debate the question any longer, but the hon. gentleman is an intelligent man and will see that his reply is not satisfactory. It is all very well for him to say: Have faith in me, I will not do anything that is not right, and I will ask for tenders. But that is not the principle upon which money is voted. It is voted on plans and policy, and if the policy and the plans meet the approval of the House, the vote is given. There is another question that might well be brought up. There is a large company in this city, the Ottawa Electric Car Company. Is it not possible to avail yourself of their power and get electricity in a wholesale way without going to the expense of getting new plant?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have already the plant and will simply have to add to it. I do not wish to commit myself to any definite plan because I want to be in the position of availing myself of any other scheme, and might perhaps accept the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman. I want to provide a good fire system and a good lighting system for less money than we have been paying. As to having plans, I am new to the office and may be mistaken, but it seems to me that estimates for public works all over Canada have been voted without plans being submitted. I am asking for the money, I will have the plans made, and then call for tenders. I propose to follow the example set in the past.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understand well the hon. gentleman, this may cost less than \$75,000 or it may cost more. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what has already been expended on the electric plant here or how much the electric plant which generates the light in the House of Commons cost, so that we might be able to estimate the cost of the change?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give that now, but will give it to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the hon. Minister, until he has a well matured plan and is able to submit it to us, he had better hold over this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give more information on this point. I am asking \$75,000 for the very thing I have described and I do not feel obliged to give any more details.

Mr. BERGERON. With regard to the first item, would the hon. gentleman tell us in what way this \$100,000 is going to be expended on the western building, the part burnt? Is that purely and simply for repairs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
For rebuilding.

Mr. BERGERON. The whole roof of the western building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
Quite so. That is for this year. My chief architect thinks it will cost \$140,000 for the whole, but we cannot spend this year more than I have asked for.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to hear that, because when the fire took place, there were a great many reports, some that it would cost the country \$100,000, and others that it would cost as high as \$1,000,000. I am very glad now to hear that it will not amount to more than \$144,000 or \$150,000.

Public Buildings—Chargeable to Income—Nova Scotia—

Kentville public building.....	\$ 5,000
Liverpool public building.....	5,000
Halifax drill hall (revote).....	12,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works what the policy of the Government is with regard to the places to be chosen for the erection of post offices and public buildings throughout the country. It will be remembered by hon. members who were in the last Parliament and in former Parliaments that the Opposition of that time opposed the Government spending money in this way, and I think it is well to be as consistent as possible now that the Opposition of that time have got into power. Therefore, I ask what is to be the policy of the Government in the erection of public buildings in towns and villages throughout the Dominion ?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend cannot blame the Minister of Public Works for that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to know if it is the policy of the Government to put up buildings in small towns or if it is their intention to limit the erection of buildings to towns of a certain number of inhabitants or to those which furnish a certain income from their post office and custom-house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
The policy of the Government is to erect buildings where it is found in the public interest to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear ; oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
I am very glad to hear that the House agrees with me so thoroughly on that point. In the case of Kentville we found ourselves in this position—we were paying \$140 per annum for the rental of our post office, and we were paying at the same time \$75 for our custom-house, making a total of \$215. Kentville is a thriving town and the inhabitants

of that town urged us very strongly that it was in the public interest to erect a building there, and the Government, after taking this question into serious consideration, made up their minds that it was.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is the population of Kentville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
The population is 2,526, and increasing every year, I may say. In 1871 the population was only 1,179 ; in 1881 it had increased but little, while in 1891 it had increased to the figures I have just given. I have no doubt that it is now about 3,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That was due to the National Policy.

Mr. POUPORE. I would like to know if the hon Minister of Public Works will apply the same rule to my county.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No doubt he will if you will give him another vote.

Mr. POUPORE. I will give him a vote whenever he deserves it. There are three thriving towns in my county, Quyon, Shawville and Portage du Fort, to which this rule ought to be applied.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
I may say a little more in answer to my hon. friend from North Wentworth and Brant (Mr. Somerville). The revenue that we collect at Kentville is very large indeed. Last year the goods—

Mr. FOSTER. What is the post office revenue, first ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
In 1895-96, the post office revenue was \$4,004.39. The customs duties collected for the same year amounted to \$20,997.19, a very large amount of money, showing that Kentville is a thriving town. As to what my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) has said, I may remind him that even a good rule cannot be applied at the same time everywhere ; but I shall certainly take good note of the circumstances he has mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
It will be about \$12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that include fittings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
We hope so.

Mr. WALLACE. And the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
We hope so, but the plans have not yet been prepared, and I cannot pledge myself to any definite course, but my intention in all these small towns, thriving though they may be, meritorious though their cases may be, is not to erect any expensive buildings.

Mr. BENNETT. Having been in the last Parliament and heard the denunciations by hon. gentlemen of the iniquity and extravagance of the then Administration in erecting public buildings in small places, I beg to call attention to some of the facts in this case. The population of this place, according to "Lovell's Gazetteer," is 1,626. The hon. Minister of Public Works tells us that \$215 is now expended in rents for the post office and custom-house in this place. Now, the hon. Minister in a wild fit of economy, proposes to retrench in this fashion—he proposes to spend \$12,000 (that is the figure he puts in, and we may fairly assume, considering his past acts, that that will swell to \$15,000)—

Mr. QUINN. Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. BENNETT. I will be well within the mark, for the benefit of the hon. Minister, and will call it \$15,000. At 4 per cent, this will be \$600 a year. He must have a caretaker for this building, which will take about \$300 more. Then there will be repairs. Altogether the country will stand an expense of at least from \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year for a service which we have now performed at \$215. Now, the hon. Minister has had a very touching appeal made to him by the hon. gentleman behind him (Mr. Somerville), but he has not yet stated the policy of the Government on this subject—whether it is proposed to go on the basis of receipts or of population, or of political exigency, but I rather think he inclines to the last. Before the item passes, will the hon. Minister state which of these three captions this item comes under—political exigency, population, or receipts of the office?

Mr. BERGERON. Before the hon. Minister answers my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), I would like to tell the hon. member for Brant that he forgets one thing. When he speaks of the denunciations of the late Government by their opponents, he forgets that the Minister of Public Works was with us at that time, and favoured all these expenditures on La-prairie post office and others of the same sort. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) ought to keep quiet; his turn is coming. So far these expenditures are only for the front benches. The hon. Minister of Public Works gives first to those who are most deserving. I understand that the first of these places for which appropriation is made is in the county of the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden, King's), and that Liverpool is in the county represented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). After these gentlemen have been served the favours will be distributed among the back benches, and my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) will get his reward.

Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For eighteen long years, some of these counties have been left out in the cold, and it would not be surprising if our friends who are electors were asking to be recognized a little, when there is an opportunity for it and the public interest is served at the same time. And on that account, it seems to me our friends opposite should be a little more charitable. I worked with them at one time, and for eighteen years hon. gentlemen opposite have been benefited by these expenditures. It is long enough.

Mr. BERGERON. We are not complaining, the complaint comes from the other side.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not agree with the Minister of Public Works that the public interest will be served by the erection of the public building he described; and if the rule is to be established that all villages of 1,000 population are to have post offices, there is not a man in this House who cannot name from half a dozen to a dozen villages in his own county as deserving of having public buildings as the towns named in this estimate. Now, there are a number of items here of the same character.

Mr. LISTER. There are the "Four Corners."

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have not any very large towns in my county, but I have three or four villages that would be just as much entitled to public buildings as these, and I do not ask for an expenditure of public money in this way. I do not think that it is in the interest of the public that the Government should go on with the practice which was established by the late Ministry in connection with these buildings. When Mr. Mackenzie's Government was in power that practice was never adopted. Public buildings were erected only in places of importance, and where the public service required the erection of such buildings. I do not think that it is in the interest of the Liberal party or of this Government now in power, to follow in the footsteps of those who have preceded them in the way of expending money for the erection of public buildings in small villages just for the sake of pleasing the electors who live in that section of the country. Now, if we are to have this rule established, then I claim that we should have public buildings in every village of the same population and which yields the same revenue to the Post Office Department and the Customs Department, as those villages that are now to be favoured by this Government with the erection of public buildings. I think that we should not adopt this system, and I, for my part, enter my protest against the Government I support spending public money in this way.

Mr. POUPORE. I would just say this, that if the revenues of the post offices in the

different villages named by my hon. friend would warrant the construction of such buildings, I think it is a good business to construct buildings in such places. I know two or three towns in my county where the rent paid for buildings is far in excess of the interest on the money which would be necessary to put up public buildings in those places. Now, if the post office revenue is such as to warrant the construction of a building of that kind, I think it is good politics, no matter from what party it may come, and that it is in the interest of Canada and in accordance with sound business principles to do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite find fault that public buildings are to be put up in the two counties in Nova Scotia represented by Ministers. Well, I suppose the fact is that these two counties have been punished for a number of years because they elected members on the Liberal side. I do not think it will be denied that if these towns had been in counties which had for a series of years been represented by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, they would long ere this time have had public buildings, judging from what has actually occurred in the past in other places. Take the town of Liverpool, in the county of Queen's, which I have the honour to represent. That is not a large county, and the town is a small one. But, in the first place, it is a shire town, and I claim that a distinction can be properly made between a shire town of a county and a town which is not a shire town. There is another point. The county of Queen's has not, up to the present time, received the benefit of a single dollar of railway expenditure. I think it has to be considered. I think it is a fair thing to note that in many of those villages of which my hon. friend speaks, where they say they have no public buildings, they probably have well-subsidized railways which represent to the people an expenditure of public money. What are you going to say in speaking of any county where, year after year, they have desired railway construction and have desired it in vain, and where they have nothing within the limits of the county to show in the way of expenditures for public buildings, or railways, or anything of the sort? It is natural, whether it is reasonable or not, that these people, irrespective of politics, should wish that some portion of the public expenditure should be made within their borders. Now, I say that if there is a county town within the Dominion of Canada which has no public works of any sort representing Dominion expenditure, it is not an unreasonable thing that they should ask to have a modest public building, not an extravagant public building. You may draw a proper distinction between a building in a large town and one in a small town. If there is a county town in the Dominion of Canada which is in the position which I

have described, which has no public building and no railways, I will justify the expenditure of a moderate sum of money there, not for an extravagant building, but a building in proportion to the reasonable requirements of the people. I think my hon. friend was mistaken in giving the population of Kentville. My impression is that it is a town of about 2,500 people.

Mr. BENNETT. The "Gazetteer" gives it at 1,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a mistake.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two thousand five hundred, I find, is the population.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Its population, I think, is larger than that of Liverpool. At all events, it is a town in the centre of a large agricultural district. Perhaps it is not more prosperous than most of the towns in the lower provinces, but it is by no means one of the least important. I think my hon. friends opposite at one time recognized its importance so far as to put a vote in the Estimates of \$4,000 for a building there, but, owing to some peculiar circumstance, which it is not necessary now to explain, they failed to provide the money when it was required. Now, the proposition is that we shall do that with respect to Kentville, which my hon. friends opposite started in to do and which they failed to carry out.

Mr. POWELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if Kentville has any railways in the vicinity, or if any have been subsidized, and if so, how many?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The town of Kentville has a railway running through it, which has been subsidized; but Liverpool has no railway.

Mr. POWELL. Is there not one to the neighbouring town of Kingsport?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a railway from Kentville to Kingsport. I was pointing out that the county of Queen's has no railway that has been subsidized. There has just been built a section of five miles of railway. Companies have projected other lines but, unhappily, they have never done anything. I do think that a fair preference should be given to a county town where they have no railways and no public expenditures of any kind.

Mr. POWELL. There is no case of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Liverpool is just such a case as I have stated. As respects Kentville, it is one of the large towns of the province, and I think if there is any place that is entitled to a public building, Kentville would come fairly within

any moderate rule which you might lay down.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the maritime provinces are concerned, perhaps a different rule should be adopted than that adopted in the other provinces. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is opposed to this vote in the Estimates. All I can say is that it is a pity that the hon. gentleman, after all the years he has been in this House and supporting the party which he now supports and which he supported when they were in power, did not find it convenient and proper to protest as strongly as he has protested to-day against an expenditure of public money on post offices in small places. I take the ground that in the erection of public buildings the Government should consider not only the population of the place, but also the amount of receipts from post office and customs and other public offices in the county. I think revenue should be the only test. But while that is my opinion, and always has been, I am bound to say that in the past it has not been recognized by hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Opposition benches. Why, Sir, the effects of this pernicious system which they adopted while in power for the purpose of buying support are to be seen to-day in public buildings in many small towns in Quebec and Ontario, yielding most insignificant incomes, nothing like sufficient to pay interest upon the amount invested in those buildings, and the care of them. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance while in power did not think it was improper to put up these buildings in small places. In the little town of Sussex a public building was put up at the expense of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that I have for the second time to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) to the fact that I did not, unfortunately, have anything to do with that.

Mr. LISTER. Well, then it was your partner. It was a long time ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I was born then, but not in politics.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose you were 21. In Marysville also, I think it is in the county which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) represents—

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had made up his mind to leave his old constituency and to seek new pastures he found that it would be wise to put an amount in the Estimates to put up a public building in Marysville. Then a building was put up in the little town of Laprairie with its population of three or four hundred.

An hon. MEMBER. Eight hundred.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. LISTER. I am told that the population is 800. It has a total revenue of \$500, \$600 or \$700.

Mr. TALBOT. \$595.

Mr. LISTER. They thought it was proper to put a public building up there, and it can hardly become a subject of complaint now if members of the Government think that buildings should be put up in the maritime provinces. We think that they should be erected in sections of Ontario which have been neglected in the past.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you said that was wrong.

Mr. LISTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always used this sort of patronage to secure support for themselves. The county of East Lambton sent in a Liberal to represent it for a couple of Parliaments, and so long as a Liberal represented that county it was not deemed expedient that the town of Petrolea should have a public building. It is a town of some 4,000 inhabitants and yielding quite a revenue. As soon as the county of East Lambton changed its allegiance from the Liberal to the Conservative party there was a vote put into the Estimates for a public building in Petrolea which cost something like \$40,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What do you think of that?

Mr. LISTER. I will not tell you just now what I think of it. West Lambton had always been true to Liberalism. The town of Sarnia had a large population and a revenue four times that of Petrolea and it was entitled to a public building, but the Government always turned a deaf ear to my applications that it should be treated in the same manner as the town of Petrolea. The inland revenue of Petrolea, according to the last return, was \$16,257.42, and the post office revenue \$7,170.92 or \$23,427.24 together. They have had a public building in that town since 1887 which cost between \$40,000 and \$50,000. The town of Sarnia has a population of 7,500, and is the county town.

Mr. BERGERON. A nice place too.

Mr. LISTER. A very nice place. Its inland revenue amounted to \$38,008.13, its post office revenue to \$9,623.02, and its customs revenue to \$111,334. In the face of that fact the town in which I live, with a population double that of Petrolea, returning a revenue to the Government of \$159,000 a year, has been refused a public building, while in the adjoining county, with a population of about 4,000 people, an inland revenue of \$16,000, and a post office revenue of \$7,000 which was untrue to the Liberal party, the late Government showed their appreciation at once and erected a public building. But to show what hon. gentlemen have done in other places I will give

a few more figures. Take Amherstburg, a small town in South Essex, represented then by the present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, he represented North Essex.

Mr. LISTER. At all events it was promised to the town prior to the elections. The revenue of Amherstburg is, from the post office, \$2,289.05; customs, \$20,000, making a total of \$22,289. Cayuga, a county town with a small population and a post office revenue of \$1,533.30, apparently no customs revenue, a public building was put up. It is in a riding represented by my hon. friend the late Secretary of State (Mr. Montague). Take Cobourg, represented now by a supporter of the Opposition, and then by a supporter of the late Government. It has a post office revenue of \$6,618.26, and a customs revenue of \$512,000. There is also the case of Cornwall, with a post office revenue of \$8,056.71, and customs revenue of \$21,000. Goderich, while represented by a supporter of the present Opposition, succeeded in getting a public building. The receipts from the post office amounted to \$6,068.99, and from customs \$22,000. There are also Lindsay, post office revenue \$9,130; customs, \$13,000; Napanee, post office revenue, \$6,331; customs, \$7,000; Perth, post office revenue, \$5,269; apparently nothing from customs; Port Hope, post office revenue, \$7,415; Renfrew, post office revenue, \$4,960; nothing from customs; Smith's Falls, post office revenue, \$7,549; Strathroy, a little town with a population of 2,500 or 3,000, post office revenue, \$4,733; Trenton, a small town with a post office revenue of \$5,515, and customs revenue of \$5,000; and Walkerville, a county town, post office revenue, \$5,012. These small towns throughout the country, when they sent supporters of the Government to Parliament were granted public buildings, while counties that elected members of the Liberal party were refused them. As examples of this latter fact take Ingersoll with a large post office revenue; Woodstock, with a post office revenue of \$12,000 or \$15,000, Sarnia, with a revenue of \$150,000, and Owen Sound. I believe a building was promised Owen Sound before the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. Before the last general election. These places have been utterly neglected.

Mr. BERGERON. They are provided for in these Estimates.

Mr. LISTER. In the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia you will find that in nearly all the small towns public buildings have been erected. When in Opposition I protested against the erec-

tion of such buildings unless the public requirements demanded them. The hon. gentlemen opposite disregarded these protestations and went ahead in their wild career of extravagance. There are certain towns as mentioned by the Finance Minister as having been utterly neglected in the past, and I am sure in so far as these places are concerned at all events some of them may be entitled to public buildings and they are more qualified for them than places which have received these favours in the past. It comes with very bad grace indeed for hon. gentlemen opposite to complain of this as being wrong who for eighteen long years supported the late Government and the course it has pursued.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has made a speech for the Opposition. He seems to forget that he is now supporting the Government. He says that we are objecting.

Mr. LISTER. So you were.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. We are not objecting. We are asking for information.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Finance has a great advantage over many of us, because he has not had the pleasure of listening to his friends protesting against items for similar purposes to this, during the last eighteen years. Under the late Administration, there was, perhaps, one case where the expenditure was hardly warranted, but generally the moneys were spent in the same way that this money for Kentville and Liverpool is to be spent, and the expenditure under the late Government was religiously and vigorously protested against by the gentlemen now in power. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), a Roman of the Romans, has been fighting for years against these expenditures, but to-day he merely makes a mild protest, and will vote for and swallow every item in the Estimates brought down by this Government. The present Government have taken the policy of the Conservative Government in this, as they have in everything else.

Mr. WALLACE. I express my entire concurrence in the remarks of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville). Although I supported a Government, generally, that did not hold this opinion, I can say that in my own constituency we have a town of 5,000 population, and I never asked for a public building of any sort for it, but on the contrary have repeatedly declined to do so. I believe that only in large towns and cities should public buildings be erected. I have in my constituency a town with at least twice the population of Kentville, and I do not think I could justify a proposition to erect in it a large and expensive public building. The Minister of Finance tells us that

places like Kentville and Liverpool have been for eighteen years suffering. Suffering from what? Were they suffering because there was not a public building erected, when public interest was against the erecting of a building there? The Minister of Finance further argues, that his Government is justified in this expenditure because these places have been punished in the past for not sending members to support the Conservative Government. There is no punishment when they have no right to a public building, on the ground of public policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite vigorously denounced the late Government, in and out of Parliament, for expenditures of this kind. But because the late Government did these things, that is no justification for them pursuing this extravagant course. The Minister of Finance also told us, that the erection of these buildings was justified on the ground that the places named have not received grants for railways. Well, there has not been one dollar of public money expended in the west riding of York since it became a separate electoral district, and the people of West York have never asked for it. That argument of the Minister of Finance falls flat. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has given us a long list of places in which public buildings have been erected, and he entered into a comparison between the town of Sarnia in his constituency, and the town of Petrolea in the adjoining constituency which has been represented by a Conservative. He told us that Sarnia did double the business of Petrolea, and in order to prove his case he said, that the customs revenue in Sarnia was \$111,000 a year. I admit, that would make out a pretty good case for him, but when I asked him what were the customs returns in Petrolea, he said they had not a custom-house there.

Mr. LISTER. I said there were no returns from it.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, if he had asked the Controller who is calmly slumbering on his right, he could have learned that there were customs returns from Petrolea, and that the customs returns for Sarnia were not \$111,000, but just one-quarter of that, or \$29,027.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) could have learned, that the customs returns for Petrolea, where he said there were no customs returns, are \$62,403, or more than twice as much as from Sarnia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. And in order to make up the \$111,000 for Sarnia, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) took the customs returns of Petrolea and added it to Sarnia, and not being satisfied with that, he took \$18,000

Mr. WALLACE.

or \$20,000 from the returns of Point Edward, and then got his \$111,000 and said: Look at the business we are doing in Sarnia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) will certainly have to revive his memory. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) comes before this House, and says: Look at the business done in Kentville. There are \$20,000 receipts from customs there. The hon. Minister was not satisfied with giving the exact returns from Kentville, but he entered the returns from Burwick, Canada Creek, Canning, French Creek, Hadleyville, Port William and Hopefield, and by this means he got customs returns of \$20,900. The hon. Minister shakes his head. Is it because there is nothing in it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Are you sure about your figures?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, quite so. I have the report of the Controller of Customs in my hands, which shows that the receipts from Kentville were \$13,920 and not \$20,927. The figures quoted by the Minister were made up from the returns of all those places I have mentioned. Let me refer again to another peculiarity about Kentville. Some hon. gentlemen opposite said, that its population was \$2,400, and the Minister of Finance repeated the figures; but as a matter of fact the population, according to the census of 1891, was 1,686.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then, these Tory officers of mine have played tricks on me.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister, if he does a clever thing, claims credit for himself, while if there is a blunder, he blames his officials.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not blame anybody.

Mr. WALLACE. We will have to put the responsibility on the Minister of Public Works and on the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures here are \$2,500.

Mr. WALLACE. The figures here are: for 1881, \$1,275; and for 1891, \$1,686; an increase of \$401 in the ten years. In my constituency there is one place with exactly three times the population, for which we are not asking for a public building, and for which I declined, when on the other side of the House, to ask, either verbally or in writing, for a public building. Yet the Minister of Finance says that because they have had no expenditure of public money there, at a place with 1,686 people, it is a proper thing to expend on a public building \$12,000, which may swell to \$15,000 or \$20,000—at a place where they now pay a rental of \$215, and where interest, repairs, a caretaker, heating and lighting will cost the Government \$1,500 a year, or seven times as much as the rental they are paying to-

day. What justification can there possibly be for this expenditure, especially by a Government pledged to economy, who swore most solemnly that if they were returned to power there would be none of this Tory extravagance prevailing throughout this country, but that they would husband the resources of the people. In my opinion the Government are doing something which they cannot justify, even with the special pleading of our good friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), in putting up public buildings at places like Liverpool and Kentville. For Liverpool I see the customs returns are \$4,579. It does not cost 5 per cent. on the average, to collect our customs duties, and therefore the cost at Liverpool should be about \$200; but, of course, in places like that, there is sometimes a preventive service, which would increase the expense. Yet the Government propose to put a public building in this place, where the post office and customs revenues are necessarily small. I think these expenditures are unjustifiable and in direct contradiction to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in Opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is in the House now. I would like to know if he would justify this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to the census returns, the population of Kentville and Canning, which are the same place for postal purposes—

Mr. FOSTER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They are no more the same place for postal purposes than Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. WALLACE. I may tell the hon. gentleman, too, that for customs purposes there is a custom-house at Kentville and another custom-house at Canning.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The figures laid before me are simply taken from the census.

Mr. FOSTER. Better withdraw the vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will withdraw the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that as the hon. gentleman's information on which he bases this vote is wrong, he will no longer persist in asking for a vote on false pretenses, and withdraw it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friends are forgetting what they did in the past. I am asking from this committee two small sums of money for two towns in Nova Scotia—Kentville and Liverpool. During the last ten years the following towns in the same province have been supplied with public buildings: Amherst, with a public building which cost \$37,588.78.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a city.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the population of Amherst?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 3,781.

Mr. WALLACE. Twice as large, and the customs returns are a good deal more than twice as much.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Annapolis has been provided with a public building costing \$14,079.93; Pictou, with one costing \$14,006.74; Tynemouth, with one costing \$12,508.66; Lunenburg, with one costing \$33,978.50; New Glasgow, with one costing \$43,285.61; North Sydney, with one costing \$25,994.35.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the population?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 2,426. Truro was provided with a public building costing \$36,690.11; Windsor, a very small town, with one costing \$32,347.29; Yarmouth, with one costing \$41,700.71. It seems to me our friends should be a little more fair.

Mr. BERGERON. We are not objecting to it. It was hon. gentlemen opposite who objected to all these expenditures under the late Government, and they are now following the same course.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not convinced by any of the arguments which have been advanced, either by the Finance Minister or my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), that the Government I am supporting are doing right in incurring expenditures such as these and such as were formerly incurred by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. Finance Minister justifies the expenditure for the erection of a public building in the town of Kentville on the ground that no public money has been expended in that section for railways.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, there has been.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister's plea recalls to my mind the argument made by the late Government when we were discussing the expenditure on the Tay Canal. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) justified that expenditure by saying that the county he represented had never previously got anything from the Government, and that consequently it was entitled to the expenditure of half a million dollars. They had never, he said, got any railway grants, and had been paying tribute to all other parts of the Dominion. This argument of the Finance Minister is just on a par with that which was made by the ex-Minister of Railways, to justify the illegitimate expenditure of half a million dollars on a canal which it costs about

\$2,000 a year to maintain and which yields a revenue of \$125.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was there any railway in Perth?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the cases are not parallel.

Mr. FOSTER. The cases are parallel. There is a railway running through Kentville which was subsidized by the Dominion Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. My hon. friend from West Lambton was just as vigorous an opponent of this kind of expenditure as hon. gentlemen sitting opposite us are to-day, and I cannot for the life of me see how he can expect to justify this vote. He did not, as a matter of fact, justify it. He pointed out some of the larger towns, where the revenue was large, but did not refer to any of the smaller towns. When he was in Opposition, however, he referred to the smaller towns, and we are drawing a fair inference from his remarks when we say that he is of the opinion that this Government has the right to follow in the footsteps of the late Government and that this expenditure is legitimate because we ought to serve our friends as they served theirs.

Mr. LISTER. I made no such statement.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We all know that when in Opposition, we laid down certain principles regarding the expenditure of public money; and when we get into power and are asked to do the very thing that we then condemned, I for one am not prepared to justify such expenditure. That is not the only evidence of this kind we have in the Estimates. We have a number of similar votes that cannot be justified. Take, for instance, the little village represented by my hon. friend who sits behind me, Montmagny (Mr. Choquette). He has obtained a vote for \$7,500 for the erection of a post office. What do you suppose the revenue of that office amounts to. There is no custom-house there. It is stated by men who live in that section that the principal industry there is a saw-mill, and that when all the pine is cut up there will be no village left. The total revenue of the post office is \$1,731, and the salaries \$639.93, leaving a net revenue of \$1,091.07. The population in the village is 1,697. Then my hon. friend on the front benches (Mr. Beau-soleil) has another post office grant for a town of about the same size and whose revenue is about the same. I for one, who have been a Liberal all my life, and shall continue to be a Liberal, if the Liberals carry out in office what they professed in Opposition, cannot justify this expenditure. I say that we have no right to follow in the footsteps of our predecessors when they did wrong, and I for one must condemn the Government in this matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. LISTER. My hon. friend, in his heated declamation, thought proper to refer to me as supporting the item now under consideration. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman that I said explicitly that the position I took in Opposition I take now, and I remind my hon. friend that whenever the question of post offices came before the House, when in Opposition, I attempted to point out to the Government the claims of the town I come from. I pointed out its claims session after session, I named the different towns that yielded to the Government far less, in many cases not one half and in others not a quarter of the revenue derived from the customs and post office at Sarnia, and I appealed to the late Government on all the grounds of justice and fairness that Strathroy, and other places through Ontario were entitled to those public buildings. Sarnia certainly was entitled to them. I urged the Government on behalf of the towns I come from and of Woodstock and Ingersoll and other places which gave larger revenues to the Government. I said you should first erect public buildings in these places which justify the expenditure on the ground of population and revenue. I have always held that the Government are bound to erect public buildings in the larger towns, and that it was manifestly partisan and unfair that the Government should have erected these buildings in small places, simply because these smaller places had representatives here supporting the Government, and have overlooked the large places. That was the line of argument I took then, and it is the same I take now. The late Government, by their policy, distributed favours throughout the lower provinces and Ontario, and it does seem hard that places of equal importance, which are supporting the present Government should not now be treated in the same way. I say now that the Government should lay down the hard and fast rule that public buildings should only be erected where the minimum population was a certain number and the revenue from their public offices amounted to a fixed minimum sum. If that principle were adopted, now and for all time, this wretched question of erecting public buildings in places where their erection cannot be justified by the revenue, would be at an end. Now that nearly all the large towns of Ontario are satisfied because they have public buildings, the next raid on the treasury will be, not from the county towns, but from the large outside towns, with populations of from three to four thousand. They will point out to their representatives that if such and such a place got a building they are entitled to one, and they will unite their forces and compel the Government to grant their demands. The only way that this can be gotten rid of is, as I stated a moment ago, to lay down

a principle upon which public buildings should be erected and not depart from it, and I believe that the sound principle is population and revenue to the Government.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. As this is as good an opportunity as will probably be afforded me, I wish to say a few words in regard to the Montmagny post office. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) who sits before me, should repeat facts that have been stated in my presence as a joke.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette). The facts I gave were taken from the blue-books, the census returns and the official report of the post office.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Part of the facts are taken from those sources—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All the facts I stated.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The hon. gentleman takes the population of the town of Montmagny alone, which is 1,600. But he must remember that we have only one post office not only for the town of Montmagny but also for the parish of St. Thomas. There is only one parish—only one church—and the town and the parish have a population of about 5,000. You take the census of the town of Montmagny and the parish of St. Thomas and you find the population is about 4,607; the population of the parish of St. Thomas, which is also served by this post office is about 3,000. More than that, Montmagny post office is also the centre of distribution for the Grosse Isle quarantine station, and for Crane Island and, in all, has a population of about 6,000. In 1885, there was a requisition sent by the town council to the Government and presented by the member for the county at that time, the present Senator Landry, setting forth the need for this building. And to show that this is not a political question, I will state some further facts. I have been asking for this post office ever since I came to Parliament. This post office was promised by the late Government and by Mr. Landry. In 1882, I was defeated by Mr. Landry, the then Tory candidate. Mr. Landry promised this post office, and the post office was an important factor in the election. In 1885, being then a town councillor, even though I knew that it would help my opponent, Mr. Landry, and give him strength in the county, I myself seconded a resolution in the council which was carried, asking the Government to build this post office as they had promised, and this was transmitted by Mr. Landry to the Minister of Public Works, then Sir Hector Langevin, in a letter dated the 16th March, 1885, and before the general election of 1887. This letter was as follows:—

I have the honour to transmit to you a request from the City Council of Montmagny, asking for

the erection of a post office at Montmagny, and offering to the Government the site necessary.

Let me reiterate my demand just as I made it in my last letter on the subject of that post office, that the foundations be laid this year. That is all we ask. From \$2,000 to \$3,000 will be sufficient for this year. Hoping to succeed in obtaining at least this sum of money for the county of Montmagny.

I remain, &c.,

(Sgd.) P. LANDRY.

In the election of 1887 this same question came before the people. Mr. Landry told the people: The Government will be returned to power, and if you elect a supporter for them, you will be all the more likely to get the post office. So I gave a pledge then to support the Government on this question. I said: If the Tory Government is returned, and willing to carry out its promises to put a sum in the Estimates to build the post office, I pledge myself to support the Government in that matter. And I did so. Every year I asked the Government to fulfil its promises; and when the question of the post office at Laprairie was up—they spent \$20,000 for a building in a place that gave a revenue of not more than \$500—I asked the Government to redeem their promises and promised them my support in doing so. All this shows that this is not a political question; it shows that this is a question of honour, for me, a question of honour for the Tory party, to support the proposal which they favoured for fifteen years and on which they fought two elections. Now I come here to ask the Government to redeem the pledge they made to the electors, to redeem the promises that the Tory Government made to the electors. I ask only for \$7,500, a very small sum, because I do not hold that we need a great or splendid building there but only such a building as is necessary to carry on the business of the post office in the county. I may explain that at the time that these promises were made, we had no custom-house, though the merchants and importers in my riding had very often asked that one be established. We have done our customs business in Quebec. Only a few days ago I received a petition signed by Senator Price—who is a good Tory—and a great many others, asking to have a custom-house established. Now, last year what was the revenue of the post office at Montmagny? It was \$1,723.19, and the expenses \$699.33, leaving a balance of \$1,043.86. So we have been giving to the Government for twenty years a net income of over a thousand dollars. I think that, under these circumstances, the Government is quite justified in putting in the Estimates this small sum to redeem the promise made by both parties in the county, a promise made by both Governments.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) if the build-

ing that it is proposed to have there is not already erected?

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I am glad to have that question put, and to give an explanation with regard to the matter. Mr. Landry, the ex-member for the riding, in 1886, to show that the Government was willing to have a post office there, induced one of his friends to put up a big stone building costing about \$10,000. The object of putting up the building was that the Tories could say: You see the building is already being put up and the Government will buy it. I was very glad of that, and I was willing to give the Government my support in doing it. But after Mr. Landry was defeated, he refused to ask the Government to buy the building. The man who was induced to put up a building had to borrow money from the Quebec Seminary. He borrowed \$7,000. But he went away to the States. He was a good Tory, good enough to get credit with Mr. Landry and the farmers, and he stole about \$30,000 or \$40,000 from the farmers in his transactions in cheese and butter and went away to the States.

The Quebec Seminary has a building there, and they have asked me and some of our friends opposite to induce the Government to buy that building, and they are willing to sell it for thousands less than it cost them. If the Government think best in the country's interest and in order to save money, to buy that building, I am willing to support them in it.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I believe this is a private residence.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** It may be used so now, it was erected as a public building.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** Was it not built for a creamery?

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** No: It was built to serve as a post office. It is a three-story stone building, with heating apparatus, a very good building, and if the Government are willing to buy it at a low price, considerably under the cost price, I am in favour of it.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** Are the Quebec Seminary the owners of the building?

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** Yes, and always have been.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** It is under mortgage.

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** No, they have a clear title to it, they bought it from the sheriff, and they had to disburse some more money to get it.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** What did they pay for it?

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.** I do not remember, but I think the mortgage was over \$8,000.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** While I have the honour of a seat in this House, I am desir-

**Mr. CHOQUETTE.**

ous of seeing even-handed justice dealt out to all, a public building for Kentville, county King's, and Liverpool, county Queen's, N.S., not excepted, the matter now before the House. I am acquainted with the town of Kentville as well as any one in the House; it is in a county adjoining my own county; is a shire town, and I do not know of any town that is more entitled to a post office than this town; and I feel that in justice to the inhabitants of Kentville they should have one. The town of Liverpool is also in the county adjoining mine, which has no railway. True there is a road projected in North Queen's, but is not built. I hope it will be built in the near future or it will be a disappointment to the expectants. It is a progressive town, and a town that is well deserving of a post office, more so, I think, than some places where post offices have been built. Therefore, I feel that, in justice to these two places, they are entitled to the grants that are now asked for.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I have been listening to this debate with a great deal of interest, and watching the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Paterson). I noticed that he was sleeping away his day of grace under the sunshine of the new gospel of the Minister of Public Works, and not saying a word about the important town of Owen Sound which he represents and which the Hon. Mr. Hardy said was going to get more than cold justice provided the hon. member was elected. This gentleman drew a distinction between cold justice and ordinary justice, and they would get the former if they elected the hon. member for North Grey's opponent. Well, they elected the hon. gentleman who tries to get more for them than cold justice, and I regret the Government have not seen fit to put in an item for a post office there, because Owen Sound is a live town, it is the county town of our county, having over 9,000 inhabitants, and they have no post office building. If the rule holds good that the Minister of Public Works has laid down for the building of post offices, I shall put in a claim for two or three post offices in our county. We have the town of Thornbury which has none, Meaford has none, Owen Sound has none. These are large and important lake towns. Up to the present time I have never asked the Government to build post offices in any of these towns, because I always held that when the service of the country could be carried on in buildings, the rent of which would cost less than the interest on the amount of money necessary to erect new buildings, it was better to continue to rent the buildings, and I think so still. But if this principle is to prevail which the Minister of Public Works has laid down then I shall, after awhile, endeavour to get more post offices in our part of the country.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I have never objected to the expenditure of money, no matter in

what part of this Dominion, if I thought it was justifiable. But it is strange to me that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) should take the ground that the doctrine he preached when he was in Opposition is all right now because the parties have changed places.

Mr. LISTER. I have not taken any such ground.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you have voted for it like a little man. Now, I do not object to the expenditure of money in post offices, and never did; what I object to is hon. gentlemen finding fault with us when they were in Opposition for doing what they called iniquitous things in the erection of post offices—for that is what we were arraigned for in the country, and a good many members supporting the present Government are sitting there in consequence of the fact that these paltry questions were raised and they got in under false pretenses; and now when we challenge members supporting the Government for doing what they condemned us for doing, all they say is, you're another, you did the same thing. The hon. gentlemen opposite only got into power on a fluke anyway, it was because they condemned us for doing just such things as they do now, and which they justify themselves in doing by saying we did the same. That is no argument at all. If it was wrong in the Conservative party to put up post offices in these small villages, it is doubly wrong for the present Government to do it, because they condemned it so strongly when in Opposition. Public men may make a mistake and be perfectly conscientious in doing it; but the Opposition is not justified, when we point out that mistake, in attempting to justify it because we did it. I do not say but that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is quite right, and that these post offices should be built down in his province that the leader of the Government said was the home of boodlers. If that is a fact, the boodlers are not all dead yet, we have got some of them in the Cabinet, because they have been boodling by building post offices in little villages all through the maritime provinces. But that is no reason why these boodlers should not die, and that we should not be quit of them. The leader of the House may well say to these men: "Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me."

Mr. McMULLEN. In the year 1890 there was a unanimous resolution passed by this House, accepted by Sir John A. Macdonald, leader of the Government at the time, that public buildings should only be constructed where the revenues of the country warranted it. That resolution was agreed to without a dissenting voice. Unfortunately, the hon. gentlemen opposite did not carry out that resolution. If they had stuck to that principle until now, I question very much if we would have before us the

items which we are now discussing. I may say that, for my part, I take strong exception to the expenditure of public money for buildings where the revenues do not warrant it; and in this case I take my stand that such an expenditure is wrong. I consider that no public building should be erected in a place until the population becomes considerable, and the revenue received at such points justifies their construction. Now, with regard to county towns, I admit there is a certain force in the argument that county towns, occupying a prominent position of that kind, should receive perhaps a little consideration. You can never lay down a hard and fast rule that can be carried out. It would cease to be a rule if it had not an exception. The rule should be that public buildings should only be put in places such, for instance, as Sarnia, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Lister). I say that in my humble opinion it was a gross wrong to that section of the country that a post office was not erected there. But if there is any place that stands out more prominently than the rest as a place where a positive, barefaced wrong was perpetrated, in the matter of the erection of public buildings, that place was Woodstock. There is a live town in which the receipts are something like \$15,000 or \$16,000 from the post office alone, besides which there is a very large customs revenue. Notwithstanding the fact that, year after year, post offices have been built in such places as Marysville and other miserable little towns up and down the country. Woodstock did not get a public building simply because it sent a representative here in opposition to the late Government and also because it elected a leading spirit in the local legislature. I contend that hon. gentlemen opposite, in this, perpetrated a barefaced wrong, and it is not much wonder that people became exasperated with them. In 1890 a resolution was moved by the Hon. David Mills, accepted by Sir John Macdonald and unanimously approved by the House, declaring that public buildings should only be erected where the revenue warranted it and where the receipts of the current year gave some balance to the credit of the country which might be invested in public buildings. I say we should get back to that rule at once.

Mr. TAYLOR. That rule was never violated.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, it was violated in several cases. It was violated in the case of Cayuga and in the case of Marysville. In this latter case there was a barefaced violation of the rule. It was also violated in other places where buildings had been put up. If that rule had been adhered to we would possibly not have had before us items which we have now to consider.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) does not want to misrepresent the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) take his seat.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has made the statement that this resolution was violated in the case of Cayuga.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman should not rise to such a point of order as that.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very well known that this rule has been violated in the case of several places.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not in Cayuga, though.

Mr. McMULLEN. I give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for discussing these points. We upon this side of the House challenged these expenditures when in Opposition and I should like now that the House should re-adopt the principle, adopted in 1890, that public buildings shall only be erected in places where the revenue and the population warrants it, and I would only say to the members of the Cabinet that if ever any proposition is made to violate that principle I shall undoubtedly support a motion to condemn it. I say that we should adhere strictly to that principle.

Mr. BAIN. Before this resolution is adopted I want to say one word. I have listened to the discussion of every question as my hon. friends on this side of the House have, night after night, in former years, when we were in opposition, and I confess that my hon. friend for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) expressed my sentiments exactly. There is no pretense that in the smaller towns postal accommodation where it is furnished by rental or in any other mode, has been any detriment to the service or to the accommodation of the public, and I have to say this emphatically that if the Government want to avoid for themselves a great deal of trouble with their supporters in the future, they had better adopt the principle of avoiding spending public money in smaller places. I do not care whether you call it a county town or anything else. In my town we collect some \$15,000 in customs, and our postal receipts are about \$3,700 or \$3,800. Some years ago we rented a post office there, and the Government spent a couple of thousand dollars in fitting it up. But suppose we had spent \$10,000 or \$12,000 in erecting a public building, you will get by that no better accommodation than we have to-day, and I do say as a question of principle, that there is no justification for simply spending public money to decorate a town with a building because it looks nice. As my hon. friend for East Simcoe says, we have the wear and tear of a large investment and we have to pay a caretaker for the building. I do think the sooner we adopt the principle of cutting off the erection of public buildings in the smaller places the better it will be for the Government. It will save them a

Mr. McMULLEN.

great deal of trouble from their supporters who are perpetually asking them to do things they should not do, and it will save large investments of money that are yielding no return to the country. I presume none of us wish to spend money simply for the purpose of spending it, and I hope we shall not have private members saying that because a railway has not been bonused through their county therefore we should spend money which gives us no practical return. We are all anxious to secure nice public buildings, but it is possible to buy gold too dearly. If this Government are to justify to the public their existence as administrators of public affairs, they do not want to do exactly as their predecessors did for there is no use of calling a Government by a new name and going on in the grooves that has been pursued in the past. I think we owe that much to ourselves, to the Government and to the public, and I do say emphatically that in this matter the very fact of the bitter discussions that have taken place, night after night in former years, in this House, did deter the late Government, in the later years of their administration, from expenditures that otherwise would have been thrust upon them by their own friends. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will bear out what I am saying, that it is exceedingly hard to refuse the applications of your own friends, of the men who have stood by you in the House, and I say that we ought to adopt the principle of cutting off these expenditures, in the smaller places, even if it does offend some of our friends.

Mr. FOSTER. This debate is valuable for two reasons, and I want to call the attention of the committee to them before the item is passed. Now, I am going to make a frank confession. Too much money has been spent on public buildings in the past, just for the sake of gratifying the pride of those places which desired to have public buildings. I acknowledge that that has been done. Before 1890 we were very sharply criticised by the Opposition in the House and by the papers outside. That was the position laid down then by the Opposition and the one which they considered it proper to adopt. They made a motion; Sir John Macdonald accepted it, and the House agreed to it. It passed without any vote at all. That laid down precisely what the feeling of the Opposition was, the principle, in reference to these expenditures, and it was acquiesced by the Government of the day that that principle was a correct one. Taking into account all the pressure which was placed upon the Government. I take occasion to say that if you look through the list of post offices and public buildings, erected since that year, you will find that with the exceptions of those which had been started before for which a vote had been asked, the rule was adhered to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I rather think that Marysville came under that head.

Mr. FOSTER. It had been in the Estimates, then left out for a year or two and put in again. I think you will find, however, that with one or two exceptions, not more than one, that the late Government did not put up any new public buildings against that rule after 1891. We acknowledge that that was a salutary rule. Those that were started, and had the land bought for them, or the like of that, we felt we ought to carry through, and if there were one or two cases outside of that rule, it was the maximum. But no one in the Opposition at that time doubted that it was the correct principle. Not a single man doubted but that when the Opposition came into power they would carry out that rule, and they criticised us since 1890 because in the case even of post offices which were in process of construction in small places, we continued the building. Now, only three supporters of the Government have made protests with reference to this. I do not think that in these very small places it is in the public interest that we ought to invest a lot of public money for which we get no return whatever.

But the grave thing that I want to call the attention of the House to is the proposition and the principle advocated by the present Minister of Finance, who sits upon the public chest, and who holds the purse-strings of the country. If ever there was a plea, open and unabashed, for the expenditure of public money on other than public grounds, it was made by the hon. gentleman who to-day is the Finance Minister of this Dominion. What was it? He justified this vote on the very ground on which we were trenchantly criticised for granting this expenditure on a previous occasion, and which they called favouritism. When a town or a county which has not had large expenditures, and which comes to the Government and says: You have not given us this and you have not given us that, and you have given it to other places; give us something now; they propose to accede to the request without reference to the principle as to whether the something they ask is a fair expenditure and in the public interest. Now, what were the reasons given by the Finance Minister, and it is grave and important to consider it under the present circumstances. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was disposed to joke at it very jauntily, and when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) raised his protest, he thought it would be like the protest that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) occasionally enters, and that there would be no persistence in it, and so the Minister in a light and airy and jocular

strain gave an answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) which did not satisfy him. But a grave answer was given by the Minister of Finance. His three points were these: First, these little towns have been left out in the cold by the wicked Tory Government, let us give them a little fire to warm themselves with, no matter whether it is on just grounds they ask it or not. What was the other reason? It was that these little places had not received public money in the way of railroad grants, and consequently they must have their share out of the public till, and so the Minister of Finance said: Give them this whether it is necessary or not. When the Minister (Mr. Fielding) came down to analyse Kentville, he found that it is on the main line of railway, and has branch lines as well. And when he came to the little town of Liverpool, which is growing smaller, and with no great future before it, unless something takes place which has not taken place within the last fifty years; he makes the argument that because it is a county town his Government should spend \$12,000 in it, although there is not much more than 1,200 of a population in the place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. More than double that.

Mr. FOSTER. The census does not show it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The census says 2,465.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, a little town of 2,400 is to have expended in it \$12,000 or \$15,000, just for the sake of giving it a little distribution of the public money. Now, that is the vicious principle that hon. gentlemen opposite thought was so detrimental, and they fought it so determinedly that it had its effect, and that in 1891 Sir John Macdonald admitted the principle laid down in the resolution, and from 1891 on there had been very few evasions of that principle. I call the attention of the House to this: that the Liberal party laid down their principle in 1891, and fought consistently on it in Opposition, until it came to their first year of power, and now they have the Minister of Finance and Minister of Public Works tell them: Oh, this was only Opposition talk, we must give these little places their sop, for they have been out in the cold so long. The other principle laid down by the Minister of Finance was: You are to spend public money just for the sake of gratifying the people and not for the public good. If that is not the principle to be laid down, then I cannot see any other principle underlying it at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must not allow the hon. member (Mr. Foster) to state the principle I laid down in the

manner he has. In the first place, I deny that any wrong would be done to the public service of Canada, if, having entered on the policy of erecting public buildings throughout Canada, you erect a public building proportionate to the size and extent of the town. If you put one public building in every county in the Dominion of Canada I deny that any great wrong is done. I say that the people of the various sections of the Dominion have a right to feel that they are sharing in the expenditure of public moneys, which we presume are always expended in the public good. And though the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says it is a violation of principle, I say it appeals to our reason and common sense that if there is a county in any part of the Dominion which is contributing of its means to every public work that is going on, and has nothing to show as its share of these things, it is a natural and reasonable thing that they should desire that some of this distribution should come to them. If that distribution comes in the way of wasteful public work, I would not for a moment defend it, but I say, if the town—if the county, because I am speaking of the county rather than the town—if the county should apply that in its shire town a public building should be put up, and if that building be of a modest character, with due regard to the condition of the town and its business, I deny that there is a violation of principle or a waste of public money in meeting the request of the people. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may say that it is the assertion of a vicious principle, but I say it is the assertion of something that is so near to human nature and common sense that the people of the whole Dominion of Canada will say that it is reasonable that the several sections of each province and the several sections of the Dominion shall share fairly in the public expenditure. Of course, you might apply the rule in such a way as to cause wasteful expenditure, for you might put in a small town a large building out of all proportion to its needs. Let us see how the principle was applied by the Conservative Government in the province of Nova Scotia. In the town of Annapolis, which according to the census has only 959 of a population—I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) will say that return is hardly just, because I believe Annapolis has a larger population—in that town with 959 of a population according to the census, the Conservative Government put up a building costing \$14,000. I also find that in the town of Baddeck, with only 1,200 of a population, they spent \$14,000 on a public building. Now, is it not natural and reasonable, when many of the counties in Nova Scotia have been supplied with buildings of that character, is it not natural that the people in the other counties should

Mr. FIELDING.

look for some consideration when they present their claims.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is not fair and reasonable for you to give it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I fancy my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) has some public buildings in his county.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I venture to say that if my hon. friend had no public works of any kind in his county he would not be prepared to take the broad and generous view he does. I have to speak as the representative of the people who have no share in the favours of the Government in the past and which hon. gentlemen opposite shared in. Though you may call it a narrow view, it is a very human view, and it is not inconsistent with the best interests of the country if it should result, as I said, in giving every county in the Dominion one public building. But I say that if you multiply these buildings, and put them up in small places, you may overdo the business. I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to put themselves in the position of members who represent Liberal counties, and who have for years seen the Conservative Government go on the principle of erecting \$14,000 buildings in towns of 900 population, and I ask them: Is it not natural that a desire should exist in the other counties of the province to have buildings.

Mr. BERGERON. But you protested against that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that in the province of Ontario almost every county town to-day has a public building, with the exception of very few.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed so, and I give the information as it came to me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that there never was a building put up by the late Government in a county represented by a Liberal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that consideration has always had some influence, and we are all human. But, I ask, is it not reasonable, after you have given public buildings to two-thirds of the counties of a province, that we should give a public building to such places as those mentioned to-day, provided that it is a modest one, and that there is in no sense extravagance or waste of public money.

Mr. HENDERSON. The last speaker stated, I believe, that no public buildings

had been erected by the late Government in counties represented by Liberals. We must remember, however, that when the Liberals were formerly in power, they saw that their friends were provided for. For example, in the city of Guelph, in the county of Wellington, they erected a large post office in a constituency then represented by a Liberal, but now represented by an hon. member sitting on this side of the House. In the county of Peel there is a large public building, which was built by the late Government. That county is now represented by a gentleman supporting the Government. I am glad the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has raised this question, for I think it is time the Government announced some fixed policy to govern them in this matter. They have no policy whatever, except the policy announced by the Minister of Public Works, that he was just going to pursue such a course as public policy dictated, and you know what that means; it means that he is going to pursue the policy which was condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were sitting on this side of the House—a policy of suiting and pleasing his own friends. I do not think it can be wise for hon. gentlemen who have condemned that policy to continue to carry it out. I think the hon. member for North Brant is perfectly right in condemning a continuance of that policy. In almost every riding in this Dominion, at least in the older provinces, there are four or five considerable towns or villages. I would not object to a county or shire town having a little more expensive building; but I do object to and I always have opposed, the expenditure of very large sums for the erection of post offices. I do not believe in expending \$20,000 or \$30,000 for the erection of a post office in any place that is not a city.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Has the hon. gentleman under his hand at present the page of "Hansard" on which he recorded his objection to such expenditures? I have been in this House for a long time, and I do not remember hearing him make any very distinct protest.

**MR. HENDERSON.** The hon. gentleman may be quite correct in what he says. I did not say that I made that statement in this House. I advocated it in the country, and I held that opinion. So far as my own county is concerned, I never asked the late Government to expend a large sum in erecting a public building there, though I had a right to do so. Consequently, the statement I made is correct. My plan is to take, say five incorporated towns and villages in a county, and, instead of spending \$30,000 for the erection of a large public building in one town, divide that into five amounts of \$6,000 each, and erect a

building in each of the five places. I know something of what buildings can be erected for in Ontario at present. Labour and material are cheap, and a most substantial building, large enough not only for a post office, but for a residence for the postmaster, can be built, with the site included, for \$6,000.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Yes, for less than that.

**MR. HENDERSON.** I can safely put it at \$6,000. For that sum you could have a very good building, almost fireproof. At any rate, you could have in it a vault for the protection of registered letters and other valuable property passing through the mails. Instead of spending \$30,000 on one building, let us have five for the same amount. Then you would save the rents paid by the Government, and an hon. gentleman reminds me that you would save the cost of a caretaker, amounting to \$400 or \$500 a year. If we are going to run the country economically, we must get away from the idea of these large expenditures, and adopt a policy suitable to the requirements of the country. I think the hon. member for North Brant has done well to draw the attention of the Government to the mistake they are making in erecting post offices or public buildings in small towns such as that referred to in Montmagny and in other counties, where it is the intention of the Government to erect buildings. For my part, I shall be happy to endorse them in adopting a policy such as I propose, and I am quite sure the country will endorse them. But I think the country will condemn them if they continue to spend large sums of money in erecting expensive post offices and public buildings throughout the country.

**MR. SPROULE.** I would like to say a few words with regard to the principle laid down by the hon. Minister of Finance, which I consider, and which I think the country will consider, a very bad one; that is, that certain towns, because they have had no public money spent in them, are entitled to have public money spent, whether it is needed or not. The country will concur in the wisdom of spending public money where it is needed to be spent to carry on the operations of the people; but the country will not justify either the present Government or any other Government in spending public money in any locality just because no public money has been spent there before. I think that is a very unsound principle. I want to say a word in regard to the statement by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), that constituencies represented by Conservatives were generally supplied by the late Government with post offices. Let me call his attention to the fact that in South Simcoe, which has always been represented by a Conser-

vative, there is not a post office or any other public building built by the Government.

Mr. LISTER. Is the county town in it?

Mr. SPROULE. Not the county town, but there is a town in it. Then take East Grey.

Mr. LISTER. Is there a county town in that?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman did not say anything about county towns. He said in constituencies represented by Conservatives.

Mr. LISTER. How large a town is in it?

Mr. SPROULE. Between two and three thousand inhabitants.

Mr. LISTER. What is the name?

Mr. SPROULE. Meaford.

Mr. LISTER. That is simply a village.

Mr. SPROULE. That was represented by a Conservative, and has been for a great many years. Take North Grey, which has been represented generally by a Conservative and which has a county town of over 9,000 inhabitants, and yet it has not had a post office erected there. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the constituencies represented by the Conservatives were all supplied, he could not have been well informed.

Mr. LISTER. Is it not a fact that the late Government promised to put up a public building in Owen Sound?

Mr. SPROULE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. LISTER. It was in the Estimates of last year of the late Government.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not aware of it. I am replying to the argument advanced by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) that the counties represented by Conservatives had all been supplied with public buildings and that it was only right we should extend the same treatment to those represented by Liberals. Take the town of South Grey, the town of Durham is a very important town, sufficiently so to have a post office built in it by the late Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And it shall now.

Mr. SPROULE. It shall now if the hon. gentleman has sufficient influence with the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps if you will conclude, I will get one built at Markdale.

Mr. SPROULE. On that principle there are many places that ought to have had post offices. I hold that it is clearly wrong.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will hold on until half-past six.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. When you left the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I was replying to the argument advanced from the other side that constituencies represented by Conservatives were all supplied with post offices, and I think I have shown that that was not the case. I mentioned the two ridings of East Grey and North Grey and also South Simcoe. I would now mention Cardwell as being a constituency which has been represented by Conservatives for a long time and which has no public buildings. I might also take West York and East York and many others on the same list. I cite these places to show that constituencies represented by Conservatives were not better treated in this respect than other places.

Mr. McALISTER. I agree entirely with what has been said by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) as to the advisability of our laying down some principle on which the different constituencies, in need of public buildings, should be supplied with them—some principle as to the minimum population and business done in a town before any public money is spent on public buildings there. The hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon referred to Liverpool as one of the places entitled to a public building. I am not in a position to say that Liverpool is not entitled to one, but I see a number of grants in the Supplementary Estimates for public buildings in places that are smaller than the town of Campbellton in the county I have the honour to represent. Take Liverpool in the county of Queen's and Shelburne, which has been mentioned by the hon. Finance Minister. The total revenue from the post office there is \$2,085.14, and the total amount of post office orders issued is \$21,212.77. Take Montmagny, which is to get a public building, the gross receipts in the post office there are \$1,743.19, and the total amount of money orders issued is \$8,623.40. Compare those with the town of Campbellton, where the population is in the vicinity of 3,000 and where the gross revenue from the post office last year was \$3,146.56, and the total amount of money orders issued \$31,826.77. If such places as Liverpool and Montmagny are entitled to a public building, certainly Campbellton is, because it is a larger place and gives a larger revenue from its post office. It has been said that places represented by Liberals during the Conservative administration were neglected and places represented by Conservatives were favoured. Well, Restigouche has been represented by a Conservative continually

since 1882, and the town of Campbellton is still without a public building. I applied for a grant for a public building there on several occasions from 1891 to 1896, when the late Government was in power, and the answer I always received was that the Government had decided not to spend any more money on public buildings in places of that sort, and therefore I did not waste my time. I bring this matter up merely to show that while grants are being made to smaller places than Campbellton, where the post office business is much less, Campbellton is still without any such grant. In fairness to that town it should be given a public building, if these other smaller places are to be thus favoured.

Mr. SEMPLE. I must say that I fully endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville). I have been a member of this House for a considerable length of time, and, therefore, have some experience in opposition, and I know how strongly Liberal members then denounced such grants, and it seems to me that a change of place should not make a change of our principles. There are a number of members present who were not in this House when we had these discussions. The hon. Minister of Finance certainly was not. It is an unfortunate thing that such items as expenditure of money for building small local post offices should be found in the Estimates. The Liberal members have followed the Government on important questions involving large expenditures: because we have had faith in their judgment and have looked to the future for results. But in a case of this kind, no such thing can be said, and expenditures of this kind are contrary to what we have professed in the past while in opposition. I hope that even yet the hon. gentleman will withdraw the Estimates for these small post offices. In the province of Ontario, a great number of counties have never received a single dollar from the Dominion Government, and many of them have received nothing from the local government. But they have taxed themselves to help on the construction of their own railways and other necessary public works. I believe also that under the late Government there were a great number of Conservative members who had large towns in their counties and did not ask for these expenditures. Only in some cases were such expenditures asked and received, and where these expenditures were made, we remonstrated because we believed that the expenditure was not in the best interests of the country. Once let it be understood that a county is given the benefit of an expenditure of this kind simply because no other public expenditures have been made within its bounds, and every place will be at once looking for something. Centre Wellington has never received anything from the Government of much value.

It is true that a post office was built in the town of Orangeville, which is in Dufferin county, and in my county. That post office cost from \$20,000 to \$25,000, and there is now a caretaker who receives \$400 a year. In the care and maintenance of these buildings a great deal of expense is involved, and if you multiply these all over the country, the public expenditures will be increased enormously.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to make a few remarks in support of the position taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Time, with its many changes, brings its revenges. I remember well the time when I used pretty nearly the same arguments in support of these works of a partially local character. I said that there were sections in which expenditure of public money on great public works like the Canadian Pacific Railway and others had been of no benefit, more than they would have gained from building a railway in Great Britain, and which had not received any grant since confederation, while, all the time, they had been paying their share towards the expense of the country. I gave that as a reason why it would be perfectly justifiable to make an expenditure of public money in such places. The Finance Minister states that in this particular place they have received no subsidies for railways, nor have they any public works built in their locality. It is quite natural to expect, as the Minister of Finance says, that the people of these localities should be dissatisfied at being called upon to contribute their share to immense expenditures in other parts of the country, while no expenditure takes place in their own locality. In some places, under these circumstances, I contend that an expenditure is perfectly justified. That is a principle upon which the late Government justified many subsidies for railways, perhaps of a provincial or purely local character. Another ground of justification was that we were receiving money in excess of the requirements of the country, and there was no better way in which it could be returned to the localities. On these grounds, we held that expenditure would be justified. But I was met with the unanimous opposition of the gentlemen who were then on this side of the House, and their press ridiculed the arguments used by the then Minister of Railways in support of his contention. But I persevered in what I held to be sound policy. I am still of the same opinion, and so I think that the hon. Minister of Finance was perfectly justified in the remarks he made in defence of a small grant for an expenditure in a section of the country which, in reality, never received any grant of public money. But what becomes of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? What part of that policy is left to them? Their demand for the control of public expenditure has vanished; their opposition to the

granting of subsidies to railways is vanished, and as to their plea for retrenchment and economy of expenditure, why, we have Estimates before us in excess of any that have ever before been presented to Parliament. I thought, perhaps, that this one little principle opposed to the arguments I used in regard to the public expenditure in localities might still be retained. But this also they have dropped altogether, and they have adopted, holus bolus, the policy of the Government they have succeeded.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not surprised that the Estimates exceed those of former years. This Government, unfortunately, is paying off legacies left by the preceding Government. Every page of the Estimates, almost every item, bears evidence of this fact.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the use of a change?

Mr. LANDERKIN. We changed you a year ago to-day, on the 23rd of June.

Mr. BERGERON. But what was the use?

Mr. LANDERKIN. As soon as we get these old debts paid off, incurred by the late Government, we will be able to initiate and carry out a policy that will be far more economic than that shown at this time.

Mr. BERGERON. That will not be believed; you cannot do that twice.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We cannot repudiate these obligations, for repudiation is no part of the Liberal policy. If any one will take the trouble to look through the Estimates, he will see how many millions of dollars there proposed have been incurred by the former Administration.

An hon. MEMBER. The Drummond Railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Drummond, yes; incurred by the former Administration, initiated by the late Administration at double the amount that will be incurred by the present Government. But they had not the nerve to carry out a measure that was calculated to give benefit not only to the province through which it passes, but to the western provinces as well. This will open up a highway to the west through the province of Ontario, and will furnish better railway communication and a better return for the money we have invested in the Intercolonial Railway. Now, to refer again to what the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) had said, this country has reason to rejoice over and celebrate this day because it is just as important an event as we celebrated yesterday, because a year ago to-day we put a Government out of power that has incurred heavy responsibilities, contracted enormous debts and followed a policy that brought about disaster. In fact, when they went out of power the people

Mr. HAGGART.

had scarcely anything left but their souls. That Government had spent the people's money, bankrupted the country and left it in such a deplorable state that the incoming Government will be burdened with its debts for many years. The Kentville post office is one of the obligations that were entered into by the late Government. If I remember rightly, and I think I do because we discussed that on one or two occasions, it was placed in the Estimates just before an election; and the then Government was obliged to build this post office, but they dilly dallied with it from time to time, and if this Government puts it in the Estimates it is because the faith of the Crown was pledged to it. There may be other places more deserving, I have no doubt if you look through the country there are. But I have an idea that this Government will stand to the policy that was laid down, that public buildings should be erected only where the public interest demands it and requires them. This Government has been carrying out this session the platform of the Liberal party; there is no part of their policy that they have scattered to the winds, as has been stated by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. This Government is obliged to redeem the obligations that have been incurred by the Conservative Government, and no doubt it will take a long time to get out of the slough into which they plunged this country during the past years.

Mr. DUPONT. You are not serious.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The country took you seriously and kicked you out a year ago to-day. The people were serious then, and I do not see why our hon. friends opposite won't adjust themselves to the position in which they find themselves by reason of the votes of the people of this country. Why don't they try to adapt themselves to it? During this session they have been doing nothing but crying like children who have been robbed of something; they are not happy, they are not contented. When we were on that side we gave them an example of chivalry and unity which it would be well for them to follow. We never asked them for post offices, we never asked them for public buildings. In fact I did not know where the departments were in these blocks. I never asked them for anything. But now we find hon. gentlemen opposite are continuously asking for things, wanting things, insisting upon things. Why, I never went to a department. I never was inside the Finance Department, I never tried to get my hand into the public chest. I wanted no favours, I asked for nothing for my riding, I was satisfied to abide by results. I scarcely know where the departments are now. I am an independent representative, I ask for nothing. I only ask that the Government should administer the affairs of this country honestly and

justly; if they want my support they can have it on no other terms. I am quite satisfied that it is their intention to do so. The character of the men give me the strongest belief that they will so administer the affairs of this country, and I have no fear for the result when we have a Government such as the present. The members of this Government are pledged to the strictest economy, and I believe they will carry out what they profess, and will administer the affairs of this country in the most economical manner. This Government is not going to be a Government carried on for the interest of party; it will be managed purely and solely in the interest of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have an idea that no Government can stand unless it is run in the same way as their Government was run, that is to say, purely and solely for the party without respect to the interests of the country. Affairs are differently managed now, and it is no wonder. Hon. gentlemen opposite got so reckless, having enjoyed the sweets of office so long, that now they are out of office they think that this Government must do precisely what they did. But they will find the public affairs managed very differently now, they will find that the public money will be spent judiciously, economically and honestly by this Administration. They are surprised that such things can be done by this Administration. The hon. the ex-Minister of Finance enjoyed the sweets of office for a great number of years, but he finds there is a sting in his honey just now. He is in the sulks, he scolds, he scolds, he scolds from morning to night. He wonders how it is that this country can get on without him having a share of the pabulum that is going. I would like to see him accept the situation, I would like to see him act like a Briton, because he will have to adapt himself to that situation, he will have to give up these tears, these groans, these lamentations, which are louder than ever they were in Rama. As to the item that is before the House now, I say the faith of the country is pledged to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about Liverpool? What about St. Martin's?

Mr. LANDERKIN. And what about Gananoque? That was a glaring instance in the old days, but I don't think the hon. member offered any objections to that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Take Ingersoll, take Rat Portage.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Rat Portage has a population now of 7,000, so I am informed, and it is growing. But I would not object to that, nor would I object to Ingersoll, nor would I object to Woodstock. In every one of these places I think the Government have acted wisely and well. They have selected places where the revenues will warrant them in erecting public buildings, and

I believe that they are quite justified in doing so. No doubt it is very nice for a constituency for the Government to follow the political morality laid down by the hon. member for South Lanark. I do not know whether he would lay this policy down when in power, but I believe that he is going to lay it down in Opposition. I do not know that there is any use in spending public money where the public interest does not require it. I do not believe that it is a good policy to lay down, I do not approve of that policy. Wherever the interests of the public demand that public money should be spent, I am in favour of the Government spending it in a legitimate and an honest way. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind hon. gentlemen again that this is a day of great importance, this is the anniversary of the battle that was fought on the 23rd of June a year ago, when the actions and conduct of the gentlemen who were then administering the Government met with the rebuke that they deserved, and the incoming Administration was hailed with satisfaction, as the people knew that they would conduct the affairs of this country honestly and economically, which I believe they will do.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice all through the Estimates that these post offices are called public buildings. Was that for the purpose of hiding them so that members on this side would not know what kind of buildings they were?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it usually happens, at all events in the lower provinces, that these public buildings are not confined to the uses of a post office. Usually the same building is used for a post office, customs, excise, savings bank, and all branches of the public service in that town.

Mr. SPROULE. But you do not say so in this case. At St. Martin's you mention post office and custom-house separately.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that there are any cases where the post office is mentioned alone. In all cases I think it will be found that the public building contains the quarters for all the Government officials in the neighbourhood.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is very unfortunate for this country that the policy was ever adopted of erecting public buildings in the small towns. It is very questionable whether it is in the public interest whether they should have been built in a number of the larger places, and it is most unfortunate that this system has been so much abused in the past. I was pleased to hear the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) urging upon the Government the desirability of adopting the principle contained in the resolution unanimously passed by the House in 1890. It would be very fortunate if the members of this House would join

in supporting the Government in upholding that policy. I sympathize very much with my friends in the present position, but I think that members of Parliament, in discussing this question, ought to be somewhat practical and reasonable. We know that for a great many years this policy was much abused. It became a scandal as an hon. gentleman said with perfect truth. Probably it had a good deal to do with putting the last Government out of power the way they abused this policy for partisan purposes, making grants to constituencies with the view of affecting elections. This policy was so abused that it became a public scandal. I can appreciate the present position. During the election, having regard to the fact that the Conservative party had put up public buildings just where they received a favourable verdict and had denied them to other places, no matter what their claims might be, and that promises were made by members of the Government and by the Conservative candidates in these constituencies I could understand that their opponents as the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) frankly stated also promised to support grants towards establishing public buildings in the towns in their counties. There is probably under the circumstances much to be taken into consideration outside of merely the revenue to be derived, although we do look upon that principle and it is a good one. As one hon. gentleman has said, the circumstances in different sections differ. The central place in the parish, or county, known as the county, or shire town, although not having a large population, although the revenue may not be large, is the principal point at which all the business of that district is carried on, and I can understand that under these circumstances members representing such a locality might make out a strong claim upon the Government to consideration. Under these circumstances I shall support the proposals brought down by the Government after the explanations given to them. I am very sorry that they have found it necessary to depart from the principle which all advocated and which the House adopted by resolution. I do not know that we are prepared to say that they are justified in departing from it even though the late Government, after adopting it, departed from it so much. I hope that for the future the members of this House will unite in sticking to the rule that has been adopted by the House, and that in the expenditure of public money to erect public buildings consideration will be given to the population and the revenue derived.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the item passes I desire to recall to the recollection of the Minister of Public Works that a little time ago he caused the services of the caretaker of the large public building at Orillia to

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

be dispensed with on the ground of economy, and he furthermore on that occasion stated that no successor would be appointed, and that the rule of the department would be henceforth that no caretakers should be appointed and that the public buildings would be placed in the care of the postmasters in each of them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As much as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman by adding that kills the whole thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that at the time, and I say it now.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Minister is going to add "as much as possible" to his proviso, I must assume that on each occasion when these buildings are completed there will be caretakers appointed to positions. I can only say that on the occasion I have referred to, I was led to understand that the Minister was not going to make an invidious distinction in the case of the Orillia post office, but that that was the rule to be laid down and maintained in the future. If it is not carried out and applied to other places I trust he will carry it out in the case of Orillia. I suppose that a successor will be appointed.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to what use he now places the rooms formerly occupied by the Dominion Savings Bank agent at Annapolis. The Dominion Savings Bank agent at Annapolis, as has not yet been made apparent, was dismissed and the office was abolished. I think the rule in the department is when the savings bank agent is dismissed or dies, the agency becomes abolished and the money is then vested in the post office savings bank. We have a nice large building at Annapolis and there are two rooms which were occupied by the Dominion Savings Bank agent. The agency now is not there. The postmaster has charge of the moneys and he carries on his business in the lower flat of the post office. The rooms are now vacant and I wish to ask if there was an offer to the Government to rent those rooms and have they been rented.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing has been decided upon. They have not been rented yet.

Mr. MILLS. Is it the desire of the department to rent them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not been able to give much attention to the question so far. I know that an application has been made for them, but I do not remember exactly by whom. I think it was Mr. DeBlois.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. DeBlois, the Dominion Savings Bank agent, wished to retain the

office. Does the Minister refuse to rent the rooms to Mr. DeBlois.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not refuse. I have not considered the matter so far. But as soon as the session is over I will decide upon it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. DeBlois has not only gone out of the office of agent of the Dominion Savings Bank, but out of the rooms. The Government can acquire some little revenue from Mr. DeBlois. It may be that when the Minister has time to give it his attention there will be no tenant to apply for it.

New Brunswick—

St. Martin's post office, custom-house, &c. \$5,000  
Chatham public building—Repairs to custom-house, wharf, boat shed, &c. . . . . 500

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have some information about this. In reference to the Liverpool public building what is to be the cost of it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no estimate made for the Liverpool public building. I may be allowed to say a word or two. I have a great deal of sympathy with what has been said to-day. I quite agree that we should not erect so many public buildings in small places. The policy has been followed in the past, but I am very glad indeed to hear what has been said in the House to-day. This will be the last time that I shall come before Parliament and ask for grants for smaller places. That pledge I will give. My hon. friends on the other side of the House have an idea of the great pressure that is brought every day upon us to have public buildings erected. I am asking money to-day for a very few public buildings. If I had yielded to the numerous demands that had been made upon me by hon. members on this side of the House, I may say, that instead of three or four public buildings I would have had fifty. I have given too much perhaps. I yielded too much perhaps, because I quite agree that we should have a more strict policy, and to give effect to the view that I now express, I move:

That the St. Martin's post office, the Berthier post office and the Rat Portage post office be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Minister going to deal justly or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Justly.

Mr. FOSTER. On what ground of public justice, does he strike out the Rat Portage post office and keep in the Liverpool post office, except it be that a Minister represents one and does not the other?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My feeling is, that Rat Portage can wait a little.

Mr. FOSTER. And cannot Liverpool wait. What has happened down in Liverpool that it cannot wait?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, Liverpool has been agreed to by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Liverpool has been agreed to because the Minister let it go.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the Opposition let it go also.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Minister starts in to say, that Rat Portage, a thriving town where population is flocking in, where it is going to be we believe one of the most important towns in Ontario; Rat Portage post office must go out, but Liverpool, because a Minister sits for that county, Liverpool post office must stay in.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. Minister has not the facts with regard to Rat Portage in mind, or he would not think of striking Rat Portage post office out. To begin with, a site is to be given to the Government which is worth \$1,500 or \$2,000, by the town. Rat Portage has about 7,000 inhabitants now. Last year it increased by 1,000, and I am told on credible information that this year it will increase 1,000 more, and it is likely to be a city in the course of twelve or eighteen months. I am very sure that Algoma has not received very much consideration at the hands of any Government heretofore, and I certainly object to this item being struck out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason why I am asking that Rat Portage post office be struck out, is, because we are only paying \$169 a year rent there, and the House evidently does not want any more money to be spent on public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. How much rent do you pay at Rat Portage?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. \$169.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you are only paying \$140 in Kentville.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Kentville has been agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. That is too thin.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We must draw the line somewhere. That is my suggestion and I am quite in the hands of the House. We must have one thing or the other.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) ought to have made this announcement before he took the vote on these three other buildings. Now that he claims that these items have passed, I would ask him to include with St. Martin's post office and the Berthier post office the post office

at Montmagny, because the post office at Montmagny is not as important as the other offices. I cannot see why he should leave the Montmagny post office grant in, and strike out the others. I think the Minister ought to strike that out too. I am glad to hear that the Minister has come to the conclusion that he will have a stiffer backbone in future in dealing with the supporters of the Government who ask for these grants. I think it is highly necessary, that if this Government is going to be maintained by the people of this country, they should turn over a new leaf in regard to these matters, even at this their first business session. It is in the interest of the Government that I have opposed these grants, because I know that the Liberal party, all through the province of Ontario at least, have been aroused at the extraordinary expenditure which was made by the previous Government with regard to the public buildings, and they have made up their minds that they would not support any party in power which would thus squander the public money. That is the reason I have brought this to the attention of the House. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works has made this announcement, and I am glad that in future we shall not have financial grants for the erection of public buildings in small villages in any of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Now, I understand that the Minister of Public Works agrees to withdraw the vote for the Montmagny post office also.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the members of the committee that we are now on item 32, and I would ask hon. gentlemen to confine their discussion to that.

Mr. LISTER. I must endorse the statement of my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dymont). In my judgment, if any of the small places in the province of Ontario or in the Dominion of Canada are entitled to a public building, the town of Rat Portage is that place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are now on item 32. The question of Rat Portage will come up on item 34.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Chairman, if there is not a motion made by the Minister of Public Works that Rat Portage be struck out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the motion was not in order.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works that he was the first to set the example to us, when he mentioned item 33.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved to strike out of resolution 32 the following words:—

St. Martin's post office, custom-house..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I confine myself to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the answer of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) as to why he proposes to single out the province of New Brunswick; take the little thriving town of St. Martins and knock its hopes out by one stroke. This is the same Minister who an hour ago poked fun at the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) because he would dare to call in question the wisdom of the Minister in putting a post office grant in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say one word.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, this Minister goes to work, and after he has satisfied the inordinate desire of the Minister of Finance for two full sized post offices in Nova Scotia, he attacks New Brunswick and Rat Portage, with a magnanimity that is worthy of him in every respect. Let us have fair and reasonable justice. I will go for striking out every one of them, but I am not going to see my own province bull-dozed in that way. If there is any fair sense of justice in putting a post office any where, Rat Portage is that place.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is very unreasonable. For two mortal hours, hon. gentlemen opposite have been denouncing my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) for bringing down, in a good humoured moment, some votes which perhaps erred a little on the side of generosity; and the moment the Minister complies with the request of these hon. gentlemen up they all rise, with the ex-Finance Minister at their head, to denounce my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) for doing the very thing which for two hours they have been desiring him to do. I say this frankly. There is not the slightest doubt that this matter of erecting buildings all over the country has been abused. It was very much abused, and it was denounced, and I was until now going to congratulate the ex-Minister of Finance on having made a very fair and reasonable statement on the question, and one that deserved to be considered both by the Minister of Public Works and by the Minister of Finance; because there is no doubt that it will not do to be creating a vast number of little post offices all over the country. As to the position in which the Government find themselves, I might just say to my hon. friends that after eighteen years in Opposition, there is not the slightest doubt that some concessions have to be made to counties which have received a very scant measure of jus-

tice or no justice at all during that time. But what I do object to is the unfairness of assailing my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, when at some considerable personal inconvenience to himself, and at the risk of displeasing some of his supporters, he accepts the advice tendered by hon. gentlemen opposite. The ex-Minister of Finance ought to lead the steps of my hon. friend in the way they should go. He knows as well as we all know what tremendous pressure is put upon the Minister of Public Works; and I know, what he perhaps does not know, to what an extent my hon. friend has stood against that pressure—what an immense number of applications, involving an immense amount of money, my hon. friend has rejected, bringing upon himself a considerable amount of odium thereby. Now, my hon. friend offers to take out one or two of these, which appear to him, after what has been stated on the other side, to be open to fair objection. I think my hon. friend's proposition is a most reasonable one, and it shows an amount of moral courage that is not often displayed in this House. If he has made a trifling mistake—and after all it is only a trifling one—on one or two matters, my hon. friend has the courage to say so, and he proposes to withdraw them, for which I think he deserves credit. He does not deserve, I will not say to be heckled, but to be censured and made light of because he is doing a thing in the public interest; and I look to the ex-Minister of Finance, who has been there and knows all about it, to help my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to help him to be just, and to go two steps further than he proposes to go, and to wipe out this crowning injustice. If he allows these two places to have post offices, let us treat all places alike. My hon. friend is entitled to great credit at this moment for deciding to strike out some of these items; but I will give him all the credit I possibly can if he will go two steps further and wipe them all out. I will put Rat Portage and Liverpool together, and place them before any business man in this world, and he will say that Rat Portage has beyond all comparison the greater claims for a post office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am myself impressed by what may be considered the unfair discrimination so far as Rat Portage is concerned, and I would not like to be the instrument of any unfair discrimination. I think it better to have some general principle agreed upon. At any rate, I do not want any advantage for my own county that is not fair and reasonable, and I am going to ask that the item be allowed to stand until the case of Rat Portage can be considered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let them all stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, under the circumstances, the hon. Minister was a little hasty in striking out one or two items; and, after having heard both sides of the House, that, while acknowledging the abuse that has existed, the great majority are willing that the public buildings he proposes should be gone on with, he might let these go through, and not strike them out, unless all are struck out.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot admit that at all. I cannot admit that the followers of the Government are prepared to adopt that line, or that any place should have a public building which does not show a ground for it in the way of revenue. In the town where I live the receipts from the post office are \$4,280 a year, yet I have never asked the Minister of Public Works to build a post office there, because I really expected that the principles we advocated when in Opposition would be honestly carried out, and I earnestly hope that after mature consideration, the hon. Minister will come to the conclusion that places which yield only a mere trifle of revenue should not have a public building, and that those members representing the counties in which these places are located, will not insist upon the Government pursuing a policy entirely at variance with that which they advocated when on the other side of the House.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the suggestion just made by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). The Government, having just put this item in the Estimates, after due consideration, did so, no doubt, on very good grounds. It is too late now for the Government to strike out that item, as it would be most unfair to the hon. gentlemen who represent in this House the constituencies affected by these votes. For is it not now a matter of public notoriety that the Government have decided to make these grants, and they should not withdraw them except on warrantable grounds. I presume that the proposition of the hon. Minister was made under the pressure of some hon. gentleman on the back benches who support the Government of the day on common matters, but my hon. friend will agree with me that he would not be dealing fairly by the constituencies in favour of which these votes have been proposed. After having properly considered and granted those sums for some public buildings, they ought not, except on very good grounds, to withdraw those items. Should my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) not acquiesce in the views which will, no doubt, be given expression to by other hon. gentlemen, when the item concerning the county of Berthier will come up, I will give to the House some explanations which will prevent it concurring in the motion of the hon. Minister of Public Works proposing to strike out the item concerning the town of Berthier.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would ask the Minister of Public Works not to press his motion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the items stand.

Mr. WALLACE. This item is for a post office and custom-house at St. Martin's. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs if there is a customs port at this place?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I think there is an outport.

Mr. WALLACE. It is not on the hon. gentleman's list. I think the outport is at Quaco. The customs revenue there last year was \$115.02, which would not justify the erection of a public building.

Montreal drill hall—New skylights and other alterations, and roof, &c..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The roof has been leaking three or four years. An inspection was ordered in 1895, and made by two local architects, who reported that a change was necessary. After I took office, I had an examination made, at the instance of the Militia Department, by my chief architect, and he suggested a change. On each side of the roof there are long skylights through which the leakage takes place. It has been suggested to remove entirely the present skylights and have a flat roof put on. My chief architect made a very careful examination, and he has reported that \$10,000 was required to make the change. That drill hall has cost a great deal of money, and, to my personal knowledge, it is being destroyed since two or three years by the leakage.

Montreal post office—New plant for heating and generating power for electric lighting, running elevators, &c..... \$18,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are under a contract for the lighting of the post office. Before that contract was made, we were paying a fixed amount which was, if I remember right, about \$3,000 per year. The contract was changed, and instead of making the expected saving, the cost of lighting the post office was largely increased, so much so that to-day we pay about \$12,000 per year for lighting purposes and the working of the elevators. It is proposed to have a plant of our own, and it is estimated that we would thereby save about \$3,000 a year over and above all expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the power?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Electricity generated by steam power.

Montreal post office—Balance due J. Nelson, architect, for professional services rendered from 1891 to 1895, inclusive, in connection with works of improvement and repairs carried out, &c. \$1,908 15

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were two architects employed,

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

Messrs. Raza and Nelson. Nelson's account is \$4,008.15, out of which he has received \$2,100. His account was recognized and certified, and he is now claiming the balance due.

Kingston drill hall..... \$30,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will be a drill hall of the same kind as the one here in Ottawa.

Port Colborne public buildings—Mansard roof for caretaker's quarters, &c..... \$1,100

Mr. LISTER. Is that a post office and customs office?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say whether there is a custom-house there.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Grounds—New sidewalks and footways on Parliament Square (revote)..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of sidewalk will you make?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Asphalt. This is a revote from the main Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference between granolithic and asphalt pavement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Granolithic costs \$1.18 square yard, and we are paying now for asphalt \$2.19 per square yard which is very cheap—the cheapest we have ever had.

Mr. SPROULE. But it costs more than granolithic.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but it is a great deal better; everybody concedes that.

Mr. BERGERON. That is for the sidewalks. Is it the intention of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to pave the walk from the stairs to the public road. That is a very muddy walk at times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we can have that done this year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this paving done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes: after public tender.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Grounds—Removal of old sheds in rear of Supreme Court building, and erection of new greenhouse..... \$5,000

Mr. WALLACE. Will that greenhouse take the place of the present one?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the old one a pretty good building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; the foundation is all gone now and must be replaced immediately.

Smith Falls public building—Compensation to contractor Robert Cameron in full and final settlement of all claims for losses sustained through stoppage of contract works ordered by the Government..... \$500 28

Mr. BERGERON. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government stopped this man from doing his work and later on they found that they should not have stopped him, and he presented claims. This was done before I came into office. It was in 1895.

Mr. BERGERON. That means that it is a good thing, I suppose.

Alexandria Reformatory..... \$9,000

Mr. BERGERON. What does this mean ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This question came before the committee last year. When we took office, we found that a contract had been entered into, but work had been stopped on account of some difficulty between the department and the contractor, Mr. Bourque. That difficulty led me to investigate the question carefully, and I found that the contract signed was for \$95,000 but that this was only the beginning of a contract which, if it had been fulfilled, and the whole building completed, would have involved the country in an expenditure of about \$800,000. I consulted my colleagues, and we came to the conclusion that the erection of that reformatory was not necessary. Then came the question whether we could agree with Mr. Bourque. There has been a certain amount of work done and a certain amount of money paid on account. I think that the sum paid was about \$2,600. Of course, there is work done for a larger amount than that. I may say that I have a report from one of my officers, which report has remained, so far, a confidential document. What I propose to do is to settle with Mr. Bourque by arbitration. I propose that the department shall appoint an architect, and Mr. Bourque another, and, if they do not agree, they will appoint a fair man as third arbitrator. So I think the public interest will be conserved.

Mr. BERGERON. And when the arbitration takes place and the matter is settled, the money paid, I suppose, will be within this amount of \$9,000. I suppose that all the work done and expenditure undertaken will be abandoned and lost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Buildings—Chargeable to Income—Manitoba—Winnipeg immigrant building \$4,600

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has asked me to put that amount in the estimates because he expects a large amount of immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only reason which my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) puts it in ? Has he not looked into the matter himself ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; that has been my reason for doing so. The Minister of the Interior has told me that it was necessary for his immigration scheme to have that amount put in the Estimates.

Mr. JAMESON. This is included in the matter that I brought up the other day. The object is to prevent small-pox and other diseases being spread by these immigrants. It is intended to add to the immigration building which is already in existence in Winnipeg, a certain number of rooms, so that in case of there being any infectious disease on these trains of immigrants that come in, those cases can be isolated without the necessity of bringing them to the Winnipeg General Hospital. I think the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) was here when I mentioned that matter the other night. When there is a case of infectious disease among these immigrants, some of whom are not going to our own country, but to Dakota, the case has to be taken to the Winnipeg General Hospital, with the danger of spreading infection among our own people. The Minister of the Interior decided that it would be well to add a wing to the building already in existence so that these cases of infectious diseases may be isolated without any danger being incurred to our own citizens.

Post office, Portage la Prairie (revote)..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Before that goes any further, I want to have a little conversation with the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend will not be so glad when I get through. Last year we had this matter of the Portage la Prairie post office before the House, and the House understands what took place at that time. At that time the site had been taken by the old Government, the contract had been let, the foundation had been laid, and some other work had been done, how much I do not know. When matters had progressed that far, a certain section of that town asked the Minister to change the site of the post office, that is, asked the incoming Government to take a building, a post office which had been settled by the preceding Government, with all this work done in connection with it, to choose another site, and to pick it up and transfer it to that

other site. The member who represented that constituency was here at that time, and a long and varied discussion took place. My hon. friend understood what was the gist of that, it is not necessary to repeat it. Suffice it to say that a very strong protest was made on this side to anything like changing the site of the Portage la Prairie post office. The hon. Minister of Public Works passed his word across this House that no attempt would be made to change the site of the post office until he should come down to Parliament and ask a further vote for that purpose. On that understanding the item was allowed to pass. On a subsequent occasion I put a question myself across the floor to the hon. gentleman asking with reference to a certain vote, because the member for that constituency was at that time in Toronto, and wanted me to telegraph him if that removal was to be carried out. I asked the Minister if any portion of that vote was to be used in changing the site of the Portage la Prairie post office, and he assured me that it was not. That left that matter then in this way—that so far as the Minister went, he had assured the House that no change would be made in the foundation until he should have come down and asked the House for a special vote to do that, that is, until he had taken the House into his confidence and released himself from his pledge. Now I think a change has been made—at least I put a question to the Minister at the beginning of this session, asking him if the post office at Portage la Prairie has been changed, and the Minister gave me to understand that it had. Now, these are the simple facts of the case. The Minister pledged himself to this House that he would not change the site of the post office until he took the House into his confidence and asked for a vote especially to do it. He asked for no such vote. He did not take the House into his confidence as he intimated that he was going to do; he told the House that he was not going to do it, but in the interim he did it. Now, my hon. friend may have a good explanation for that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there is some misunderstanding in that regard. I do not remember to have pledged myself to come before this Parliament and ask for a vote for that purpose, but I may have done so. The facts of the case are these: The question came up last year in the House when Mr. Boyd was present. I submitted the facts, which were that the change was asked for by the Board of Trade, and by the Town Council, and by a vast majority of the electors. The first site had been forced upon the town; I proved that to the House before. In face of the protest of the Board of Trade, of the Town Council, and of the majority of the electors, that site was first chosen by the late Government, and I made up my mind

Mr. FOSTER.

that a change should be made. I disclosed all these facts last year, I did not take the House at all by surprise. Another site was offered to us.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a discussion as to a better site, this is simply a discussion as to whether the Minister kept faith with the House. The very same statement he made here to-night as to who asked for the change, as to the petitions that came in, as to the first site being a bad one and the second site a better one—that was all discussed in this House hour after hour, and after it was all discussed, the Minister made me that pledge, and he repeated it again on a subsequent occasion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I remember rightly, the pledge I made was that, as I intended to go to the Northwest I would take information. I may be mistaken now, I have sent for the "Hansard" to see. I think the only pledge I made was that I would take additional information because I then disclosed all the facts to the House. If I made that pledge I must apologize, but I do not believe that I did.

Mr. FOSTER. I have looked the matter up, I have had before me the "Hansard," I asked a question of the Minister in the earlier part of the session, and I know just exactly what it is. I do not accept the Minister's apology. When a Minister takes the House into his confidence and gets an item of the Estimates through with the promise—and I want to tell him, and he knows it, that he would not have got that item through without that promise. There was a long debate at the latter part of the session, and the Minister made the promise to get this item. His promise was as straight as man could make it, that he would not have the site changed until he came to Parliament and asked for a special vote for that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The pledge I made was that I would come before this Parliament and ask for authorization, and so I did. When my main Estimates were presented to the House this year they contained an item of \$5,000 just for that change.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This year, in my main Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, is my hon. friend going to change his ground that way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why did he introduce it? I am right, then, in my assumption that he did give his pledge, and he changed the post office site before he laid his Estimates on the Table.

Mr. LISTER. It should be changed, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be, I am not going to argue that question. I am going to say that when we are discussing items in this House, and when we have the pledge of a Minister across the floor in the House, there is no consideration that can allow a Minister to go back on that pledge unless he carries out the condition that he made when he made that pledge. If a Minister undertakes that with the House, well, the House will have to advise itself that the Minister's pledge may be overlooked.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am surprised that the ex-Finance Minister should allude to the Portage la Prairie post office at all. If ever there was a disgraceful job perpetrated upon a long-suffering people, it was the first location of the Portage la Prairie post office. A site was chosen at the extreme west end of the town, quite beyond the centre of business; in fact, beyond almost all the business establishments in the town. It was chosen contrary to the wishes, not only of the great majority of the people of Portage la Prairie, and to the wishes of the Town Council and the Board of Trade, but directly contrary to the inspector of public buildings, the official of the public works department. That gentleman positively refused to report in favour of the site selected. The sum of \$75 a foot was paid for that land by the late Government. I attended an auction sale of land a year ago last winter and for property alongside of this land for which the Government paid \$75 a foot, they were only able to get a bid of \$20 a foot. Nobody wanted it. The people of Portage la Prairie were justly and rightly incensed in regard to that matter, and they took every possible means in their power to have the wrong righted. People who do not know the circumstances and the location of the town might be misled by the plausible story which has been told on the other side of the House, but the fact is that the people of Portage la Prairie were almost a unit in desiring the removal of that post office and public building to a site further east. A petition was signed very largely and by almost every responsible business man in Portage la Prairie favouring the removal. That petition was committed to the care of the then mayor of the town, Mr. W. J. Cooper, for transmission to the Public Works Department. We never heard of it any more. Then the building began to be put up. When the Government was changed on the 23rd of June last, one of the first expressions of public opinion at Portage la Prairie was that, "Now we will obtain justice in reference to the post office." The citizens went to work, and they thought as a matter of justice that a site should be provided. However, the Minister of Public Works took a firm stand. He said that while a certain expenditure had been undertaken by the late Government and

while he could not hold himself responsible for their misdeeds—I would be sorry for him if he had to do that—at the same time he could not justify the loss which would be caused by the purchase of a new site and the removal of the foundation. Then the citizens formed themselves together and purchased a site which cost \$80 a foot. They presented that site to the Government for the purpose of the erection of the building. That building is now being put up and everybody is satisfied, except two or three wire-pullers who were the means of implementing the first bargain. These gentlemen are not so very much dissatisfied either because they got \$75 a foot for land which is not worth more than \$25 a foot. The building is going on and the Government has got a valuable site, worth at least \$80 a foot instead of a site that was dear at \$20 to \$25 a foot. I would have thought that the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) would be ashamed to reopen such a shameful chapter, small and short as it is, in comparison with the large and long shameful chapters of maladministration of our public affairs; I am surprised that he has opened up such a chapter of the misdeeds of himself and his colleagues in office, and I am sure that the people of Portage la Prairie, of Manitoba and the people of Canada, as far as they are familiar with the question, will have nothing but words of praise for the Minister of Public Works for taking the stand which he has taken. He has made a good bargain for the people of Canada and he has satisfied the people of Portage la Prairie. I am surprised that the matter should have been reopened in the manner in which it has been.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not responsible for the surprise of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford). The hon. gentleman may or may not have understood my point; he has not seen it or else he has avoided it. I do not propose to take any position as to the question of the site at all. It is simply a question as to whether a Minister has passed his pledge to the House and the country after having given that pledge. I think there can be no doubt even with my hon. friend (Mr. Rutherford) as to where the surprise would come in a case of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must admit that I was pretty clear. In answer to a question put to me by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) I said:

I will not make any change until I come to the House and ask for \$5,000.

I must frankly admit that I did so, but at the same time if the hon. gentleman refers to the whole debate which took place he will find that I stated very distinctly that I would make the change if a free site were provided. Time was pressing and I must admit frankly that I forgot that I had given that pledge to the House. Having

disclosed my intention to change that site if a free site was offered to us I thought that I was perfectly free to act. I will be frank about it. I recognize now that I did go farther than I had said. I said to the House that I would not make the change until I came and asked for the \$5,000. As soon as the question came up I stated that the change had been made, but at the same time I must say that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is right that I had given that pledge. The change has been made as it had been entirely agreed by the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read the debate very carefully and I understand the whole drift of the discussion. The objection was not made to the change of site, but it was to the cost involved in the adoption of the principle that where a new government comes into office it may pull down and rebuild public buildings erected by a preceding Government, and it was after a long debate that the hon. gentleman the Minister of Public Works gave this pledge. Here is what passed :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking for \$5,000 necessary to make the change.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that if the hon. gentleman does decide to make the change suggested, he will not make it until he has come down to the House and asked for \$5,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not make any change until I come to the House and ask for \$5,000.

Later again Mr. Boyd put this question to the Minister :

Mr. BOYD. Before any site is selected, and before any change is made, will the hon. Minister come down to this House and ask for the money?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. That establishes my position.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not deny it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have nothing to say : I do not want to ask for apologies or anything of that kind. All I want to say to the Minister is that it is well when he makes a pledge of that kind and the House depends upon it that a note should be made of it so that it will not escape the memory because it rather helps to destroy the confidence that you may expect from both sides of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite admit that I should have taken a note of it, but the hon. gentleman will find that the question had been threshed out and it was practically agreed upon, but at the same time I gave that pledge, and perhaps I should have kept it.

Mr. WALLACE. Is it only "perhaps" that he should have kept it?

Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, well, it is my hon. friend's English.

British Columbia—

Victoria drill hall and accessory buildings—Revote \$3,600—To complete.....	\$ 5,700
Williams Head Quarantine Station—Quarters for crew, alterations, improvements, furniture, instruments, &c.....	7,000
Victoria—New post office (revote).....	10,000

Mr. MAXWELL. I would like to know what has been the cost of this drill hall.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the original contract was for \$22,000. If my officers are rightly informed I think the total cost has reached the amount of \$30,000.

Mr. MAXWELL. Not more?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not more than that.

Mr. MAXWELL. It is one of the jobs out there you know.

Victoria—New post office..... \$10,000

Mr. MAXWELL. What is the full cost of that post office in Victoria?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost will be \$312,000.

Mr. MAXWELL. What is the population of Victoria?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 20,000.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia..... \$60,800

Mr. MILLS. Does the Minister intend to let Hampton Pier in Annapolis County go to entire ruin?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not find I made any provision in the Estimates for that.

Mr. MILLS. I might refresh the Minister's mind. When I asked him the question before, he said he would take it into deep consideration; it is there yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course I did, but I could not find my way to do it.

Harbours and Rivers—New Brunswick. \$49,117 50

Mr. FOSTER. Where are those wharfs on the St. John River for which you are asking \$2,500?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those wharfs have not yet been located, but we have received numerous requests to build them.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, the idea of asking a vote to build a wharf without even having located the places where that wharf is to be built. Why, it is worse than the electric light business this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not worse at all, it is just as good.

Mr. FOSTER. You are estimating on air.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been numerous petitions sent for these wharfs, although they are not actually located.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the plan on which these Estimates are compiled all the way through. If so, we will have to be very critical. If the Minister is going to spend \$2,500 on wharfs, he must know where they are surely.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would simply ask that that item should stand until to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman from Albert (Mr. Lewis) could tell us where Two Rivers is?

Mr. LEWIS. It is in Albert County.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a harbour there?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Minister explain what he proposes to do with the \$5,000 for hydrographic survey in St. John Harbour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has never been any proper survey of the harbour, and numerous requests have been made for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is not for the inner harbour, which is pretty well known, but it is to cover the channel in and out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The channel and the entrances have to be surveyed.

Mr. McALISTER. I am very much pleased to see \$2,000 in the Estimates for the public wharf at Dalhousie, which requires repairs very much, but I must again express my disappointment at seeing nothing in the Estimates for the public wharf at Campbellton. As I have pointed out to the Minister of Public Works on several occasions, the way we are situated there we have no wharf accommodation at all, and until the private wharf to which the other wharfs are connected is taken over by the Government or another wharf built, we can have no access to the public wharfs at all. In addition to that, considerable money has been expended there on a ferry wharf. That wharf never was completed and has been of no service whatever. Until it is completed it is impossible for any boat to land there, and I would ask that a small grant be made to complete and extend it, so that the ferry boat can use it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I intend visiting Dalhousie if I can, and will give my attention to that subject.

Shippegan Harbour—Extension of protection works, and repairs to same..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works, which cost a considerable amount of money, were partially destroyed a year ago. They are very important, because they afford accommodation to the fishermen between the Baie des Chaleurs and the Northumberland Straits. These works have cost in the neighbourhood of \$90,000, and we hope that with this sum of \$10,000 we shall be able to put them in a good state of repair.

Cape Tormentine—Repairs to break-water..... \$25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that this be reduced to \$12,000, because we shall not be able to spend more than that much this year.

Amendment agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers—Quebec—Rivière du Lièvre—Urgent repairs to retaining walls in connection with Little Rapids lock and dam..... \$4,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works, as my hon. friend knows, have cost a large amount of money. The water is pushing itself inside of the wharfs, and with this amount of money we feel able to save those wharfs.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any navigation going on there now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there is not as much as formerly, because the phosphate industry has stopped; but we feel that we should not let these wharfs fall into disrepair.

Isle Perrot—Addition to wharf, north side. \$2,500

Mr. BERGERON. In connection with this item I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to some boulders at the end of this wharf which are dangerous to navigation, especially in the fall, when the water is low; and there has been a demand for some years that they should be removed. The work could be done in a short time when a dredge is passing there.

Cacouna—Extension of wharf..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What wharf is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a wharf there, but the pier is not long enough, and we want to build another pier.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the pier you have to build?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that there are several hundred feet between the block and the shore.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you get out to the block ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We can only reach the block at high water. It is a tidal harbour.

St. Nicholas—To provide for the construction of a public wharf..... \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is St. Nicholas ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the fine county of Lévis. It has no public work at all, and it has a right to a wharf. There is a large parish that has no wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend going to undertake the policy of building wharfs up and down the St. Lawrence River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, only where it is necessary.

Gatineau River—Protection of east bank of river between Canadian Pacific Railway Bridge and the Ottawa River..... \$4,600

Mr. BERGERON. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote is explained by the words of the resolution. The bridge has been greatly damaged, and it is claimed that the damage has been caused by our dredging.

Mr. FOSTER. What dredging has been done on the Gatineau River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand from the chief engineer that years ago dredging was done, which changed the current and caused that damage.

Mr. FOSTER. How many years ago was that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand it was some seven or eight years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will require millions if he is going to undertake to repair the river banks, along rivers like the Gatineau, which have become damaged through the effect of improvements made on the river seven or eight years back.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the officers of a public department say that the damage had been caused by our own works, I think we are responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there navigation on the Gatineau River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, up to the railway. It was after being informed that there was navigation that I assented to that item.

Mr. FOSTER. What navigation is going on there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I went over the ground the other day and found half a dozen of barges loaded with lumber there.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. FOSTER. We should know where we are. On every stream where lumber is carried, does the Dominion Government take the position that it is going to look after the navigation of that river ? Suppose this river is navigable, and for the purpose of improving the channel we dredge it, and eight years later the river bank falls away, is the Government going to take upon itself the expense of protecting the river bank in every case ?

Mr. WALLACE. There is another feature, and it is this, that this is practically private property. Gilmour & Co. have piling grounds there, and vessels go up and load at those piling grounds. There is no public wharf there or navigation for the public at all. We are doing this simply for the benefit of private parties.

Mr. POUPORE. There were considerable improvements made in the river by the Dominion Government, and the passage of logs down the stream by high water has so destroyed the banks that the channel is blocked. The Dominion Government derive every year revenue from the passage of the logs down the river, and it is quite just and proper that they should clean up the river when the channel is blocked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that the late Government spent very large sums for the very same purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not for clearing out the stream, even supposing you are going to enter upon the good work of cleaning out all the logging streams in the country for the passage of lumber. This item is for protecting property on the river bank.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. The facts are these. Seven or eight years ago the Government decided to make certain improvements to the booms which are the property of this Government.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the dams at the mouth of the Gatineau the property of the Dominion ?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Yes. The Government decided to make certain improvements consisting in the construction of piers and dredging the river. A pier was constructed in the centre of the river, and the result of its construction and the dredging was that the stream was diverted from its natural course, and considerable damage was done to the properties of the riparian proprietors. Complaints were made by these proprietors and by the municipalities interested, whose municipal road had been taken away by water. It was shown that the change in the current of the stream was the immediate cause of the damage. Five or six years ago, the Dominion Government acknowledged that the damage was the result of the work that had been done there by the Government, and expended a sum to protect the banks, which, I

am informed, was in the neighbourhood of \$3,000. They thus admitted that they were responsible for the damages caused to these riparian proprietors and the municipalities. It happens that the protection given was insufficient, a portion of those works was carried away by water, and it has been found necessary to make some more repairs. At my personal request, the hon. Minister of Public Works was kind enough to put at my disposition one of his engineers, Mr. Chas. Taché, who lives at Gatineau Point, and with whom I went over the place. I verified myself the extent of the damages, and Mr. Taché made a report in which he says that the cause of the damage to these properties is the works made in previous years by the Dominion Government. In face of that report, the Minister of Public Works thought it was his duty to insert a sufficient amount in the Estimates in order to avoid future damages. This is not a favour given these people by the Dominion Government, but simply an act of justice, because I submit that, under the circumstances, we are legally bound to indemnify the parties injured. Legally speaking, I consider the Government responsible for the damages.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of this bank which has to be protected. Does it extend along a considerable portion of the river, and is it owned by private individuals?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. A portion is owned by different individuals and there was a road on the shore which has been destroyed, being worn away by the water. In several places the road is located four or five acres from where it was originally located. Thus several riparian proprietors and two municipalities are interested.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this caused by a building of a pier?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. That is the conclusion at which the engineer of the department arrived—that it was through the dredging and the construction of the pier in the middle of the river.

Mr. FOSTER. The pier was built for the benefit of the lumber mills there?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. And the slidage and so on, are the property of the Government?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. No doubt about that.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Government gets fees from them?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) the report of his officers upon that question?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it was Mr. Pelletier who made the survey there upon which this item is based.

Mr. FOSTER. And the legal opinion given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Champagne), who has just taken his seat, is shared by the representative in the House of the Department of Justice that if improvements are made in the river and a wharf constructed, and eight years afterwards, the side of the bank was eaten out, the Government is responsible?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should not forget that in what I am doing, I am only following the course adopted by him, and I thought that he himself had consulted the law officers.

Mr. FOSTER. But is my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) only to do what we did?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember that we received any dues or owned any slides or booms on the Gatineau.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes; no doubt about that.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the receipts?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give that information now, but it will be found in our report.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. gentleman will bring that information before concurrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me that this opens up a very large question. If the Dominion Government have control of this river, they have a right to make what improvements they see fit. The contention is that the Dominion Government is responsible and will be for all time to come, for protecting the bank owned by private individuals, and that, if a road along the river is washed away, the municipality will have a claim. I understood the Minister and others behind him to say that this was a legal question and that he was bound to make the repairs. But I would like to know, and I think the committee has a right to be informed by the Minister of Public works, whether the Minister has consulted the Department of Justice on the question of our being bound to make these repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only repeat what I have already said—the work having been begun under the late Government it was assumed that all this had been done.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not understand that this work was begun under the late Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it was.

Mr. COCHRANE. You say that, but I do not so understand the case. I under-

stand that the improvements to the river were begun, not the protection of the banks.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Yes, the protection of the bank was begun by the late Government.

Mr. **BERGERON.** What is the length of the bank we are protecting?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** About half a mile.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Ste.

Anne de Sorel—Ice-piers..... \$3,600

Mr. **BERGERON.** What is that for?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The ice is doing very great damage there every year and some of these ice-piers have been altogether carried away, and must be replaced.

Rimouski Pier—Repairs..... \$500

Mr. **FISSET.** (Translation.) I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to the fact that the vote asked for is not large enough for making the necessary repairs to this wharf. I take occasion to say that such a small expenditure will almost prove useless as you will not be able to make all the necessary repairs.

Mr. **BERGERON.** (Translation.) There is another item for that purpose in the Estimates.

Mr. **FISSET.** (Translation.) I am speaking of the wharf at Rimouski. I know there is some difference of opinion in that connection between the Public Works Department and the Department of Railways and Canals. The Department of Railways and Canals is of opinion that those repairs are under the control of the Public Works Department; while the Department of Public Works says that they are under the control of the Railways and Canals Department. I understand from a remark made to me by the Deputy Minister of Public Works that the department claims that it has nothing to do with the building of wharfs for railways. I coincide in this view of the matter. At all events, all the hon. gentlemen know that the wharf at Rimouski is used in connection with the hauling of the English mail, and therefore, is a public work of absolute necessity. The woodwork inside the wharf is in a state of decay and a portion of it is gone. The wharf inclines considerably. This expenditure of \$500 will hardly cover the cost of the works that are to be carried out this year. I am even afraid accidents may happen, owing to the wharf being so much out of repair. I know that a report has been made by the railway officials, in which the facts I have just alluded to were stated, as they, no doubt, wish to free themselves thereby from all responsibility in the matter.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Now that you are through with the Quebec items, Mr. Chairman, I think I must congratulate the Gov-

Mr. **COCHRANE.**

ernment upon the justice rendered to Quebec. But I must say I am very sorry not to see an item I would be glad to see. I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) has forgotten that a good many of the electors who are living on the shore of the feeder to the St. Louis River, Valleyfield, have been making very strong representations to him on the subject of damages to the property of farmers on the shore of that river. The Government have built some works over there. These have not been completed, unfortunately, and the earth on each side of the feeder has fallen in. In fact that piece of work is now in a very bad condition. It is very dangerous because the water, instead of following its natural course, deviates, and some of the farmers have suffered very heavy damages, comparatively, through the water getting into their cellars and destroying their vegetables, &c. In fact, we have a claim for some damages from the Department of Public Works, which I think he will find in his department, to the amount of \$1,500 or \$2,000. I understand that the last time the Minister was in Valleyfield they made a complaint to him, and he promised to look after it. I thought I would find in these items an amount necessary to cover these damages, and also to clean the feeder and to repair the gates, which are to-day in a very dangerous condition. In fact, if these gates were broken away, it might happen that the whole stream would follow that course as well as to pass through the channel. This was brought to the attention of the Government some time ago by the gate keeper, Mr. Bergevin, who came here to Ottawa for that purpose. I hope that the hon. Minister will take note of it.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I remember Mr. Bergevin made some representations to me, and I think we can find enough money in our general vote of \$10,000 for these small affairs.

Mr. **BERGERON.** Will my hon. friend take note of it? Because it is really serious.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Yes, the chief engineer has a note of it.

Mr. **BENNETT.** May I ask if this Iberville wharf is a Government dock, or the property of a private individual?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** It is a Government work.

Honora, Manitoulin Island—Wharf..... \$6,000

Mr. **WALLACE.** I would like to have some explanation about that item. Is that a Government wharf?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** We have been building a new wharf there, which will be the property of the Crown.

Mr. **OASGRAIN.** Did the hon. gentleman say the wharfs in Ontario are not Government wharfs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of them are.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to know whether the system of paying tolls upon all the wharfs is to be kept in force. I raised this question last year when the item was voted, and my hon. friend was good enough to say that he would try to devise some means by which, upon certain wharfs where a very small revenue was derived, to do away with the tolls. Now, in the county of Montmorency there are certain wharfs upon which certainly the tolls do not amount to a sufficient sum to pay for the keepers. I would remind my hon. friend that the population of the county of Montmorency have enjoyed no Government favours in the way of subsidies for railways or to steamboats to carry them from the Island of Orleans to the city of Quebec or to any other place. I would like to ask the Minister what policy the Government have adopted on this point regarding the tolls.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That question does not come up in my department. As soon as the wharfs are completed they are passed over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think he has not yet made up his mind as to his future policy with regard to these wharfs.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like the hon. gentleman to try to make up his mind between this and the next session in relation to tolls upon wharfs, especially in the county of Montmorency.

Mr. WALLACE. I must ask again for some information about this wharf in Honora, Manitoulin Island. Perhaps the hon. member for Algoma can give us some information.

Mr. DYMENT. I do not know what information I could give. The wharf is not built yet.

Mr. WALLACE. That is directly contrary to the statement of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg you pardon. I said distinctly it was a new one.

Mr. WALLACE. I never heard of this place before. Is it going to be a Government wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be Government property.

Mr. LISTER. I hope the present head of the department, if he intends building another wharf up there, will not do as the late Government did. As a matter of fact, they spent about \$10,000 on another man's property under an agreement that the conveyance should be made to the department. The conveyance never was made to the department, the department never took control of the wharf and the person in whose

name it stood, mortgaged it to the bank, and the Government lost all the money that was put in it.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a timely warning, but it is not information about this wharf.

Mr. DYMENT. It is in one of the best settled portions of Manitoulin Island, and was promised by the late Government. It is about thirteen miles from Little Current.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there any town there?

Mr. DYMENT. No; there is a settlement and mills.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is the owner of the mills there?

Mr. DYMENT. Dr. Herriman.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there anything besides Dr. Herriman's mills?

Mr. DYMENT. There is a store there.

Mr. WALLACE. I never heard of the place before.

Mr. DYMENT. As Algoma is about one-half the province of Ontario, I could not be expected to know all the places in it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will put up a lodge there.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Manitoulin Island is full of them.

Port Stanley—Assistance towards harbour improvements..... \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. Does that finish the improvements?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The ground, I suppose, is given by the company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have undertaken to pay one-third of the amount.

Hilton or Markdale Wharf—To provide for purchase of wharf property, including water lot, wharf and storehouse..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount of \$5,000 is asked from Parliament to purchase from Mr. A. G. Duncan his wharf property.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is Hilton?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is on St. Joseph's Island. That wharf is now owned by Mr. Duncan. He charges heavy tolls, and the inhabitants think that they should have as much right as those of any other part of Canada to have a free wharf. The Government, after having read the petition that has been presented here, with the approbation of my hon. friend (Mr. Dymont) decided that the people have a right to a free wharf.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Why should not the people of Montmorency have a free wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will settle the case of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain).

Mr. HAGGART. What amount has been expended there?

Mr. DYMENT. About \$11,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government built a part of the wharf and were not wise enough, I am sorry to say, to become the owners of the wharf.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is this wharf to be made free upon which no tolls are to be paid?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the first place the wharf was built by Mr. Duncan. Later on the Government made an addition to it. To have access to the shore the people were obliged to pay a large amount of money. We have made up our minds to free them from that burden.

Mr. HAGGART. When you are making an expenditure of that kind why do you not expropriate the property?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We did not make the expenditure; it was made by the late Government.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you not do it now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am doing it now; I am buying Mr. Duncan's wharf.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is this to be a free wharf or not?

Mr. DYMENT. It will be a regular Government wharf upon which the tolls will be of a trifling amount. Heretofore Mr. Duncan has been charging about ten times the amount of the right tolls. Farmers and others have worked up quite a market at the Soo. They have to take their produce over the wharf and they have the profit taken out of it by the tolls. This is a very cheap way to get back the money we have spent upon this wharf.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What do you pay now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be charged whatever tolls are prescribed.

Mr. SPROULE. The wharfs are generally taken over by the municipalities after the Government has built them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure of it, because I put a bill through myself with the assistance of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The municipality owning the

Mr. TARTE.

wharf charge shippers for use of it, and the money is set apart for the repair of the wharf. Take Meaford, Thornbury and Penetanguishene, for instance, where the wharfs are all under the municipalities. Certain tolls are charged after they have been assented to by the Governor in Council.

Mr. DYMENT. That is not the way we have it in our part of the country, there is a regular toll which the Government have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is handed over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should you refuse to do it on one side of the Georgian Bay and not do it on the other.

Mr. LISTER. On St. Joseph's Island they do that to help settlement.

Mr. BRITTON. If the tolls are of a very small amount this will be a continual bill of expense to the Dominion Government, because the cost of maintenance has to be borne by the Dominion Government, and in all quite a large item is proposed to be paid. If therefore the practice has not generally been as it has been stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) of passing these works over to the municipalities by legislation in that behalf, it would seem to me that it ought to be. If it is a fact that so many of these wharfs are being built for the convenience of the people and only a nominal toll is charged and that the maintenance year by year is charged to the Dominion Government, then some are getting a great convenience that others such as have been spoken of by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) ought to get. I think that this is a matter which should be dealt with by the Minister of Public Works with the object of adopting some general system.

Mr. DYMENT. I said trifling in comparison to what the owner has been charging, and besides the toll that the merchant or farmer pays the Government are getting from every boat that calls from \$2 to \$2.50 every time they call. Boats from Collingwood, Owen Sound and other places frequently call, and this is a source of revenue.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think if the Government build wharfs they should control them. I know that year after year we have voted money for wharfs in Quebec and in the western part of Ontario, but at Toronto, Kingston, Brockville, Gananoque and all those points on Lake Ontario and the River St. Lawrence the wharfs are private property and have been built by private individuals who charge whatever tolls they like. If the Government own a portion of the wharfs they should control them all.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. In the Maritime Provinces most of the wharfs are owned by private parties, but some are owned by the Government because they are considered to be of national importance.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)**. Possibly some principle should be adopted by which aid should be given only to wharfs that are of national importance, that are of importance to the whole province or the whole Dominion. But I think we should not be asked to vote items of this kind that we really know nothing about. I do not know whether the Minister desires us to understand that all these wharfs in the country are Government wharfs or not.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Part of them are our property and others are not.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)**. On what principle does the Minister of Public Works proceed in regard to affording assistance to these wharfs. I can understand that if the wharf is of Dominion or provincial importance it may be desirable to afford it aid, but I do not understand that we should vote aid to other wharfs except under special circumstances which the Minister ought to explain to us. He has not given us information in respect to any of these wharfs, and I think before the item is passed the Minister ought to explain which of them are of national or provincial importance and as such are deserving of Dominion aid.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. I have not asked for a cent for wharfs which are not our property.

**Mr. WALLACE**. Is there not a vote for Collingwood Harbour that belongs to Collingwood.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. That is not a wharf. I am speaking of wharfs now.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that these amounts were voted for wharfs for national importance. I think that the wharfs at Kingston, Brockville and Gananoque, are of as great national importance as the wharf at Iberville for which \$8,000 is being voted. The wharf at Kingston is at the foot of Lake Ontario where all the commerce of that great lake is landed. These certainly are wharfs of much national importance.

**Mr. CASGRAIN**. The national importance of it is that they are in the county that Mr. Tarte represents.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. I see. If the Government are making light tolls in certain portions of the province of Quebec, the people of the province of Ontario should have the same facilities for carrying on their trade.

**Mr. QUINN**. If these wharfs are Dominion wharfs they are passed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Quite so.

**Mr. QUINN**. What system is adopted for fixing these tolls, and is the system uniform?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. They are of a uniform rate.

**Mr. QUINN**. Are the same tolls charged on the Marksville wharf as on the Montmorency wharf?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

**Mr. QUINN**. That seems fair.

Fort Francis Lock..... \$25,000

**Mr. BERGERON**. I think we heard something about the Fort Francis Lock before. What is this for?

**Mr. FOSTER**. The Minister cannot expect us to give \$25,000 for this resurrection without knowing something about it?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is a monument to the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie's wisdom and foresight, and ought to have been built twenty years ago.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The trouble is that he was twenty years ahead of his time when he made the expenditure.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. St. Francis Lock was built in 1875 and it has been abandoned since, but to-day it is found to be a work of great importance in view of the development of the mining regions there. When that lock is repaired it will give about 200 miles more of navigation.

**Mr. HAGGART**. Will the completion of the lock enable you to go from Rainy Lake to Lake of the Woods?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Yes, with a few improvements we are making in the Rainy River?

**Mr. BERGERON**. How much money has been spent already on that St. Francis Lock?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. The Government I understand has spent in the past \$280,000.

**Mr. DYMENT**. As most hon. gentlemen know, probably the best mineral country in Canada is in the Seine River district. Most of the boats are on the Lake of the Woods and there is only one on Rainy Lake above the locks. All the supplies going into that country have to be transhipped there to this one little steamer, at very great inconvenience and cost. This work will help the mining interest in the Seine River district.

**Mr. HAGGART**. What is the depth of the water on the sill of the lock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
Six feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you intend to have six feet all along on the Rainy River.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter that has been laid before him during the present session. I notice that for all along the shore of Lake Ontario, there is only a grant of \$4,000 in these Estimates. The town of Bronte, an old Indian reserve, and a place of some considerable importance, midway between Toronto and Hamilton, has made a demand on the Minister some time during the session, through a deputation of the municipal council I am told, for improvements there. About a year ago an engineer was sent by the department to survey it, and he made a report. There is a very considerable amount of fishing done in that neighbourhood, and it is very important that the Government should resuscitate the pier, and put the harbour in such a shape that the people may transact their business. I know the work is of pressing need, and I would be very glad indeed if the Minister would look into the engineer's reports in his department and take the matter into his consideration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister's own friends in that section of the country are very anxious that he should make the harbour useful for the people of that neighbourhood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
My chief engineer will take a note of my hon. friend's remarks.

Harbours and Rivers—Manitoba—Lake Manitoba—Opening of additional outlets to prevent overflow of lake, and maintenance of same at proper level for navigation purposes..... \$25,000

Mr. BRITTON. This lake is a very large lake, and a vote of \$25,000 for such a purpose as is named here, unless there is some explanation of it, seems a strange one.

Mr. HAGGART. I never knew that it was an objection to navigation that a lake would rise above its ordinary level.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The real facts of the case are that the rising of the water in Lake Manitoba is causing very damaging floods, and that to make these floods impossible for the future, it is necessary to deepen the outlet of the lake. I caused a survey to be made, and the report is that with this sum we shall be able to deepen the channel in such a way as to prevent the recurrence of these floods in the future.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, the Minister asks for a grant of money for the purpose of preventing a lake overflowing private property. On what principle does he justify that? According to his statement, it is not for navigation purposes at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The effect of the work will be first to prevent the overflow of the lake, and at the same time to improve navigation.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. In regard to this item, I may perhaps be able to give the committee a little information. Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis are the natural basins for the drainage of a large part of north-western Manitoba. Into these lakes the water from a large number of streams and from an enormous area of land flows. The outlet of Lake Manitoba is very narrow. The only outlet is Fairford River, which flows into Lake St. Martin, and thence through the Little Saskatchewan, the water finds its way into Lake Winnipeg. There is a fall of 100 feet between the two lakes. This small outlet is blocked with boulders and silt, until after a succession of wet years and heavy snowfalls in Manitoba, a large area of north-western Manitoba is partially inundated. Not only land owned by private persons, but an enormous area of valuable Government land is flooded, and a large settlement of Icelanders who settled on the west shore of Lake Manitoba have been forced to leave their homesteads. The settlers all around Lake Manitoba, engaged in ranching and fishing, are being forced to leave their houses. Lake Manitoba is situated on the north side of Portage Plains, an exceedingly fertile and valuable region, and some 40,000 acres of valuable wheat land occupied by settlers who have put up fine houses and other buildings, is being inundated. An inundation took place in 1882, after which we had a series of dry years; we have recently had a succession of wet years, and these people are being driven back from their homes again. As an economical measure, this is a small sum compared with what will be saved by the drainage of the lake. As regards navigation, the idea is to keep the lake at its normal level, to widen the outlet without deepening it in such a way that the navigation on the lake will not be destroyed. I understand that the department have had thorough surveys and reports made on this question, and are well advised in asking for this sum of money. I know that the people in my constituency are exceedingly anxious to have this work carried out. I have been receiving letters and telegrams about it for some time back. In fact, it has been a live question for years, because people knew that the lake would at some time again overflow its banks and make trouble. I am very much pleased to see this sum in the Estimates, and I am sure it will benefit a very large section

of Manitoba, because it involves not only the district immediately surrounding Lake Manitoba, but a much larger area, for, owing to the country being so flat, the water is dammed back for a considerable distance.

Mr. HAGGART. The only reason the hon. gentleman has given for this grant that I can see it that the Government own some lands there. I was not aware that the Government owned any lands there that we have not granted to railway companies. Those that we have not granted to railway companies will, I suppose, come under the designation of swamp lands which belong to the Manitoba Government. The hon. gentleman has made a very strong argument for provincial assistance, to prevent the lake overflowing its banks, but he has made no argument for assistance from the Dominion Government for that purpose.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If the hon. gentleman will look over the geography of the country, he will find that the Dominion owns a very large quantity of land around Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. HAGGART. I think I am acquainted with the geography of the country, and I think that all the land belonging to the Dominion in that country is set apart or scheduled to the different railways there, and those lands in which the odd sections are reserved belong to the Manitoba Government under our agreement with them.

Mr. QUINN. What is to be the whole cost of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not expect to spend more than this \$25,000, and so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to spend any more.

Mr. QUINN. It seems a small amount for the work to be done, and it would be useless to undertake it if you are spending what is insufficient.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It will be quite sufficient.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report I have is that \$25,000 is sufficient for the work proposed.

Harbours and Rivers—British Columbia—  
Columbia River—Improvements in nar-  
rows between Upper and Lower Arrow  
Lakes..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What depth will that give?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seven feet at low water.

Mr. FOSTER. What width of channel?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One hundred feet

Mr. FOSTER. Does this take in the whole construction?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that to complete the work would require about \$25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. So that this is only to do part of it. Is it intended to make the whole channel a uniform depth of less than seven feet, or is it proposed to do a portion of it fully?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We intend to do a portion of it fully, and then go on with the balance of the work.

Fraser River—Improvement of ship chan-  
nel, additional amount..... \$50,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

I want to take the House into my confidence about that item because it is a very large sum indeed to ask, and before I put it in the Estimates I hesitated very much. I visited British Columbia a few months ago and inspected all the works. As hon. gentlemen know, we have expended about \$600,000 on them, and have about 21 feet of water between New Westminster and the sea. I have a little plan here which will explain the whole thing. At the end of the works is Western Isle. We have built up a channel in the Fraser River by means of matrices. At the end of these matrices is Western Island, and the current is now threatening to destroy Western Island and pass behind the works. If this happened our works would be altogether destroyed. The river is the most difficult in America perhaps, according to the engineer. The current and floods are terrible during spring, and Western Island is the basis of all the work. If that island were destroyed, our works would all disappear. I have already had a report from Mr. Gamble, the late engineer, and also from my engineer who has visited the river himself, and both agree that it is necessary to spend that amount of money to protect our works. A few days ago I received a telegram from Mr. Roy, stating that if we did not spend immediately that sum of money, our works certainly would be destroyed, so that I was face to face with the fact that works on which we had spent \$600,000 would be destroyed if I did not obtain a vote for the amount I ask.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman going to do it by days' work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have done that in the past. We are well equipped for that sort of work.

Maria Street Bridge, over the Rideau  
Canal, Ottawa—Reconstruction .....\$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. Does the city contribute anything?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Both the city and the Canada Atlantic Railway are to pay their share of the work and I will not spend a dollar if they do not pay their share.

Mr. **FOSTER.** What is the share the Canada Atlantic Railway will have to pay?

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Mr. Booth will be obliged to build in iron the part of the bridge he has built in wood. I may say that the shares have not been defined, but I have had several interviews with both Mr. Booth and the Mayor of Ottawa. I understand that the Government is bound to pay one-third.

Mr. **HAGGART.** The hon. gentleman does not intend to spend anything unless the proportion which is at present agreed upon between the city and the Dominion shall be adhered to. And Mr. Booth is to complete the diversion caused by the extension of his railway into the city.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Quite so.

Prince Edward Island—To provide for the purchase of the following wharfs on the Hillsboro' River from the provincial government, by paying for each wharf the amount expended on it, from the 1st of July, 1873, to the 30th of June, 1897, together with interest at 5 per cent per annum, viz.:

For Red Point Wharf....	\$4,028 31
For Haggarty's Wharf....	5,745 00
For Cranberry Wharf....	2,069 85

\$11,843 16

Mr. **FOSTER.** This is an item we want some explanation about.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Some years ago, after the decision in Holman vs. Green, the Government of which my hon. friends (Mr. Haggart and Mr. Foster) were members, purchased from the local government of Prince Edward Island those piers which were deemed of national importance. They sent an engineer down to examine all the piers of the island and reports were made upon them. Some piers were taken and some were rejected. But the provincial Government refused to abide by the conclusion of the engineer, and pressed for other piers to be taken, on the ground that they were of national importance. So far as the piers here named are concerned, the late Government practically adopted the first named, the Red Point wharf, and, about four years ago had a sum voted to put it into proper repair. But it was never formally taken over. Now, Haggarty's wharf and Cranberry wharf are on the same arm of the sea, the Hillsboro' River, which runs up twenty miles and has some 7 or 8 piers upon it. I may say that the steamers run twice a week up that river as far as Mount Stewart. The Government decided that it would not be fair to take any of the piers

Mr. **TARTE.**

on the north side of the river because though, years ago they were useful and might be considered of national importance, after the railway was built, they were not deemed of national importance, because all the shipping was done by the railway on the south side, and therefore they rejected the claim of the local Government with respect to the piers on the north side of the river. With respect to the south side, the Red Point pier was recognized as one that should be taken over by the late Government and they voted the money for its repairs three or four years ago. So only two, Haggarty's wharf and Cranberry wharf which stood in exactly the same position as Red Point wharf, have yet to be decided. When my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) submitted to me the petition of the local Government that, these wharfs should be taken over, I told them my personal judgment was that, they should be taken over, but that I thought he would not be right in taking them over unless he had the report of an impartial engineer on that point. So he sent Mr. Hagan, maritime engineer at St. John, and he made a report on the wharfs on both sides of the river. After reading it carefully over in Council, and reading what I had to say upon it, the Government decided to strike out all the other wharfs except these three, but decided that these were fairly within the rule laid down in Holman vs. Green. The engineer's report was strongly to the effect that these were of national importance and should be taken over.

Mr. **WALLACE.** What is the price paid?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Only the actual cash paid up by the provincial Government.

Mr. **HAGGART.** Do I understand that they claim that these wharfs should belong to the Dominion under some arrangements of the terms of confederation?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** No, not of confederation. It was not thought by the lawyers of the maritime provinces that these piers belonged to the Dominion. But a trial took place in the Supreme Court known as Holman vs. Green, and in that case it was decided that these wharfs belonged to the Dominion. Consequent upon that decision, the Government—I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) was a member of it—took over the piers of Prince Edward Island to the amount, if my memory serves me right, of about \$120,000. My hon. friend from East Queen's (Mr. Martin) can tell what the amount was.

Mr. **MARTIN.** I think it was something less than \$100,000.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** When these wharfs had been taken over, a request was made to the local

Government: Let us settle accounts and give us a clear receipt. But the local Government, then a Conservative Government, refused to do that. They refused to accept the decision as final. But certain wharfs were taken over by the Dominion Government, and others were not. But subsequently the Government practically took over Red Point wharf, and had money voted to put it in repair. The question then arose as to Cranberry and Hillsboro' wharfs. An engineer was sent and the conclusion was reached that most of the wharfs were to be left to the local Government, but these were so near the rule laid down in Holman vs. Green that they had to be taken over.

Mr. MARTIN. I am very much pleased that these three wharfs are taken by the Dominion Government. While I say that, I think it is rather unfortunate that the question has been taken up at all by the Dominion Government unless the whole question in regard to these wharfs in Prince Edward Island is taken up.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We cannot do everything in a day, you know.

Mr. MARTIN. But the hon. Minister of Marine told me the other day—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is so much conversation I cannot hear my hon. friend (Mr. Martin).

Mr. MARTIN. If the Chairman would stop the conversation, perhaps I could be heard better. I think if there is anything inopportune about this, that inopportune-ness is in the hon. Minister allowing this question to be taken up only partly. The three wharfs that he mentioned are near Charlottetown in the district which the Premier of Prince Edward Island represents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) also.

Mr. MARTIN. I know that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman oppose this?

Mr. MARTIN. No, I do not oppose it. But I say it is unfortunate—and I hope the hon. gentleman is hearing me, if he does not hear me I will try to speak louder—that the Government in taking up this question did not take up the whole question of the wharfs in Prince Edward Island. No person was louder in his denunciations of this course than the hon. Minister of Marine himself. I say that from the expectations which he raised in the minds of the people of Prince Edward Island, it was thought that when he occupied a seat in the Cabinet, not only these wharfs but others would be taken over by the Government. The hon. gentleman knows that it is only a

small number of wharfs that should have been included in this list. I wish to call his especial attention to the wharf at Murray Bay. If I do not mistake, a memorial has been forwarded to the Government last spring about that particular wharf. I know that a meeting was called during the winter season which was attended by the two local members—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope the hon. gentleman will leave that matter open because he knows the intention of the Government with regard to the railway.

Mr. MARTIN. What railway?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From Murray River to Belfast.

Mr. MARTIN. Does that interfere with the wharf?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; but I hope the whole question will be left in abeyance.

Mr. MARTIN. What connection can there be between a wharf and a railway? If the hon. gentleman wishes to shirk this question—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not shirking; I do not say that it ought not to be taken.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to inform the committee that the provincial representatives, friends of the hon. Minister himself, agreed to memorialize the Government in regard to the expenditure at Murray River. There is no doubt that the wharf at Murray River is just as important as any of these wharfs which are mentioned in this item. I need not remind him, also, of the pier to which I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works several times and as to which I have not yet received a decided answer. I refer to the pier at Bell River. When this engineer went down to Prince Edward Island it is a pity he did not visit Murray River and Bell River. I might also mention a few others. There is McAuley's wharf, and a wharf at Alexandria. Either of these wharfs are of just as much national importance as those which are mentioned in this item. I am astonished that we have no information in regard to this pier at Bell River, but that is not all that I have to complain of. While this money is voted, it is not voted to put these wharfs in repair. What is this money for? It is money voted for the local government, but those wharfs are to continue in the same miserable condition that they are in now. I do not say that the local government may not want this money very badly, they are friends of the hon. gentleman. But instead of this money being spent on repairs for those wharfs, it is to be paid over to the provincial government to extricate them out

of their straits. While I am pleased to see these wharfs taken over, I am sorry that there is no item to put them in good repair. I wish also to call the attention of the Minister to the wharf at Red Point, as I called it to his attention last session. While this money of \$4,028.31, is to be paid on account of that wharf, there is not one dollar to be spent upon it; while there are \$5,745 to be paid for Haggarty's wharf, and \$2,069.85 for Cranberry wharf, there is not one dollar to be expended on them. Where is that money going? The hon. gentleman may stand up here and make it appear that these wharfs are to be built, but there is not one dollar going to be spent on these wharfs, this money is going into the provincial treasury. I thought after the argument used by the Minister of Finance to-night in regard to getting a post office at a small village in Nova Scotia because that village had not received any railway subsidy. I thought if that argument was good when applied to small villages all over this Dominion, it should apply with still greater force to a whole province. If any hon. gentleman can stand up and say that he demands a post office for a place because they have no railways built at the Government expense, what is to be said in favour of a whole province whose claims date from confederation. It appears that there is one argument to suit the case of a Minister in one province, and another argument for a private member in another province. Now, if the Minister of Public Works wishes to deal fairly in regard to those wharfs, he will send an engineer down to the province of Prince Edward Island and re-examine, as he did in these three cases, the other wharfs which the late Government has not taken over, so that eventually even-handed justice may be done all round. The memorial which the premier of Prince Edward Island presented here only includes the wharfs in his own district, leaving wharfs equally important in other sections of the island without any mention being made of them. The hon. gentleman knows that there are many wharfs in Prince Edward Island equally important with these. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who assumes a paternal care over the interest of Prince Edward Island, has done that province a great injury by taking these wharfs over without going into the whole question. There are other wharfs of national importance that are not included among those situated on this small river. No doubt these are of importance, but not one dollar is to be expended on them. I think that not only should those wharfs be examined by an engineer, but all these other wharfs which are not assumed by the Dominion Government, should also be examined. Now, I wish the Minister of Public Works to tell me if he is going to send an engineer down to inspect that work at Bell River; and he might also include Murray River.

Mr. MARTIN.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want to debate this matter. I am sorry my hon. friend has talked about the Hillsborough River as a small river. Everybody knows that it is an arm of the sea. I have seen five British battleships at one time anchored in that river.

Mr. MARTIN. Just excuse me for a moment. The hon. gentleman takes a particular pleasure in trying to misrepresent me. I did not say small river. A small river—I am sure it is not as large as the St. Lawrence. Certainly it is small, comparatively, as I suppose I am small compared with the hon. gentleman who is now a belted knight. The East River is small compared with the Amazon or the St. Lawrence. I think the hon. gentleman says that in order to be reported in "Hansard" and to make a case against me in Prince Edward Island. I would remark, for the benefit of this committee that I am going to give the hon. gentleman a warning. Every time I attempt to say anything in this House the hon. gentleman has taken particular pains to belittle me and to misrepresent me. But, Sir, so long as I have a seat in this House I will strike out for fair-play, and the hon. gentleman, great as he is, and orator as he is, will find that I am not going to be put down or misrepresented by him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I did not wish to misrepresent him or to put him down. If the hon. gentleman did not speak of this place as a small river, I will say nothing more about it. It is a very large arm of the sea. But he don't oppose this vote, he says it should be more extensive. Well, I dare say that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may be induced to make a further examination of these Bell River and Alexandria wharfs, and other wharfs that may at some future time be considered. But we are all agreed that these ought to be included, so there is no more controversy about the matter. The wharfs were reported to be in first-class condition by the engineer who was sent there. There is no occasion for any more repairs at present. I do not see why we should get into a political fight about this. We have already taken a vote for \$5,000 for the purpose of purchasing Creosote piles for general repairs for the wharfs. I am sure that my hon. friend will agree that this is a step in the right direction. Instead of having these ordinary hemlock or spruce piles, we have done away with them and we propose to get creosote piles to repair them with, and we have brought down this vote.

Mr. HAGGART. I am opposed entirely to it. I have never heard a reason advanced why the Dominion Government should take over these provincial works, and especially after taking them over why they

should pay for the amount expended by the provincial governments hitherto. The only argument that I have heard advanced that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has advanced in regard to it was the decision in some case.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes, in the case of *Holman vs. Green*.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I did not mean the decision in that case. That only referred to the jurisdiction.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman's own Government adopted that decision and took over a large number of wharfs in pursuance of it, and others were left in doubt. For those which were taken over they paid \$100,000.

Mr. **HAGGART**. If these works were taken over as a matter of Dominion or national importance it was not a matter of necessity at all, but of option. The most extraordinary argument that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries uses for the purpose of taking over those wharfs is the one used in regard to the wharf on which there was expended \$4,028.31 by the provincial government and when it comes to the Dominion Government there will be a further expenditure. Because the Dominion Government expends a sum of money for repairing the works and the provincial government says we are liable for all of the money expended by the provincial government on that work. All the works are precisely in the same position, and he believes they ought to be taken over too. This is the argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I hope the argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have no influence with the Minister of Public Works, and we will not be taking over works in regard to which the statement will be made that they are of national importance. In taking over these works and assuming all the expenditure that has hitherto been made we are undertaking a little too much.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I was about to suggest something in the line that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has just mentioned. I do not quite understand why anything held in *Holman vs. Green* would make it necessary or desirable to take over these wharfs, and particularly I do not see why on account of anything decided in *Holman vs. Green* it should be necessary or expedient to repay to the provincial governments the amounts which the provincial governments have expended upon these wharfs. A principle of that kind might involve this Government in some conclusions which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not at present foresee. For example I think a logical result of this principle

which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has laid down, would be that the Government of Canada would be obliged to repay to the province of Nova Scotia all the subsidies given to railways that were subsequently declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. There are in Nova Scotia a number of railways which have been declared to be railways for the general advantage of Canada. I believe there is now outstanding a claim by the province of Nova Scotia for a refund of subsidies expended by the province of Nova Scotia upon these railways. I am not desirous of dealing with the merits of that question, but I merely desire to put it interrogatively to the Minister whether or not the principle which he has laid down to the committee to-night would not logically involve the conclusion that the Dominion Government should repay to the province these important subsidies. It strikes me at present that it would involve that, and, if so, this fact would involve a very important matter both to this Dominion and to the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman has probably a much better acquaintance than I have with the case of *Holman vs. Green*, of which I have nothing more than a general recollection, and I would like to ask him or the Solicitor General, who no doubt has the case in mind, whether or not the decision in that case is in any way touched by the judgment of the Supreme Court which is now on appeal to the Privy Council. I have not examined that judgment critically nor the judgment in *Holman vs. Green*.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I argued the case of *Holman vs. Green* myself. The decision in *Holman vs. Green* was to the effect that the bottoms of the harbours belonged to the Dominion of Canada, and in the course of that argument it was intimated that the piers were within subsection B of the Dominion Act and became the property of the Dominion of Canada. That was the decision. The late Government, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) was a member, acted upon that decision. They sent a commissioner very properly to Prince Edward Island to see what Dominion piers were within the decision of *Holman vs. Green*, and he reported that A, B, C, D and so on were within the decision. The moment they made that report the Dominion Government became owners of these piers and the local government said "you must pay us what we have paid upon them." They said "all right." Then there was the question as to whether the other class, E, F, G, H, were within the decision. The Dominion Government contended that they were not, and the provincial government contended that they were. The Dominion Government paid over \$100,000 for those piers in regard to which

there was no dispute, leaving the others in regard to which there was a dispute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was it a question of fact?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a question of fact. The question was whether the pier was a pier coming within the meaning of the Dominion Act. The Government sent a commission to determine that fact because it depended upon that fact whether the piers to be taken over by the Dominion Government were of Dominion or local importance. There was no other criterion that could be suggested. The late Government took over a large number of piers and paid for them. But they did not take over three or four piers which the provincial government thought that they should. Subsequently the late Government practically adopted the Red Point pier and paid \$600 or \$700 to repair it. They practically made it their own. This question was pressed year after year. The provincial government said, "There are three or four more piers that you have not taken; you must take them and bear the expenditure because they are Dominion piers within the meaning of the British North America Act and within the decision of Holman vs. Green. The Government sent down the Dominion engineer to go over the ground and he has reported. This Government is determined not to accept the contention of the local government in regard to seven or eight piers, but they accept the decision of the engineer in regard to these three cases. They think they are of such clear Dominion importance as to justify our taking them over from the provincial government and paying the expenditure that the provincial government has made upon them. There is a larger number of piers in that same estuary that the Dominion Government do not propose taking over. All the piers upon the north side of the river they did not take over at all. It is only a distinction between a wharf which is used for local purposes, and a Dominion pier.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand whether the commission the hon. gentleman speaks of, went to Prince Edward Island for the purpose of deciding a question of fact, or, as the Solicitor General has pointed out, the question was of law. Does the hon. gentleman remember what Holman vs. Green decided with respect to the facts necessary to give the Dominion Parliament jurisdiction?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is some years since I had my attention specially called to the case, but my recollection is: The schedules of the British North America Act declared that public harbours shall belong to the Dominion of Canada, and that piers shall belong to the Dominion of Canada. Piers

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

evidently did not mean every little local wharf erected for a local purpose. Then the question came: What is a pier? That was not a question decided by the court, but the Dominion and local governments between them determined which were piers in the meaning of the British North America Act and which were local wharfs. That commission took over a large number of piers, and we paid for them, but two or three were left in dispute, and the dispute has been continued from year to year. Now, a second commission has determined that these three piers should be taken over by the Dominion. I do not dispute what my hon. friend from East Queen's (Mr. Martin) says, that we may have to take over two more. Perhaps we may. He speaks of Alexandria and Belle Creek piers. Perhaps they may be taken hereafter. At present, after discussing the matter with the Minister of Public Works, we decided that the evidence with regard to these three piers were so clear that we had to recommend them being taken over.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the judgment in that case was that it gave jurisdiction over the foreshore.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; it said that these piers were the property of the Dominion Government.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the Provincial Government would have the right to collect this money from the Dominion Government and it is not optional with the Dominion Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is correct.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In justice to the late Government, I ought to say that the province of Nova Scotia has already received the advantage, as respects her wharfs and piers, which under this arrangement is now granted to Prince Edward Island. Some years ago, while I was Prime Minister of the province, I thought I had a fair claim on the Dominion, and I based it on the argument that as respects a number of these piers they had expended Dominion money upon them. I am glad to say that to the extent of \$70,000 the Dominion Government recognized this claim of the province of Nova Scotia. They did not give us all we asked for, but we do not get all we ask for in this world.

Mr. BORDEN. They did not give you all you expected?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was connected with the matter professionally, but I think he has forgotten it. They did accept a very considerable number of these piers and breakwaters, and recognized them as Dominion works. I was glad to be able to receive

from the late Government—although our Government was politically opposed to them—the sum of \$70,000 upon the principle which Prince Edward Island is now getting the benefit of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend the Solicitor General consider *Holman vs. Green* in any way touched on the case recently decided by the Supreme Court of Canada, and now in appeal?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) refers no doubt to the fishery case? He is aware that the judges did not all agree in the answers they gave to the questions. I think one of the judges said he would not be bound by the decision in *Holman vs. Green*, but on the whole the answers are on the line of the judgment in that case. In my own province the beds and foreshores of harbours are under the control of the Dominion Government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from some one who heard the argument in the Supreme Court of Canada, that it seemed to proceed on the line of acquiescence in the case of *Holman vs. Green*.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The kernel was in the question: Did they declare that we should have jurisdiction, or that the property was in the Dominion? They declared the property was in the Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. This matter was thoroughly discussed in the House some years ago, and the views which are advanced by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) are not tenable in this case. I am pleased to see that the Minister of Finance has come to the rescue of Prince Edward Island in regard to this item. I wish to call attention to the remarks of the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davis). He thinks that because I agree heartily that these three wharfs should be taken over, I should sit down in my seat and say nothing at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, oh.

Mr. MARTIN. That was the gist of his remarks. I pointed out to him that there were a good many others besides the wharfs I have mentioned. These four or five wharfs which I have mentioned are in my own riding, and the hon. gentleman knows that there are wharfs in King's County and wharfs in different parts of the province, which are of Dominion importance and should have been taken over by the Dominion Government years ago. I think that this Government have begun well in this matter, and I am going to give them praise for doing what they have done. However, they should go a little further, and

since they have taken up the matter, now let the engineer make an examination of these wharfs which have not been taken over, and see how many of them are of Dominion importance. The wharfs in Prince Edward Island are more numerous proportionately than in other parts of the Dominion; but are not expensive structures; that is necessarily so, as the province is densely populated, and the people must get out their products largely by water. I would be very pleased if this whole matter had been gone into, and I feel that some of this money should be expended on these wharfs.

Department of Agriculture—To pay John Leafloor, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, the sum of \$100, being the difference between \$300 per annum and \$400 per annum..... \$100

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you require this vote?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This messenger is a man who was put on at the time of the census, and he has been paid \$500 a year. When I wished to make him a permanent messenger in the department, I had to put him back to \$300 a year; but as I found him a very efficient officer, and as I put him in charge of the messenger service of the department, I decided to allow him \$400.

Supreme Court—To provide a salary of \$900 to R. G. Davis..... \$100

Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason of this increase?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He is secretary to the judges of the Supreme Court, and at the request of the judges his salary is increased to \$900.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you increase his salary more than the regular statutory allowance?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think he comes within the statutory allowance at all. He was recommended by the judges for a larger increase, and we made it very moderate.

Mr. HAGGART. They will recommend anything. I do not know any reason why he should get more than the statutory increase.

Mr. BRITTON. I agree with what the hon. gentleman says. I would not take the recommendation of the judges for an increase of salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know Mr. Davis. He is a very deserving man indeed, and I think he ought to get the increase.

Mr. HAGGART. He is a lawyer, and he will get the support of every lawyer in the House.

Gratuities to penitentiary officials to be retired..... \$5,000

Mr. HAGGART. Have you a list of the officials to be retired?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the list.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must have a list on which this sum is based.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There were four or five mentioned by name as certain to be retired at Kingston. There is a number expected to be dismissed, I understand, from the St. Vincent de Paul. That cannot be ascertained until the report is made.

Mr. HAGGART. I heard the hon. gentleman say most distinctly with reference to Kingston penitentiary that he intended to dispense with the services of four or five. That would not make up the amount.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We began with Kingston, and from there we went to St. Vincent de Paul, and from St. Vincent de Paul we should go to Stony Mountain. If the results are what we met in Kingston, \$4,000 or \$5,000 would be fairly adequate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the principle upon which the gratuity is based?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It depends on salary and length of service.

Mr. WALLACE. I presume there will be no gratuities to those whom the commissioners recommend should be dismissed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No gratuities will be given to those who are not entitled to them.

To pay expenses of commission appointed to inquire into the Algoma election.... \$547 30

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). That election was held on the 30th June and not the 23rd, and an inquiry was instituted to ascertain why it had been postponed. The election had been ordered for an earlier date. The writ was issued in time for the election to be held at an earlier date, but it was not. Mr. John Trerar, Q.C., of Toronto, was appointed commissioner, and went to Algoma to investigate. The returning officer was a Mr. Plummer. I could not give all the particulars without reading the whole commission.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the facts could be briefly stated without the hon. gentleman having to refer to the commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, there could not. The writ was sent to the returning officer in ample time for him to have held the election on the 23rd of June. Instead of issuing the writ he returned it to Ottawa.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could he not have been summoned before the Bar of the House?

Mr. HAGGART.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The writ was evidently received by him in time, but he returned it to Ottawa, and it was found in the hands of one of the officers of my department. It was brought to this officer's room by a messenger without word or explanation, and I cannot tell why the writ was not executed. The election was held at a later day.

Mr. WALLACE. By the same returning officer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The case certainly demanded an explanation, and I do not think the explanation was altogether satisfactory.

Mr. WALLACE. You have paid \$547 to a gentleman to ask the revising officer why he did not hold the election on the 23rd of June instead of the 30th.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not to ask why, but to find out why.

Mr. WALLACE. The writ was returned to the same returning officer and he held the election. I should like to know why we should give \$547 to Mr. Trerar merely to ask a question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If a writ is issued by the proper authorities, the returning officer must obey it, and it is a very serious thing not to obey a writ. Such a thing might have a very serious effect on the whole political condition of the Dominion. We want to know why he did not obey the writ. The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says he could have summoned him before the Bar of the House, but that is considerably more expensive than sending a man to Algoma to make an inquiry and examine witnesses.

Mr. WALLACE. Could this man not have been asked why it was he delayed the writ? He was an officer of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another point and that is whether the hon. member for Algoma is sitting here legally as the member for Algoma. We have no report of the commission, and we do not know whether it was held regularly or not. This is a matter which should come before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With all deference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it seems to me a remarkable proceeding to issue a commission to investigate the conduct of the returning officer without first demanding an explanation from him. His course was regular or it was irregular. If regular, there was no need of a commission; if irregular the first thing to do would be to ask him for an explanation of his conduct. Suppose a business corporation appointed an agent to do a particular thing, and that agent

conducted himself in an irregular manner, would the business men in whose employ he was issue a commission to investigate his conduct without first asking an explanation. I do not know whether the matter is one for a commission or not—we have not the papers before us to judge of that. But, giving the Government the benefit of the doubt, and assuming that this was a matter with which a commissioner might properly deal. I do not think that there was any justification for sending out that commission without first asking for an explanation, which the Government might possibly have obtained at the expense of a postage stamp.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was tried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that it was not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman could hardly have understood that from anything that was said on this side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to say that it was of no use to ask for an explanation, and that led me to understand that no explanation had been asked.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That may have been my fault in explaining. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) said there were circumstances so suspicious about that case that the Government thought it worth while to issue a commission to ascertain why he kept it back.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the circumstances?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officer was ordered to hold an election but failed to do so. And he has given no explanation.

Mr. WALLACE. Was an explanation asked?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but none was received. The officer in charge of these matters, the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, was applied to and he had no explanation to give. We thought that this was not a matter merely of party importance but of national importance, and that the officer to whom the task of holding an election was committed should hold that election or else make a return to this House setting forth why he did not. If this was allowed to go on without inquiry, every returning officer might take the matter into his own hands and say: I know that the House of Commons does not care, and I will hold an election or not just as I please. The intention of the Government was, if he was guilty of wilful fraud, to punish him, and the commission was issued to ascertain the facts. I think that

hon. gentlemen in this House will agree that we did the right thing.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the finding of the commission?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be brought down and laid on the Table.

Mr. SPROULE. But it should be brought down and laid on the Table before we are asked to vote this item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The question of finding has nothing to do with the voting of the money, and the question is whether the commission should be issued or not, and the finding has nothing to do with that.

Mr. QUINN. Before this item is passed, I desire to say that a different course should have been pursued. I understand we are now voting the Estimates for the year ending the 30th June, 1898. It appears, that the Government have allowed two years to elapse without consulting the committee appointed by this House for the purpose of dealing with just such questions as this. If any steps had to be taken for the investigation of an election which was held or which should have been held on the 23rd June last, I think those steps should have been taken in the committee on—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will my hon. friend permit me? We are willing and more than willing to allow the item to stand and bring down the report.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is not Algoma one of the constituencies where the returning officer has discretion in holding an election?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is no use wasting time on the matter. We will let the item stand and bring down the report.

Mr. QUINN. Will the next items stand also?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are different altogether. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will explain them all.

To provide for payment to deputy returning officers, enumerators and others, the amounts withheld by the returning officers on these districts:

Alberta.....	\$2,519 05
South Victoria.....	145 11
Chateauguay.....	41 12

————— \$2,695 28

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This is a very simple matter. A man named Quinn was appointed returning officer in Alberta. After the election and after

he had made his return, he filed accounts for amounts due to deputy returning officers and enumerators of \$13,800.63. These amounts were taxed by the Auditor General down to \$7,505.62. The returning officer had received an advance from the Government of \$5,200, and he applied the whole of the money he received not to pay the accounts as taxed by the Auditor General but to pay accounts as he alleged them to be himself. Therefore there was a deficiency. Now, we ask the House to give us \$3,719.05, to pay the enumerators and the deputy returning officers who have received nothing in accordance with the accounts as taxed by the Auditor General.

Mr. QUINN. Does the same explanation apply to South Victoria?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Absolutely the same explanation, except that in the case of Alberta, the returning officer, under a show of right and a pretense that he has a right to money, has refused to pay over. But in the other cases the returning officers made default and disappeared.

Quarantine—Towards necessary steps for the prevention of the spread of tuberculosis in cattle throughout the Dominion \$20,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Mr. Fisher). A great deal of attention has lately been turned to this matter of tuberculosis in cattle. I have received many appeals from all parts of the country to deal with it, and I felt that in the interest of the health of the people in this country as well as of the health of the animals themselves, some investigation, or at all events, some educational process, ought to be undertaken in regard to dealing with this disease. I find there is a good deal of fear in regard to it throughout the country, a fear which I think is not altogether justified by the facts, because I am satisfied that on the whole the cattle in Canada are as healthy or perhaps more healthy than those of any other country. At the same time this disease does exist in Canada, and I find that the farmers throughout the country, through ignorance of the disease and of the way it is propagated among the herds, are unintentionally allowing it to spread when it might be arrested. I wish to do something towards informing the farmers and stock keepers in regard to this disease, and of the way in which its spread may be stopped, and to inform them of the steps necessary to guard the health of the people in the country from the spread of tuberculosis, or consumption, from the cattle to the human animal. I have not yet actually formulated the details of a plan by which this may be done. A good deal has been said about compensation for slaughtered animals, but I propose to be very careful indeed about entering upon a plan of that nature. It is possible that in any instance that may come before me where it is clearly shown

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

that there is absolute necessity in the public interest for slaughtering animals, I may perhaps on certain occasions order the slaughter, and then feel bound to compensate under the law which requires, in other contagious diseases, that where an animal is diseased the compensation should be one-third the original value of the animal. But I may say that I hesitate very greatly indeed to adopt a regular system of compensation; and the vote I ask for here is not such a sum of money as will at all enable me to undertake a general compensation. Not only so, but I do not propose to enter upon any course of compulsory testing. I say this in order that people may not fear that I intend to pursue that course which has been pursued in some of the states, where the state has undertaken to compel people to make the test contrary to their will. I do not wish to undertake that at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister—and I do not see any other item in which I can refer to it—to a new disease which has broken out amongst the fruit trees in the Niagara Peninsula and is causing considerable alarm there. I think some half a dozen members of the House of Commons, myself amongst them, received telegrams the other day urging strongly that some action be taken in reference to this matter. I understood the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, brought this matter to the attention of the Minister. I hope in the interest of the people in that section who are very much alarmed over this matter, that he is doing something to prevent the importation of trees that are diseased. I think that absolute prohibition should be applied, if necessary, to prevent that disease from coming into the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This matter has been brought to my attention by formal resolutions sent in from a meeting which was held at Hamilton and a previous meeting held in the Niagara district. I have taken them into careful consideration, and have consulted the horticulturist and botanist about it, and I propose to make such investigation as will enable me to prevent the spread of the disease. So far it has been found in only four places in the whole of Canada, and I believe there is very little if any more disease in the country than that. But I propose thoroughly investigating it, and at the ensuing session of Parliament, if any such prohibitory measures are found to be necessary. I shall ask Parliament to give me power to carry them out.

Immigration—Further amount required for general immigration expenses..... \$25,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reason of that is found

in the adoption of the policy of advertising through Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and Germany; and the officers of the department estimate that the expense of this advertising will amount to the sum asked.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Would the Minister of Agriculture give us information about those Galicians who have gone across the line? I see an item in one of the North-west papers saying that it cost us \$1,000 to bring them into the country, and now they have gone out of it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The item before the House now is simply for advertising, as I have explained. The hon. gentleman's question is not one that I object to at all, but it has nothing expressly to do with the vote immediately before the committee.

**Mr. SPROULE.** But in that is involved the question as to whether it is wisdom to advertise for a class of people that come to this country and do not stay here. I ask the question in connection with this item, as I am not aware of any other item for immigration to be considered, when I could get the information.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I admit the hon. gentleman is well within his rights in asking for this information, but I have not got it. All the information I have is that this vote is for the special purpose that I have mentioned.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Then the Minister might let the item stand.

**Mr. SPROULE.** He could furnish us the information on concurrence.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I will give it on concurrence.

Militia—Gratuities to officers to be retired, including \$2,040 to Lt.-Col. Bacon, Brigade Major, appointed 14th December, 1866, resigned 14th December, 1883, to accept civil service appointment..... \$12,140

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** This, I may mention, is chiefly in connection with the contemplated retirement of certain professors from the Kingston Military College who were mentioned in the course of discussion on that subject. These officers are expected to receive a gratuity in proportion to the length of their service.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Why should we give a gratuity of \$2,000 to a gentleman in respect to civil service employment?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Colonel Bacon, with whom several gentlemen on the other side of the House are well acquainted, has spent thirty years in our service. During the first seventeen he was in the service as brigade major

or deputy adjutant general. He would have been, in the ordinary course, entitled to a considerable gratuity on retiring. After thirty years of service he is being retired for the good of the service. He is an old man and not able to serve us as he used to do. I think he is over seventy years of age. The superannuation allowance which he would receive would be very small. I think his present income is about \$1,500 or \$1,600, so that he would only receive about \$500 under the present system. We submit this item to the committee as a reasonable gratuity, in addition to the small superannuation.

The Militia Contingent to represent Canada at the Queen's Jubilee, London, England..... \$10,000

**Mr. BERGERON.** Is that an addition to the \$26,000 we voted the other day?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I do not expect that we will be called upon to expend it all, but it may be that these companies will be detained for a considerably longer time than was expected, owing to the holding of a great review, and if they are there will be an extra charge. I do not know whether I am interfering with the prerogative of my hon. friend the Postmaster General when I say that all the expense we are going to in connection with the Jubilee will be much more than repaid to us out of the sale of Jubilee stamps.

Subsidy for carrying the mails between Canada and Newfoundland during the seasons 1893-94-95..... \$2,510 40

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** This is an old debt, apparently, which is reported to my department as being due for services rendered from time to time.

**Mr. HAGGART.** That is under the Post Office Department.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL.** No; mail subsidies are under the Department of Trade and Commerce. I would say to my hon. friend the leader of the House that this is an old debt that apparently will have to be paid. I have some little knowledge of the circumstances, but I ask the committee to consider it as a matter still under deliberation. The claim has been made for some time, and the officers of my department seem to think it should be paid. The parties have asked either to be paid or for a fiat in order to bring an action for payment. I do not think it has been determined absolutely that it should be paid.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** As a matter of fact, the parties did carry the mails whether they had a contract or not, and therefore it is only fair that they should be paid.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I think so, but the contract between them and the Government of Newfoundland has not been produced. I thought it was proper to see

the contract under which they have performed the service. It is not in Canada, but we have asked that it should be sent to us.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think where accounts seem to have been unpaid by the late Government the present Government should look well into them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This one was reported to me as not having been paid by the late Government. If an account had been unpaid by the late Government, I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) that I would be cautious indeed about paying it.

Steam communication from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1898, weekly between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports..... \$5,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been looking around to see if the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) or any of his colleagues, the Patrons, were present. They have a plank in their platform protesting against steam subsidies. They should be here to protest against this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not risen in the House very often this session, and I do not intend at this late period of the session to make a long speech, but I may be allowed to offer my sincere thanks to the leader of the House, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, for the subsidy of \$5,000 he has consented to place in the Estimates for a steamer's service between Quebec and Gaspé Basin. This small subsidy will enable a company to charter a steamer that will establish weekly communication between Gaspé and the rest of the province of Quebec. I must say that the county of Gaspé, the oldest in the Dominion, is perhaps, the only one deprived of railway communications. For years and years my electors have agitated the railway question, but with no practical result. In order to help the population there, the late Administration granted large subsidies for a steamer's service between Dalhousie, N.B., and Gaspé Basin. I must say that I do not object to this subsidy because the service is a most creditable one, and this part of the country is most deserving and most industrious. Apart of all other commercial interests served, at this period of the year, thanks to this steamer's service, the county of Gaspé is visited by thousands of tourists and sportsmen, coming from every part of the world. I may add, as a personal reminiscence, that last year, during my campaign, it was my good fortune to meet Mr. Rudyard Kipling, the celebrated English poet, who could not conceal his admiration for the grand scenery of that part of Canada. In fact, I am sure that Rudyard Kipling was inspired by the picturesque nature of Gaspé when he wrote his beautiful poem on Canada. Now, Mr. Chairman, coming to

Mr. MULOCK.

practical facts, it is true that the southern portion of Gaspé, that is to say, the portion facing the Baie des Chaleurs, was well served by the Government, but the northern part was completely ignored. From Gaspé Basin to Cap Chatte, a distance of some 150 miles, with a population of ten thousand people, scattered on the coast, no communications were given. This population is composed chiefly of fishermen. There are no steamers plying between these two places.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the "Campania" not pass there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. She passes there, but she will not stop. As a result, the fishermen are left completely at the mercy of a few greedy merchants, who, in the autumn, buy their fish and other products, at a ridiculously low price. The fishermen are not even paid in cash. They receive provisions in exchange. This state of things has led to abuses which are well known to this House. For the last year the fishermen have tried to sell their fish to certain Quebec firms, but with no success, because they were deprived of communications. I have seen myself, some of those fishermen who had been waiting at night in open sea, in small boats, the passage of a steamer in order to send their fish to Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Do they sell their fish to Le Boutillier & Robins and Colas & Co.?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, that is the trouble. They sell their fish to these companies and at a ridiculously low price. They want to get competition, so that they can sell their fish at higher prices.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Renaud firm, and almost all the firms in Quebec, deal with Le Boutillier & Co.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was saying that fishermen had to wait the passage of steamers, in open sea, in order to send their products to Quebec. Some would succeed, but in most cases, the fishermen had to come back with their freight, the captains of the steamers refusing to stop. It is stipulated that with this service, the steamer will stop at all ports and harbours between Gaspé and Cape Chatte, giving this population the communications that they are entitled to have. I am sure that this will enable them to sell their products at better prices, competition being the life of trade. It will also develop that part of the country which is rich in natural resources of all kinds.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What steamer is going down there for this subsidy?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know what the regulations of the department are, but I suppose that when the subsidy is voted, they will call for tenders.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Surely you cannot get a steamer to go down there for \$5,000 a year?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The subsidy is a very small one, I know.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You have the "Campana" there now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The "Campana" runs from Montreal to Pictou and Summerside and Charlottetown, but she does not stop on the northern part of the county of Gaspé.

Mr. BERGERON. She might stop if she got the \$5,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I saw Mr. Garneau, one of the directors of the company, and he said it would not pay them to stop between Cape Chatte and Gaspe Basin. I may say that the company which owns the "Campana" is a large company, and they have a fine steamer and are doing a good service. They go direct from Montreal to Quebec, stopping at Father Point, Gaspé Basin, Percé, and sometimes Cape Cove. During the election of 1897, I had to make my campaign in a small boat, as the "Campana" would not stop for one or two passengers, or for a barrel of fish. They say the trade is not large enough to induce them to stop. I may also state that the "Campana" is used for summer tourists, and she has certain fixed trips advertised for months before in Canada and the United States. They will not stop for that small trade on the northern part of the county of Gaspé, but with a small steamer, say of 300 tons register, they could do a good trade. The people along the coast could then send their fish and potatoes to Quebec, and buy their supplies at a cheaper price there than they do now in the stores established in these little harbours. For years and years the people of Gaspé have been at the mercy of some greedy merchants like the Robins and others.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know I have some of my friends amongst them, but I say that the people of Gaspé have been at the mercy of these merchants. They are obliged to sell their fish at ridiculously low prices, and they are not paid in cash. They are paid in provisions, and sometimes do not see a red cent during the whole year. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) should not object to this vote, because when this service is established, these Gaspé fishermen will be able to trade with the merchants of Quebec. This is practically a Quebec subsidy. The only representative who ever worked for the county of Gaspé was the late Dr. Fortin, who was a good Conservative, but who did noble service for that county. Since his time the county has been completely ignored. It is the oldest county in the Dominion, yet it is the only one, strange

to say, which has been deprived of railway communication, and this Parliament will not end before I agitate this question for a railway in the county of Gaspé. In the meantime, I must be satisfied with this small subsidy of \$5,000, and I must specially thank the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) for his courtesy towards me and my electors. The first time I met that hon. gentleman on the question, I showed him the statistics, and when he saw the census returns and the trade that was carried on there, the hon. gentleman promised me that a subsidy would be granted. Tonight I am glad to extend to him my warm congratulations, and I am sure the county of Gaspé will appreciate what the hon. gentleman has done.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. After the very interesting lecture which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has given us about Gaspé and its trade, I must say that I do not exactly understand why we should be called upon to contribute \$5,000 for a new service. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) properly says that Gaspé is one of the oldest counties in the province of Quebec, but up to the time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) was elected to represent it, the steamship service there met the requirements of the trade and commerce. The hon. gentleman tells us that the steamer service at present in existence does not consider that the trade of that locality is sufficiently large to warrant them in calling in to these different ports for a barrel of fish, as the hon. gentleman says, or for some goods which the fishermen send to Quebec. Why should we pay \$5,000 more to establish a new line for the purpose of accommodating a trade, which is not sufficient to induce the present steamer to call at certain places. Anxious as I am to see all facilities extended to trade in the different portions of the province of Quebec, yet, the information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) has given us, does not warrant the House of Commons in voting \$5,000 for a new line, when the trade is not sufficiently large to induce the present steamer to call at these small ports. I do not believe it is possible for the hon. gentleman to convince the House that that new line should be established at a cost of \$5,000 per annum.

Mr. HENDERSON. I simply want to say that to my mind, living as far away from Gaspé as I do, this subsidy looks somewhat fishy? At the same time, I think we had better grant it and not lose any further time.

Steam communication between Port Mulgrave, Arichat, Canso, Guysborough and Port Hood during the years 1893-95—Revenue of lapsed amount..... \$7,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This goes to Mr. Roderick Macdonald, no doubt well known to several

hon. gentlemen opposite. The service was rendered, and the money was voted, but it has lapsed.

Mr. HAGGART. Why was it not paid?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot exactly say why, except that there seems to have been some dispute. Mr. Macdonald did not sign his contract, as he ought to have done, but he did undoubtedly perform the service.

Mr. BERGERON. Was this service performed by the steamer "Rimouski"?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

To provide for the services of counsel and other expenses in connection with the Fisheries Reference, to argue the appeal for the Dominion before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council..... \$8,000

Mr. HAGGART. Does it require \$8,000 to argue that case before the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is the amount which the Department of Justice forwarded to me as the probable amount required. Mr. Christopher Robinson argued the case before the Dominion Supreme Court, and he has been retained to argue it before the Privy Council, and there will be an English counsel with him.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think the amount is any too large. I know that some gentlemen go to England on cases not half so important, and get \$5,000 or \$6,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that this is one of the most important cases that ever came before this Dominion. Mr. Christopher Robinson fixed his fee at \$5,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And he ought to get it.

To provide for the expenditure incurred by Dr. Andrew McPhail, Montreal, on the scientific examination of the cause of the blackening of canned lobsters.. \$2,185 45

Mr. POWELL. What is the result of this investigation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The result is very satisfactory indeed. I think it will be established that Dr. McPhail has discovered a means of preventing the blackening of the lobsters. He carried on the investigation at the factories in the maritime provinces himself in conjunction with a scientific medical man from Montreal. After he returned, he continued his investigation at McGill College; but he found that he had not there sufficient scientific apparatus to enable him to complete it, and he applied to the department for permission to go to London University to finish his work there, and of course we consented. The amount of his bill was \$2,185 for expenses. I wanted to

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

submit it in the fisheries vote, but the Auditor thought it should be in a special vote. He has determined that the cause of blackening is bacteria, and he proposes to overcome it by the introduction of some antiseptic. I would not state positively that the investigation has been successful, but the indications are that it is so.

Indians—Manitoba and the North-west Territories—To provide for the completion and equipment of the Elkhorn Industrial School buildings..... \$5,000

Mr. HAGGART. It is surely time that expenditure for these industrial schools for the Indians should cease. An enormous sum has been expended for that purpose, and a number of the members from the North-west have deprecated the expenditure. They say that the cost of teaching the Indians in the North-west is largely in excess of the cost of educating the white people there.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is true, and it is a subject that is engaging the attention of the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman knows that that system grew up not under our Administration. The subject deserves the best attention of the Government, and it will have it.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the leader of the Government if that is the object of the present Minister's visit to Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. If the hon. gentleman wants a full explanation, I will read it to him.

To provide for the payment of gratuities to retiring officers in Manitoba and the North-west Territories..... \$5,630 78

Mr. WALLACE. Who are the parties to receive the gratuities?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are 36 altogether and I shall put the list on the Table.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the hon. Minister of the Interior was not present as he is not to-day, but the Government handed over the details to the Minister of the Exterior, the hon. member from Quebec West. Have they voted want of confidence in that hon. gentleman that he is not in charge of the department to-day?

Mr. DOBELL. I might explain that the multiplicity of my engagements prevented me.

Amount required to pay claims in connection with the sale of certain lots in the town of Banff, made prior to the passing of the Rocky Mountain Park Act, 1887... \$2,500

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are claims which have been standing over for some years. These parties had bought lots in Banff from the

agent of the Government who gave them an agreement of sale and had put up improvements on these lots. The lots were taken back on the ground that they had been illegally sold and these people claim damages. A commissioner was sent out to investigate, and after a great deal of trouble it was decided to make them a reasonable allowance, which was, of course, much below the amounts they claimed.

Mr. HAGGART. The claim came before the late Government, and the report of the Minister of Justice was that they had no claim whatever, but I suppose you have further report from the Justice Department lately?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but the nature of it I am not prepared to say. I am not basing this on strictly legal grounds. We thought that we ought to pay these men who had bought the lots in good faith and put up improvements.

Mr. CLANCY. Their cases were dealt with entirely on equity?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Messrs. Williamson and Taylor have a claim against the Government for damage done their holding in the town of Chatham. They claim \$250. The sum was voted, but the department would not certify to the cheque until the Chief Engineer gave his certificate. The Chief Engineer knew nothing about it and would not certify, and those gentlemen have not been paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In what year was that?

Mr. CLANCY. In 1892 a settlement was made, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will see that the amount due is paid.

To provide for the payment of gratuities to temporary employees of the outside service of the Department of the Interior. (Payments from this vote shall be charged to the several services under the control of the department)..... \$6,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have a list here showing the amount paid to each temporary employee dismissed. There were 36 altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. Put the list on the Table and it can be referred to on concurrence. It used to be the habit of paying them by Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The sum of money has to be voted. You cannot pay the amount by Order in Council, but must get a grant from Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. But you can take a vote in a general way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what we do. We

take a general vote. But it is thought best to put it in this way.

Mr. BERGERON. But if this is required for this department, how will the other departments do to fulfil the same sort of obligation to their employees.

Mr. HAGGART. They have taken votes all along, some of them about as much as this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, they have taken votes all along.

Government of the North-west Territories—  
 Schools in unorganized territory \$ 5,000  
 Further amount required by the  
 N.W. Government. (Subsidy  
 to be paid half-yearly in ad-  
 vance)..... 40,000  
 ----- \$45,000

Mr. BERGERON. What schools are these?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the same vote as usual.

Mr. HAGGART. It seems to me that it is \$5,000 extra.

Mr. BERGERON. It is very awkward not to have the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will let this item of \$5,000 stand.

An hon. MEMBER. Give the information on concurrence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well, we will give the information on concurrence.

Additional amount required to meet salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and officers on preventive service..... \$6,250  
 Amount required for the purposes of defraying expenses of special preventive service..... 5,000  
 Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service.... 5,000  
 To pay John Reid for services..... 200

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) please explain the first item?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The additional amount is required to pay salaries.

Mr. WALLACE. The amount in the Main Estimates was nearly as large as it was last year. Why is this extra amount required?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The main estimate was the same as it was last year. But there were expenses this year that were not covered last year. My hon. friend will remember that Mr. McKay was appointed inspector. While the main vote was \$48,750, the expenditure in 1895-96 was only \$46,327.05. But the salary of Mr. McKay, who was appointed, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows, under his own

administration, was only paid for a month or two and \$1,666 was unprovided for in the vote, and also his travelling expenses of \$400. Mr. Clute was inspector at New Westminster. He received \$400 as inspector while he received his salary at that point. The growing importance of British Columbia made it necessary that he should devote his whole time to the work of inspection. In 1895-96 there was not expended the full amount of \$46,589, which left a difference unexpended of \$2,161. That being the case the hon. gentleman might naturally say: You don't require such a large vote because you have an unexpended balance. I am showing the extra amounts which bring it up to \$8,666 more than we are estimating for. That accounts for the \$1,600 to Mr. McKay; and there are travelling expenses, \$400. Then Mr. Jones has been appointed chief preventive officer at a salary of \$1,600. Then we propose to have two more assistant inspectors at \$1,500 each, and their travelling expenses, \$400 each. That makes a total of \$8,666, which we have to meet as extra over the annual expenditure of 1895-96, being \$2,000 less than the estimate was for. We deduct that from \$8,666, which leaves the amount of \$6,500 for which we ask a vote.

Mr. WALLACE. You are creating two new offices altogether.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am taking two officers who have been long in the service and are on the pay-list at the ports of Montreal and Kingston; and I propose to put upon them the extra duty of assisting the inspector. These are Mr. Lemieux, who has been over twenty years in the service at Montreal, and Mr. Shaw of Kingston, who has been in the service about the same length of time. Mr. Lemieux has been receiving \$1,000, and Mr. Shaw \$1,200. As assistant inspectors it is proposed to give them \$1,500. I will ask the House to grant me this vote so that if I find it necessary to engage them the whole time as assistant inspectors, they can be paid out of this vote. I have found, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has found, that the inspection of the ports has not been done as it should have been, and results which are not in the public interest, have occurred. I propose to have a more frequent inspection of the ports than has taken place in the past. We have many ports that have not been looked into for years, and irregularities in more than one port have come to light. It has been pleaded on the part of the collectors that the department were remiss in their duty, and that the ports have not been inspected often enough.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has taken officers from the service in Kingston and Montreal. I think their places do not require to be filled. The present staff is

Mr. PATERSON.

sufficient to enable him to dispense with the services of those men.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has dismissed an official from his department on the plea of economy, and he is asking more for the officers of the department now than his predecessors asked. He stated that one of the reasons why Mr. Webster was not required was that he could dispense with him, but he has not only asked for the full amount that was required to carry on the office last year, but an amount in excess.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Webster was in the inside service in my department and we thought we could work the present staff without him. No one is being put on in Mr. Webster's place. These officers are for outside work.

Mr. QUINN. Is it the intention to fill the position of assistant collector in Montreal?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, it is not the intention.

Mr. LEMIEUX. While we are discussing this item, I would like to ask the Controller of Customs if any settlement has been arrived at between the Government and the late Mr. O'Hara. I understand that he had a claim against the Government for having acted as collector of customs at the port of Montreal during three years. I think I voice the sentiments of the commercial community of Montreal in asking the Government to settle this claim with his family.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Nothing has been done in that way; it would require a special vote of the House. But I have listened sympathetically to the plea that was put in for Mr. O'Hara. There are several other gentlemen in the same position whose claims have been before the department. They were before the Council last year, but nothing was done in that direction, and nothing has been done this year.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the Minister said some time ago in the House that these claims were still under the consideration of the Government.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. They are under consideration now, and they can be considered another year as well as this.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the Controller to say that Mr. Jones is appointed as special preventive officer. Does his salary appear in this \$5,000?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There was a sum of \$5,000 for an additional cruiser which it is possible we may find it necessary to put on. This is taken as a precautionary vote in order that we may have the money if it is necessary to do so. It is not for the payment of Mr. Jones.

**Mr. HAGGART.** There is another item that the Minister will please explain :

Amounts to be paid to the Department of Justice, to be disbursed and accounted for to it for secret preventive service.... \$5,000

If I understand this properly the Department of Customs are going to pay that amount over to the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Justice can dispose of this \$5,000 in any manner he likes.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.** This is put in in this way purposely by myself. It has been thought necessary to have a sum of money to provide for secret service officers, and I preferred, so far as my department was concerned, that it should be handed over to the Department of Justice and expended in that department. It is put in plainly so that hon. gentlemen can see what it is for. I dare say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows that smuggling in different parts of the Dominion has become somewhat serious, I may say very serious, and vigorous attempts have been made and will continue to be made by the Government to put a stop to it as far as possible. In order to do that it is necessary that an expenditure shall be incurred, and it is one of those things in which we cannot see a direct return. You will see in the Estimates and additional expenditure but you will not see, as far as my department is concerned, anything to offset it, but I trust you will find in your Inland Revenue returns an augmented receipt. If we are able to stop this illicit traffic the expenditure shows against the Customs Department, but you will find the result in the augmented receipts in the department of my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière).

**Mr. HAGGART.** I have no doubt that the Department of Customs will obtain receipts commensurate with the expenditure. But I protest against the granting of a large sum of money to any member of the Government for which he will not account to the Auditor General and of which the House will not have any control. This thing has been objected to again and again. Twenty or twenty-five years ago when a vote was taken for this purpose strenuous opposition was offered by hon. gentlemen who are at present controlling the Government. They objected notwithstanding the fact that the Government offered at the time to submit the vouchers to the leader of the Opposition to show that the expenditure was not diverted to any other purpose and was justifiable. Here are \$5,000 to be placed in the hands of the Minister of Justice which he can expend for any service that he likes, and he does not account to any one for that.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** What was the amount objected to before ?

**Mr. HAGGART.** There never has been a vote of that kind for the last ten years.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** I refer to the vote of twenty or twenty-five years ago.

**Mr. HAGGART.** \$15,000.

**Mr. LANDERKIN.** This is only \$5,000. I think the amount previously was \$50,000.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I remember twenty or twenty-five years ago, although I was not in Parliament then, that it was considered necessary at that time on account of the Fenian invasion of the country to send men into the Fenian camps and this money could not be accounted for. It was justifiable on that ground.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Although this is not a time to prolong this discussion, I may say to the House that smuggling in the St. Lawrence has attained such proportions and is inflicting such tremendous damage on our revenue, that very active steps must be taken to put an end to it. We cannot by any possibility deal with informers in a matter of this kind publicly. If we make public their names and make public the amounts which they receive we will imperil their lives and utterly destroy their utility. I think it is one of those cases in which we can with considerable propriety make an arrangement whereby the leader of the Opposition might be shown the various vouchers and the various ways in which the money was expended, and in concurrence I will be able to state to the hon. gentleman whether a plan can be adopted with that end in view. I think it is done in England, and it is a reasonable thing for hon. gentlemen to ask.

**Mr. HAGGART.** That will satisfy us.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I do not think it will satisfy me as one of the third party in this House. I think this is no time for this discussion, and we might allow these three items to stand over.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** It is absolutely necessary in my judgment to bring this smuggling business to an end, to reach not the unfortunate man who is employed for the purpose of conveying liquor in his schooner from St. Pierre and Miquelon or wherever he brings it from, but the man who provides the supplies and holds out the inducements to this unfortunate man to engage in this nefarious practice. I think we can reach these men in only one way. In dealing with men of that sort we have to use means that under ordinary circumstances one would be loath to have any connection with. I find that we can only attain the result by the use of money applied in the proper quarters. I think that if we use money in that way it will serve the purpose. We are desirous of suppressing this traffic. There really ought to be some way arranged so that these accounts should be submitted either to the leader of the Opposition or some other gentleman on the other side of the House to show for what purpose

this money has been expended. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen will agree that we can only suppress this traffic by reaching the men in cities who supply the money to carry on this business and who secure the profits.

Mr. WALLACE. I have no doubt that the largely increased duty on tobacco and on spirits will stimulate smuggling. The Government will find that they have made a mistake so far as revenue is concerned, but I do not propose to discuss that special point. I see the Controller of Customs has a sum here of \$6,250 for the purpose of paying inspectors. I think the explanation of that point does not cover more than the vote of last year, and that this \$6,250 is an additional sum for inspectors. You can fairly say that the \$5,000 will be for officers of the preventive service. Then there is a second item of the amount required to defray the expenses for the preventive service, and the Controller of Customs tells us that that may be used to procure a steamer in the gulf at some of the lower ports. He may use it for any preventive service he likes. There are \$15,000 for this service, all of which is more or less secret. I do not think the Government should ask for such a vote without being able to tell the House specifically what they propose to do with this money. The machinery of the department is quite sufficient to provide for this matter without giving publicity to the names of those who are acting as spies for the Government. It is not necessary for these names to appear in the accounts. The Controller and the officers directly concerned would be aware of it, but the names are not published in the Auditor General's Report or anywhere else. In times past hon. gentlemen opposite were the most strenuous opponents of the secret service, although at that time it was known that foes were outside and inside of this country too, and that it was necessary to use money to circumvent them and get into their camps. It was a far more justifiable secret service vote than this, because you had to have a secret service then to get into the confidence of men who were plotting for the destruction of our country. My experience as Controller justified me in saying, that there is no necessity for asking for such a vote as this from the House.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. How would the machinery of the department protect the informer and compensate him?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, because there are men who are informing to-day, and whose names are not given to the public. The hon. gentleman ought to know that.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am not aware of that, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows, or ought to know, that these informers only get their pay if there is a seizure made and the

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

proceeds are there for them. Suppose information is given where no seizure is made, and where the parties are to be punished, how are the informers to get their money? Could the department do that?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, there is another resource.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. How could that informer be paid?

Mr. WALLACE. The department has 5 per cent of the seizure devoted for a certain fund.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Could the informer be paid out of that fund?

Mr. WALLACE. I think so.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. He certainly could not.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Because we asked the Department of Justice with reference to paying John Reid, whose name is in the Estimates now, and we were told by the Department of Justice that we could not pay it.

Mr. WALLACE. That was a case where the department could not pay it out of any fund.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There were no proceeds.

Mr. WALLACE. Not at all. This case is half a dozen years old, and I asked the Department of Justice whether Mr. Reid could be paid, not from these funds, but from the contingencies of the department.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) could not pay John Reid out of any fund.

Mr. WALLACE. I submitted a case to the Department of Justice whether John Reid had a legal claim against the Department of Justice, and the department replied that he had not.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The question the hon. gentleman submitted to the Department of Justice was, that John Reid had given information with reference to persons defrauding the revenue. There was a fine of \$9,000 imposed upon the individual, but he cleared the country and there were no proceeds from the seizure whatever.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there was.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There were no proceeds from that seizure, and the hon. gentleman submitted to the Department of Justice, whether this man, whom he thought in the public interest ought to receive something, should not receive a certain amount.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I move that the committee rise.

If hon. gentlemen wish the Item to stand, let it stand, but we cannot remain here any longer. We have to meet at 11 in the morning, and the members of the Council have something more to do. It appears to be utter waste of time to proceed now.

Resolutions to be reported.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 147) respecting certain Savings banks in the province of Quebec—(from the Senate.)—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

#### ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1898, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, 23rd June, 1897.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

### CARETAKER AT FORT ANNE.

Mr. MILLS asked :

Who has been the caretaker of Fort Anne, in the county of Annapolis? When was he appointed? When will his services cease? What was the total amount of the pay of said caretaker during his term of office? What is the gross amount received by way of rentals and sales of grass during the time said caretaker had control?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. H. E. Gillis has been caretaker. He was placed in charge of the property on the 22nd February, 1892. His services will cease after 30th June, 1897. The total amount of his pay was \$250, and the gross amount received by way of rentals and sales of grass during the period was \$244.53. No expenses have yet been reported. The net proceeds were \$244.53 so far.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, it would be well for the leader of the Government to give the House some information to which it is entitled, and which so far as the Opposition is concerned, I feel that we have been a little lax in asking from the Government. Everybody knows, that for the last ten days, Parliament has simply had a precarious existence. The rump of Parliament has been left, but the main body has dispersed to its home. Since that time large and important measures have been pressed through the House, and very large and important measures have been brought down and are still remaining on the Order paper. I think the time has now certainly arrived—it probably arrived some time ago—when we should ask the leader of the Government what are the measures that he proposes to call the attention of this rump Parliament to, for the remainder of the time that it may please him to keep it in session. We are entitled, before we go one step further, to know what the view of the Government is in this respect.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Well, Mr. Speaker, I may observe in the first instance, that while it is true that some of the important measures to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) alludes have not reached their final stage, they have, I think, with very few exceptions, been placed before the House, and if my memory serves me, fully discussed before any considerable number of members went away. I do not at this moment remember, nor do I see on the Order paper, any measure which can be considered of importance, which has not been submitted in one shape or other to the House, and been discussed.

Mr. HENDERSON. What about the railway resolutions?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. With the exception of the railway resolutions, a very large proportion of which the hon. gentleman knows have been discussed in this House before, and actually proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. Not under the present conditions.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Actually proposed by the hon. gentleman himself, or his colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. Not under conditions which contemplate the doubling of the subsidies.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That I think will be found to apply to only a very limited percentage of them.

Mr. FOSTER. That remains to be seen.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think too, that the conditions imposed are ones, which, when they come to be discussed in the House, will be found calculated to advance the public service, and they are conditions which I think the hon. gentleman himself—at least I don't despair of having his own approval of them before we close.

Mr. WALLACE. Can the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) properly say that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was discussed before the members went away?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think so.

Mr. WALLACE. They had made their arrangements to leave and were actually on their way, before that matter came up for discussion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I remember that the leader of the Opposition not only discussed it, but expressed his warm approval of it before the members disappeared. I think he was supported therein by his colleague the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Foster). Practically speaking, the only measure of importance, apart from the railway subsidies to which I have alluded, are that same Crow's Nest Pass Railway—the bounties and so forth have been before the House for a month. The supplies with the railway subsidies are the only ones that can be considered of real importance, that have not been long before the House. I may be able, after three o'clock, to tell the hon. gentleman more definitely what measures we propose to proceed with; but if he looks over the list he will see that although it looks a little long, there are very few things in it, with the solitary exception of the railway subsidies, which have not already engaged our attention.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not answered my question as to what they propose to proceed with. I find, for instance, that on June the 19th the House was in committee on a Bill to further amend the Post Office Act. We do not know whether it is the intention of the Government to pro-

ceed with that or not. Then I presume that the Bill with reference to the Franchise Act is virtually abandoned. There is a Bill for the abolition of the civil service superannuation, and the retirement of the members of the civil service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is tacitly understood that both these Bills would not be pressed.

Mr. FOSTER. Then with regard to the resolutions respecting the Superannuation Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Item 19 on the Order paper is based on that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is abandoned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had no announcement with regard to the Act further to amend the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We had some discussion on that, and it really is tied up with another Bill of the Postmaster General's.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to proceed with that Bill?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will be able to tell the hon. gentleman after three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Then with regard to the Manitoba School fund which was not introduced until June 11th, that certainly is a contentious matter which will evoke a good deal of discussion, and a most important principle is involved, that has never been explained to the House yet. Is it the determination of the Government to proceed with that?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not now in a position to inform the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is the Criminal Code amendment which the Minister of Marine made a urgent though brief plea for. Are we to consider that his remarks were the funeral oration of that, for the present session?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there is a strong opposition to that it may not be pressed.

Mr. FOSTER. The Crow's Nest Pass Bill involving three and a half million dollars has been left aside for a few days into a resting place. Will my hon. friend tell us whether it is intended to let that still rest there, or whether it is proposed to draw it out and give it another start on the rails.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

(Continued)

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We will inform my hon. friend later.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Then, we have a resolution respecting the raising of a loan, which my hon. friend, in the interest of economy, must see through. Then, we have the House in committee upon certain railway subsidies, involving an expenditure of from \$1,500,000 to \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, according as incidents and circumstances may eventuate, depending on the good-will of the Minister of Railways.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You are anticipating your argument against it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I have still some left ; I do not give it all out at one stage. Then, there is a Bill to amend an Act respecting certain savings banks in the province of Quebec, which the Solicitor General proposes to go on with. We have got down to certainty on some, and to a state of not very greatly prolonged uncertainty on others. The hon. gentleman thinks that by three o'clock we will be able to define the will of the Government for the present. I do not ask him to tie himself down for a very long period ; that would be insecure.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. I would like also to ask the leader of the House to say at three o'clock what he intends to do with item 36, referring to the Bill to promote the safety of railway employees. It has already been reported.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am very much afraid, with every desire to facilitate the hon. gentleman's wishes, that he will have to maturely consider that measure for a few months.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. I may say that as the hon. gentleman's leader promised the railway men of this country that he would this session give them legislation on this subject, he had better consider it, and not myself.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. We will both consider it.

**SUPPLY.**

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Customs, &c.—Additional amount required to meet salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and officers on preventive service..... \$6,250

Amount required for the purposes of defraying expenses of special preventive service ..... \$5,000  
 Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service ..... 5,000  
 To pay John Reid for services..... 200

Mr. **FOSTER**. I laboured under the disadvantage of not being present last night when this item was allowed to stand. Would the Controller of Customs think it too much trouble to let the House know what the purpose of that vote is ?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. We discussed the two first items rather fully last night. We were at the third item. The explanation I gave was that a certain sum more would be required in order to meet the expenditure for the coming year. We based our estimate upon the expenditure of 1895-96, when we found that we had estimated for \$2,161 more than we expended. With the charges which will stand against this fund in the future, we shall require something like \$6,500 more, in addition to the \$2,161. There was the salary of Mr. McKay, \$1,666, and \$400 for his travelling expenses. Mr. Clute, in British Columbia, is paid \$400 as inspector, receiving the balance of his salary as collector of customs at New Westminster ; but, owing to the extent of the business there, it was thought desirable that he should be assigned to the duties of inspector alone. Therefore, we provide for his whole salary out of this item this year. Then, a new preventive officer has been appointed in the preventive service at a salary of \$1,600. We propose two assistant inspectors at \$1,500 each. These inspectors are in the service now, and have been for over twenty years, one attached to Montreal, and the other to Kingston, the former receiving \$1,000 and the latter \$1,200. They are still attached to those ports, and drawing their salaries there ; but we provide for their salaries here, in case we should have to draw them from the ports to do inspection work continuously. We also provide \$400 for their travelling expenses.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am not surprised at all at the item, as I hold in my hand a return showing the number of new appointments. I need say very little with regard to professions of hon. gentlemen opposite as compared with their practice, but as we all feel interested in knowing how they have carried out their professions of economy with regard to appointments. I shall read a return showing the names of new appointments to the customs, together with the salaries and dates of appointment from the 1st of July, 1896, to 27th of April last :

RETURN to an Order of the House of Commons, showing names, offices, salaries and dates of appointment, of all persons appointed to the Department of Customs from the 1st day of July, 1896, to 22nd April, 1897.

## PERMANENT STAFF.

Names.	Port.	Office.	Salary.	Date of Appointment.
			\$	
F. G. Forbes	Grand River, P.E. I.	Sub-collector	120	15th July '96
J. S. Clute	New Westminster, B.C.	Inspector	2,000	1st Nov. '96
J. M. Crispo	Havre au Bouche, N.S.	Sub-collector	150	6th do '96
Louis Bazinet	Joliette, P.Q.	do	200	14th do '96
J. H. Johnston	Grafton, O.	do	300	14th do '96
J. H. Fraser	Wallaceburg, O.	Collector	700	14th do '96
A. Brownlee	Barrie, O.	Sub-collector	600	14th do '96
A. J. Mackenzie	Hamilton, O.	Re-appoint. surveyor	1,500	1st do '96
J. B. Richard	Sherbrooke, Q.	Collector	1,200	18th do '96
T. E. Anderson	Napanee, O.	do	800	10th Dec. '96
A. S. Valleau	Deseronto, O.	do	700	14th do '96
T. F. Furness	Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I.	Sub-collector	75	1st Jan. '97
Peter Grant	New Westminster, B.C.	Collector	1,400	1st do '97
C. E. Aucoin	Cheticamp, N.S.	Prev. officer	150	1st do '97
T. B. McQuarrie	Mabou, N.S.	Sub-collector	150	1st do '97
L. P. Shaffner	Middleton, N.S.	Collector	450	1st do '97
F. Colquhoun	Berlin, O.	do	1,200	1st do '97
Peter McMillan	Grand River, P.E.I.	Sub-collector	120	1st do '97
F. A. Osborne	Edmonton, N.W.T.	do	200	1st do '97
T. F. Pattison	Thorold, O.	do	750	1st do '97
E. O. Lemieux	Beauce, P.Q.	do	300	8th do '97
O. D. Glasgow	Niagara Falls, O.	Prev. officer	600	14th Jan. '97
E. H. Balcom	Salmon River, N.S.	Sub-collector	60	19th do '97
S. Harris	Margaretsville, N.S.	do	400	8th Feb. '97
N. Porter	Simcoe, O.	Prev. officer	600	1st do '97
W. G. Scott	Guysborough, N.S.	Sub-collector	400	9th do '97
J. F. Hill	Welland, O.	do	500	4th Mar. '97
J. Brien	Essex Centre, O.	do	600	4th do '97
J. P. Simpson	Roxham, P.Q.	Prev. officer	300	4th do '97
Thos. Smith	East Chezzetcook, N.S.	do	60	1st Apl. '97
James Beith	Bowmanville, O.	Collector	1,000	5th do '97
J. H. Cavanagh	New Glasgow, N.S.	Prev. officer	600	7th do '97
M. J. McPherson	Kincardine, O.	Sub-collector	600	1st do '97
J. H. C. Atkinson	West Dock, O.	do	500	1st do '97
F. N. St. Michel	St. Jérôme, P.Q.	do	300	1st do '97

## ADDITIONS to the Extra Staff, from 1st July, 1896, to 22nd April, 1897.

J. G. Rathoon	Fort Erie, O.	Act'g. landing waiter	600	3rd July, '96
Geo. House	Black Creek, O.	do prev. officer	400	6th do '96
James Jones	Niagara Falls, O.	do landing waiter	600	6th do '96
T. Chandler	Ottawa, O.	do prev. officer	250	6th do '96
R. D. Pew	Niagara Falls, O.	do do	600	8th do '96
J. G. Nunn	St. Thomas, O.	do do	300	6th do '96
A. Guay	Ottawa, O.	do do	540	3rd Sep., '96
A. G. Masuret	Northport, U.S.A.	do do	\$3 per day.	5th do '96
R. Lusby	Amherst, N.S.	do do	200	12th do '96
P. Bérubé	Ottawa, O.	do do	540	14th do '96
T. J. Mather	Gretna, Man.	do do	600	14th do '96
C. Beausoleil	Montreal, Q.	do do	\$1.50 per day	19th do '96
J. D. Gordon	Trail, B.C.	do sub-collector	900	1st do '96
J. Sinclair	Toronto, O.	do asst. appraiser	800	3rd Oct., '96
T. N. Dancey	Goderich, O.	do prev. officer	500	15th do '96
A. E. Waterhouse	Albani, B.C.	do do	200	16th do '96
Harry Gayfer	Hamilton, O.	do appraiser	1,000	17th do '96
L. Dionne	St. Thomas, Montmagny, Q.	do prev. officer	50	23rd do '96
D. M. Cameron	Hamilton, O.	do do	Net proceeds,	3rd Nov., '96
O. Bourget	Quebec, Q.	do do	seizures.	3rd do '96

Mr. SPROULE.

ADDITIONS to the Extra Staff, from 1st July, 1896, to 22nd April, 1897—Continued.

Names.	Port.	Office.	Salary.	Date of Appointment.
G. Walker	Vancouver, B.C.	Act'g. landing waiter	\$60 per month.	4th Nov. '96
M. Fitzgerald	International Pier, Sydney, N.S.	do prev. officer..	100	5th do '96
M. McKenzie	Millsville, Boularderie Isld., C.B.	do do	100	5th do '96
E. M. Kerr	Crystal City, Man.	do do	150	7th do '96
W. Peebles	Hamilton, O.	do landing waiter	600	12th do '96
C. H. Parsons	Golden, B.C.	do sub-collector..	300	13th do '96
Hugh Leahy	Prescott, O.	do prev. officer..	\$35 per month.	13th do '96
J. M. Douglas	Montrose, O.	do do	*\$3 per day.	13th do '96
J. F. Williams	Ingersoll, O.	do prev. officer.	500	13th do '96
P. Simpson	Vicars, P.Q.	do do	300	14th do '96
C. V. Porter	Five Mile Pt., B.C.	do do	Pd. by Ry. Co.	11th do '96
John O'Neill	Halifax, N.S.	Actg. deckhand St'r. "Argus"	\$1.25 per day.	20th do '96
E. W. Miller	Toronto, O.	Actg. appraiser..	1,400	24th do '96
Thos. E. Flynn	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	do tide waiter..	500	25th do '96
M. O'Reilly	Nelson, B.C.	do prev. officer..	1,000	27th do '96
G. B. Fraser	Chatham, N.B.	do landing waiter.	\$45 per month.	12th Dec., '96
Jas. Harris	Vancouver, B.C.	do do	60 do	14th do '96
H. P. Shadwell	New Westminster, B.C.	do do	60 do	16th do '96
Wm. Case	Halifax, N.S.	Engnr. str. "Argus"	55 do	23rd do '96
Angus Munn	New Westminster, B.C.	Actg. landing waiter	800	24th do '96
D. Fortin	Montreal, P.Q.	Actg. prev. officer..	\$1.50 p. wk.dy.	24th do '96
James Beer	Steveston, B.C.	do do	200	26th do '96
W. T. Scott	Hamilton, O.	do messenger..	300	29th do '96
R. J. Cooper	do	Telephone attendt..	\$13 per month	29th do '96
D. J. Reddy	Halifax, N.S.	Actg. tide waiter..	550	4th Jan., '97
Alex. Hackett	Colchester, O.	do prev. officer..	50	14th do '97
Wm. Marchant	Victoria, B.C.	do appraiser..	1,400	15th do '97
A. H. Taylor	Ottawa, O.	do do	1,200	18th do '97
Ed. Morrissey	Brush Wharf, P.E.I.	do prev. officer..	50	20th do '97
Jas. Caton	Owen Sound, O.	Landing waiter..	\$45 per month.	30th do '97
S. H. Arsenaunt	Egmont Bay, P.E.I.	Act'g. prev. officer..	50	5th Feb., '97
A. Everett	St. John, N.B.	do appraiser..	800	19th do '97
Geo. Livingstone	Great Bras d'Or, N.S.	do sub-collector..	160	19th do '97
W. Thos. Junkin	Fenelon Falls, O.	do prev. officer..	100	26th do '97
Colin Quick	North Dock, Pelee Island, O.	do do	50	24th do '97
J. W. Walsh	Spry Bay, N.S.	do do	60	5th Mar., '97
W. A. Dalton	Port Lorne, N.S.	do do	60	1st Apl., '97
J. A. Carpenter	Bloomfield, N.B.	do do	400	9th Mar., '97
Neil Currie	Thessalon, O.	do do	400	11th do '97
Wm. Allen	Sutton, O.	do do	100	10th do '97
R. Jordan	Byng Inlet, O.	do do	300	16th do '97
Alex. Calder	Toronto, O.	do messenger..	500	16th do '97
J. H. Harquoil	Dalhousie, N.B.	do prev. officer..	300	24th do '97
R. F. Stockdale	Stag Island, O.	do do	\$50 per month.	25th do '97
J. H. Dandreth	Berlin, O.	do landing waiter	600	30th do '97
W. M. Galbraith	Victoria, B.C.	do prev. officer..	300	29th do '97
F. L. Jones	Board of Customs	do chief prev. offi.	1,600	31st do '97

I suppose that is our genial friend that used to go by the name of the Ottawa liar around here.

E. P. Flynn	Arichat, N.S.	do collector..	800	6th Apl., '97
R. J. Thorne	Digby, N.S.	do tide waiter..	\$1.50 per day.	7th do '97
E. Outhouse	Tiverton, N.S.	do prev. officer..	60	7th do '97
J. B. Martineau	Montreal, Q.	do messenger..	\$1.50 per day.	12th do '97
S. A. Brodeur	Valleyfield, Q.	do sub-collector..	500	13th do '97
Chas. W. Murray	Vancouver, B.C.	do waiter..	\$70 per month.	13th do '97
Forbes Jones	Weymouth, N.S.	do prev. officer..	400	17th do '97
D. B. Stevens	Trail, B.C.	do landing waiter	\$65 per month.	20th do '97
A. Forrester	Rossland, B.C.	do do	\$65 do	20th do '97
W. M. Wood	Rossland	do do	\$65 do	20th do '97
M. E. Johnston	Gananoque, O.	do do	\$1.50 per day.	15th do '97

\*To be paid by the Railway Company.

I wonder if he was recommended by the genial Whip from Gananoque (Mr. Taylor). These are the names of those who have been added to the list since the 1st July, 1896. I only read the list because it is an evidence of the economy which the hon. members representing the Government have displayed since they came into power, and in carrying out the principles which they said should guide them if they were given control of the government of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) if the collector at the outport of Wallaceburg at the village of Sombra, has been dismissed, and, if so, who has been appointed in his place. Also I would like to ask if the collector of customs at Courtright has been dismissed, and, if so, who has been appointed in his place. Will the hon. gentleman deign to give the committee any information? I see he is perfectly silent. I understand that these dismissals have taken place within the last few days, but the hon. gentleman seems to sit silent even when information that may quite reasonably be expected, is asked of him. The committee is entitled to an answer. Does he expect his silence to be taken as an answer? Of course, he may take what course he pleases.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I have not the information at hand. I thought it better to wait until after the hon. gentleman had taken his seat. I did not at first, nor am I sure now that I understood the names of the officers concerning whom he asked.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall have to crave the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) as I think the members of this committee have a right to ask his attention, and that he shall not discuss other matters when this subject is before the committee. If he had paid a little attention, he would have heard what I have said.

Mr. BRITTON. That is a courteous way of asking a question.

Mr. CLANCY. No doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) will teach us courteous manners later on, but meantime we are not asking advice from him. I asked the Controller of Customs if the collector of customs at Sombra had been dismissed, and, if so, who was appointed in his place. I asked also with regard to Mr. Cronk, the collector at Courtright, whether he had been dismissed, and, if so, who had been appointed in his place. I have heard that these dismissals have been made.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Speaking from memory, as to Sombra, I do not remember that name. Is Mr. Roebuck at one of the points mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy)?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am not quite sure whether that order has passed the Council yet or not, but the dismissal has been recommended, I know, and if the hon. gentleman has heard that it has taken place, the probability is that it is so. I could ascertain the facts and give them to the hon. gentleman at a later time.

Mr. CLANCY. What about Courtright?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. As far as my memory goes, I think there has not been a change there; but I cannot speak with certainty.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely the hon. gentleman knows whether he has sent a recommendation to Council within the last few days with reference to these matters or not.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I said that I had sent a recommendation regarding Mr. Roebuck.

Mr. WALLACE. What about Mr. Cronk?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I will find out.

Mr. WALLACE. That is exceedingly satisfactory, I am sure. We are the ones who want to find out, and we are asking the one who is supposed to know, and he takes our position and says he wants to know.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If you would give notice of the names you want to know about, I would have the information ready.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not asked information concerning any names.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Speaking from memory, I say I do not remember that case. There has been a good deal of business before me, and one can hardly carry all the facts in mind. But I have told the hon. gentleman that I will get him this information. I will have it for him this afternoon. I suppose he can wait that long.

Mr. CLANCY. I am quite willing to wait. But I think we are entitled to the information at that stage of the proceedings when, if necessary, a reply can be made to any statement that may be made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson). I suppose that it would be better to let this item stand, unless the hon. gentleman will consent to discussion taking place, if necessary, when the information is given.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have no objection to all the discussion taking place that the hon. gentleman wants. I may say, in answer to what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, that he has read a return in which he refers to a great many new appointments. There must be appointments in the public service. If gentlemen die, if gentlemen re-

sign, if gentlemen are superannuated, if gentlemen are dismissed, their places must be filled, if the offices that they held are necessary to the public service. And in a large service like the customs service, deaths will happen, cases will arise of gentlemen asking for superannuation, owing to being enfeebled: cases will arise in this department as in others, where charges have been preferred against officers and it has been found that they have violated their duty, and their services have been dispensed with. These officers have to be replaced. And though my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) read the names given in a return covering the appointments from the 1st of July, I notice that some names given are those of officers who were appointed before I came into office, for instance, the collector at Black Creek. But the hon. gentleman did not call this fact to the attention of the committee. Nor did he mention the fact that this return calls for the date and appointments of all persons appointed in the Department of Customs for whatever reason or whatever cause. As I have said, a great many officers have deceased, and others have been superannuated and others dismissed. But the hon. gentleman will find, I think, when the expenditure for the year comes down, and he can judge more properly with regard to the matter, that the expenditure has not increased, or, if increased, it has increased very little. I do not deny that there has been an increase in British Columbia. That was necessary, and there will have to be an additional expenditure incurred there if we are to carry on the work thoroughly. Then the same gentleman said that I was appointing officers not only in Canada, but in the United States. Very well, we have officers in the United States, we have had officers there for years and years. He referred to Mr. Mazurette, a gentleman who was appointed by his predecessor, resigning the office. Mr. Mazurette is appointed to work in the United States, and the railroad upon which he is engaged pays his salary as they did before, and it is no burden at all upon the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to place a return upon the "Hansard," with the view, I suppose, of leaving an impression that appointments have been made right and left without any necessity for them, and with the result of greatly increasing the cost to the country. I think when the actual expenditure for the year is in his hands, bearing in mind what he has said on the present occasion, he will find that his fears were groundless as to a great additional expenditure being entailed on the Government through the appointments that have been made.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice, making all due allowance for appointments that were made by the late Government after 1st July, 1896,

that a larger number of these appointments were made late on in the season and a great many in the spring. Now, when I count up the number who have been dismissed and take the number of new appointments, I find that the new appointments are more numerous than the dismissals; therefore I assume that there must be quite a number of additional men employed in the service over what were employed before; and if additional men are employed, their salaries must come from some source; therefore, it cannot mean a reduction of the expenditure, but rather an increase, and an increase is not in the line of economy.

Mr. MILLS. I notice in the list read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the office at Port Lorne, Annapolis County, was mentioned. I would like to ask the Controller whether Officer Graves is still in his position at Port Lorne.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There was some change made in Annapolis County, but I would hesitate to state to the hon. gentleman now from memory whether Mr. Graves is still there. Some offices were changed there, and the officers as well. If he would like a statement in reference to that, I will be prepared to give it to him.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to know whether Mr. Graves is now in the custom-house at Port Lorne, or whether he died or resigned, or was superannuated or dismissed; and if he was dismissed, the cause of his dismissal.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. The Controller has just told us that the expenditure is not increased in the Customs Department. In face of the facts, I do not know how he could make such a statement to this House. What are the facts? That in 1894 our expenditures for the Customs Department were \$921,000; in 1895 they were decreased to \$917,000; in 1896 to \$896,000, when the present Government came into power. In 1897 the Estimates are \$953,000, or an increase of \$57,000 over last year. They were not satisfied with that, and this year they are asking in their main Estimates \$956,000, that is more than ever before, and \$60,000 more than in 1896, and \$3,000 more than their last year's accounts. Now they come down to the House and ask us in addition to this \$956,000, for \$16,250, or a total of \$972,000, a higher figure than has ever been reached before in the extravagant days of the Tory Government, by more than \$50,000. Yet, Sir, the Controller of Customs tells us that they have not increased the expenditure. The hon. member for East Grey has read out a list of names of new appointments. According to a return which

was presented to the House the other day at the request of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), there is a statement that there were dismissals, superannuations, &c., on the permanent staff amounting to forty; and on the temporary staff to thirty-eight, making seventy-eight dismissals. Now, the new appointments show thirty-five permanent and seventy-eight on the extra staff, making a total of 113, or thirty-five more appointments than there were persons dismissed or whose services were dispensed with. Now, in my opinion, that increase was altogether unnecessary. I realize the fact myself that our staff was sufficiently large, and the estimate shows that we were trying to reduce expenditure and were successful in reducing expenditure, not so much as we might have done, but at any rate we were going in that direction every year. Now, these gentlemen who are pledged to economy, pledged to retrenchment, pledged to reduce the expenditure, the first thing that they do is to increase the expenditure by the amount which I have just quoted, increased it from 1896 to the present time by \$70,000 in those two short years.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—he has compared the expenditure of one year as he ascertained it, with the Estimates, and he speaks of the Estimates as an expenditure. Does he think that is fair, when he knows that the amount estimated for is not paid? Does he think that it is fair to take the expenditure of one year and compare the year he speaks of with that lower expenditure when he had an estimate, as I am informed by officers in my department, cut off just prior to the election by \$50,000, for which he had made no provision, when he had not dispensed with the services of the officers, when those officers were in the employ of the Government, and when they had to be paid out of the funds I had asked Parliament for?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has asked me if he thinks that I am fair in comparing the expenditure of one year with the estimate of another. Well, I can say this: After the hon. gentleman has been about eleven months and a half in office he ought to know something about what the expenditure is for the twelve months. Last year when they had only been in power for a month or two, they came here and pleaded that they wanted sufficient money to cover contingencies; and now when eleven and three-quarter months of the year have expired, the hon. gentleman should be in a position to know whether his expenditure has tallied with the Estimates that he asked the House to vote. After eleven and three-quarters months the Government come down and ask us for \$16,000 more than the Estimates, making \$953,000 for the current year. He knows to-day that \$953,000 is to be ex-

Mr. WALLACE.

pendent. If he knows this to-day he is in a position to know exactly what is required for the next year. I think that is a fair proposition, yet in the face of that he comes and asks for \$98,000, an increase of \$19,000 over last year. This is less than one week of the end of the present fiscal year, and he has asked for \$953,000 for that year. Yet he comes back to the House within one week of the close of the year and says: "I asked for \$953,000 last year, We have come to the end of the year; we have spent that \$953,000. I find I will not be able to conduct the affairs of this department for \$953,000, and I ask you to vote us \$19,000 more." The argument that he advances that you should not compare the Estimates of one year with the expenditure of another I do not think will hold water, because he is in a position now to know what he will require, and he is now coming and asking for unlimited sums of money. If we had confidence in the hon. gentleman we are fast losing it because what are the facts? There have been 113 appointments and 78 dismissals from this department during the term for which a return was brought down to this House, or 35 new appointments in excess of the dismissals. In many cases when officials drop out for various causes it is not necessary to reappoint men at all, and if 78 of them are dispensed with there should have been less than 78 new appointments. I am waiting with interest to find out what was the cause of the dismissal of Asa Cronk of Courtright whom I know to be an able, efficient and honest officer of the customs. But we come to the items which the Controller of Customs asks this House to vote. The first item is, "Additional amounts required to meet salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and officers on preventive service, \$6,250." This amount is increased over the present fiscal year 1896-97. In that year the salary of Mr. McKay, the inspector for Ontario was provided for. I am not sure whether the salary of Mr. Clute of British Columbia, was provided for in 1896-97.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. This is an increased expenditure of \$1,600. What else? We find that the salary of Mr. Jones, who was appointed chief preventive officer may be taken either from this item or that it may be taken from the following item. It has no business to be taken from two items. When the Controller of Customs comes here and asks for \$6,250, there should be a definite statement of what the money is intended for because when the Controller of Customs asks for money he must be in a position to give a detailed account of every expenditure under the item. The next item is, "Amounts required for the purposes of defraying expenses of special preventive service, \$5,000." I asked last

night, "What are you going to do with this \$5,000?" The Controller of Customs said, "We might charter a steamer, buy a horse, or do anything with it." I think that is no statement to be presented to this committee. The Controller of Customs ought to say what he is going to do with this \$5,000. He ought to come prepared to say to this committee, "We have adopted a plan of preventing smuggling, and for that plan I will require \$5,000." In addition to the \$5,000 taken for preventive service there is the item of \$6,250, or over \$10,000. But we come to the next amount; "Amounts to be paid the Department of Justice to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service." I think this item is altogether objectionable. Such a thing has not been known in the history of the Government of this country for many years. I remember a quarter of a century ago or more when the Fenian raids were taking place that the Government had to send their agents into the camp of those who were plotting for the destruction of this country. Then a secret service fund was essential to the protection of the people and the Government of this country, but those times have passed away and the Government are not asking for any such secret service fund. The Controller of Customs comes down and says, "We want for customs purposes a secret service fund." I think this country. Then a secret service fund was ever obtained in the Department of Customs before. Is this the first instance upon which a secret service fund has been asked?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I never asked for the item before.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not ask the hon. gentleman what he has done before, but he has the records of the department under his hand, and I asked him if in the history of the Customs Department secret service money has ever been voted by Parliament. He tells us that he has never asked for it. He has not been very long in power.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman was in power.

Mr. WALLACE. When I was in charge of the department I did not ask for a secret service fund because I did not think it necessary. The Customs Act gives enormous powers to the Controller of Customs and the officers of the Customs Department. That has been considered necessary that the collection of the revenues may be made properly. The collection of three-quarters of the revenue of this country devolves upon the Controller of Customs and in order to protect these revenues, in order to protect the money of the people of Canada, extraordinary powers have been given to the Controller of Customs, powers which many people think are too large to be exercised by any person. That may be, but here is

a proposition to enlarge these powers, to give \$5,000 into the hands of the Controller of Customs, to use in any way that he likes. What might be the effect of that?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is not the way it reads.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; to be expended in any way he likes; "To be paid to the Department of Justice, to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service." The Controller of Customs accounts for the moneys that he expends to the Department of Justice.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, I hand the money to them.

Mr. WALLACE. Who employs the men? The Controller of Customs?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. What has the Controller of Customs to do with it then?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. He has to pay the amount on the requisition of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Controller of Customs simply pays the amount to the Department of Justice why not vote the amount to the Department of Justice which will have the spending of it. But the wording of this item says that it is the Department of Customs that shall expend the money, and it is only this department that has the machinery for spending it. The Department of Justice has no machinery; is not acquainted with the details of the working of the department and could not use the money advantageously. What does it mean? An engine of oppression which can be used against every importer and manufacturer in this country, you are holding a whip over their heads. We are told that this secret service money is wanted for the purpose of detecting men. We are told that smuggling is going on in the country and they say, "We want to go into the warehouses of these men who are sending out these smugglers in order to detect them." A very praiseworthy object. Sir, that power does not end there. If they wish to enter an importer's or manufacturer's establishment in Montreal or Toronto, they send their secret emissary as a secret spy, and they take this money to do it. The machinery of the Customs Department is sufficiently strong to-day without adding this additional engine. It is altogether wrong to vote \$5,000 as a secret service fund, which may be used to ruin the business of any merchant in this country, if dishonest men are employed, and dishonest men might be employed on work of this kind.

Mr. QUINN. No decent man would do it.

**Mr. WALLACE.** This proposal of the Controller of Customs should not receive the approval of this House. It is unprecedented in the history of the Customs Department of Canada, and it is unnecessary, because the machinery of the department is at present ample to carry out the law effectively. It establishes a system of espionage over the honest merchants of this country, and it may be worked to their ruin. The Government can fairly be asked to withdraw this vote.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My opinion is that this is a vote which we ought not to pass, and it is a system which ought not to be initiated. There is only one case in which I would be prepared to entrust to the Government the funds of this country without audit. That would be in the case of some question of national existence, or of some danger which threatens the nation. In that case, it might be well sometimes to ferret out secret foes, and to grant the power to the Government to a limited extent inasmuch as it is almost impossible for ordinary methods to reach the object in view. But, Sir, in the history of this country for twenty-four years, I do not think there can be an example found of any vote given to any department of government, outside of the ordinary and usual service of the country. This is an innovation which puts \$5,000 in the hands of the Minister, to be used in any way the Minister likes within the limit of preventive service, where the white light of public criticism through the Auditor General cannot beat down upon it at all. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) can take a vote of \$5,000 with reference to his department, every Minister could ask for the same vote, and the opening wedge is put in, and it will be given him by the majority of the Government, and a precedent made. Is it not possible for my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) to carry out the service of his department without contravening what has been the stated principle in the disbursement of public moneys ever since Parliament took that matter into its mature consideration, and decided that there should be a parliamentary officer, to wit, the Auditor General, who should audit all accounts which would then be submitted to the criticism of Parliament? The thing you are asking to-day may be wise and proper in itself, but do not go into greater peril, and take a course which is beset with difficulties in the end, if you undertake to sanction the principle of employment of moneys without audit, and without the criticism of the House. Granted that if you had this \$5,000 of secret service money you might effect an object, but that object, it seems to me, might well sink into significance before the principle you are establishing, that a Government, with a majority at its back may send public money without accounting to the representatives of the people. I appeal to my hon. friends op-

**Mr. WALLACE.**

posite, to not initiate the course outlined in this vote, and to not put us to the test of having to forcibly show our protest. I am making this statement, not from any partisan idea at all. I have been in a Government for eight or ten years, and I have supported the Government for longer, but I most assuredly say that I would not have been a party to the employment of public funds in this way. Unless some national peril threatens us—and in that case I would be willing to put the whole resources of the country into what we might think was a proper channel for avoiding that peril—but in a case of this kind, I do not think the circumstances call for it, and I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) seriously to think over whether it is not better for him to forego this vote and depend upon the ordinary and effective machinery of the customs preventive service.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** I do not at all object to the criticism which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has directed against this vote. It is quite right that a proposition of this kind, which is unusual, should be criticised, and it is quite right that we should be asked, what are the special circumstances which impel the Government to ask for this vote. I have got to say this, and I wish the House to consider the matter seriously. The most clear evidence has been brought to the Government for many months, that the entire service of the customs is utterly inadequate as at present administered, to prevent the frightful system of smuggling which is causing great immorality all through the lower St. Lawrence districts, and I believe extending in a considerable extent to the maritime provinces. We have good ground to believe that the revenue is at present being defrauded to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, by the illicit importations of quantities of spirits, particularly from St. Pierre and Miquelon, and from the quantities that are brought in in various ways from the adjacent republic. The existing machinery of the customs has proved hopelessly inadequate to deal with that evil. It is a great evil. We hear reports from those who are in a position to know, that it is demoralizing the population of whole parishes along the lower St. Lawrence. We have very good reason to believe that the ramifications of this system—for it has attained to the dignity of a system—extend not merely along the St. Lawrence, but that they have their headquarters in the city of Quebec and, to some extent, in Montreal, too. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is a man of business. He must know that it is utterly and hopelessly impossible to obtain the requisite information, which alone would enable you to cope with and suppress this great and growing evil, unless the informers know that their names will be kept secret, and that they will not be exposed to the vengeance of the par-

ties against whom they give information. That is perfectly well known. It is one of the reasons which justified, to some extent, the criticism of the hon. gentleman on the occasion of the bringing down of the Budget, when he pointed out that when the excise or customs duties were raised to a high point, there was great danger of increasing smuggling. I admitted at the time that that part of the hon. gentleman's argument required grave consideration; but I want him and the House to understand that when we ask for this small special vote for the purpose of carrying on an effective secret preventive service, we do not do it without having absolute proof that in a large section of Canada an extensive system of smuggling is going on. The loss to the revenue is immense; but that is not the most serious part of it. The demoralization of a large section of our people is immense; and if ever there was an occasion—I do not except even the so-called Fenian secret service—when the Government were justified in saying to the House, Trust us with the administration of this insignificant sum for the purpose of putting down this great evil, it is this occasion. But I recognize the force of what the hon. gentleman said last night, and in the few remarks I made on the subject I stated that we were perfectly willing to submit to the leader of the Opposition for the time being an account of the mode in which that money had been expended. That has been done in England on more than one occasion when the Government have had, for various reasons, to ask for secret service money. It is not a vote which we desire to press too strongly upon our friends behind us; but we think they may fairly, under the circumstances, trust the Department of Justice with the administration of this small sum of money, when I tell them that, so far as we can judge, the loss to the revenue resulting from this system of smuggling amounts to \$700,000 or \$800,000 a year; and when I tell them further that the resources of the Customs Department have been wholly inadequate to cope with this evil. If the hon. gentleman has any other suggestion to make, we would not object to consider it. We do not want to use this money for any illegitimate political purpose, I do assure him. We simply want to use it for the purpose of putting down this great evil which I have alluded to, and which has not been grappled with successfully for many years past. There are many men in this House who can corroborate more fully than I can the great loss to the revenue and the great injury to the country sustained by this system of smuggling; and, without unduly disparaging the hon. gentleman's remarks, I think he might reasonably accept the offer I made last night to submit a detailed account of this expenditure to the hon. gentleman or to his colleague, the leader of the Opposition, and I would not mind adding the ex-Controller

of Customs—I do not object to a triumvirate, and a triumvirate may be found existing on that side—on condition that they will pledge themselves on their honour not to reveal the names of the persons who may be the beneficiaries of this fund.

•Mr. FOSTER. I quite understand my hon. friend's point of view, and his argument from that point of view has considerable strength in it, no doubt. I only called attention very strongly to the other side of the case, which we must look at before we commit ourselves to this policy. There is no one point, so far as I can see, on which this vote could be justified, except the desirability of getting information from the informer without the informer being subject to publicity and to consequent persecution. I take it that is the only thing which could not just as well be got at by the ordinary machinery as by this special machinery. If it is true that that matter as to the informer can be got over without the adoption of this principle of a secret service fund, my hon. friend agrees with me. I think, that that should be done. Those gentlemen who have had the disposition of customs and excise ought to know that better than myself. I know that this matter of smuggling is a terrible evil, as demoralizing as it can be on the community at large where it is carried on, utterly subversive of all respect for law; and no means can be too strong or vigorous to stamp it out if that can possibly be done. But this matter of smuggling is not a thing of recent date.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But it has grown to frightful proportions.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite aware that it has grown and that it is growing, and that the higher you put the duties the more it will grow. That formed a subject of conversation in my time very frequently, and the view which I got from the officers was that those officers, with the machinery they had, were quite as able to cope with the evil as they could do it in any other way.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But they have failed.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and my hon. friend may get this vote, and the Minister of Justice may dispense it, and the whole of it may be spent, and at the end of the year the Controller of Customs will have to come forward and say that there is an immense amount of smuggling still. With 5,000,000 people along our frontier, and the incentive so great as it is for smuggling in tobaccos and liquors, it is impossible to stop smuggling; and the Department of Justice, the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Customs combined cannot stop it. But I do not want to take the stand of burking the possibility of stopping it, and I have thought of this suggestion. The Auditor General is

the parliamentary officer for auditing the accounts; he is a man of sense and a man of honour and probity; and if the hon. gentleman will extend his proposition so that this expenditure shall be audited by the Auditor General, with the supervision of the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition—

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS**. But without the publication of names.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Auditor General has before him scores and hundreds of individual payments which he never displays on the pages of his books. I know—and I am not giving away any secret—that in the course of auditing accounts, he has called in certain Ministers and asked them for information, and when that is given to satisfy him, he has passed the account, but has not displayed it on his books. The Auditor General is the ultimate judge of what he will display, and what he will not display; and I think we may trust him, when the revenues of the country are in hand; and no man in the service of the country would rather have the revenues conserved than the Auditor General.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I may say at once that, on the condition, of course, that publicity is not given to the names, I see no objection to accepting the hon. gentleman's suggestion, which is as I understand, that the audit of this expenditure shall be made by the Auditor General, and that the leader of the Opposition shall be allowed to know likewise what passes, both gentlemen being under pledge on their honour not to reveal the names of the recipients of the money. We would require that, because, the hon. gentleman knows that in the case of smugglers carrying on smuggling on so extensive a scale as we know they are doing, men's lives would not be safe if it were known that they have given information to the Government. In order to get information, these men must go among a very lawless set of men, and to a certain extent, must take their lives in their hands. We know what has occurred in England and in other countries where smuggling has been rampant. We know that an informer would get an extremely short shrift if the men on whom he informed knew of his proceedings. On the condition stated, I accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I make that suggestion and I think it will meet the case. We do not forego the audit. The Auditor General has the audit, the leader of the Opposition has the right to see all the documents. If those three gentlemen, the leader of the Government, the Auditor General and the leader of the Opposition are satisfied, that is all that is necessary. If those three have cognizance, I do not think the Government would dare to attempt anything wrong, and

Mr. **FOSTER**.

in the second place I think it might be well left with the Auditor General.

Mr. **WALLACE**. It does not do away with the fact that the Government are asking for this sum.

Mr. **QUINN**. Without any desire to obtrude myself upon the notice of the House at this stage, I cannot refrain from expressing my objection to this vote, not so much because it may be used for political purposes, but because of the principle of it. I object to the principle of the vote. It is only necessary to mention the fact that the system has been abandoned in England for many years, except in connection with the discovery of treason, and it is even a question if it will not be abandoned in that case also, in view of the experience the authorities in England have had with the informers who have been paid out of the Secret Service fund. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the only reason for this was the protection of the informers in order that their names should not be exposed. But the customs law of this country provides that protection.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. For a number of years I was the agent of the Minister of Justice in Quebec city. We took out a great many suits against smugglers, and not in one instance could we succeed, because informers would not come up to give evidence as they were afraid for their lives.

Mr. **QUINN**. My hon. friend says that the Government had great difficulty in obtaining convictions, as they could not get the informer to go into the witness box.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. We could not get them to inform or have their names mentioned under any circumstances whatever, even in private.

Mr. **QUINN**. Then my hon. friend thinks that if a sum of money is put in the hands of the representative of the Minister of Justice in the city of Quebec which will enable him to go to a man and say: Here are \$100 or \$500 cash give me such and such information, he can get the information. But is that information on which the Government ought to rely for the purpose of committing smugglers or anybody else—information purchased at so much a word? The Customs Act now protects informers. Under it the Minister of Customs, the Controller and Collector of Customs, the meanest official in the Customs Department who has received information is not bound to divulge the name of the informer to anybody. The lowest officer in the customs may walk into an establishment in the city of Montreal and seize that whole establishment, and is not bound to give to the collector of customs, to whom he reports the seizure, the name of the informer on whose information he is acting. Not only that, but in obtaining the judgment of the Controller of Cust-

toms he does not declare the name of the informer. He simply reports to the Controller that there is an informer in the case and asks him to be good enough to appropriate one-third of the amount realized for the benefit of the informer. If that is not sufficient protection for the informer, I do not know what more you can want. I do not know how you can have better protection by putting the paltry sum of \$5,000 spot cash in the Estimates for that purpose. If it be necessary to increase the amount paid the informer, give him one-half instead of one-third. If \$700,000 a year are being stolen from the Dominion by smuggling, the country can well afford to lose \$350,000 a year to recover double the amount. Increase the protection given the informer, if you will, but do not put it in the hands of any officer of any department to send private spies into a merchant's office to purchase his clerks. Do not allow any officer to purchase, for example, the office boy, a lad of fourteen or fifteen, and get from him information, not altogether accurate, against his employer. I could give you some instances of the operation of the Act to my own knowledge, in the city of Montreal. An establishment in Montreal imported certain machinery from the United States. The manager charged the company the full amount of duty and obtained from it a cheque for that amount, but in making the entry he undervalued the goods and pocketed the difference in duty. He was dismissed some years later, but still within the five years which would prescribe the offence. He then went to a subordinate official in the customs and laid the information that this machinery had been smuggled or entered at a lower valuation. The machinery was seized, confiscated and sold, and this informer shared with the customs officer the money realized on the sale of that machinery. Here was the man who actually perpetrated the fraud, laying the information and getting one-third of the money.

Mr. BERGERON. Did not the cheque of the company show that the company had paid the full amount of duty?

Mr. QUINN. Quite true, but the decision of the Minister of Customs at the time was that the company was obliged to pay, and this man who had committed the fraud pocketed some \$3,000 or \$4,000 by the transaction.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. What year was that?

Mr. QUINN. It is a good many years ago, and I do not think it necessary to give the particulars.

Mr. TALBOT. What became of the man that did it?

Mr. QUINN. Nothing was ever done to him.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not made an officer of the Government, was he?

Mr. BERGERON. Was he knighted?

Mr. QUINN. Let me give one other instance to show how the existence of such a law has a corroding and deteriorating effect on the community. How much worse it will be if we sanction, by a vote of this Parliament, the expenditure of a secret service fund for which nobody can be held accountable by this House, concerning which nobody will be bound to explain one word, which may be put into the hands of degraded officials—for I do not think that anybody will pretend that every officer in the Customs or in the police department of this country is above reproach—say only that it may be put in the hands of indiscreet men, and I say it will have a most degrading and debasing effect upon the community in general. But I said I would give you one other instance. The case I speak of is that of a wholesale merchant who, being weak and under the pressure of hard times, consented, at the solicitation of his financial manager, to pass certain items through the custom-house fraudulently. He did pass the entries of two seasons in that way. But he was a perfectly honest and honourable man and wished to do right. But he was enabled by the means I have suggested to tide over a very hard time. Being successful afterwards, he wished to make a settlement with the customs, although what he had done was utterly unknown to the customs authorities. He tried to effect a settlement in a quiet way. He sent a representative to the Department of Customs to ask the Minister what steps would be taken if he should make a clean breast of the whole affair and offer to pay the amount of the frauds he had perpetrated. The answer was not satisfactory. Of course he could not afford the penalties the law would exact if he should make the confession, and he determined to wind up his business. In the meantime his financier, the man who had prompted him to perpetrate these frauds became aggressive. He tried to get rid of this man but the man said: If you dare to dismiss me, or if you do not give me so much money, I will expose you to the customs authorities. So the merchant consented to give the amount of money required for the time being. But, of course, his life became intolerable; he could not stand the strain of his position very long. The consequence was that within two years he was obliged to wind up his business—a large wholesale importing business—and leave the country. Now, here is a case where a man used the Customs Act, knowing that he would be sheltered as an informer, for the purpose of blackmailing the man whom he had led to commit a crime. After all, what is the defrauding of the customs? I do not mean

to say that it is an act that ought to be lauded or approved by members of Parliament, but I can imagine offences much more serious than the defrauding of the customs, in fact, I think that on the Statute-book of this country there is no law an offence against which is less serious than that of defrauding the customs, except where the frauds are carried on to such an extent as to materially impair the revenues of the country. The offence in itself is not a high crime, it is not treason, it is not anything like the offence, for example, of stealing from a private individual. But where it is carried on to such an extent as seriously to impair the revenue, then serious measures ought to be taken for the purpose of protecting the revenue. But I think it would be a serious mistake if, for the purpose of protecting the revenue, we should be obliged to descend to methods that have been dropped by the mother country. We know, that as a matter of fact, in the mother country the secret service exists only for one purpose, and that is for the purpose of discovering treason. We know that in the mother country there is no such thing as advertising a reward for the conviction of a prisoner. We have a striking example of that in the case of the great Jack-the-Ripper atrocities. During the whole of the time when these atrocities were being committed the British Government did not offer a reward of a single shilling for the discovery or detection of the man who committed these crimes. Having such an example as this before us, I say it would be unwise for this Parliament to have a secret service to protect the revenue of the country. As I said, it is not necessary; ample protection, as I have explained, is given. If it is necessary, let us spend a larger sum of money, let us have a larger number of vessels; let us send down five hundred officers if one hundred are not enough—let us send a thousand, let us send an army, but for Heaven's sake, do not introduce this vicious system.

Mr. TALBOT. Who will be the general of the army?

Mr. QUINN. I would suggest the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) himself, as he would make a pretty good detective. Hon. gentlemen scoff at the idea of employing an army. I am sorry they do not look more seriously at the question and think of the horrible consequences that will flow from this force for the corruption of innocent boys—because that is what it comes to—and ignorant men to betray their employers, on the plea of protecting the revenue of the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think that I ought to say a word on this subject because I come from a part of the province of Quebec where smuggling of whisky is taking place at an enormous rate, and increasing every year. I

Mr. QUINN.

am sure that if my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) were here, he would corroborate what I say. I do not look upon this vote which the Government asks Parliament to grant so much as a protection for the revenue as I regard it as a protection for the morals of the country. The smuggling of whisky is going on at such a rate in the lower St. Lawrence that parishes in which whisky was hardly known before are becoming demoralized, and where not only the men and women drink, but the very children also. Every means have been taken to prevent the bringing of illicit whisky into the country. We have spent large sums of money in this service, and special cruisers have been built and sent into the St. Lawrence to assist in protecting the revenue. The clergy also have done their best and have adopted most extreme measures in some cases to stem this evil, which threatens a large part of the province of Quebec, and nothing has yet succeeded. To my knowledge, the law has been often violated in the district of Quebec where I was the agent of the Minister of Justice for some time. Under instructions from the department I took every means I could think of to bring the smugglers to justice. But I did not succeed. We meet smugglers in the streets and know that they are engaged in that occupation and that they are getting rich in it. We know that large quantities of illicit whisky are brought into Quebec and into the parishes along the St. Lawrence. We know the men who are engaged in this business but we cannot get evidence to convict them. Why? Because these men are very astute; they know their business perfectly well, having been engaged in it a long time; and they understand, if they are as good detectives as they are smugglers, they will find the men who have informed upon them, and I say that the life of an informer upon these matters in certain districts in the province of Quebec is certainly in danger every day. Therefore, not only as regards the protection of the revenue, but more as regards the protection of the morals of a great part of this country do I favour this proposal. I say that even if it is against the principle of good administration to give to the Government a secret service fund, seeing the great evil with which we are threatened, I say we should not oppose this vote, especially under these circumstances which have been stated to us, that these accounts are to be audited by the Auditor General and two members on this side of this House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I agree with very much of what the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has said. But I must say that under the late Government smugglers were not prosecuted with much vigilance. I can cite one instance which the hon. gentleman will re-

member. Proceedings were taken against a most prominent smuggler.

Mr. FOSTER. If we want to discuss this question properly, it is just as well not to raise the party question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I can say this, Mr. Chairman, that some years ago there were complaints about smuggling, and the late Government of Quebec imported a Montreal lawyer to take out proceedings in Quebec against the smugglers. One smuggler was convicted, and when his friends saw that, they bought that lawyer off and paid him a large sum of money, and the other prosecutions were dropped.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is his name ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The hon. gentleman knows him very well. I approve of this action of the Government to prevent smuggling; but I must say that in my opinion, the very best way to put down smuggling is to reduce the duties on liquor. It is just as well for the Government to get \$1.20 on two gallons of liquor as \$2.40 on one gallon of liquor. If they reduced the duty on liquor, the importation would be much greater, smuggling would be less, and the Government would have just as much revenue as it does now. If they do not wish to reduce the duty they will be compelled to spend a large sum of money in employing two or three cruisers to prevent smuggling.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock p.m.

## Second Sitting.

THURSDAY, 24th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### REPAIRING WALKS—PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

Has the contract for repairing the walks in front of the Parliament Buildings and for road work in front of the post office been let? If so, to whom, and at what price per square yard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. The Sicily Asphaltum Paving Company of Montreal. 3. \$2.19 for mastic sidewalks around the Parliament and departmental buildings, and \$3.39 for rock asphalt in front of the post office.

### PRIVILEGE—THE SENATE AND THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to a report in the Ottawa "Citizen" of this morning, in which report the hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell is stated to have said :

The Whip of the Liberal party in the House of Commons has been telling members of the Senate that, if they rejected this measure, the Government would withdraw the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Bill. What in the world had the one to do with the other? It was simply an idle threat, used in the hope of influencing members of the Senate who were known to be in favour of the Crow's Nest Pass Bill being passed, and who were friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I simply wish to state that if the hon. gentleman said what he is here reported to have said, he was misinformed, for I never made such a statement to a Senator or to any other person; nor would I be guilty of using a threat to a Senator or to any other person. I simply wish to make this statement, although it is a matter of indifference to myself personally, but I think that it is only fair to the Government and to the public, as well as to myself, that I should say that there is no truth whatever in the statement, so far as I am concerned, and I am sure that the hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell would not wish to misrepresent me.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I think before the Orders of the Day were called, we were promised some statement about the intention of the Government with regard to the business of the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Yes, I will tell the hon. gentleman what we propose to do. In respect to Item 18 it is not the intention of the Government to proceed; with respect to Item 19 for the abolition of the civil service, we do not proceed; with respect to Item 22, the House in committee on the Civil Service Superannuation Act, we do not proceed. With respect to 26, we want to have a little conversation with our friends about it. It seems a very innocent little Bill, and we think that they are under a prejudice about it. With respect to Item 27, we will proceed; with respect to Item 28, we will proceed. Of course, we go on with the Loan Bill, and with the resolutions for subsidies, and such of the other matters as the House will enable us to consider.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend, in view of the extraordinary estimate which was brought down last night, if it would not be a wise thing

for him, or for the Minister of Railways, to explain what is meant by that estimate. I think it would probably contribute very much to the enlightenment of the House, and might save us time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I admit the hon. gentleman has a right to expect explanations, but I think they will properly come when the item is called.

Mr. FOSTER. I will suggest to my hon. friend that at this stage of the session, as he himself will admit, we should know what is proposed before we can make much progress with business. Now, I suggest that for the better progress of business we should have that explanation as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman as well as myself is not disposed to delay prorogation unnecessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not at all dispute the right of the hon. gentleman to have full explanation of the item in detail whenever the item comes down, but I think it would be more convenient at a later stage. But if the hon. gentleman wants to have it earlier, I will endeavour to see that it is given him if possible either to-night or to-morrow morning.

Mr. FOSTER. I just reiterate what I said before, that it is of such an important nature and has become of so controversial a nature, that I am quite sure that the business of the House would not be impeded if the explanation with reference to that was made at as early a period as possible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will bear that in mind, and I will endeavour to comply with what, under the circumstances, I admit to be a not unreasonable demand. If possible, I will let the hon. gentleman have what he desires either at half-past eight to-night or at eleven o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. FOSTER. Half-past eight to-night will be preferable, if we can express a preference in the matter.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Government ought to state their position in the matter now, because having put the estimate there, they are in a position at this moment to make the full explanations that are necessary. I think this is an opportune time, and it would facilitate the business of the House for them to state now their reasons for bringing this down, and the probable results of such an arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will endeavour to meet their views as far as I reasonably can.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Customs..... \$16,450

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this item is adopted, I want to ask the Minister for a word or two of explanation. In the statement that was read this morning by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) I noticed an appointment made at Gananoque of a preventive officer. I want to ask the Minister if that is a permanent position and what salary is attached to it?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). My impression is that it is just during the summer months. In reference to the question asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I may say that the services of Mr. Henry Roebuck, as customs officer at Sombra, have been dispensed with and a successor has been appointed, Mr. Myers. With reference to the other question, concerning Mr. Cronk, customs officer at Courtright, no change has been made respecting that position. There is, however, a charge I believe lodged against him, but no action has been taken thereon.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the charge?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. A charge of partisanship. Then the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) asked me with reference to Port Lorne. The memorandum given me with reference to that is that that outport was abolished by Order in Council, and the sub-collector, Mr. Walter Graves, was superannuated at an allowance of \$96 a year.

In reference then briefly to one or two points that have been brought up by the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) I may make a remark or two. In reference to the return to the House which he mentioned, I may say that that return calls for a list of those who have been dismissed from the service. It did not call for those who had died, but those whose services had been dispensed with. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) called attention to the number of appointments that existed as compared with those who had left the service for one cause or the other. Of these extra officers fourteen replaced deceased officers; nine replaced officers resigned; eight replaced permanent officers dismissed; one replaced a permanent officer superannuated; one replaced an officer who was promoted; two replaced officers transferred; four replaced officers employed during the season of navigation only; three replaced officers paid by railway companies, and two officers were ap-

pointed without salary, making a total of 44. In reference to the increased expenditure, I think the ex-Controller of Customs will find that it is accounted for by the increased necessities of the services in British Columbia and by the officers in connection with the preventive service. I will say that the Government have been fully impressed with the necessity of adopting strong measures to combat more successfully with the smuggling of liquor in different parts of the Dominion. As has been said on both sides of the House, it is becoming a serious matter. It is estimated that many hundreds of thousands of dollars of revenue are lost in consequence of the smuggling which is going on. We propose to adopt precautions, and we ask the House to place in our hands a sum of money to enable us to combat with this practice. Whether we shall be entirely successful time alone can tell, but if we should be successful in a partial degree in combatting the evil the country will be far more than compensated for the outlay. The \$10,000 in the Main Estimates for a new cruiser is an additional expenditure. As to the \$5,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, though a boat has not yet been engaged, I have thought that perhaps the committee would trust me with that fund and place it at my disposal, so that if I found that necessity demanded it and it could be used successfully, I might be able to engage another cruiser, at least, during a portion of the summer months. Then the \$5,000 for extra preventive officers I think will be necessary. Complaints are not only coming to us from the maritime provinces, the province of Quebec, but our friends from the western coast assure me that there is a great deal of illicit liquor coming in there, and I have been impressed very strongly that steps should be taken to check that traffic. The \$6,250 is intended specially for preventive officers. While part of it will go for the inspection of the ports the greater part is for the preventive service. Then \$5,000 extra is asked for. This I do not wish to retain in my own hands, but the ex-Controller of Customs is wrong in saying that it is to be left at my disposal to do as I please with it, and picturing secret service men going into the stores of responsible and respectable merchants and terrorizing them. There is nothing of that kind at all in it. The whole thing is in connection with the endeavour to stop this smuggling of liquor which is becoming of such magnitude. I desired, and the Government concurred in it, that that sum should not be disbursed by me but should be paid over to the Department of Justice as they may require it for such proceedings as they may adopt in the effort to restrain this practice. It is true, what the hon. gentleman opposite said, that the names of the informers are not divulged. The name of the seizing officer appears, and the remittance of one-third which may be given to the informer is sent

to the seizing officer, and that officer, knowing who he derived the information from, gives the money to the informer. But hon. gentlemen will see this difficulty. Under the provisions of the customs law the informer is entitled to a portion of the proceeds that are derived from the confiscation of the goods after all the necessary expenditure has taken place. One-third of the net amount is given to the informer, one-third to the seizing officer, and the Government retains one-third. But supposing a case is given to the Department of Justice in which information would have been given to that department about an illegal transaction having taken place some time ago. It would be criminal in its nature. They would have it brought before the courts and the conviction of the guilty party would have a most deterrent effect especially if it should be a case of a person of business standing and wealth. It would strike a very great blow at the practice of smuggling, but there would be no proceeds from it. It would be a criminal action and there would be nothing to divide and no fund out of which the informer could be paid under the law as it stands. I think hon. gentlemen would see the distinction.

Mr. WALLACE. There is no fund out of which he could be paid, but there is a fund out of which he could be paid his disbursements, and the expense to which he had been put.

Mr. QUINN. There is another procedure open to them even if the man has been convicted in the criminal courts, and the operation of the criminal courts has been exhausted. A man can be pursued by the Government for a specific sum of money, and I think the limit now is any time within seven or ten years after the commission of the offence, and any money which is recovered from him by such proceedings may be divided with the informer. Information upon which a man may be convicted or upon which a complaint may be based is certainly sufficient to bring a suit to recover the amount of money. It will not be pretended surely that our judges are more lenient to persons sued under such circumstances than our juries are. A man might be convicted of smuggling by a jury and the Government certainly could recover against him a condemnation for the specific sum of money sued for by the department.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) think that persons in possession of this information will wait; that they will, so to speak, take their chances of waiting until this suit is all over. The pressure always is for the distribution of the fund, the object being to secure it. I only mention the case to show that the law does not cover all these points. We have an item here to pay Mr. John Reid for services, which has been put in, subject,

however, to the will of the committee. This matter came before the late Controller of Customs, and he found this was the case of a man who gave information that led to the detection of frauds that had been going on, I think during some years, and which extended into many thousands of dollars. The papers revealed that there was something like \$9,000 fine imposed on a man responsible for the frauds, but nothing was derived from it. This informer would have been entitled to some \$3,000 if the fine had been collected, but nothing being available the department were not able to give him anything at all. The ex-Controller of Customs thought that it was a claim that ought to be paid. He thought that this man's services deserved recognition, and he was anxious to pay for them. He asked the Department of Justice to give him an opinion as to whether he could not pay it out of the 5 per cent that they retained on the seizure. The Department of Justice advised him that the man had no legal claim and that it would not be possible to pay him out of that fund. I have simply given this case by way of illustration. Therefore, if this amount is available to be disbursed by the Department of Justice, it will promote the object which we have in view.

Mr. QUINN. I do not want to make a speech on the subject, but I consider that I would not be performing my duty to my constituents if I did not enter my protest against the vote properly. I know that the merchants of Montreal will view this vote with a great deal of regret indeed. I know that the merchants have hoped for an amendment to the existing laws, and I am satisfied that a great many members of this House have not taken the trouble to understand the Customs Act, or else they would not vote for this. Merchants hoped for some change that would permit them to have their cases decided upon promptly, and not be left as they are at the mercy of irresponsible officers, the object of many of whom is to share in the fine which may be inflicted. Although we have the assurance of the Minister to the contrary, I have no hesitation in saying that eventually this money will be used to corrupt the employees of merchants and manufacturers. I register my disapproval against it. One vote amounts to nothing, but my vote shall be given against it, and for that reason, if the item is carried, I wish it to be carried on division.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to get some information from the Controller of Customs. It has been suggested, and properly suggested, that a change should be made in the mode of inspecting the customs offices and inland revenue offices all through the country. For many years past, it is well known that the inspectors have been appointed on political grounds, and that men who had scarcely any knowledge whatever

Mr. PATERSON.

of accounts, and who were not qualified to audit the accounts, were placed in these positions. The result of that method of inspection has been that at many ports, notably very recently, Peterborough, Dundas and Berlin, large defalcations have occurred. The Customs Department ought to establish a new system of inspection, and appoint competent accountants who would be able to go to these officers and see whether the accounts were in proper shape or not. If this were done, defalcations would be prevented, and large sums of money saved to the treasury. Every one knows that these inspectors have not been appointed in the past because they were qualified for the positions, but that the appointments were in every instance made on political grounds. The last one was the appointment of a gentleman who formerly sat in this House, and who had the appointment in his pocket while he was still voting in this House. I have nothing to say against that gentleman; I am on good terms with him; but I say that he is not a competent officer to discharge the duties of such an office. The Customs Department ought to appoint men as inspectors, not because they are politicians, but because they are competent accountants who can ascertain if the books are kept in proper shape. I ask the Controller of Customs if it is the intention of the Government to make any such change as has been suggested in order to protect the revenues of the country?

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to say a few words with reference to the statement made by the Controller of Customs, as to the dismissal of Mr. Roebuck and the proposed dismissal of Mr. Cronk.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said that Mr. Roebuck had been dismissed, that Mr. Myers had been appointed his successor, and that Mr. Cronk had not yet been dismissed but that there was a charge against him. The reasonable inference from that is that Mr. Cronk would be treated in the same way as Mr. Roebuck. I am informed that Mr. Roebuck has been dismissed without any investigation, and merely upon information given to the Controller of Customs by persons who are seeking the place for themselves, who are politically hostile, and who have made up their minds to conjure up a charge whether one exists or not. There is no more inoffensive man in Canada than Mr. Henry Roebuck. He has never spoken harshly of any political party in his life. True, he has his own views, but he has never been a hostile partisan, and has never taken an offensive part in party politics. I am sorry to learn that Mr. Myers has been appointed in his place. I can say nothing derogatory of the private character of Mr. Myers, but he is one of the most offensive partisans in the district, and

he has earned his position, if he could earn it in any sense, by making a charge against one of his fellow-citizens. There was no opportunity given Mr. Roebuck to convince the Controller of Customs that these charges were without foundation, but upon the tittle tattle of the neighbourhood, the Controller of Customs dismissed Mr. Roebuck. If any one could be chargeable with active partisanship, Mr. Myers is that man. Charges are secretly made against the civil servants of this country, and let me ask, Why are they not investigated? They are not investigated for the reasons that if there was an investigation it would be made perfectly plain to the Controller of Customs that there was no foundation for these charges. This system sets spies upon the civil servants to plot against them, so that these spies may earn positions through their own infamy. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) stated last session that one of the charges against Mr. Cronk was that he attended a Conservative convention at Dresden in 1896. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) I have no doubt had such information, but I have positive personal information that that statement is utterly destitute of a particle of truth. Mr. Cronk did not attend any Conservative convention and he did not take part in the elections. Nevertheless, he is singled out for punishment. The sword is now suspended over Mr. Cronk's head, but I venture to say that no investigation will be held, for the reason that the Controller of Customs dare not hold an investigation any more than he dare hold an investigation in regard to Mr. Roebuck. I say it is a public outrage. The hon. gentleman is not restrained, even by the strength he should show as a Minister of the Crown, from yielding to the clamour of his friends who are earning their positions at the price of personal honour and of everything that is manly, by plotting against their fellow-citizens, with the full security that the hon. gentleman here will turn a deaf ear to every complaint, and refuse an investigation for the sake of avoiding difficulties in a matter which is utterly unwarranted and a disgrace to the Government of Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that nothing should be spared in the effort to put a stop to smuggling, and I understood that it was settled this morning between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, how that matter should be dealt with. There is a great deal of smuggling done, not only in the lower part of the province of Quebec, but also on the border, and in the district of Beauharnois—and I am sure the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) will bear out what I say. Both the regular and the special officers, I believe, have done their duty in the past in that district; but there is one thing in which I think we ought to make a new de-

parture. In the past, when an officer of the Customs Department has detected a man smuggling, petitions have been got up and demands have been made from members of Parliament and others, both Liberals and Conservatives—and I have been one of them—in favour of the man who had been found guilty of violating the law; and the Minister would yield. I believe a stop should be put to that. If those who violate the law knew that if they were caught they would not be pardoned, but would be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law, I think it would do a great deal to stop smuggling. But my purpose in rising is to ask the Controller of Customs who are the securities for Mr. Brodeur, whose name was mentioned this morning as having been appointed collector of customs at Valleyfield, and what is the amount of the securities?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have not that information with me, but I will bring it down on concurrence. In reply to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), I wish to say that the question of the better inspection of ports has not been lost sight of, and I am taking a vote here for the payment of the salaries of two additional inspectors—one now at Montreal and one at Kingston, both over twenty years in the service, and both very capable men. It is my intention to avail myself of the services of these gentlemen in order to have an inspection at much more frequent intervals than hitherto. There have been several cases of irregularities, I regret to say, which might not have occurred if there had been a more regular and frequent inspection. Unfortunately, Mr. Boultbee, one of the inspectors, is almost wholly incapacitated; I think he is not able to do any work. With reference to Mr. McKay, perhaps he might not have been the most suitable man who could have been appointed, but from what I have seen of him, he is endeavouring to do his duty. But we required more help than we had, and I trust to be able to look after the ports more closely than has been the case in the past.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has done me the honour to refer to me as being like himself a representative of a border county. The hon. gentleman is not exactly the representative of a border county, while I am strictly so. My county runs along a frontier of some fifty-five miles, and the temptations and facilities for smuggling, I admit, are very great. But I reside in the county, and I know pretty well what transpires there, and I am prepared to say that my constituents are not like those of a former member of this House, who described them as protectionists by day and free traders by night. The only wonder to me is that, as I believe, so little smuggling takes place on that frontier. What smuggling does

take place is to a large extent of a petty character. I am prepared to say that smuggling on a large scale does not exist there, and has never existed, partly, I dare say, owing to the conscientiousness of my constituents and partly to the vigilance of the officers. These officers, I may say, have been in office for some time, and so far as I know they have discharged their duties efficiently and thoroughly. With regard to what the hon. gentleman said as to the appeals made to the representatives of border counties—I suppose he means his own county and the adjoining counties and my county—I can appeal to the late Controller of Customs and the present Controller of Customs in support of my statement that the appeals for the relaxation of the law from myself have not been frequent. When those appeals have been made, they have been in reference to cases of peculiar hardship, where the smuggling was of a petty character—generally a few gallons of coal oil, which is the commodity, if anything, that my constituents bring into the province without paying duty—and where, as an accompaniment of the seizure, a horse and vehicle have perhaps been seized. In cases of that kind there have been occasional appeals, and I am bound to say that, both by the predecessors of the present Controller, and by him, in the rare instances in which I have found it to be my duty to apply to him, I have been treated, on behalf of my constituents, reasonably and considerately. But I am bound to say, in reply especially to what has been said by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), that I do not consider this a good time to relax the rigidity or severity of the law. Owing to some of the changes that have been made in the tariff, the temptation to smuggle particular articles will be greater than it has ever been before, and I would regard it as a great misfortune if any relaxation were made in the instructions to officers, or if any encouragement were given directly or indirectly to people living along that long frontier, to do differently in the future from what they have done in the past. With regard to the item before the House, with reference to which the hon. member for Montreal Centre has had a good deal to say, my opinion is that if a man has been honest in his business, as he ought to be, he has nothing to fear from the attempt to bribe his employees with money to make disclosures. What can they disclose, if he has observed the law as it should have been done? I do not consider that an argument of any great consequence. With reference to the inspectors, I differ from my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), so far as my experience goes. I do not know what may have taken place in his province, but I am bound to say that the duties of inspector in that part of the country where I live have

Mr. SCRIVER.

been thoroughly and honestly performed. Mr. O'Mara, who holds the position in the district in which I live, is quite capable of performing these duties and has, to my knowledge, performed them efficiently. He is a good accountant and makes a thorough examination of the offices along the frontier at stated intervals, and in no instance that I am aware of has any official on that frontier been convicted of dishonesty since I have had the honour to represent that county. I would only say once more that I trust every means possible in the power of the officials at the head of this department will be taken to check smuggling, especially on the Lower St. Lawrence. Smuggling is the only ground for the application of this money, and the prevention of smuggling is what is aimed at by the estimate before us. If the statement in the newspapers and the reports which have reached me are at all correct, smuggling has gone on there to a deplorable degree, and has been the cause of great demoralization, both as to intemperance and dishonesty in all that territory below the city of Quebec, and I do trust that no effort will be spared by the department to put an end to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot agree with the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in what he said about inspectorships. He said that they were all political appointments. His information is certainly not accurate. It is true that two appointments may be said to have been due to politics—Mr. Boulton and Mr. McKay. Mr. Boulton is not an accountant but an experienced lawyer, and the department utilized his legal knowledge with reference to those seizure cases somewhat at that time, and he was found valuable in that regard. Mr. McKay has had a training which fits him for that position. He has been a business man all his life, and has had a business training which fits him for the position.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What business did he follow?

Mr. WALLACE. The last business he was in was keeping a grain and flour and feed store.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That does not qualify him for an inspectorship.

Mr. WALLACE. He had an extensive business experience.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What did he do before that?—he kept a hotel.

Mr. WALLACE. With regard to the other inspectors, there is Mr. McMichael, the chief inspector, a man who has been all his life in the customs service, and who never was a politician, because he entered the service almost before he was out of his teens. His appointment was in no

sense a political one. He is one of the ablest men in the public service to-day. His assistant, Mr. Belton, is also a very competent accountant. With regard to the other inspectors, Mr. O'Meara, of Quebec, has been all his life in the service, and his appointment was not a political one. He was in the customs at Quebec many years before he was promoted to the position of inspector. Mr. McLean's case, of the province of Nova Scotia, is exactly the same. He was in the department from boyhood in the city of St. John, and was promoted to an inspectorship. Mr. Clute, of British Columbia, and Mr. Hill, of Nova Scotia, were promoted in the same way. Captain Young, of Manitoba, is also a gentleman who never took an active part in politics, so that all over the Dominion to-day you may say that Mr. McKay is the only inspector who may be said to have been a politician. The charges made by my hon. friend from North Brant are, therefore, not accurate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was not Mr. Boulton a politician?

Mr. WALLACE. The Controller of Customs told us that he is incapacitated from work, and therefore I do not refer to him.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. He is in the service yet.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Controller has said he was incapacitated. With regard to the other point, that these large amounts had been asked from this Parliament, \$10,000 for a new vessel and \$16,000 for the preventive service, because smuggling is increasing, when I was Controller my information was that smuggling was decreasing. I concede, however, that the increased duties in the tariff on tobacco, between 50 and 60 per cent, and on liquors, will encourage smuggling, no doubt, and the Government will have to exercise extra vigilance. But I deny that smuggling was on the increase, and the proof will be found in the correspondence which I had with many priests in the province of Quebec, who were very ably assisting the Customs Department in ferreting out cases of smuggling and preventing smuggling wherever they could. No more ardent men could be found anywhere than the priests of the province of Quebec, recognizing as they did the evil of introducing smuggled liquors throughout the country, which work so much injury to the people. They did their best to prevent it and assist the Customs Department in carrying out the law. But I recognize the fact that with their assistance and with the extra force we had placed in the province of Quebec for the preventive service, the evil was decreasing, so that this large expenditure to-day, which is proposed for that prevention, if necessary at all, is necessary only because of the largely increased duties upon tobacco and

spirits. So that my objection to these votes is as strong as ever, notwithstanding what has been said about the necessity of preventing smuggling. It is as strong as ever against the proposed secret service vote. I am opposed to the principle of that service money being used. I am safe in stating it has never been found necessary in Canada to vote a dollar of secret service fund for the customs service, and I do not think it is necessary to-day. You are putting a weapon in the hands of men which they may use judiciously and carefully, but I say we should not give this power to any man. But we may not always have so conscientious a Controller of Customs as the present occupant of that office.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not disburse the money.

Mr. WALLACE. It is under the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson's) control.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, it is handed over to the Department of Justice. They are to dispose of it and account for it; the Customs Department has no charge of this.

Mr. WALLACE. That makes it all the more objectionable, to my mind. The Controller of Customs has the machinery for this purpose; he has full control of the preventive service; he has new officers whom he has just appointed; he is reorganizing the staff, and yet he says that the \$5,000 he asks us to vote is not to be utilized by him but to be handed over to the Department of Justice. And he gives us no idea what facilities the Department of Justice has for preventing smuggling. The money is to be handed over to the Department of Justice for them to do what they please with. I say that whatever is expended for the prevention of smuggling should be used by the Controller of Customs. Nobody else can do it effectively; nobody else, in my opinion, can do it at all. The customs officers are the only men who are responsible; they are the ones who know the law. As I view it, the Department of Justice would have to employ the customs officers. If you do that, you have two heads for one staff—you will have both the Controller of Customs and the Minister of Justice having charge of the same men. That would be an unworkable scheme.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to say a word with regard to what the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) has said concerning the inspection of custom-houses. It is well known to the people in my section of the country that while Mr. Mewburn, who was a practical accountant, was inspector of custom-houses in that section, no defalcations took place.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not correct.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** Mr. Mewburn's was a political appointment; he was an active politician before he became inspector.

**Mr. SOMERVILLE.** But he was not an active politician in the sense that Mr. McKay was. Mr. McKay was the Whip of the Conservative party in this House, and he was discharging his duties as a member of this House while he had in his pocket his appointment to the position of inspector of customs. Now, as I said, defalcations were not heard of, to my knowledge, during the time that Mr. Mewburn discharged the duties of his office. When Mr. Boulton was appointed, he was a politician—no doubt about that. He was appointed because he was a politician, and he was not a Dominion but a local politician and a worn-out local politician. After Mr. Boulton's appointment, we had a defalcation in Peterborough of \$12,000 or \$14,000, we had a defalcation in Berlin of \$9,000 or \$10,000, and we had a defalcation in Dundas of several hundred dollars. These were all under these capable men, who, the ex-Controller of Customs says discharged their duties so faithfully. If they had been careful officers, would it have been possible for these defalcations to have taken place? They were not the work of a single year, but it was proven on investigation that they had been going on year after year, in some cases for twelve years.

**Mr. WALLACE.** They were going on during Mr. Mewburn's time, then?

**Mr. SOMERVILLE.** Not at all.

**Mr. WALLACE.** You have just stated so.

**Mr. SOMERVILLE.** Even if they were, that is no reason why the department should not try to protect the revenue of the country better now than they did before. As I say, with all respect for Mr. McKay—because I have every respect for him as an individual—I fear that when he was appointed, whatever he may have become since, he was not competent to discharge the duties of that office. I say that without fear of contradiction, because I know Mr. McKay's history better than the ex-Controller of Customs knows it. I know that for many years Mr. McKay kept a hotel in Hamilton, and not a very large hotel either, and afterwards he kept a flour and feed store in Hamilton. And I would like to know what a flour and feed store has to do with the customs. Nothing. Mr. McKay was appointed simply because he voted in the last Parliament to suit the leaders of the Conservative party. There is no use trying to conceal the fact. I hold that the Customs Department cannot be properly protected against thieves if they have not better inspectors, gentlemen who understand book-keeping and know how to audit accounts.

**Mr. BERGERON.** The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) seemed to think  
**Mr. SOMERVILLE.**

that I want to be unjust towards some of his electors. That was not the motive. I simply wish that the law be respected. The hon. gentleman said that he remembers two or three cases in which he had been appealed to. How much more then, must I have been called upon, being a supporter of the Administration at that time. I know that in every case the Minister of Customs tried to be as kind as possible to the people and remit the fine—

**Mr. SCRIVER.** You were better treated than I, then; they never remitted a fine for me.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I remember the Controller of Customs treated my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) very well, and though he may not have ever remitted a fine, he remitted a great part of it. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) could tell a good deal about that if he were here. I am not blaming anybody, but I hope that in the future we shall abandon that policy. My hon. friend from Huntingdon spoke about petty smuggling—a few gallons of coal oil and things of that sort. Though my county is not on the border, those who bring goods in without informing the customs officers must come through Huntingdon. I can tell my hon. friend that he can go into stores in my county and see there india-rubber coats that have been smuggled, as well as considerable quantities of tobacco. So far as coal oil is concerned, I do not want to scandalize my hon. friend from Huntingdon, but I have known men to come into the town of Beauharnois with three barrels of coal oil, and to get there they had to cross the county of Huntingdon and a great portion of the county of Beauharnois. If these are small matters, there is no use of talking about any smuggling being a disadvantage to the country.

**Mr. BENNETT.** I think that the hon. member for North Wentworth and Brant (Mr. Somerville) was hardly fair to Mr. McKay, the customs inspector. I think that good taste, possibly, would have suggested that Mr. McKay's name should not be connected with this matter at all. However, since the hon. gentleman saw fit to parade the case, he should have gone further and told the whole facts. He knows very well that Mr. McKay was, for more than one term, mayor of the large city of Hamilton. His tenure of office there as well as his ten years' membership in this House are enough to show that he was a man of more than ordinary business ability. If it is anything to Mr. McKay's credit, I must say that he certainly in one case detected an error in books and brought it to the attention of the department, and that where the hon. gentleman's idol, Mr. Mewburn, had failed, having passed over the same error.

**Mr. LISTER.** My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as usual, under pretense

of asking a question respecting the item, began to sing the old song about dismissals. I would remind my hon. friend that in his whole county I think only one man has been dismissed, Mr. Roebuck. I do not think there has been any other dismissal in his county, not because they should not be dismissed, but because of the generosity of the Controller. As for myself, I only became aware the other day that such a dismissal had taken place. As the hon. gentleman knows, the township of Sombra adjoins my own county, and I have known for many years what was going on in that township, as it formed a part of my county for the local. I can tell my hon. friend that Mr. Roebuck, for many years before he was appointed to this office, as well as after, took a very active part in politics, and on many occasions a very offensive part, so that if he was dismissed he only has himself to blame. I can tell my hon. friend that he drew voters to the poll, that he attended public meetings, that he took an active part in the organization of the party in that county, and in every way that an active partisan could act, Mr. Roebuck has acted since he became an officer under the Government, as well as before.

Mr. WALLACE. Did these occurrences take place before his appointment or afterwards?

Mr. LISTER. After as well as before. Of course, he had a right to do as he liked before, he was then his own master. Then my hon. friend referred to Mr. Cronk. Now, I want to say to my hon. friend that I do not think he is doing his friends any service by making wild statements as he does here to-day. Men are little more than human who will sit here and listen without protest to the extravagant statements made by my hon. friend respecting the dismissal of officers throughout the Dominion; and I believe that he would be more truly a friend of Mr. Cronk and of others, if he did not make these extravagant statements in the House and elsewhere. So far as Mr. Cronk is concerned, his is a small office to be sure. Mr. Cronk has not been dismissed. I have made no complaint against him at all, although my hon. friend wishes to make out that I am urging on the dismissals of officials. I can say to my hon. friend that if I thought proper to make a complaint and to urge the dismissal of Mr. Cronk, I believe I could pile up abundant evidence to justify the Government in making that dismissal. But let me say, moreover, that there is a Mr. Alnus in the Customs Department, in the town of Sarnia, who left his duties and came into the county of Haldimand and for months, while drawing his pay, as documents in the department will show, was actively engaged in the political contest in the interest of the late Secretary of State in the county of Haldimand. That man has always been an active partisan. But he

says that he was ordered to go there on that occasion by the chief of the department. I have not investigated that, but I believe that there is some evidence for it, and if that be true, I would feel great reluctance in taking proceedings against him, because he did not act voluntarily. But my information is that that is the answer Mr. Alnus makes to that charge of going into the county of Haldimand, going upon the stump and actively canvassing through the county, leaving his duties at the port of Sarnia, and, at the same time, receiving his pay as a public officer. If there is anything that will justify the dismissal of an official, I am sure that my hon. friend will say that that would justify it. Yet I have not taken any steps to have that man dismissed, for the reason, as I say, that he claims that he was ordered by the then head of the department, the Hon. Mr. Wood at that time, to leave the office of Sarnia and go into the county of Haldimand for the purpose of helping the then Secretary of State. My hon. friend talks about a person being appointed in Mr. Roebuck's place being a partisan. True, he is a partisan; true, he has taken an active part in support of the Liberal party in the past; but we expect him now that he holds office, to cease to be a partisan, to cease to take an active part in politics in the future. If he does, he must expect to receive the same sentence that has been awarded to his predecessor. We know that in all these appointments, it is the active men who are appointed, but what we expect of them is that after they accept employment under the Government, they shall cease to be partisans and shall devote themselves to the business which they are paid by the country to perform, taking no part in politics except to exercise the right to vote which they have as citizens. So long as they do that under this Government or any Government, they will be perfectly safe in their position, but when they cease to become non-partisans and become partisans, then they must expect to fall with the party they supported.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is careful not to state that he had any personal knowledge of Mr. Roebuck's partisanship; the hon. gentleman makes no charge, and why? The hon. gentleman knows no grounds upon which he could make such a charge.

Mr. LISTER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CLANCY. He has not stated to the committee that he knew personally of any offence of the kind. Now, let me say to the hon. gentleman that when he counsels moderation; when he asks this House to take his advice, we cannot believe him disinterested. Does that advice come from so pure a source that hon. gentlemen on this side should be greatly impressed by it? It would be much more to the credit of the hon. gentleman if he were able to inform

the Controller of Customs that he had personal knowledge of Mr. Roebuck's alleged offence and that he had more than mere tittle tattle which, as he must know, must be greatly discounted. Now, would it not be a fair thing for Mr. Roebuck, before dismissing him, to have given him a trial and to have made perfectly sure that he merited dismissal? I know Mr. Roebuck many years, he is a most efficient officer, no one has complained that he was away from his office and neglected his duty, therefore the public service did not suffer in the least. Then the hon. gentleman said that he hauled voters. I deny in toto that he ever either hauled voters to the polls, or canvassed voters in the late contest. No doubt he cast his vote, he is known as a Conservative, and he does not attempt to conceal it. But the hon. gentleman has made no defence of his dismissal, although the hon. gentleman is an adept at special pleading he has not been able to bring to his aid the shadow of a reason why Mr. Roebuck should be dismissed. He is not able to say that he has personal knowledge of Mr. Roebuck's alleged offence, or that he has been dismissed because he neglected the duties of his office; he has only been able to repeat mere hearsay in the neighbourhood, statements of men who were anxious possibly for Mr. Roebuck's dismissal in order that they might take his place. I am informed that the gentleman who has now been appointed to the office was the one who formulated the complaints against him, or many of them; he made affidavits about Mr. Roebuck's offensive conduct, and now he is awarded the office. I can only repeat that these are not wild statements, in any sense. It is not a wild statement to say that the Government are encouraging a class of conduct that is degenerating the civil service. Now, the hon. gentleman says that this man who has been appointed was a partisan before, but he is not now. He was very careful to say that Mr. Roebuck was a partisan before he was appointed, and that is part of the offence, in the hon. gentleman's mind; yet it is not an offence in his mind that Mr. Myers should have been a partisan. I say that no gentleman should be considered an offensive partisan, whether he is in office or out of it, unless it can be shown that he neglected his duty and that the public service suffered in consequence. They stand precisely on the same ground, and it is a mere piece of special pleading to attempt to make a distinction where there is no difference existing. The public service will be degraded by the admission of men into it who have earned their position by being spies. You have held out inducements to men to do things which are not manly, which will not improve our service and which will not improve the morals of those engaged in it.

Mr. LISTER. So far as Roebuck is concerned the complaint is that he was a

Mr. CLANCY.

partisan after he had been appointed to the service and continued to be one. So far as his dismissal is concerned I made no charge here against him. Mr. Mills was the gentleman who opposed the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) now in this House, and I suppose if he goes to the department he will possibly find an abundance of evidence that this man was an offensive partisan. What I do know is that he was an offensive partisan while he held office.

Mr. QUINN. Before the item is passed I would like to ask the Controller about another branch of the subject, or rather to draw his attention to the memorials that have been sent to the department from the Montreal Board of Trade and the different other trade associations in Montreal and throughout Canada asking, on behalf of the merchants, for the appointment of a committee or a court or a board of arbitration, or the adoption of some means that will bring about the speedy trial of persons charged with infractions of the customs law. I need not say much upon the subject, except to draw the attention of the Controller of Customs to the fact that one of the great evils from which the mercantile community suffers is that when complaints are made to the department against them and which necessitate the seizure of certain goods and certain property of these merchants, that property remains in the hands of the department for a very long time so that very often it is impossible for the merchants to dispose of it in any way. In many instances the complaint is utterly unfounded, and the injury that is done to the merchant by the seizure of his goods is incalculable. This has operated to such a great extent and to such an injurious extent upon the mercantile community, particularly in Montreal, that the Board of Trade and several other organizations have memorialized the Controller of Customs in past years asking that some means should be adopted to bring cases of that kind to a speedy trial in order that the goods may be realized on with as little delay as possible. I would ask the Controller of Customs if this matter has been taken into consideration, and if not, that he would give it his attention in the near future.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I believe that there were memorials of that kind sent in, in times past. The subject is engaging the attention of the department. I do not think that there have been many complaints of delay since I have been in office. We endeavour to despatch business as quickly as we can. Of course, after the seizure is made, thirty days are allowed to parties to put in their defence. If they waive that and ask for an earlier decision we try to give it to them.

Mr. QUINN. The delay in these cases is very often most injurious. I would like

to see some procedure adopted that will tend to a speedy trial. I think that is what the mercantile community ask for and I am glad to draw the attention of the Controller to it, and I hope that he will address himself to the subject with the view of having something done for their relief.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an impression prevailing in the House that most of the smugglers are to be found below Quebec. I cannot speak for other counties, but only for my own, and I will say that there are no smugglers in Gaspé.

To pay L. A. Frechette for technical translation..... \$100

Mr. FOSTER. What were Mr. Frechette's services ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I do not want to take up the time of the committee too long, but I desire to draw their attention to the necessity there is for this work. We want to have our laws and our regulations in such language as might pass muster even if they were submitted to the inspection of the finest scholars. I must admit that it is very difficult for us in this country to find out the technical terms now current in France to describe the different points connected with the material and operations employed in the department. It is true that the French language, such as it is spoken in the province of Quebec, is wonderfully pure, and I think there are very few words employed by our habitants that cannot be found in the most classical works of 200 years ago, in the time of Racine and Corneille. Since then there have been so many changes, so many improvements, so many names applied to modern inventions that the difficulties in the way of making an intelligible translation are great. I allude to this to show the necessity of employing such an eminent French scholar as Mr. Frechette to make our translations. These 57 pages contain very many words which though they may not have become classical, are in common use in France and ought to be used in this country.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the hon. gentleman the Controller of Inland Revenue not think that he will have to translate them into the vernacular to be understood by those who use these rules.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. Mr. Frechette generally puts between brackets the English word or a word in general use among us. We speak good French, but we do not speak exactly modern French.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that little brochure to be used ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. These are the regulations of our department.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they to be used in Canada ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, they are to be used in Canada.

Culling Timber—

James Patton, in consequence of promotion made in Supplementary Estimates for 1896-97.....	\$ 300
To provide for the salaries of Martin O'Brien and Edward Kelly, two superannuated cullers who are to be put back on the permanent staff.....	1,400

Mr. FOSTER. Why are these two to be put back on the permanent staff ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The amount of square timber that has been produced this year and which has reached the port of Quebec is much in excess of what has been sent there during the last few years. Two years ago the department of cullers was reorganized, and 22 were pensioned off and only five retained. The gentlemen connected with the lumber trade have discovered that the present number of cullers is quite insufficient to meet the increased shipment of square timber from Quebec. They have sent a petition to the department, a few lines of which I will read :

We, therefore, beg that you will take our representations into most favourable consideration, and cause two additional cullers to be added to the present staff, by reinstating Mr. Martin O'Brien and Mr. Edward Kelly, who are well known to ourselves and to the trade generally, as thoroughly competent for the duties of this position, and who will be fully acceptable to the purchasers, shippers, sellers and buyers. The present value of timber renders it absolutely necessary that the measuring should be correctly done to the satisfaction of all parties, and these men, from their ability, experience and character, would be acceptable to the entire trade.

I might have hesitated about acceding to the prayer of the petition were it not for the following offer which we have received :

Readily recognizing that the increased cost of such addition to the present staff, which was only reduced to its present number by the late Government last year, should be borne by the trade, and not wishing to ask for the expenditure without showing our willingness to bear the same, we beg to express our readiness to pay, in addition to the present rate, 1 cent a ton of 40 cubic feet, which would be ample to meet and entirely cover the proposed additional outlay.

That petition was signed by gentlemen well known in the lumber trade, amongst others McArthur, Egan, Mackey, J. K. Ward, N. Flood, Cook, Calvin, Poupore, Bryson, Booth, Gilmour Company, Alexander Fraser, Calvin Company, Dunlop, St. Anthony Lumber Company, Whitney, Sharples, Dunn, Kennedy, Burstall ; in fact, all the representatives of the timber trade. In view of the liberal and fair offer made in the petition, I thought it only right to appoint these two cullers, in whom the trade has ample confidence.

To provide for the salary of George Roy as chief inspector of raw hides.....	\$1,500
--	---------

Mr. QUINN. I would like to ask the Minister about the dismissal of Mr. Mooney, who was hide inspector in Montreal. I understand that Mr. Mooney was dismissed on the alleged ground that he was not qualified for the position.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Mooney and another gentleman whose name I forget were in partnership for the inspection of hides, and sometime last September, the tanners and leather merchants complained of their inspection and asked for their removal. They were not officers of the department, but paid by fees, the inspection being voluntary. I refused to entertain a complaint against them until I got a petition signed by the leather trade and that petition was sent me and upon that I acted.

Mr. QUINN. Would the Minister be good enough to let me see the petition he refers to?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Certainly, I will be glad to show it to the hon. gentleman any time that he calls, but I have not it with me now.

To pay expenses of commission appointed to inquire into the Algoma election.... \$547 30

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I brought down the report which the hon. gentleman asked for the other day.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that in the few minutes which I have had to look over the report, it has been impossible to get any intelligent view of it, and, therefore, I will not try to make any criticism of the vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has to be paid, and if there is any fault to be found with it, it can be criticised afterwards.

Post Office Department—To provide for arrears of salary, from 1st January to 30th June, 1897, due B. M. Armstrong, being the difference between the pay received by him as a first class clerk in the Toronto post office, and his salary as controller of the railway mail service..... \$500

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go any further with the Estimates of the hon. Postmaster General, I want to remind him of a return which I asked for early in the session, I think on the 3rd of May, giving the correspondence with reference to the appointment of Mr. King to the postmastership of Marsh Hill, and the change from Mr. King to the next postmaster. My hon. friend knows that before I asked for the return, I tried in a great many different ways to get the information, and my hon. friend blocked me, at one time particularly, by pointing out that I had one "G" in the wrong place, although he must have known quite well

the person to whom I alluded, and the information I was after. I would like to hear from my hon. friend what reason he has to give for not bringing down the return in answer to the order of the House—a return which it would not take his officers twenty-five minutes to prepare.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). When the hon. gentleman called my attention to some returns a little while ago, I at once asked the secretary to have them prepared. Shortly afterwards he handed them all to me, except this one regarding Mr. King, which he told me was not forthcoming owing to the papers having been mislaid. I thought they might be in the hands of the Deputy Postmaster General, who has been away about six weeks, and who has been back only two days. I assure the hon. gentleman that the delay has been quite unintentional and departmental. If the hon. gentleman will not cause that to be an obstacle at this moment, I will do all I can to procure the return. I have not the custody of the papers, and know nothing about them. Orders have been given to produce them.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to be too insistent, but when an order of the House has been given for a return, and it is very easy to comply with it, it should be complied with.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing intentional in the delay.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I asked for a return giving the names of the postmasters and other persons in the employ of the Government in the counties of King's and York, N.B., who have been dismissed since July, 1896, and all the correspondence connected therewith. The Government have brought down a return of the postmasters dismissed, but no one else, though I know that lighthouse keepers and other officials have been dismissed in both of those counties. Then, I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General to this correspondence, which is incomplete. While it contains the letters of the member for King's (Mr. Donville), and some of the letters of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) with reference to York county, the correspondence of the department is almost entirely omitted. Reference is made to it, but the letters themselves are not here; and what I particularly wanted to find out, the position of the Postmaster General and of the Government in the matter of dismissals, as disclosed in the correspondence, is not before me in this return at all. I find that the present member for King's has begun a systematic crusade against the postmasters in the county of King's. He has on his own responsibility, as a member of Parliament, demanded their dismissal, and if his demand has not been immediately complied with, he has reiterated it. He has made very seri-

ous charges against some of these gentlemen, but in no one case has an investigation been ordered or have these gentlemen been given an opportunity for stating their side of the case at all. This is a matter of some moment, so far as the character of these gentlemen is concerned. I suppose a member of Parliament considers his character and reputation somewhat dear to him, and if a member on either side of this House rises and asperses the character of another member, he is quickly brought to book, and, if his aspersion is a wrong one, he is made to apologize. This is done because hon. gentlemen prize their reputation, and do not want it aspersed without good and sufficient reason. Now, the reputation of a gentleman living in a county and conducting one of Her Majesty's post offices is just as dear to him as the reputation of a member of Parliament on either side of this House, and it ought not to be aspersed with impunity any more than the reputation of a member of this House. I find that the hon. member for King's has not contented himself with simply asking for the dismissal of postmasters in that county, but he has made the gravest charges against them in some cases, and there has never been a single opportunity allowed to these gentlemen, so far as I can gather from the correspondence, to meet those charges, and they have become patent and public. While not saying anything with reference to the value of his assertions, I say that they are no more to be accepted than the assertions of any honest man in the county of King's or York. When a gentleman, even though he occupies the exalted position of member of Parliament, goes so far as to ask for the dismissal of a man who is respected in his locality, who is an honourable right-thinking man, and asperses his character, it becomes a grave matter indeed. And it is not fair for any member of a Government to libel that man's character by accepting the aspersion, and in consequence recommending his dismissal. I do not know that we can play with men's characters in this House with impunity, because we happen to be members of Parliament and Ministers of the Government. I do not think that we have any moral or social right to do it, I do not think the accident of having an office gives us in any way the right to be anything else than careful of the reputation of men who are our equals as citizens even though they do not occupy the positions some of us do.

Take, for instance, the case of Mr. Fowler, a gentleman whom I have known from his youth up, a gentleman of undoubted character; I find that a demand was made for his dismissal from the post office at Belle Isle Creek, and that the post office be handed over to Mr. Wm. H. Henderson. The first demand is as follows:—

I am informed that Mr. Fowler, the present incumbent, is making arrangements to dispose of  
159½

his store, and I see no reason why his successor should not have the office. In addition to this, Mr. Fowler was a most active partisan, and I am not satisfied at the way the mail matter was handled on many occasions in my county. If you desire any further information, I shall be pleased to give it. If this can be done without delay, I shall be very much pleased.

What is the imputation there? First, that Mr. Fowler is an active partisan, and then that he was derelict in his duty because he did not handle the mail properly. When a charge like that was made, was it not the duty of the Postmaster General, before dismissing him, to have, at least, asked the inspector to look into the matter? No such action was taken, but the Postmaster General was a little dilatory in attending to the peremptory demand of the hon. member for King's, and shortly afterwards the demand came again, but the letter reads somewhat differently. Evidently something has transpired which led the hon. member to think he had not made a sufficiently grave charge, and that the Postmaster General was not disposed to dismiss the man:

Some time ago, I wrote you with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Fowler, postmaster at Belle Isle Creek, and have yet received no reply. Fowler has been a worker against us of the very worst type.

There are some pretty bad types that work for politicians. The hon. Minister of Public Works has had some experience, and I dare say he knows some pretty bad types of political workers on one side or the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
On the other, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that. Here is a charge made by the hon. member for King's, that Mr. Fowler is a worker of the very worst type. No political heeler who has followed my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works through his devious political windings, in and out and out and in, is as bad as Fowler was. The man's character is aspersed. Then the writer proceeds:

He stood at the polls against me on election day, and to my knowledge paid out money in bribes to defeat me.

There is a man who is charged with bribery, with political corruption, with having violated the laws of the land, with being the worst type of a political worker, and with handling the mail matter in a manner which was not honest and right. Did the Postmaster General, when this man's character was aspersed in that way, take the least trouble to find out whether an honest man had been lied about, or did he simply dismiss him and leave him to bear the onus of these charges? That is only one case and there are others, more or less bad. There are fifteen cases of dismissals of postmasters. One of them

was the dismissal of a postmistress at Collina in the county of King's. The first letter is dated the 22nd September, and is as follows:—

I would be much obliged if you would remove the present incumbent of the post office at Collina and appoint Mr. Chamberlain in her place. I have no hesitation in recommending this. And all our friends there think it to the advantage of the public it should be done. The present post office has been used as a political centre, and the people are not satisfied about the mail they receive. It is stated that newspapers and other matters have been suppressed, and I do not think there can be any doubt in proving this. It will be very satisfactory if you can carry this matter out for me, if you have time.

The hon. member for King's thinks it is of no consequence at all to asperse a man's character, and evidently thinks it is no less a light matter to asperse the character of a postmistress. In the first place, he asks for her dismissal, and then he says that there has been tampering with the mails. Now, it so happens that the statement he made that this postmistress was just about leaving the locality is hardly borne out by the facts. The first letter was written on the 22nd of September.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who signed it?

Mr. FOSTER. James Domville.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was in King's.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been trying to impress on my hon. friend's upper story that it was in King's.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The people were too good for you there. It is valiant on the hon. gentleman's part to attack the member for King's when he is in England serving the Queen.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not attacking him, but the Postmaster General, and if in order to attack the Postmaster General I have to read the correspondence of the hon. member for King's, which has been put before the House, I am not attacking him behind his back. The letter written on the 22nd September did not bring about the desired results, and on the 28th October, Mr. Domville wrote:

I wrote you, some time ago, with regard to the post office at Collina, and have not yet received any reply. Mrs. Folkins is going to leave any time, and I should like to get the post office transferred before she does. The post office has always been a political centre against us, and in the past the delivery of some of the papers and letters has been anything but satisfactory.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The delivery apparently was tardy.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, who is a doctor, speaks from experience. So that the second letter gives as a reason why her services should be dispensed with that she was going to leave the place, and it was necessary to transfer the office before she

Mr. FOSTER.

left. But what kind of leave was she taking? She had been there as postmistress, she had asked for leave of absence from the inspector and she got it, she had the assent of her security, the guarantee company, to keep the guarantee good for the person who was to take her place during her three months' leave of absence. That was the leaving she was going to do; but it was represented to the Postmaster General as a reason for taking the office from her that she was going to leave the place and he wanted the office transferred before she left. Here is an application for the leave, and here is the granting of the leave by Mr. King, and here is the transfer of the security by the London Guarantee and Accident Company, Limited. Well, Sir, these are two samples. I am not going to take up the time of the House reading more. Now, I simply put the fair, honest question to gentlemen here who do not want to hurt people's reputation, who want to see justice done—has justice been done by taking an ex parte statement of the member for King's and dismissing people, honourable people, good people, whom I personally know and vouch for on the ipse dixit of that member, and not even allowing them the chance to answer the charge, which is a weighty and serious and grievous charge, if it can be established? Is that fair and honest treatment? Does not partisanship go too far when it goes so far as that? And what becomes of that guarantee which was given to us by the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that no dismissal should take place of any man against whom a charge was made without his being given an opportunity to rebut that charge. That promise was made in this House, made solemnly; it is recorded in "Hansard" over and over again.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) think that that is not so?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that it was said over and over again.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, over and over again. If my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) wants to hear it once more, I shall be glad to give it to him again.

Mr. RUSSELL. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) mean by "over and over again?"

Mr. FOSTER. That must mean that it was repeated two or three times at least. But suppose, for argument sake, that it was said but once. How often must the leader of a Government and of a party solemnly state his position and give his pledge in order to make it binding? This is what he said, according to "Hansard" of 1897, page 62:

We announced on the floor of Parliament last session that no member of the civil service, whether of the inside or outside service, would be dismissed, except for cause. We declared that every man against whom a charge was brought, would have an opportunity of defending himself before a court of inquiry.

That seems inclusive, quite inclusive enough to suit my purpose. Honourable men and women, just as honourable as any who sit in these seats, have been used in the way I have pointed out and their characters taken from them so far as it is possible for their characters to be taken from them in that way, and they have been dismissed from office. Now, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to a case in the county of King's, to the dismissal of the lighthouse keeper at Oak Point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What was the name?

Mr. FOSTER. Pickett. The young gentleman who was appointed to this position is the son of the Episcopalian clergyman at Oak Point. His family is of the best and most respectable, they are just as good as we are—any of us—their word I would take as quickly as I would that of a member of Parliament, and so, I think, would anybody who knows them. That young man received his dismissal. I asked whether there was an investigation and why the dismissal was made, and the answer given me—I have not it at hand, but the hon. Minister will remember it—was that no investigation had been held, but that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had declared that this gentleman had been guilty of offensively partisan conduct and that was sufficient. I have a letter from the gentleman in which he denies in toto that he was guilty of offensive partisanship in any way, and he asks the simple question: Why am I to be thrown from my position and be degraded in the opinion of my neighbours on a charge which I have had no opportunity of answering? Mr. MacAlpine perambulated that county and held investigations. He was asked to hear the case of this gentleman, but the answer was that the department had adjudicated upon that. And the answer in this House was that an investigation had not been considered necessary because, forsooth, the member for King's had said that this young man must go on the ground of offensive partisanship and the Minister had taken that as sufficient. But right beside this young man, there are those against whom the same charge was made, and they are tried, and, in some cases, if I am not wrongly informed, the report was that they were not guilty. But my young friend is turned out of his position without notice and without trial, while his neighbour is given a trial, and if it is proven that he has not

been guilty of offensive partisanship, perhaps, will be retained. Where is the equal justice in that? Where is the justice, any-way, of throwing a man out on a charge simply made by a member of Parliament of offensive partisanship, without giving him a chance before your own appointed commissioner, such as he is, to prove the truth of the charge. I do not want to carry this matter further. Some people will say that it is pea-nut politics talking about dismissal. But I hold that the element of truth and justice cannot be eliminated from the public life of Canada without detriment to all our interests, and I hold that a private citizen's character and honour are just as dear to him and as little to be trifled with as the honour of a member of Parliament. The difference in position makes no difference in principle; and what I do feel is that though we may be in a position which gives the power of life or death over these people, we ought yet to be just and merciful—and, above all things, to be just. But somebody may rise and say: You dismissed an officer at some time. That may be true, but does it alter the principle? I leave this matter before the House, and I say that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) as between man and man, has not acted rightly. I do not wish to make imputations against a member of Parliament, but I state here in my position as a member of the House, that I would take the word of any of these I have referred to, as readily as I would the word of the member for King's. The fact that we may write "M.P." after our names does not make our word a bit better than if we had not that privilege.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). When the matter of dismissals was brought up, I stated, speaking for myself and myself alone, that unless I was overruled by my colleagues, in cases where a member of Parliament wrote to me and, over his own signature, stated deliberately, that he took the responsibility of saying that a certain public official in my department had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship, to his own knowledge—

Mr. MILLS. How about an unsuccessful candidate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope the hon. member (Mr. Mills) will allow me to proceed—if a member tells me this of his own knowledge, I thought that would justify me in acting without the expense of an investigation. I think so still. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that a member of Parliament's word is to be trifled with by a Minister. I think that if a member of Parliament, representing a county, having a personal knowledge of the official in the county

that I cannot possibly have, comes to me and states: Your lighthouse keeper stood on the platform beside me, and abused me and abused your leader—I cannot tell him I will not take his word.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he say that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have forgotten the exact statement in this case, but it was to the effect that this man had been to his personal knowledge an active and offensive organizer and politician at the last election against him. I accept that statement. I would do it again. I thought I was acting on the lines laid down clearly in this House before. The hon. gentleman mentioned to me a large number of other names that he wished dismissed, and he said they were active politicians. I said: Are you prepared to place your signature to a paper that you know that of your own personal knowledge? Are you prepared to take the responsibility in the House, if it is challenged of proving the statement in your place in Parliament? He was not. In those cases I would not accept his statement, and I required an investigation. But I think the hon. gentleman will see that it would never do for a Minister to tell a member of Parliament who says deliberately: Of my own knowledge I know such and such to be the case, and I pledge my honour to you as a member of Parliament that I am prepared to defend this in the House—it would never do for a Minister to ignore that statement. To say that you won't receive it unless you send a commissioner down to investigate, would be to sever the relations which should exist between a Minister of the Crown and the members who are supporting him in this House, or who are opposed to him. I think my hon. friend will see that I was fully justified, and that the action I took was not inconsistent with the statement made by the Premier last year. The Premier stated that whenever there was a charge made against a man he should have an investigation. He did not refer to a case where a member of Parliament made a statement on his own personal knowledge and there is no necessity in such case for an investigation unless you are prepared to state that you won't accept the pledged word of a member of Parliament given over his own signature that the thing has occurred to his own personal knowledge. I may be right or I may be wrong, but that is the stand that I have taken all through.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister accept the statement of a member of Parliament on this side of the House as well as the statement of a member on that side?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not going to deal with hypothetical cases, I deal with actual cases. The hon. gentleman does not ask me to ac-

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

cept his statement, yet, when he does, I will be prepared to deal with it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has laid down this proposition, that when a member of Parliament makes a statement before him that a man has been guilty of partisanship, he will accept his statement. Now, I ask the hon. Minister if he will accept the statement of members on this side of the House to the same effect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman's case is unique. I am not so sure whether he is a supporter of this side or not.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not asking this in view of my own case, I am asking about the general proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that a more immoral proposition than that laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, could not possibly be uttered. The hon. gentleman is not to see that even-handed justice is carried out, he is not to see that every one accused has opportunity to defend his character, his honour and his place. He has only to see what is the statement that his supporter makes to him, he has not to go beyond that at all. And what is that statement made by a supporter? Simply a charge. And how far has he a right to go? Let him say this to his supporter: You state that this gentleman who holds that office has been guilty of offensive partisanship? Yes. Then, I will have an investigation at once, and if he is guilty, he shall not keep that office. Is there anything fairer than that? Surely my hon. friend cannot say that a member of Parliament, because he happens to support him, shall be not only the prosecutor but the judge. But that is what he makes him. The member for King's comes and says, This man did so and so; dismiss him. The Minister does not look into it. Now it is sufficient reason, if any member of Parliament says it, to have an investigation, and that is fair treatment, fit for any member of Parliament. If I say to my hon. friend, Such and such a person has been guilty of bad conduct in this office, and I give you that information, you have a right to make that the basis of an investigation, and I do not think you could refuse it. If a man on this side does that, you have just the same right to do it, and no more. But what right can there be in your making a man who prefers the charge, who is interested in getting the person removed, because he has some person else that he wants to put in, and who is consequently an interested prosecutor—making him at once the judge and the executioner? But you sit there in your office pretending to carry out justice in high places and you simply register the prosecutor's charge and carry out his judgment. Now, that is not justice, and there is no fair-minded man in this country, I do not care where such a case

happens, that will call it justice. I was a member of Parliament before I was a Minister, and I have had pressure brought upon me to have officers discharged. Men have come to me and said, Such and such is the case, can you change that officer? My answer invariably was: If you can give reasons I will have an investigation made, and that was carried out if the reasons were sufficient. That is the best I ever got, and that is the best I ever should get, or any other member of Parliament. Outside of that, how far are we going? Members of Parliament are peccable and fallible, just as men outside of Parliament, and members on the Government side are not a whit less so than members on the Opposition side. But does not my hon. friend see that the man who sits in high places should do justice, and that there is no justice in this country on an ex-parte statement? The execution of a man because somebody is interested in his removal and declares that he has been malfeasant in office and consequently ought to go—that is outside the deeper question as to the interest and property that every man has in his own reputation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend's statement did not go that length, to suppose malfeasance in office; it was with respect to a very particular class of offences, and with respect to those only, that my hon. friend declared that he thought it his duty to take the formal statement of a member of Parliament; it was with respect to a class of cases in which men are removed very often on the score of active partisanship, it was with respect to those alone. And be it understood that it is with respect to those alone that my hon. friend intended that rule should apply.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad of my hon. friend's help; he has helped me particularly with the Postmaster General. Now, with the Postmaster General's cases, there was not simply the charge of political partisanship, there was the charge of malfeasance in office in both cases that he cited. Now, I agree with the leader of the Government on that point, there is a distinction. I have his help on that point; but where it is a charge of malfeasance in office which blackens a man's character, that man has an indefeasible right to his own reputation, and he ought not to be robbed of it unless he has a chance to defend it and to obtain a court of inquiry. But in reference to the act of political partisanship, a man's right to his office is just as strong if he has not been a political partisan, because, under the theoretical principle laid down last year you are bound not to disturb the man in office who has not been guilty of political partisanship. So his title to his office stands on just as good ground, and he ought not to be deprived of it on the testimony of hon. gentlemen opposite unless he has been guilty

of active political partisanship of an offensive kind, I suppose. Therefore, injustice is done even in the case I mention. Now, I put this question to my hon. friend: Suppose there is a statement by this man that he was not guilty of offensive partisanship, and he asks for a court of inquiry, will my hon. friend grant it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If statements came to me that I had been misled in any matter of the kind, I would have an inquiry. It is not the first time I have done it.

Mr. FOSTER. And if the inquiry proved to your satisfaction that he had not been guilty of offensive partisanship, would you restore him to his position after you found that he had been wrongly dismissed? The hon. gentleman is inevitably driven to that conclusion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to inquire of the ex-Minister of Finance whether the principle which he has laid down was ever put into practice during the time that his Government was in office. Where has there ever been a case in which a man has been suspended from office for offensive partisanship where he has been accorded a trial and dismissed on the basis of that trial? The hon. gentleman cast a serious reflection upon the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) in the remarks which he addressed to the committee. He was rather severe upon him because he knows that it was clearly proven that the leader of the Opposition after dismissing a man from the Intercolonial made no reply for six months to the question of the dismissed employee as to why his services had been dispensed with. It took him almost a year to explain to the young man's father that he had been dismissed for offensive partisanship. Was there any trial in that case or any investigation? The action was taken on ipsi dixit of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. One case in eighteen years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now that the ex-Minister of Finance has laid down the rule that should be followed will he get up and give us a single case in which that rule was followed while his party was in office?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) need not think that he is going to get his friends out of this thing by a statement of that kind. Every member on that side of the House; no, I will qualify that because some are too honourable to engage in that sort of thing, but there are members on that side of the House who go into this thing in a systematic way. By the list which I have read, and which shows what has been done in the short space of a few months in the county of King's, you will see that they have gone to work to rout out every postmaster in that county who is a friend of mine or the Liberal-Conservative party.

Take the ten years I have been in Parliament and go through the records with the Postmaster General, who has a great facility for hunting out records, sometimes private records, you can go and nose around with him into all the private and public records of the department and in ten years you cannot find more than two or three instances of officials who have been dismissed in the whole county of King's.

Mr. TALBOT. They were all your friends.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), who sits on a front seat and ejaculates so often, does not understand anything about that. We had in the town of Sussex in my county an officer about whom such a row has been made lately, the collector of inland revenue (Mr. Scoville). He and his family were open road travelling and field travelling opponents of mine. After the election pressure was brought to have that man dismissed, but I said: If he has done his office work properly I will not ask for his dismissal. Though he and his family were always opponents of mine he remained in his office until after the election of June 23rd took place.

Mr. McMULLEN. We can all cite cases of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you cite a case in my own county the opposite of that. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) cannot do it. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has been studying Scripture, and he has read that the sins of the father are visited upon the children even unto the third and fourth generation. In York there is a father and he is a good friend of mine, and I believe he is not a good friend of the Minister of Railways and Canals. His son, who had a post office, has been dismissed because his father was a partisan. That is visiting the sins of the father upon the children.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is Scripture warrant for it unto the third and fourth generation, does it not say?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he thinks he has carried out even-handed justice in the case I have mentioned?

Mr. BERGERON. I think we are losing a great deal of time in speaking about these dismissals. We have had them under discussion for the last three months, and I think we have had enough of them. I am surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has not made up his mind before this that it is perfectly useless to talk about them. If we were to talk about them for six months we could not change the determination of the Government. They have no principle and no established system, but they

Mr. FOSTER.

have made up their minds that whenever their supporters want positions they must find a hole for them. There may be one excuse for this. If there is one thing more than another that is the curse of this country it is patronage. People are given too much to the idea that they must have positions in the Government employ. I have known well-to-do farmers who left their farms to get Government positions so as to receive ready money at the end of the month. I repeat that this is one of the curses of our country. I can quite understand that hon. gentlemen, having been in Opposition for eighteen years and at last getting into power, their friends are eager to secure positions occupied by Conservatives, and that they are pressing them for these places. A man wants to get a position and he must have it. He goes to the member for his county or to one of the Ministers, and says: "I must have that place." That is all the principle there is about it, and if we talked here for a whole year we would not change it. It is apparent that the spoils system has been introduced for the benefit of the party in power, and we cannot change it no matter how much we desire to do it. It will be left to the people to say what they think of it at their first opportunity.

Mr. MILLS. Just here I wish to refer to a case in Annapolis county which comes in very nicely with what has been said by the last speaker. He said that whenever a Liberal desires a position, he goes to the unsuccessful candidate or to the Liberal representative and he gets a position if he has been an active partisan. I will refer you to the case of Daniel J. Riordan, in Annapolis county.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) if this case comes under the item we are discussing now?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; it is all right, I know what I am talking about. Riordan was a man who in 1891, forged the names of three young men, who were not of age, to declarations. He not only forged their names, but he also forged the name of a magistrate, and acting as the agent of the then Attorney General and the present Attorney General of Nova Scotia, placed these declarations before Judge Savary, the revising barrister. The declarations were forged, the magistrate's name was forged, the names of the men whom it was sought to have placed on the list were forged, and the subject matter of the declarations constituted perjury because the men were not of age.

Mr. LISTER. Did you prosecute him?

Mr. MILLS. He was prosecuted. Three declarations were put in. I was present before Judge Savary's court myself and examined this man upon the stand. I forced

him to admit upon cross-examination that he signed the names of the magistrate and of the parties sought to be placed on the list. This man was indicted and brought before the grand jury. I am very sorry to say it now for the man is dead, but the tool of the Attorney General, the sheriff of the county so manipulated the grand jury at the time, that the grand jury brought in "no bill"; giving it as an excuse—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. Just wait; do not laugh yet, you will hear enough of it—giving it as an excuse, that it was done as a political matter, and that such things when done in the way of politics should be excused.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Were the grand jury all of one politics?

Mr. MILLS. The matter is not ended yet. At all events, all of these affidavits have been published. I had the paper containing them here, but thinking the session would end sooner, I sent it home. This man Riordan has been after the postmasters in Lower Granville, James H. Thorne and Capt. Covert. You cannot find more honest and respectable gentlemen than these two. Mr. Thorne has been the warden of the county, and is connected with the most respectable family in the maritime provinces. These two gentlemen came under the bann of this Daniel J. Riordan, and what did Daniel J. Riordan do? He said that they were partisans in the late election, and a charge was brought against them, and the charge was investigated, and a court was held. James H. Thorne was called upon and Mr. Covert was called upon by the post office inspector and the Attorney General Longley, and they found nothing against them, and the charges were dismissed. But that office must be got for Daniel J. Riordan somehow, and how was it got? The Government abolished both of the offices, and appointed Daniel J. Riordan postmaster of a new office in between. I intend to discuss that more fully, but these are the plain facts. A more disreputable piece of business never was transacted in a civilized country than that. Two honest men were turned out, and the Government put a man in office who ought to be in the penitentiary.

Mr. MACLEAN. I must take this opportunity of denouncing the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), as well as by the the Minister now leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright), and some time ago by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). They said they would dismiss a public servant on the statement of a member of this House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never made such a statement.

Mr. MACLEAN. You practically made that statement here to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I put a most important qualification, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) leaves out. I say that if I stood on the hustings and saw an official actively and offensively opposing me, it would be childish that I should hold a judicial investigation to know whether my eyesight deceived me or not. If a member comes to me and says: Of my own personal knowledge I know such and such a thing to be the case, and I am prepared to defend it in Parliament; that dispenses with the necessity for an investigation, in my opinion.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a brutal and butcherly doctrine, but it has been laid down in this House by the present Ministry before to-day. It is un-British, because the British principle is, that a man charged with an offence has a right to be heard and tried, and if guilty to be punished. The right hon. the leader of this Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laid down the principle last session: that every man against whom a charge is brought would have an opportunity of defending himself before a court of inquiry. But, these hon. gentlemen opposite have abandoned that doctrine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Railways has abandoned that doctrine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. These gentlemen have repudiated the policy of their leader in his absence, and they have set up the spoils system in this country as it has been practiced in the United States. I expected better than that from gentlemen now on the Treasury benches. I expected that they would have lived up to the principles which they professed in Opposition. I am disappointed in their conduct, and I am more than disappointed at the manner in which they have abandoned the policy announced by their leader.

Mr. HAGGART. If there can be a worse doctrine than that laid down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways, according to the statement of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost). The Minister of Railways does not want any member to make a charge against an official, because according to the statement of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost) in this House, he was furnished with a list of all the employees on the canal, and told that it was his option to have them discharged or to leave them on as he thought proper. That statement of the hon. member (Mr. Frost) is published

in "Hansard," and the hon. gentleman, in reply to that letter from the Minister of Railways, said: I did not exercise the right that was given me by the Minister of Railways, but I recommended that they should all be retained in their positions. The Minister of Railways did not even want a charge laid against any of these men, for he was prepared to dismiss them without any charge at all. Two keepers of bridges have been discharged in my county, and two others put in their places, and I venture to say that the Minister of Railways has not a single charge from any member of Parliament, or from any other person in the constituency against the men whom he dismissed. If he wants to know the names I can give them to him.

Mr. FROST. I had nothing to do with those in South Lanark.

Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking of those in Leeds, and you had the option to discharge every one of them without making a charge.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I agree with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that more time is taken up with this question than it deserves.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not say that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) lays down the principle that the Government should not respect the advice of a member of Parliament in these matters. I know a gentleman who will go further than the hon. member for York. I refer to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the late Premier of this Dominion, and I believe that he will not even take the word of an ex-Cabinet Minister. His colleagues came with him to this House over a year ago, bound by oath to stand together—

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, you interrupted me a moment ago when I was speaking, and I now ask you what this has to do with the item under discussion?

Mr. LANDERKIN. This has reference to dismissed officials. These men were sworn to stand together—

Mr. MILLS. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the same rule of order which you apply to me should also apply to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am sorry to say that immediately I brought the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he was out of order. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) brought up the question of dismissals in the Railway Department. It would be much better for the despatch of business if hon. gentlemen would confine themselves to the item under discussion, which is to provide for the arrears of salary from 1st of January to 30th June, 1897, due B. M. Armstrong.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will deal with the dismissals that took place on the other side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is a very disagreeable question to you.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A meeting was held in Toronto by these gentlemen opposite, and they dismissed their leader, Sir Charles Tupper, and he got no trial or no inquiry. There was no court, and another was named as his successor. Did they give their leader a trial? No. These are the gentlemen that are now claiming to mete out fair-play to the people, but why did they not mete out fair play to their Premier? They dismissed not only officials, but members of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, you do not like to hear this. Why do you not like to hear your record? You are willing to discuss the record of the Government here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Address the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Talk about morality. Talk about the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) lecturing us upon political morality—the man who came to the House and declared that his leader was an imbecile, but who ten days afterwards crept into the arms of that imbecile. He to lecture us on political morality—it would require a man with a prodigious cheek to do it.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure that if I got off that rot, you would call me to order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There has been no investigation into the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper by his friends, when they met in Toronto the other day and shipped him. Did they try Sir Mackenzie Bowell when they shipped him? Did they try the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) when they kicked him out? Did they try Mr. Ouimet when they kicked him out? Did they try Mr. Daly, the late Minister of the Interior, when they kicked him out? He belongs to the department of the exterior just now. They get up and talk about an official whose salary was perhaps \$100 a year, and here are officials whose salaries were about \$7,000 a year—

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I knew I would bring you to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry to deprive the hon. gentleman of so pleasant and congenial a task, but I would not like to have a sudden death from apoplexy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the subject, and I would like to have the decision of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very willing to render a decision, that this discussion which has been going on for the last few minutes is absolutely out of order. If I understand the rules which should govern us in the discussion of the Estimates, we should confine ourselves entirely to the item under discussion. The item under discussion is concerning Mr. Armstrong, and I consider that the hon. gentleman who has just raised the point of order was himself out of order when he began the discussion. At the same time, I think it has gone far enough, and we should now come to business.

Mr. LANDERKIN: All I have to say, in conclusion, is that I regret that the hon. member for York will not take the word of his supporters on the other side of the House. I quite agree that the Government are justified in taking the word of their supporters, and the followers of the hon. member for York will appreciate him when he will not take the word of a single one of his supporters.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries laid down this afternoon a doctrine which I will not invoke.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling was that this discussion was out of order.

Mr. BENNETT. What I wanted to say does not refer to post offices, but if I had not been interrupted by the Chairman, I would have finished before this.

Mr. MACLEAN. Who is now acting chief clerk in the Toronto Post Office instead of Mr. Armstrong?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When Mr. Armstrong was removed to Ottawa, no new appointment was made in the Toronto Post Office, but the duties were re-arranged. I would not venture to say exactly how, but I know that the deputy postmaster took some increased duties, and I think the postmaster himself did the same.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will there not be a chief clerk, then?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will be no appointment in place of Mr. Armstrong.

Post Office Department—Amount required to enable certain increases of salary payable under the Civil Service Act, and accruing on 1st January and 1st April, 1897, which were temporarily suspended, to be continued during the year ending 30th June, 1898..... \$1,397 50

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read the explanation furnished by the secre-

tary. The statutory increases occurring on the 1st of January and the 1st of April having been withheld, no account was taken of them in framing the Estimates for 1898. As similar increases have been granted in other departments, and as in many cases such increases seem to be deserved, the sum of \$1,397.50 is required in order to enable the salaries to be carried on during the ensuing year at the advanced figures.

Mr. FOSTER. I have had something to do with estimates for some time, but I never before saw an estimate of this kind offered to the House. Whenever the Minister has a clerk who he thinks should have a special increase, he takes a special vote for that increase. But here is the Postmaster General asking for a lump sum in order that he may increase the salaries of certain clerks as he chooses. We ought not to grant that. If the hon. gentleman wishes to increase the salaries of any of his clerks above what is allowed to them, let him bring down estimates for the different amounts, and state what clerks he proposes to advance, and how much he proposes to advance them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course, the hon. gentleman understands that none of these increases will be beyond the amount allowed by the statute. The increases have not been made yet, and I have not had time to consider the merits of the various clerks; but I intend, as soon as the House prorogues, to go through the department with a view of dealing with each case. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I could bring on concurrence a list of the clerks to whom it will apply.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the hon. Postmaster General brought down his bill, I called the attention of the House to what appeared to be his policy in that matter as it is in this. In his bill he desired to grant contracts without tender, and to act upon his own responsibility.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg pardon.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the present instance the hon. gentleman, different from any of his predecessors, and different from any precedent known to this Parliament, wishes to get a lump sum of money, and to distribute the increases according to his will, and not according to the rules which have been invariably followed up to the present time. I think this is most objectionable, and there is no department in the whole service in which an excess of that kind could be more disastrous than in the Post Office Department, as the clerks in it are very numerous, almost an army being distributed all over the Dominion. I am not imputing any motive to the hon. gentleman. I am discussing this purely as a departmental measure, which is to my mind very objectionable, and should not be tolerated in this Parliament.

**Mr. SPROULE.** It seems to me that we are drifting to a very bad principle. In the early part of the session, the Postmaster General spoke to this effect: We have suspended the law which provides for statutory increases and reserve the right to consider each individual case on its merits, and as we find increases are earned, we will bring down Estimates giving the names of the parties to whom the increases are given and whatever other information is required from the House. But here we have this item submitted to us:

Amount required to enable certain increases of salary payable under the Civil Service Act, and accruing on 1st January and 1st April, 1897, which were temporarily suspended, to be continued during the year ending 30th June, 1898..... \$1,397 50

We did not hear anything about increases being temporarily suspended, but understood that they were permanently suspended and that the Ministers reserved the right to themselves to give increases only to those who were recommended by the heads of departments as entitled to it. We are not told to whom these increases are to be given, nor to how many. The amount may be divided between two or among three or four. We should have all this information before passing the item.

**Mr. FOSTER.** If the hon. gentleman wishes to make the increases, he need not change the amount, but might bring down a list of the names and the amount opposite each, and then the item would be regular.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not wish to exceed, in any case, the limit which the law imposes, but I want to have time to properly consider each case, and would not like to be compelled to make the increases in all the cases. If it would meet the case, I would be happy, at a later stage, to make a list of any increases that may be made, but I only ask not to be compelled to make the increases until I have considered each individual case.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It would no doubt be a convenience to the hon. gentleman to allow him time to make up his mind, but he should have done this before submitting the Estimates. We ought not to go outside the established rule. The hon. gentleman should let this stand until to-morrow in order to settle on the names.

It being Six o'clock, the committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

**DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.**

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). By Sir **ADOLPHE CARON.**

sent and your good-will, Mr. Chairman, I will just reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition on the point he was inquiring about. As I understood him, he desired to know why we had brought down an Estimate for the purpose of paying rent to the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway during a few months of the coming financial year. I would simply say this: We are of the opinion that, under the circumstances, it is very desirable that the experiment should be tried, at any rate for a few months, with the object of seeing what the result would be of extending the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal. We consider, of course, that the action taken by another body in this respect was ill-advised, but, at the same time, as it has been taken, it is proposed to proceed, not on the basis of any agreement, because, as a matter of course, that is at an end now—but we think it is desirable that the experiment should be tried. We think it important, whichever way it goes, that the House and the country should have an opportunity of judging whether we are right in our contention, in which case the objections would disappear, or whether we have been mistaken, in which event it would not be necessary for us to proceed further with the experiment. For those reasons we desire to ask the House to give us the power of carrying out for a few months the experiment of connecting the Intercolonial Railway with the city of Montreal, as originally intended.

As regards the other matters, if we make reasonable progress with the Estimates we are now engaged in, I think I shall ask the Minister of Railways, at a convenient hour this evening, to proceed with a statement as regards the subsidies to which we propose to direct the attention of the House, and we will probably, also, take a stage in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass. That, I think, will be as much as we can hope to achieve this evening.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Will the hon. gentleman oblige the committee by stating, not in minute detail, the lines of the agreement upon which the Government propose to make this experimental trial?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I may say that we are not in a position at this moment to state the terms of any agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or any other company, whose rights it will be necessary to acquire and use for the purposes of this extension. We have made no agreement, as yet, but we contemplate the extreme probability of our being able to make an agreement which will commend itself to the Government, and will enable us to acquire the use of these lines for the term we have mentioned within the sum we ask Parliament to grant for that purpose. Of course, as to the details, I could not now give the

House and the committee any information. That would be obviously impossible as, since the action was taken in another place, we have had no means of considering the subject or of entering into negotiations with a view of making even a temporary arrangement. We are firmly convinced that the policy of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal is a sound one, and we shall adhere to it. We think that it is not in the interests of the country that the Intercolonial Railway should, any longer than is absolutely necessary, be compelled to terminate at the point where it now terminates, and we shall address ourselves to the making of such an arrangement—if Parliament gives us the grant that will enable us to do so—as will give the matter of extension a fair trial. I do not wish to convey to the committee the idea that the experiment which the time at our disposal—now about nine months—will enable us to make, will cover the ground adequately, but it will give us some information, and it may possibly be that we may ask Parliament for means to continue the experiment for another year. These are matters which will come up in due season.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will see that a great many difficulties surround the arrangement, if the Government simply come down without any matured plans at all and ask for a vote of \$150,000 or \$160,000 for what, as I understand it, is altogether in the air. The old agreement has passed away, that, as I understand my hon. friend, is the position; but if the House will grant them this amount of money, they will try to make some arrangements by which they can get into Montreal. That is simply asking the House to give them a large sum of money without any conditions attached to the grant at all, without anything on which the House can base that vote. I point this out to my hon. friend. I wish to point out another matter which occurs to me. No arrangement or experiment that might be made under conditions of that kind in the short space of eight or nine months, would probably be considered satisfactory either by those who are in favour of making this arrangement, or by those who do not see the wisdom of it. These points occur to me at the moment, and I bring them to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. May I ask if any sum of money has passed to the Drummond County Railway under the proposed arrangement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. None whatever.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say that there is a limitation to the obligations which the Government would assume in connection with any arrangement we might make, and that is the

limit of the sum voted by Parliament; and hon. members will see further that the sum named corresponds with the amount which was agreed upon with the two companies as the consideration for which we should acquire the necessary facilities for extending the railway to Montreal. And, presumably, the arrangement which may be entered into temporarily may be on the lines—certainly it will not be in excess of the terms which are contained in the contract agreed upon, and which now, by reason of the action which has taken place, is at an end. I may say to the hon. gentleman further that, so far from there having been any arrangement at all between either the Grand Trunk Company and the Government, or the Drummond County Company and the Government under which they would receive any consideration from the Government, there has been an entire absence of anything of that kind. The only thing that has taken place is that we have given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company an assurance that we will ask Parliament to make to that company the usual 15 per cent grant, as hon. gentlemen have seen in the proposed resolution. We intend to ask Parliament to give them 15 per cent of the amount for the reconstruction and enlargement of the Victoria Bridge—the assistance we grant not to exceed \$300,000. I may add further that it is our purpose to ask Parliament to give the subsidy in the ordinary way to the Drummond County Railway Company in order that they may go on and complete their road. That subsidy, of course, would apply only to the mileage that remains uncompleted, that is to say, between Moose Park and Chaudière, the exact distance, I believe, being 42½ miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rate of the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is proposed under the same conditions as other railway subsidies which have been brought down.

An hon. MEMBER. That is \$6,400 a mile?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subsidy proposed is \$3,200 a mile; but under the terms of the resolution, if the Governor in Council is satisfied that the expenditure on the road, that is the bona fide reasonable outlay, exceeds \$15,000, we propose that in this case as in others, we can pay 50 per cent on the amount in excess of \$15,000 per mile, but not to exceed, on the whole, \$6,400 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is the intention of my hon. friend, I suppose, to include that on the general Supply Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether it is customary here to include the general Supply Bill—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). No.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We do not propose to take any different course in that regard from that which is customary.

Mr. **FOSTER**. All I can say is that hon. gentlemen opposite will consult their own interest, and, I am sure, the convenience of the House, if they will bring that measure down as soon as possible, with just as full explanations as they can give to the committee at that time. The Opposition will take it into their consideration with a view to doing what is best for the country. And, perhaps, I may be permitted to say that we act as a Parliament made up of two Houses, and if this House, which is a component part of Parliament, takes it into its head that a certain thing is good and pushes it, or that a certain thing is bad and vetoes it, it would ill become the other branch of Parliament to say that we acted from partisan motives. I hope that the same charitable and just judgment will be used by us toward what is an essential component part of the Parliament of this country, and that whatever is done will be considered to be done upon business principles, and not from considerations of partisan interest.

#### POST OFFICE MAIL SERVICE— CONTRACTS.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I should like to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to the case of the Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin contract for the carrying of the mail. I may say that my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) will remember that I mentioned to him that I would bring this matter before the House. I would like to know the names and amounts of the new tender for the Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin mail service. The tenders, as I understand, were received on the 11th of the present month. When I happened to occupy the position which the hon. gentleman occupies to-day, the contracts were signed with Mr. Sutton. So far as my recollection goes, speaking from memory, I understood that Mr. Sutton was the lowest tenderer, and, of course, the hon. gentleman, having the official records of the department, will be able to say whether I am correct. As I understand it, when the last by-elections took place, an hon. gentleman who does not belong to this House, but who took a strong interest in favour of the party who now sit on the right of the Speaker, insisted that this contract should be cancelled. I know not whether there were reasons why it should be cancelled, but I understand that the contract was cancelled. Judging from the information which was sent to me from the constituency, a very strong memorial was sign-

Mr. **BLAIR**.

ed addressed, I believe, to the Postmaster General by the wardens of the different municipalities, asking that Mr. Sutton should be allowed to continue to hold the contract until the time expired. This memorial was signed by the wardens of Gaspé, Newport, Pabos, Grand River, Cape Cove, Douglastown, York, and most of the merchants. The large fishing houses, as I understand, and the most prominent merchants in the locality also joined in signing the memorial I have just referred to, asking that Mr. Sutton should be allowed to keep the contract until the term expired. I also believe, from the information that I have received, that the post office inspector, Mr. Bolduc, would certify that Mr. Sutton was carrying out the work to the satisfaction of the department. Of course, I need not say that Mr. Sutton was at the time that he entered into this contract, and still is, a Conservative. I do not understand that there is any charge made against him for political partisanship in the last elections, which took place, but I know, as a matter of fact that Mr. Sutton is a strong Conservative. But, unless there are very strong reasons brought forward by the department to show that this contract should be cancelled, and although he did not take any prominent part in election matters, I think it would be hardly reasonable to suppose that the mere fact of his disagreeing with the political view of hon. gentlemen opposite, would be a reason why the contract should be broken. As I have already stated, I notified the hon. Postmaster General that when his Estimates came up I would take occasion to question him upon this point, as I will have an opportunity of questioning him about another case. But when the matter first came up on the ordinary Estimates, the hon. gentleman was away, and I did not like to bring it up until he was present, but I told one of his colleagues that I intended to bring it up. Now, I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman the names of the tenderers with the amounts, the amounts of the tenders accepted; and also whether it is not a fact that under the old contract which was signed when I was Postmaster General, Mr. Sutton was the lowest tenderer.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I thank the hon. gentleman for having, in advance, informed me of his intention to make these inquiries, and I have no fault whatever to find with anything which he has said. The old contractor was Mr. Sutton, the contract was awarded to him in 1895, he at that time being the lowest tenderer. The contract was for a service of 103 miles in length. It was represented to me by the late Mr. Fauvel, the then member for the county, and also by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) in this House to-day, that the service could be better performed and at a less rate if it were divided into sections. Accordingly, it was divided into three sep-

arate sections, one section from Gaspé Basin to Perce, a distance of 39 miles; another from Newport Point to Paspébiac, a distance of 34 miles; and the third section from Newport Bridge to Perce, a distance of 30 miles. The hon. gentleman is correct in stating that the date for receiving the tenders was the 11th of June. I have been furnished by the department with the names and the amounts of the various persons who have tendered, and the contracts have been awarded in each case to the lowest tenderer. But, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is always an interval between the sending off of tenders to the inspector to complete the contracts, and the contracts being completed. That is the state of affairs at this moment. The 11th of June has just gone by, the papers have been put in the hands of the inspector of the district, Mr. Bolduc, and, up to this moment, they are not completed, the usual delay of carrying out contracts at a remote point like that must take place. Under the circumstances, I am sure that the hon. gentleman will not ask me at this date to give publicity to the names and the amounts of the tenders, because it is quite at variance with sound practice under similar circumstances, either in public or in private tenders, to give the names of the tenderers and their amounts until a firm contract is made; to do otherwise might prejudice the public service. Men may withdraw, schemes and complaints, and demands may be made, so that the lowest tenderer may, perhaps, drop out, and finally we may find ourselves with higher tenderers to deal with. Therefore, it is only in the public interest that I am obliged to refuse the hon. gentleman; I am sure he won't press me for that information in detail. I may say, however, that for the three sections there was substantial tendering. For the first section I named, there were seven tenderers; for the second section, fifteen tenderers; for the third section, nine tenderers; and in each case the contract has been awarded to the lowest tenderer. I have information showing the price at which the contract has been performed by Mr. Sutton. I think I can without prejudice to the public interest say that the total amounts of the three lowest tenders that we are now dealing with and expect to carry into effect, as furnished to me by the department, aggregate the sum of \$3,320. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) here is turning up the amount of the original contract and he will see how that compares with original contract price.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not altogether agree with the view which the Postmaster General takes about the letting of public contracts. I believe that the Government, like an individual, ought to keep faith with a contractor who enters into a contract with the Government or with an individual. The Postmaster General has

just admitted that Mr. Sutton was the lowest tenderer. Would it be right for the Government, before the termination of that contract, to say, "We are going to break through the contract; we are going to invite new tenders. We are going to throw you overboard before the term of your contract expires, and we are going to let other people take this contract." The hon. gentleman has just stated that the new contracts were let to the lowest tenderers. If they have been let to the lowest tenderers, there is no possible reason, public or private, why the hon. gentleman should not give the names of the new contractors as well as the prices at which these contracts were granted. I call the special attention of the Minister to the fact that the leading commercial houses and the wardens and mayors of the various municipalities, outside of any political influence whatever signed a strong memorial to the Minister asking him to permit a man who had carried out his contract to the satisfaction of the department, as is shown by what Mr. Bolduc has reported, to continue to the end of his term. Mr. Bolduc has had no communication with me about the matter for the reason that I invariably have no communication with any department except through the political head of it, and if I cannot get the information through the political head of the department, I am satisfied to do without it. I am informed that Mr. Bolduc, the inspector, stated that the contract was carried out to the satisfaction of the department, and the strong memorial which has been signed indicates that it was carried out to the satisfaction of the public. I remember that during my term of office when Mr. Sutton was the contractor we looked upon him as one of the best contractors we had in the department. I merely draw the attention of the Postmaster General to this fact, because I think it is a very unsatisfactory thing to allow the public to get hold of the idea that because there has been a change of Government, contracts which have been signed shall not be respected. The Government ought to be a standing example of the faithful carrying out of contracts between the private individuals, and I say that it is a bad thing that the notion should get abroad that merely because there is a change in the Government contracts which have been signed shall not be respected. The information which I have received and letters which have been sent to me by some of the most substantial houses in that district indicate to me that it was not from any personal motive but that the real reason why this contract was cancelled was because Mr. Sutton was a Conservative, and the hon. gentleman or his friends behind him wished to have somebody else belonging to their own political view to get the contract instead of leaving it in the hands of the late contractor.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would say to the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) that the contract was not cancelled, so far as I know, for any such reason. The contract contained a provision saying that it might be cancelled after three months' notice, and the reason the contract was cancelled was this: I was informed by the then representative of the riding, Mr. Fauvel, whom we all regret is not left with us, and who represented one of the most extensive business concerns in the riding, that with one continuous contract, covering 103 miles, the general public was unable to fairly compete.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But it had been let.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know how it had been let, but by letting this 103 mile contract none but men able to handle a 103-mile contract could tender for it. By dividing it into three sections—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Dividing the patronage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have stated the principle upon which I have been dealing with these contracts. There is no question of patronage in the matter. Perhaps I would not be transgressing the confidence of the department, or injuring the public interest, if I told the hon. gentleman, and since he is so deeply interested in the welfare of Mr. Sutton, and suggests that I took this action for the sake of patronage, it would be a source of gratification for him to know that Mr. Sutton is one of the successful tenderers. I omitted to ask the department what price the hon. gentleman was paying for his 103 mile contract, but I have the report issued by the hon. gentleman for 1895-96, in which the contract appears in the name of Mr. Ramier, "Gaspé Pasiu to Paspébiac, service 103 miles, V. P. Ramier, \$6,720."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may be a translation for Sutton.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the name of the contractor that the hon. gentleman has given to the House in his report, and for this service the price set down is \$6,720 per annum. By dividing it up into three separate services and making it possible for the general public to compete I have received tenders aggregating \$3,320.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For the same service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For identically the same service, same lines, same routes, same times. I have not the contract here. I am assuming that these are the correct figures which I have found in the public report of the hon. gentleman. I have beside me the report of my officers

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

giving me the figures of the three lowest tenders, which aggregate \$3,320, a difference per annum of \$3,400, or a difference in four years of \$13,600. I leave it to the hon. gentleman if this is not a good enough reason for adopting the course I have adopted.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Even then I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman admits that the Sutton contract was given to the lowest tenderer. If that be so, his contract up to the time it expired should have been respected, and the hon. gentleman with his view to economy should afterwards have advertised for new tenders. I must ask the Postmaster General to bring down these contracts before I can congratulate him upon his economy. I want to see just what kind of service we obtain from these individual contractors, so that I can judge between them and the contract entered into with Mr. Sutton. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) says he has selected the three lowest tenderers, but he does not give the names or the amounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Your friend Mr. Sutton is one of them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That shows how wise it is to advertise for tenders, and not to attempt to do away with tenders as the Postmaster General asked to do by his Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never asked for such a thing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The fact of Mr. Sutton being the lowest tenderer and receiving the contract, proves that the department looks upon him as a good contractor. I contend that a contract was entered into between the Crown and Mr. Sutton, and up to the time when that contract expired, he should not have been interfered with.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the postal contracts are concerned, I can bear testimony to the fact that all the contracts that have been cancelled by the Postmaster General, in my own and in the adjoining county, have resulted in a very great saving indeed to the treasury. Every contract he has let in the county of Lambton has been let at a considerably reduced price, without destroying in any way the efficiency of the public service. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) has talked about the Government keeping faith with contractors, but the hon. gentleman knows that in every one of these post office contracts, there is a clause under which the department has the right at any time, and for any reason, to cancel that contract and ask for new tenders. Within my own knowledge of the results achieved, I can say that the Postmaster General was perfectly justified in cancelling these contracts, and in every instance he has effected a saving of from 10 to 30 per cent. There is no injustice done to the contractor,

because he knows that it is in the power of the Postmaster General at any time to cancel the contract, and to re-let it by giving the required notice. If the cancellation of contracts has been at all extensive, I venture to say that a great deal of money has been saved to the country by the action of the Postmaster General. Why, Sir, it is only necessary to take up this supplementary report of the Post Office Department, to see that contracts which had been let for \$8,000 and \$9,000 by the late Government, have been cancelled and re-let by the Postmaster General at a saving in many instances of 50 per cent, and in some instances of more than that. It is shown by this report that the administration of the Post Office Department in the past has not been all that we had a right to expect from that department. Under the late Government contracts were awarded, and they were renewed from time to time without tenders being invited, and the result of the re-letting has been the saving of many thousands of dollars to this country. I will ask the Postmaster General, what the saving to Canada has been by reason of the cancellation and re-letting of contracts, up to this date.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) the information later.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As representative for the county of Gaspé I happen to know something of this Sutton contract. The late Mr. Fauvel and myself asked the Postmaster General to cancel this contract, because the largest firms in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, represented to us that the service was not sufficient, and that Mr. Sutton having the contract for a route of 103 miles, sub-let to certain people at a very low price. At every parish in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure the mails were exchanged, and it appears that on two or three occasions they were lost. I will not criticise the administration of the department by the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), but if I remember aright, the papers I saw in the department last winter show that this contract for \$6,000 had been given the last time without tender.

Mr. Fiset. When?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it was a few days before the general elections.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was not Postmaster General a few days before the election.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me refer for a moment to the impartiality and indeed the severity of the present Postmaster General, in dealing with these contracts. Six or seven contracts were advertised in my county during the last winter for carrying the mails. The time had lapsed and new notices were sent. I came to Ottawa at

that time thinking that perhaps my Liberal friends in the county should have a chance to get these contracts, because according to the notices the Minister was at liberty to give them to any of the tenderers. I represented, I confess, to the Postmaster General, that these contracts should be given to my political friends, because the figures in their tenders were not much higher than the figures in the tenders of Conservatives. The Postmaster General in every case gave the contract to the lowest tenderers, and out of seven contracts five or six were given to Conservatives. That is the law, and it has been followed very closely by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). My friends in the county of Gaspé now understand that the lowest tenderer will get the contract. That is the case with the present contract. I again repeat that there were serious complaints against the carrying of the mails in that district. There was one sub-contractor for each parish and they exchanged the mails. This continuous exchange of mails from day to day, every morning and every evening was most damaging. It is reported that three or four times the mails were lost, and the largest firms, one of which was that of Mr. Fauvel, protested against that state of affairs; and this is the reason why the contract was cancelled.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to lay before the committee what I think are important matters to be remembered when this question of mail contracts is discussed. I had some experience of that department, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that no contract was ever renewed in my time as Postmaster General without a tender, except upon the report of the officers of the department, who believed, as I believe today, after my experience, that we could get the contracts carried out more economically if we renewed with the old contractor than we could if we called for new tenders; and I will give the hon. gentleman the reason why. Take the case of Sutton. I mention him, not because I think his contract would better illustrate my argument, but because his contract was for 103 miles, and to carry out his contract he required to have horses, wagons, harness and other plant. I used to call upon the contractors, subject to the advice of my officers. I did not pretend, and do not pretend now, to know the geographical location of these contracts. It is quite a specialty, and the special adviser of the Minister, whether the deputy or one of the inspectors, has a perfect knowledge of the contracts, and he advises the Minister what it is best to do; and I am quite certain that when the hon. Postmaster General has gained more experience in that department, which is to a certain extent a technical department, he will see that the new contracts are always higher than the old. With the country developing and the requirements of the people increasing every

day, I can say as a result of my experience that when we called for new tenders, almost invariably—I think it can be proved from the records of the department—the new contracts were higher than the old ones. Of course, there is a clause in every contract providing that by giving three months' notice you may cancel a contract; but the question I am discussing is whether or not it is good policy to do that. In the case of Sutton, my hon. friend who represents the constituency (Mr. Lemieux) says he knows of complaints which were made against the Sutton contract. Who knows of these complaints, if not the department whose duty it is to look after the mail service all over Canada, and I believe it will be found that Mr. Sutton gave universal satisfaction.

Mr. LISTER. He sub-let the contracts. He did not do the work himself.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand my hon. friend's argument, and it would be a strong argument if the Postmaster General had not among the records of his own department this memorial signed by all the leading fishing houses of that district.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The names the hon. gentleman has just given are really the names of the Tory committee of the county of Gaspé.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That only proves that the whole business of that county is in the hands of Tories. I protest against the use that is made of the name of Mr. Fauvel. Mr. Fauvel has gone to his long rest, and I think it is rather unbecoming to make use of his name to excuse what the department has done. Let the department take the responsibility, and not throw it upon a dead man. If the hon. gentleman will read the memorial placed in the hands of the Postmaster General he will find who the men were; it matters little to me whether they were Tories or Liberals. I am not discussing a political question; I am not discussing whether the Tories or Liberals were in favour of Mr. Sutton; I am discussing the fact that Mr. Sutton had signed a contract with the Crown, and that Mr. Sutton was recognized by the officers of the department as a good contractor. Mr. Fauvel was a friend of mine, and he was justly respected among the people of Gaspé.

Mr. LEMIEUX. His letters are in the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But he was not the whole trade of the district. His was one of the small companies. Collas, Robin & Company did more business in one month than the Fauvel Company did in ten months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Fauvel house is one of the largest in the Dominion—Le Bouffiller Bros.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have had an opportunity of studying that part of the province of Quebec, which the hon. Postmaster General, from his numerous engagements in the province of Ontario, has not had. I am not discussing whether Mr. Fauvel was one of the leading men or not; but if you take up that memorial and read the names in it, you will find that the preponderating weight of the commercial interests of that county testified that Mr. Sutton efficiently carried out the contract. Of course, you have a clause in every contract, giving you the right, on giving three months' notice, to cancel the contract; but I think this clause is inserted for a specific purpose. If you find that the contract is not properly carried out, you can take advantage of that clause; but if the contract is properly carried out, you surely should not cancel it, simply because you want to get rid of a man who does not see, politically speaking, through the same glasses as you do. If the Postmaster General will look into this matter, he will find that the information I have received is absolutely reliable. He will find that for the purpose of cancelling that contract, Mr. Sutton was sacrificed and three friends of the hon. gentleman brought in. And Mr. Sutton was sacrificed, not because he did not give satisfaction, because the fact of his being now accepted by the department shows that he fulfilled his duty. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as he has stated that the lowest tenders have been accepted, to give the names and amounts.

Mr. LISTER. Is the hon. Postmaster General in a position to tell the committee what proportion of contracts has been cancelled and what saving has been effected thereby?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the total number of contracts cancelled for the year, but I can give him the amounts saved. The amount paid by the late Government, under contracts which had been cancelled by my direction, was \$381,237.22. These are four year contracts and they were cancelled and renewed by public tender, and in every case the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer. The gross amount was \$277,302.25 as compared with \$381,237.22, making a saving of \$103,936.97 per annum, or for the four years which these contracts had to run, a saving of \$415,747.88.

Mr. HAGGART. Were they for the same service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. There may have been occasional cases which would not be altogether identical, but in many of the cases the contract was for a tri-weekly service and I renewed it as a daily service. In other words, the service obtained by the public exceeds in mileage that of the cancelled contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman does not give any figures at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to give a little bit of my experience which may show the committee that there were savings as well under the late Government. I remember that in the case of one of the last contracts in my county, which was about to terminate, I advised the then Postmaster General to call for tenders and he did so, and the result was that instead of costing \$430 the service was obtained for \$219. In another case, where we had a daily service costing \$200 and a semi-weekly at \$100, the two running together, the new service was obtained daily for about \$225. That was under the late Government. I mention this to show that what is occurring to-day was occurring then, but it was not the practice then to open a contract unless we knew there were people anxious to tender and there was reasonable probability of obtaining the service at lower figures.

I wish to make this statement and I make it fearlessly, that while this amount of money seems to be saved, in reality it is not. I do not believe we have any right to say that we have saved \$400,000 to the people if that saving has simply been ground out of poor men who are compelled to do this work for half what it is worth. There is no doubt that plenty are doing the work for half what it is worth. There are men keeping up a horse and wagon and working from seven in the morning until eight at night for the miserable pittance of 75 cents a day, and I cannot think this Government can boast of saving money when the saving is effected by grinding men down in that way. I confess that I have little sympathy for the system which brings about such a state of affairs. It is proper that we should economise, but I do not think it fair that people should be asked to do a public service at starvation pay. The Postmaster General would be perfectly justified in allowing a little more than he has, so as to reasonably compensate those who are doing this work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not the Act of Parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may not be, but to my mind there is no great necessity in this country for grinding people down to the very last figure. The class of people who do this work are respectable men. They have to be honourable men, they have to be men of integrity who enjoy the confidence of those around them, they have to furnish sureties, and I am not in favour of grinding these men down to the bottom cent for the services they perform. I fail to see that the country is so much richer simply because we have squeezed a little more out of these poor men.

160½

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would not have taken part in this debate were it not for the statement made by the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron). He said that in nearly every case, under this administration, new contracts were let for more than the old ones, and that during his term of office he never renewed a contract without calling for tenders. I might draw his attention to the contractors in the district of Saskatchewan, Messrs. Leason & Scott, who have had the mail contracts for eighteen years. Tenders were never asked for. People wrote time and again to the department saying they were willing to take the contract for \$5,000 a year less and put up the securities, but no attention was paid to them. Leason & Scott got \$9,000 for one contract from Saskatoon to Onion Lake. The contract was cancelled, and I think it has been re-let for about \$4,000. These people had that contract for about 18 years; and if the hon. gentleman will figure that out, he will find that the country is out about \$75,000.

Mr. LISTER. That is one of the poor men that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) talks about.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Yes, this is one of the poor men. I know that time and time again people tried to have tenders called for that work so that they could get a chance to tender for it, but they never could succeed. This is only one instance; if I desired to take up time, I could give other instances of the same kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was surprised when I heard the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) state that tenders had always been asked for when he was Postmaster General. In looking over the supplementary report issued by the Postmaster General, we find cases in which the hon. gentleman must admit that that rule has not been carried out. For instance, we have the case of the mail contract between Back Bay and St. George. The report says:

This contract was let without tender for the term commencing on the 1st July, 1892, at \$274.88, while there was a tender in the department for \$153, the loss being \$487.52 for the term. It was renewed for the succeeding term without tender at the same rate, but the present Government cancelled the renewal and invited tenders. A contract having been obtained for \$140 per annum, the saving for the term will be \$539.52.

Now, this tender was put in by Mr. Dewar for \$153.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When was that?

Mr. McMULLEN. It was in July, 1882. I have here the correspondence that took place.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was not Postmaster General then.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will read the correspondence and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that he was.

St. George, 13th January, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I desire the renewal of my mail contract between St. George and Back Bay upon the same terms and conditions as now held. The present contract terminates 1st July, 1896.

Praying that you will kindly assent to my wishes, and grant a renewal for a period of four years from 1st July next.

I am, &c.,

(Sgd.) A. J. SEELYE.

Hon. Sir A. P. Caron, K.C.M.G.,  
Postmaster General.

Ottawa, 23rd January, 1896.

My Dear Mr. Foster,—The Postmaster General wishes me to ask you whether you have any objection to the renewal for a further period of four years of the contract for the mail service between Back Bay and St. George. The present contractor is Mr. A. J. Seelye, whose application for renewal the inspector recommends.

An early reply will greatly oblige.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) WILLIAM WHITE.

Hon. G. E. Foster, Minister of Finance.

Ottawa, 12th February, 1896.

My Dear Mr. Foster,—I have much pleasure in informing you that, in accordance with your recommendation, I have authorized the renewal of Mr. J. A. Seelye's contract for the mail service between Back Bay and St. George for a further period of four years.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) ADOLPHE P. CARON.

Hon. G. E. Foster,  
Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

Ottawa, 25th February, 1896.

Dear Sir Adolphe,—Mr. A. J. Seelye, of St. George, N.B., has made application for the renewal of his contract for carrying the mails between Back Bay and St. George, N.B. I will be glad if you can meet Mr. Seelye's wishes in this matter.

Yours truly,

GEORGE E. FOSTER.

Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G., P.M.G.

Ottawa, 25th February, 1896.

My Dear Mr. Foster,—Referring to your letter of the 25th inst., recommending the renewal of Mr. A. J. Seelye's contract for the mail service between Back Bay and St. George, I beg to say that, on your recommendation, this contract was renewed on the 10th inst. My letter of the 12th inst. informed you of the fact.

Yours faithfully,

ADOLPHE P. CARON.

Hon. G. E. Foster,  
Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

Now, there is a contract that was renewed by the ex-Postmaster General—

Mr. LANDERKIN. By the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster).

Mr. McMULLEN. The ex-Finance Minister requested that it should be done and it was done in the face of the fact that there was a contract in his own office to do the work for \$175. If the hon. gentleman

Mr. McMULLEN.

wants to follow this case, he will find it at page 258, in the supplementary report of the Postmaster General, page 258. I see it before him.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) sees it before me, he sees more than I do.

Mr. McMULLEN. I saw that the hon. gentleman was looking over a blue-book and I thought it was this one. I will make the hon. gentleman the present of the copy that I have if he wishes. I congratulate the country and the House upon having a man at the head of this department who will do his duty fearlessly and will give contracts at the lowest price. I was surprised at the remark of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). If we are not to accept the lowest tender, what is the use of tendering at all. If people are prepared to do the work even for nothing, however low a tender they may make to the department, the department is justified in accepting it. If the work is not efficiently done, the department can cancel the contract. I am glad to know that we have turned over a new leaf, and I hope that before long the expenditure of this department will be brought within revenue. Hitherto enormous sums have been thrown away for mere favouritism. This system will be done away with. I trust that the Postmaster General will long continue to preside over the department which he manages with such ability and with such advantage to the people of the country.

Mr. LISTER. I have the case of another poor man—the contractor for the mail service between Eastern Harbour and Port Hastings, N.S. That contract was let, as the facts appear here, and renewed without tender. When the present Postmaster General took office, he cancelled the contract and called for tenders, and the result is a saving to the country of \$4,000 a year—fully 50 per cent of the price paid by the late Government for many years for this mail contract. In this case the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and not the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) appears to have taken a very lively interest in securing to these contractors the continuance of their contract at the exorbitant price which they have paid for so many years. The ex-Postmaster General wrote the following letter to the Deputy Postmaster General:—

Ottawa, 7th September, 1895.

My Dear Col. White,—In the matter of H. A. Archibald's contract for carrying mails in Cape Breton, I should feel obliged if you will not advertise for tenders until I have an opportunity of speaking to you on the subject. Please make a note of this, and oblige.

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Then Sir Adolphe Caron writes a letter:

My Dear Sir Charles,—In accordance with the recommendation you make in your letter of the 7th inst., I have authorized that the notices advertising the Eastern Harbour and Port Hastings mail service be withdrawn.

Yours faithfully  
ADOLPHE P. CARON.

Then Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper writes this extraordinary letter :

My Dear Col. White,—Will you kindly bring to the favourable attention of the Postmaster General the following proposition in regard to the contract for carrying the mails in Cape Breton, at present performed by H. A. Archibald, of Port Hastings :—

1st. That the department advertise contract as a whole. This is the manner in which it was formerly put up to tender.

2nd. That your department do not call for tenders sooner than six weeks before the contract is to be awarded, or six weeks before the expiration of the present contract.

3rd. That four days be allowed to parties to whom the contract may be awarded, to complete arrangements and furnish securities. This was the time allowed Mr. Finn, the late contractor.

4th. That the amount of security to be given should be made \$13,000. This will prevent irresponsible persons from tendering.

I am told that all previous contractors on this route have failed to give satisfaction to the public, and were involved, having heavy judgments rolled up against them, finally having to abandon the business on account of the small consideration paid.

Now, Sir, of all the letters that were ever written by a public man, I do not think that this letter can be paralleled. We have the fact here that Mr. Archibald had been contractor for carrying the mails between these points for a number of years, that that contract as a matter of fact had been renewed from time to time without tender, no notice ever having been published from the first date inviting the public to tender for the carrying of these mails. But we find that for the avowed purpose—because it could be nothing else—of preventing people of moderate means from tendering, the Postmaster General was asked to put up this contract as a whole. And what more was he asked to do? Why, Sir, not to issue invitations for tenders until six weeks before the contract expired, and to provide that there should be four days only allowed for the purpose of completing the security to be given for the performance of the contract. I am told that this place is nearly a thousand miles away from here down in Nova Scotia, and the man was expected to send his tender in, to get a letter advising that the tender was accepted, and then, within four days, to make all the provision necessary for the purpose of carrying out a pretty extensive contract. If the hon. gentleman had publicly proclaimed that his object was to prevent that contract being taken at a reasonable price, he could not have done it more effectively than in the letter which appears in this book. It was to be provided in this notice that the

man who had the tender should only have four days to complete his security. In other words, after receiving the notice that his tender was accepted, he was to be in Ottawa and have his security completed and be prepared to carry out the terms of his contract. It was simply asking for an impossibility, and it meant nothing more than this, that it was intended that Mr. Archibald should get this contract under guise of asking for tenders. It was always intended that this man should get the contract, because the terms of it were so severe and onerous that no person else could possibly have taken it. But the Postmaster General, when he came into office, cancelled this contract and re-let it, and the result has been a saving to this country of \$4,000 a year, or \$16,000 in the four years this contract had to run.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The saving was about \$6,000 a year, not \$4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. A very good catechism.

Mr. LISTER. I know my hon. friend does not like it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me a word—I enjoy it very much. The hon. gentleman thinks that in this fresh and early period of the session we had better undertake two or three days' discussion on these past contracts. If the members of the Government and gentlemen sitting on that side desire it, we are quite willing for it, but I was under the impression that we were somewhat in a hurry to get through with the business, and if so I would just suggest whether going into this back matter—which cannot be allowed to go on unless it is thoroughly discussed, and the record of the party on the other side, I do not care how far back, is brought up—I want to ask the Government how long they expect to keep us here if this is carried on. The hon. gentleman need not be at all afraid that I am feeling badly over this, I am not; but I just want to point out that this brings on recrimination, undoubtedly, and that if we are prepared at this time of the session to go into a debate as to the records of the two parties—well, we are ready for it if you are.

Mr. LISTER. I am very glad indeed to bear the hon. gentleman make this statement, because for the last three weeks it has been more strongly impressed on my mind from day to day that the hon. gentlemen were merely marking time, that they were wasting time deliberately, and I thought that we might just as well take part with them.

Mr. FOSTER. When it is desired to get through with the business it is always incumbent, I think, on the Government that the Government party should be restrained a little. The Opposition has its rights, you

know, of attack and criticism ; but I want to point out to my hon. friend that this is opening up a very inviting field.

**Mr. LISTER.** I have no desire to prolong the session, but when my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General gets up and makes charges that we are not saving any money, I think it is in the interest of the Government that the contrary should be shown.

**Mr. WALLACE.** These hon. gentlemen are claiming their great superiority over the late Government, and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) seems to have been put up to eulogize the Postmaster General ; at any rate, the Postmaster General was ready with his answer, and everything appeared to be cut and dried to give a sounding cheer to the Postmaster General for his great economies in cutting down contracts for these men who, I say, are the worst paid men in Canada to-day. I do not believe that the country will endorse the cutting down by \$10 or \$15 or \$20 per annum a contract where the men are really earning more than twice that amount in honest service to the country. But when the Postmaster General makes these great claims to economy, and brings down his estimate to the House, what do they show ? In 1893 the expenses of the Post Office Department were \$3,421,000 ; to-day they are several hundred thousand more than that. In 1894 they had increased to \$3,517,000 ; in 1895 they were \$3,593,000 ; in 1896, \$3,665,000. You all know that just before an election claims are made for postal routes. It is inevitable that the expenses should increase immediately before an election, and very properly so, because people want more postal facilities, and perhaps they were refused before. Now they get them, and they are entitled to the best postal facilities that the country can give. For these four years the average expenditure was \$3,549,000. Then we come to the present Postmaster General. Last year the Postmaster General asked for \$3,787,000, or \$238,000 more than the average of the previous four years. Does that show his great economy ? For this year he asks \$3,636,000 or \$87,000 more than the average of the four years. Yet he claims that he has been economical, and that he has cut down the contracts of these men, one of whom I know spends the best part of the day driving a team of horses fourteen miles over a bad road for \$229 a year or 70 cents a day. The Postmaster General gets just a little over thirty times that each day for his arduous labours. I am sure that the country will appreciate the fact that this mail carrier is to be cut down \$11 per annum. I am sure that if the Postmaster General has made these economies that he modestly boasts about and which he gets hon. members to ask him about he will be able to show it in the Estimates produced before this House. I find that \$3,640,000 are asked for the present year, the highest

**Mr. FOSTER.**

estimate in the history of the country with the exception of 1896, when it was \$25,000 more. So I think that before the Postmaster General can make a claim to exercising economy in the administration of his department he should ask for less money and conduct the affairs in a much more economical manner than he has yet done.

To compensate Mr. Harry Knauf, of the Dead Letter Branch, for technical services as translator of the German and Norse languages, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act., \$200

**Mr. FOSTER.** I want to ask the Postmaster General in reference to the fourth item. Of course it is understood that the third item stands until the details are brought down. Why is this extra sum of \$200 given to Mr. Henry Knauf ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to allow me to refer to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) for a moment. I would say to my hon. friend for West York that the figures which he has quoted are not correct figures showing expenditures of the department for the years to which he has alluded. There was a constantly increasing deficit in the department and it increased during the year 1895-96 by the sum of \$68,000. I think that is the amount which you will find in the special report of the auditors, Messrs. Cross and Munroe, contained in my report laid on the Table of the House this session. I assume that that deficit had been accumulating during the years in regard to which he has quoted. There was no correct balancing up of accounts or a clearing up of the liabilities so that the apparent expenditure as appearing in the accounts did not indicate the real expenditure.

**Mr. WALLACE.** What was the amount of that deficit ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The total amount is, I think, \$687,000. It had been growing and there was not a correct balancing. However, I do not desire to go into that question. I just wished to answer that part of the hon. gentleman's statement.

**Mr. WALLACE.** The Postmaster General says that the overlapping accounts amounted to \$687,000, and that that extended over a period of years. Could he tell us how much it was in the fiscal year ending 1st of July, 1895 ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** At the end of the fiscal year, 1895, the liability outstanding was \$616,000.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Is that what the hon. gentleman called an overdraft ?

**Mr. FOSTER.** This whole discussion will come up on an item which the hon. gentleman the Postmaster General has in the Estimates for meeting that amount.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Very well, I will not press it. I will inform the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) what

is the meaning of this \$200. There is in the dead-letter branch a gentleman named Mr. Knauf whose business it is to decipher dead letters. He discharges the ordinary work of a third-class clerk. He is a German, and being familiar with the Norse languages is of special value to the department. He has shown me that it was the intention of the late Postmaster General (Mr. McLennan) to increase his salary by \$300 a year. He did increase it \$300 one year, but it was not continued as Mr. McLennan left the department.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary has he now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$1,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are giving him \$200 more ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) objects to it, I shall not press it. Mr. LeSueur recognizes him as a most efficient man, and I believe he is of special value. He is not a friend or acquaintance of my own, but he has been a valuable man in the department. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not think it a fair proposal, let him say so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that during my time in the department my information was not exactly the same as that of the hon. gentleman as to this officer deserving an increase. I think it is a very large increase, but the hon. gentleman may have had more information than I had.

Mr. FOSTER. The next item calls for two increases contrary to the Civil Service Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Messrs. Lindsay and Smith are in the mail service branch, and they are very efficient officers. I had to make special demands upon their time during the past year and I may say in carrying out the work of their branch they have given me most efficient service. They are not the 4 o'clock men that are sometimes alluded to, but they have practically remained in the department until almost midnight in the discharge of their work.

Mr. SPROULE. What salaries have they now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Smith has \$1,350, and Mr. Lindsay has \$2,000 or \$2,050. They have certainly done two days work in one.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may add my testimony to what the Postmaster General has said. These are very efficient officers and are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to make another and probably a final appeal to my hon. friend the Postmaster General to know what he thinks of these additions.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the Postmaster General can explain why two clerks out of his whole department should be rewarded in this way with an addition of \$150 each, particularly the one who enjoys a salary of over \$2,000 a year. There must be a great many clerks in the department who are getting less than \$1,000 a year and surely they should have claims for a little advancement. True, the Postmaster General has said that these men had to work harder than the others. It may be that they have some particular duties to discharge. I will be bound to say that there are many clerks in the department paid under \$1,000, who would be delighted to have some special duties assigned to them so that they might get this \$150. Would the Postmaster General tell the committee what special work these two gentlemen have recently been so untiringly assiduous in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Lindsay is superintendent of the mails contract branch and has been in the service for perhaps a quarter of a century. Mr. Smith has been in the service for from 15 to 20 years. Mr. Lindsay is a most valuable officer.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to say differently of Mr. Smith, but I speak of Mr. Lindsay first, as superintendent of the branch. He is industrious, efficient, courteous, and most devoted to the public service. I think his services are even underpaid at the salary of \$2,050. The same may be said of Mr. Smith.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to the other members of the staff there are nearly 300 in the inside service, and some of them did receive during the past year increases as the result of the votes of last July. The increases which in the ordinary course would have been awarded from 1st of January and the 1st of April, were not granted, because I did not think that these increases, statutory or whatever else you may call them, should follow as a matter of course, but that they should be granted on a special report recommending a particular officer, and not on a mere perfunctory recommendation grafting them all in as has been to some extent the practice. I therefore intend to have a special report with regard to each officer, not to be severe, but simply to grant these rewards in an intelligent way.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is in the post office in Toronto a third class clerk who day after day for many days has been discharging the duties of chief clerk, and chief administrator of that post office. He does all the work, and yet there are a great many other clerks who are his seniors who have received increases year after year, while

this young man cannot claim the reward he is entitled to owing to the rules as they are now. If the Postmaster General intends hereafter to pick out the men in the post office service who are entitled to increases, I will back him up in that. In the meantime I would direct his attention to the case of this man which I have mentioned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman let me know his name.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General missed the point of my inquiry. I asked, what special services Mr. Lindsay has been affording the country in the past few months. The people of the riding I represent have a commendable amount of curiosity, and they peruse the public accounts with the greatest possible avidity. For instance, they find in this wonderful work—the author of which I would name, if I were able to give him all the credit due for his curiosity in probing it out—they find one contract which was cancelled, and in the carrying out of which, in all kinds of wind and weather a man travelled 32 miles a day with a team of horses for part of the year, for the princely remuneration of \$1.50 a day. The Postmaster General, having regard to how far a dollar goes in this country, and the little opportunity that is afforded a man for honest employment, thought that \$1.50 a day for a man and one horse, and two horses part of the year, was altogether too much. I think he has been successful in securing the services of a man and a horse to travel the 32 miles for \$1.15 a day. This is a very curious man whose contract was cancelled, and he has written me for a copy of the Public Accounts showing the salaries paid, and I will be bound to say, that with that curiosity which dominates in him since his contract has been cancelled, he will want to know how it was that the Postmaster General thought that \$1.50 a day was too much for a man with a pair of horses, whilst \$7 a day was not sufficient for Mr. Lindsay. I am not complaining that Mr. Lindsay is getting too much, but if the Postmaster General is in on a streak of economy, surely there are several ways in which it might be practised instead of cutting down the services of a man and two horses in this way. It is true the Minister has got the work done for \$1.15 per day instead of \$1.50, but as it is equally true, that as the new contractor is a good Liberal he tendered low on the expectation that he would get an advance, and an application has already been made to me as to the means and ways he will get that advance. The Postmaster General I expect will have that contract on his hands in a short time. It is but fair for the Postmaster General to tell the House what special services Mr.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Lindsay and Mr. Smith have rendered to entitle them to be picked out for increase to their salaries. I have nothing to say against Mr. Lindsay. I have known him for the past five or six years as a most courteous and obliging official, but his department is largely routine work, and I think he was well paid for it at a salary of \$2,100.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The mail contracts in charge of Mr. Lindsay involve an annual expenditure of nearly \$900,000, and they amount in number to between eight and nine thousand. During the past year, we have renewed about 600 contracts.

Mr. SPROULE. Renewed or re-let?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Renewed, after advertisement and tender.

Mr. SPROULE. They were re-let.

The POSTMASER GENERAL. Very well. In addition to that work Mr. Lindsay has a great many other details in connection with this branch. There are constant applications for new services and for changes of route, and it is more or less an intricate branch of the service of which he has made a study. He has the mail service of the country at his finger ends, and his services to the department are extremely valuable. Without him it might take at least a couple of efficient men to do the work which he does. The vote before the House is for extra service during the past year, and I may say that Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Smith, has returned to the department almost every night and remained there until midnight. They return back practically every night to the department—he and Mr. Smith; and I think they are certainly well entitled to the small allowance I ask the committee to let them have.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not a word of objection to the amounts given to these three officers; but I think the Postmaster General has made a mistake in selecting three, and his action cannot but excite jealousy in the department. If he had made these increases on some principle, there might have been some justification for them. I have not a word to say against the increases to Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Smith. I know Mr. Smith to be one of the best officers in the department; I know that the Auditor General was anxious to get his services. But we do not find any increase proposed for Mr. Matheson or for Mr. Everett, two heads of branches of the department, and most efficient officers in any civil service in the world. I do not know of any offices requiring more efficiency or more inventive skill than those presided over by these two gentlemen. It must cause jealousy among the officers in the department to see special increases granted to these three officers.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I am exceedingly sorry to notice that the system of granting sums of money to civil servants, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, is being continued. In the cases mentioned by the Postmaster General, there may have been exceptional services rendered; but if we are going to continue this system, I think it would be much better to amend the Civil Service Act. I found fault with hon. gentlemen opposite when they practised this system. It appears that every clerk who has any possible excuse upon which to hang a claim for additional salary, makes application and presses it until, eventually, possibly with the assistance of the deputy head, the Minister gives way and the evil continues. I think the Civil Service Act should be amended in some way, so that we shall not be asked every year to pass votes of this kind.

**Mr. CARGILL.** I would like to know from the Postmaster General on what principle he is proceeding when he proposes to increase the salaries of these civil servants, and, at the same time allows contracts to be let at such very low rates as that to which the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has just referred, from which a man with a team has been making \$1.50 a day. Here we have civil servants who are paid \$3,000 a year asking for an increase of salary. In the last general elections the hon. Postmaster General sympathised with the Patrons of Industry, one of whom I had the pleasure of running my election against; and one of the principles laid down by the Patrons of Industry had reference to the salaries paid to the officials in the different counties. They put the case in this way, and it is very hard to meet their arguments. For instance, they say, a man has an investment of \$5,000 or \$10,000 in a farm and stock. He has three or four sons and daughters, all of whom work on the farm, and at the end of the year, when he totals up the accounts, he finds that he has scarcely sufficient money to pay his taxes. I think that the men who get contracts to carry the mails in different parts of this country at \$1.50 a day have a much greater claim on the Government of this country for increased remuneration than the civil servants at Ottawa. I am not questioning at all the efficiency of the civil service at Ottawa, but at the same time I believe they are well paid and they are paid chiefly by the toiling farmers of this country; and I think it is the duty of the Postmaster General and of every member of the Government to consider very seriously the requirements of the agricultural community before coming down here and asking for increases to the salaries of the civil servants.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The hon. Postmaster General stated that these gentlemen who are now to have increases were engaged in working overtime. He has not yet stated the character of the work that was being

done by these gentlemen. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if they were engaged at any time in preparing the supplement to the hon. gentleman's report, which I confess has very much the appearance of a campaign sheet.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The preparation of that valuable work was not commenced until a very recent date. I think it was laid upon the Table about the first of this month, and its compilation would probably take a couple of weeks, not more. Prior to that time, these gentlemen were engaged in the work of their department, not only during the day time but also in the evenings. Their work involves the preparation of advertisements, the laying out of routes, correspondence with the inspectors, overhauling contracts, and receiving and opening tenders. Every Friday at 12 o'clock, the tenders are due, and a very large number come in every week and are opened in the presence of two officials—I think these two, or one of them at least. This work probably extends over Friday, Friday night and Saturday. These tenders are sometimes for a bulk sum, sometimes for a trip sum, involving many additions of figures.

**Mr. WALLACE.** How many clerks in that branch?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I could not say.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Was that a new class of work which devolved upon these gentlemen or the ordinary routine work? The hon. gentleman has told us that the only new work was the compiling of this very excellent book.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not know who compiled it.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The gentleman who did compile it evidently endeared himself to the hon. gentleman and is now being paid for his service. Was not the work done by these gentlemen the ordinary work performed by them in years past?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** They did in one year far more than a year's work. Not only did they deal with the ordinary expiring contracts which were brought to a sudden end and re-let. The work is not mere routine. There is a good deal of routine in it, but also a great deal of head-work is required for the proper management of the work of the branch.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I cannot agree with my hon. friend in claiming the clerks who were employed upon this interesting literary work which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table. But I would blame the Minister who permitted to be placed on the Table of Parliament private letters having no connection with official life or departmental practice. I do not blame the men

who were ordered to do this probably disagreeable work, but the Minister who gave the order.

I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend to the case of the postmaster at Carleton. On the 10th September, 1896, a letter was addressed to John Lefebvre, Esq., postmaster. The letter is as follows:—

A complaint has been made to this department, that during the recent Dominion election you had taken an offensive part as a partisan on behalf of the Conservative candidate in Bonaventure, canvassing during the campaign and on election day, conveying voters to the polls, and using offensive language against the Hon. Mr. Laurier and the Liberal candidate, Mr. Fauvel. It is further alleged, that even since the election, you have continued to use abusive language towards each of these gentlemen. In case you may desire to make any observations as to the correctness or otherwise of this complaint, opportunity is hereby given you, pending further action.

Mr. John Lefebvre could not take advantage of this invitation to answer the complaints because he had died and was buried before the election took place. Consequently, his offensive partisanship cannot have been very considerable. But the letter came into the hands of one Auguste Lefebvre, and he wrote to the Postmaster General stating that John Lefebvre was dead and buried, and that he was acting postmaster, and that if the complaint was intended to apply to him, he had never taken any active part in the election of the 23rd of June, he had never driven or canvassed, and he asked the Postmaster General to grant him an investigation. Well, nothing more was heard from the department until the by-election took place, and the hon. gentleman who so worthily represents the county of Bonaventure, pressed very considerably by his friends, insisted upon Auguste Lefebvre being dismissed. The friends of the hon. gentleman said to him: Time is pressing, tomorrow the vote will be taken, and unless you dismiss Lefebvre, the result may be disastrous. Without any notice to him, and although he had written on the 15th denying the charge and asking an investigation, the day before the election the Inspector came down, Mr. Bolduc, and bundled out the bags and everything else appertaining to the position of postmaster, and transferred them to the house of one Boudreault, a man who cannot read or write but who is a good Liberal. It is important that Boudreault should be, just before the vote is taken, appointed postmaster in the place of Lefebvre. The inspector, after going over the office and looking into the books, found everything in the best possible order. There was no complaint against Mr. Auguste Lefebvre, but the place was wanted for somebody else. Mr. Lefebvre is one of the best citizens in the locality, and a merchant, and like all country merchants

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

is not rich, but an honest, honourable man, and his dismissal without charge or investigation should be resented by every honest man in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General as to these two men, Smith and Lindsay. I understood him to say that the only work they did outside of their regular work in the department, was to compile this valuable report that we have before us. This work, the Minister told us, occupied two weeks. He seems to be paying them pretty liberally for that work—at the rate of \$75 a week.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They did a great deal more than the ordinary work of the department that they would be called to perform, for the reasons I have mentioned. In reply to my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), as to why Mr. Auguste Lefebvre was relieved from the position of postmaster, I will say that the notice to him happened to be addressed to Jean Lefebvre, but it was received by Auguste Lefebvre and accepted as intended for him. The reason for the mistake, as I am informed by the officers of the department, was that the name had not been changed in the postal guide since the transfer of the post office from the deceased Jean to Auguste. But, as I have said, no prejudice resulted, as the notice was accepted by August Lefebvre and replied to by him.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the way I have said?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He replied denying the statement. The removal was made on a statement presented by the late Mr. Fauvel.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the charge?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Fauvel's letter was as follows:—

I beg to own receipt of your communication of the 17th past, inclosing a letter from the postmaster at Carleton, county of Bonaventure, re charges of his doings in the past election. It is nothing less than I expected from him, and I can only re-echo my recent charges, backed up by memo. from Mr. P. E. Perron, civil engineer, of Carleton, who is now in this city.

I, therefore, ask for the removal of the post office from Mr. Lefebvre, and recommend Mr. Joseph Boudreau for the position.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is that a letter from Mr. Fauvel?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a copy of the letter of Mr. Fauvel, the original of which is in the department. There was evidently an earlier letter, because he refers to it, and I do not find it here. There is a letter also of the 2nd November, 1896:

Before leaving Ottawa, I sent you a declaration from Mr. P. A. Perron, of Carleton, giving the details for the removal of A. Lefebvre as postmaster at Carleton, P.Q. Since then I have had no acknowledgment of the receipt.

This, it will be observed, was on the 2nd November, 1896. The removal of Auguste Lefebvre took place, I think, in March of this year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The day before the by-election.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, have it that way.

Of all the most obnoxious partisans against us during the late and previous elections, Mr. Lefebvre was, I may say, the worst, and I should deem it a special favour that he should be removed as soon as possible. He has repudiated, by letter, the accusations that I had previously placed before you, but this does not amount to much, as the greatest criminals in the courts of justice will invariably plead not guilty.

Mr. Fauvel accompanied these letters of 1st October with the statement of Mr. Perron, who lives at Carleton, and who says:

At the request of Mr. W. LeB. Fauvel, I have the honour to place before you the following facts with reference to the postmaster at Carleton. Mr. Auguste Lefebvre, the present postmaster at Carleton, is the son of Jean Lefebvre, who resigned his position on the 1st June.

I will omit a part that seems to have no reference to the subject.

During the last electoral struggle, in the post office and before many persons, one of the postmaster's brothers-in-law spoke infamously against Mr. Laurier, —

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Why did you not dismiss the brother-in-law?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Have patience.

—branding him as a renegade, and saying that he trampled upon Christ himself. Infamies of this kind were repeated every day before the Liberals. During the whole time of the struggle the post office was the place of rendezvous for the Conservatives, the place where they met to organize for the fight. On the eve of the nomination, Auguste Lefebvre himself went to Dalhousie for Hon. L. Philippe Pelletier and other speakers, and on the morning of the nominations he accompanied the Conservative candidate to the house of the returning officer. Since the election, his children have called their animals by the name of Fauvel, &c. The post office is far from being a secret place. If a letter is sent or received from a political leader, all the Conservatives know it immediately. For some years, registered letters have been stolen at the post office.

And so on. Mr. Fauvel, at all events, believed that assertion to be correct, and he further asserted of his own knowledge concerning this officer: "Of all the most obnoxious partisans against us during the late and preceding elections, Mr. Lefebvre was, I may say, the worst." On the 13th March, 1897—that is the day before the voting, my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) says:

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Two other members, the hon. member for Chi-

coutimi (Mr. Savard) and the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) gave me their word by telegram as follows:—

Postmaster Lefebvre, of Carleton, has been violent partisan. Replace him by Joseph Boudreau.  
(Sgd.) P. V. SAVARD.  
(Sgd.) O. E. TALBOT.

On the statement of hon. gentlemen who are here to explain for themselves, I considered the case fully established, as I accepted the word of these gentlemen, and acted accordingly.

Mr. WALLACE. I believe that the increase to these two gentlemen, Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Smith is totally unjustifiable. This is not an honorarium for a service rendered this year, but it a permanent increase of salary of \$300 per annum.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is not permanent.

Mr. WALLACE. It says: "To provide an addition of \$150 each to the salaries of A. Lindsay and W. Smith, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." The hon. gentleman said, a while ago, they had to obey the law. Why did not they obey the law in this case? That is proposing to violate the law, and asking Parliament to consent to it, or to make a new law applicable to these two gentlemen. He says Mr. Lindsay is affable, polite, industrious, and so on. I presume that we have hundreds in the civil service who are so. I know there are men in the Department of Customs who, during the three years that I was there, came back almost every night to work, and I will venture to say, worked longer hours than either Mr. Lindsay or Mr. Smith, and did not get \$150 increase contrary to law. They were not asked to do any dirty work, either. I contend this increase is for all the time they may be in the service. I presume it is not the intention to decrease their salaries next year. Now, I wish to call attention to another matter. I heard a prominent official in the Post Office Department, some time ago, say there had not been a dismissal in the post office for political reasons for forty years. He could not say that now, because there have been dismissals by the score, by the hundreds, perhaps. We do not know how many, because sometimes there are investigations, and sometimes they are dismissed without any investigation. In my opinion, the postmasters of this country are a class which should not be dealt with as civil servants are. A member of the civil service gets a salary sufficient for his maintenance, and gets increases as the years go on, if he proves efficient, and he is superannuated at the end of his time. Postmasters are not in that position; they cannot be superannuated. They receive small salaries, ranging from \$20 up to \$100, and sometimes \$400 or \$500. They are not in the same class; therefore, I claim that they

should be left free and untrammelled, and that was the rule until the present Postmaster General assumed that office. Take a case that has come under my own knowledge, in the west riding of York. Mr. J. P. Rupert, when I was a candidate in one of the election campaigns, was president of the Reform Association of the west riding of York. He conducted the campaign, and did all the duties pertaining to the presidency of the Liberal Association. He arranged for the meetings; he organized the campaign, and did all that work, and did it exceedingly well. He was likewise, during all that time, and for years afterwards, postmaster in the village of Maple, a position worth some hundreds of dollars per year. But I never made any attempt to have him removed, because I did not think that I had any right to interfere with him. He was performing his duties of postmaster properly, and that is all the department could require of him. I know some persons said that he was a Government officer, and should not interfere in politics. But that was not my feeling, and I did not see any reason why he should not take an active part, if he desired to do so. That was the rule that obtained until the present Postmaster General assumed that office. Now, without a moment's warning, a rule is made that has never been recognized before, a rule that any man, if he only receives \$20 a year, keeping a post office, not for his own benefit, but for the accommodation of the neighbourhood, as many hundreds and thousands of postmasters do, the Postmaster General says to these men: You are not to interfere in politics; you are permitted to vote, but that is the extent of your interference. I say, such a regulation is entirely unauthorized, that it is improper, that the Postmaster General has no right to assume that power. The letter read by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) shows that the Postmaster General has written letters to men, saying that they have no right to take an active part in an election. What is to prevent a postmaster from doing so? Is there any law or regulation prohibiting postmasters from taking part in elections in this country? Of course, I do not refer to city postmasters, who are on the civil service list, but to those ten thousand postmasters throughout the country who are not on the civil service list. Is there any regulation prohibiting those men from interfering in politics?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are many obligations upon people in life for which you may not be able to point to any direct law compelling them. Public officers such as postmasters, I think, take office on an understanding that they will maintain political neutrality and keep aloof from political struggles. It is impliedly part of the conditions on which they assume the office. There is no law saying that a mem-

Mr. WALLACE.

ber of the permanent inside service should not take part in a political struggle, but the impropriety of it would be recognized.

Mr. WALLACE. There is a written obligation so far as the civil service is concerned; authorities have laid it down, precedent has established it, the rule is recognized, that a member of the civil service is not to take an active part in political matters. But no such rule exists with regard to these postmasters, or has ever existed in this country. The Postmaster General says there are unwritten obligations that are recognized in respect to postmasters. I say no such obligations have ever been recognized, from the fact that, until he came into office, there has been no dismissal of a postmaster for forty years in this country for political reasons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is speaking without full knowledge of the facts. The postmaster of the city of Hull, Mr. Loucks, was dismissed without a moment's warning, after the election of 1878, for political reasons.

Mr. Fiset. In Rimouski and Matane, postmasters were dismissed for the same reason.

Mr. WALLACE. Was the postmaster of Hull in the civil service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was postmaster in the city of Hull, the same as the other ten thousand the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. WALLACE. The postmaster in a city gets a salary, and is in the civil service. Hull being a city, the postmaster of that city is in the civil service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster at Hull is on the same basis, as far as the office is concerned, as the postmaster in the smallest office in Canada. It is not a city post office.

Mr. WALLACE. I can say that the statement was made to me by a high official in the Post Office Department who knew and who ought to know, and it has been generally recognized. When the present Postmaster General went out on his various political campaigns, he gave it out to the postmasters that they must not interfere in elections. In North Grey, I know that he did so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He cannot know it.

Mr. WALLACE. I know that the hon. gentleman interviewed a postmaster not far from Owen Sound and gave him a warning that he must not take an active part in the political campaign.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never gave any such warning to any living man.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement was made to me in Owen Sound. I was there at the time, and I know that the Postmaster General was making himself very busy visiting postmasters. I know that a postmaster visited him there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must again correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace). He must not mistake anything. I made no visit to any postmaster, though I may say that when I was in Owen Sound the postmaster of that place called upon me as any gentleman might, and I treated him as I would any gentleman. I did not order him out of my presence. I never interviewed or communicated directly or indirectly with any postmaster there during the political campaign.

Mr. WALLACE. We will have to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but he cannot deny that he has dismissed a large number of postmasters without holding an investigation. The case that has been cited here is one of very many that have occurred.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The discussion is out of order.

Mr. WALLACE. This is a nice time of the day, Mr. Chairman, to tell me that I am out of order. I am very glad you called my attention to it, because I have just finished my remarks.

Lachine Canal enlargement..... \$216,000

Mr. FOSTER. What we wanted on this item were the names of the officers on these different canals who have been dismissed, and the names of those who have been appointed in their places.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will hand to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) a statement.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that this is very bulky, and it is difficult even to cursorily analyse the statement off-hand. Perhaps my hon. friend had better go to some other of his items until we have a chance to look this over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection.

Railways—

Intercolonial—To complete the Dartmouth branch .....	\$25,000
To supply and erect clock on tower of station at St. John.....	500

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways and Canals will be kind enough to state for the information of the committee the state of efficiency in which the Intercolonial Railway road-bed and rolling stock now are. I saw a statement in the press, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will give an explanation of it. The statement was that the revenue and expenditure of the Intercolonial had been brought pretty nearly to a balance on ac-

count of the degradation of the road-bed and the rolling stock. I wish to know from the hon. gentleman and from the officers of his department, what state of efficiency the Intercolonial is in at present, both in regard to the road-bed and the rolling stock, as compared with any prior time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will probably find that information in the report which has been laid on the Table, at all events up to the end of the last fiscal year. I have no later data. I think that I perhaps could say that the Intercolonial is not in any less state of efficiency nor is its condition in any less satisfactory state now than it was at the close of the fiscal year ending 30th June last.

Mr. HAGGART. No, that is not satisfactory. I think that in the report there is a general statement that the road-bed and the rolling stock are in a very efficient state. I may say that when I was at the head of the department I gave strict orders to the officers who had charge of the Intercolonial Railway that neither the road-bed nor the rolling stock was to be in any way degraded, that they were to be kept up in a most efficient condition, and the hon. gentleman must know from the officers of the department whether this was carried out after the time that I left and whether the road is in as efficient a state as to any prior time. The Minister has his deputy there and he can ask him whether the statements I make are correct or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not going to say, from personal knowledge, that the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is not correct. I have made no remark with reference to the condition of the Intercolonial Railway as the hon. gentleman left it, reflecting upon its condition, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman should assume that I did so.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not saying that you did.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not at all reflecting on the hon. gentleman's management of the railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I see the hon. gentleman does not intend to answer that question. I see from the debates that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) stated a few days ago that during the last general election in June there were 400 more men employed than were usual. He made the comparison at the period which did not correspond with the period of the preceding year. I now tell the House and the Minister of Railways, that no official of my department, and no official of the Intercolonial got orders or even a hint from me, to employ any persons but those absolutely necessary for

the road, on account of political or any other purposes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), when he made that statement, had Mr. Pottinger, the superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, and he had the deputy of his department, he had them to refer to to prove the incorrectness of the statement he made, that any one was employed on the Intercolonial Railway for political purposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have given personal attention for several years to the enormous number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, and I submitted to the House a comparative statement of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which showed that far more men were employed per mile on the Intercolonial Railway than on either of the other two. It is admitted on all hands that the Intercolonial Railway has been over-manned for years, and I am glad that the Minister of Railways has announced that he has dismissed a large number of employees, and thus relieved the country of an enormous drain for supporting this road.

Mr. COCHRANE. It will be like the Customs Department; they will weed out some and appoint more.

Cornwall Canal..... \$145,600

Mr. HAGGART. The Sheik's Island dam on the Cornwall Canal is now about to be completed. Has the Minister any reports in his department on this. I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) visited that place himself, and I would like him to state whether he thinks that work is for the benefit of the public or whether the expenditure on it is also for the advantage of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was advised by the officers of his department that the work done on the Cornwall Canal was necessary and proper. I am not going to make any assault upon the policy which the hon. gentleman pursued in that regard. He appears to be very anxious that I should assail him.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no desire to do it. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that I am not going to be drawn, at this moment, into any criticism of the course he pursued, nor do I think that he ought to insist upon me expressing very high commendation. I am willing to leave his work as he directed it to be done, and as it was done, and I am content to pass no opinion upon it one way or the other. I think he ought to be perfectly willing that I should assume that attitude.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. BRITTON. In this vote there is a claim of \$600 for interest, which matured in 1887. If it was a just claim it would appear to one not acquainted with the facts that it should be paid by the late Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have carefully considered this matter, and I have come to the conclusion that that \$600 ought to be paid to Mr. Smith. The claim is of long standing, but it is one that should not be prejudiced by reason of the delay in paying it. Mr. Smith was adjudged a considerable amount for land damages, but he refused to accept the principal as a final settlement of his claim, contending that he was entitled to interest from the time the property was practically expropriated by the Crown. Others under similar circumstances had been paid interest. The matter dragged along until the interest increased to about \$1,200. It remained unadjusted until the change of Government, when an Order in Council was passed by the late Government on the 8th July, 1896, giving Mr. Smith half the interest which he claimed. He then refused to take it, but recently he has expressed his willingness to accept the \$600 in full payment for his claim for interest. The amount ought to be paid him.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not finding fault with this, but Mr. Smith gave a conveyance in full to the Government for \$4,000. Perhaps he had a mental reservation in his mind at the time about interest. He claimed the interest from me. But my answer was, here is your conveyance for the money you agreed to take. I suppose that was your intention at the time you agreed to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know Mr. Smith personally, except that I have met him since this matter came up. The sum was offered to him, and he was told that unless he accepted it on the terms offered, that is, without interest, he would not get his money, and he accepted it. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that he did not maintain the attitude he has stated he maintained, because he himself recommended it to Council, and on the strength of his recommendation, Council passed an order on the 8th of July, 1896, for the payment to Mr. Smith of \$600. He has quite overlooked that fact, but that is the fact.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember anything of the kind. If the hon. gentleman has it there, with my signature, it is correct; but I do not remember that I recommended any such Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the Order in Council, but I know that it was passed on the 8th of July, I presume on the recommendation of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SNETSINGER. Does the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) remember giving the contract for Sheik's Dam without a tender ?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember anything of the kind. I remember that on the recommendation of the officers of my department I granted an extension to a contractor who had the contract already, and at the lowest price.

Mr. SNETSINGER. The contract was given to Gilbert & Sons for that section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can settle the question by stating whether he was Minister of Railways on the 8th of July, 1896.

Mr. HAGGART. I may have been Minister, but I may not have been there. It is very likely some one was acting Minister at the time. I do not remember that I signed anything of the kind. It is possible I did, but I have no recollection of it.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—

To pay wages of employees whilst unoccupied owing to delays for which the Electric Company were not responsible..... \$ 624

Construction..... 80,000

To pay Contractors Hugh Ryan & Co. the cost of pulling down and rebuilding timber wall in prism of canal, &c. 5,796

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the \$80,000 is to pay the balance of the claim of Mr. Ryan ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, this is to pay the Ryan firm.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be a very appropriate time for the hon. Minister to give some information with regard to the men who have been dismissed from the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. Some time ago when I asked him about them, his answer was that these men were considered as being employed only during the season of navigation, and when they were put off at the end of the season it did not necessarily follow that they would be employed again. I see that in the list handed to us to-night, out of the thirty-seven men put off there were only three re-employed. My information from some of these men is that they were dismissed without any complaint, political or otherwise, being made against them, and without receiving any information as to why they were dismissed. I would like to know on what grounds the hon. Minister has dismissed them? If on political grounds, it seems to me a very extraordinary course; if because he is adopting a new principle, of dismissing all the employes along the canal at the end of the season. I am sure he is not adopting a course which will meet with the approval of the country. There is no doubt that men leave the em-

ploy of the Government as they leave the employ of private individuals, with a good reputation or a bad one. If a man is dismissed and no reason is given for his dismissal, it will naturally be assumed by some people that he has been dismissed for not doing his duty, and this might interfere with his getting employment elsewhere. I think the Minister should tell us why he has dismissed and whether he gave them an opportunity, previous to their dismissal, to defend themselves or to refute any charges which were perhaps unjustly brought against them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is applying the rule to the cases of persons who are only employed temporarily, that is to say, only so long as their services are required for the season, and when the season is over and the canal is closed, they are no longer in the Government employ, and it is open to the Government in the following season to select any men for that season. There is no similarity between the cases of the men thus employed and the men who are in the civil service. I think the hon. gentleman himself will recognize that a very great distinction exists.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman follow the same rule with the employees of this House, such as sessional clerks and sessional messengers, who are only employed for each year, but come back in the following year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are probably in the civil service. You cannot class men employed temporarily in the capacity of labourers with men in the civil service. When the hon. gentleman says that only two of the men have been re-employed during the current year, of those who were employed last year, he is in error. He will find on looking over the list that a considerably greater number than that have been re-employed. The staff on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal was to a considerable extent reorganized. A number of men were dropped out. We proposed to get along with a smaller staff than has been customary on that canal. The reorganization of those in the higher class of employment on the canal has also been very carefully arranged for. We have considerably reduced the cost of maintaining the service on that canal, as we have on some of the others. Some of the men were unquestionably exceedingly offensive in their conduct during the election.

Mr. SPROULE. Which of them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were quite a few. The hon. member who represents that constituency could throw some light on that question. I confess I did allow myself to be guided very largely by the knowledge and

recommendations of that hon. gentleman with regard to those employed.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it in the interests of the service that men who have become familiar with the work should be dismissed and others put in their place? The list of dismissals and appointments was laid on the Table only a few minutes before these Estimates were submitted, no doubt lest we might otherwise have time to go into an analysis of it, but a rapid glance over it shows that men who have been doing the work year after year and who expected to be taken on this year again at the opening of navigation, were ruthlessly left aside and others appointed. Such a course was not followed in the past. Is it not a fact that on the canals the same men were re-employed year after year, and that, in pursuance of this understanding, these men have bought lots and built houses in the vicinity of their work, which they would not have done had they considered themselves liable to be not called upon again once their season's work was over. Take one man who was dismissed, on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, he has only one limb, but did the work satisfactorily, and there is no information that he took any part in the election, or even voted, and it does seem a most inhuman thing to dismiss such a man as that. Then, with regard to the other parties dismissed, I would like to have the names of those who were considered offensive partisans and the name of the member who represented the riding and on whose representations they were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were not dismissed.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, they were not re-employed, and it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. HAGGART. This is the first time in our history that any such policy as the hon. gentleman has introduced has been pursued. Every employee on the canal formerly was appointed by Order in Council, on the understanding that he would be kept on during good behaviour. There has been just the opposite policy introduced on the Soo Canal. The hon. gentleman said the reductions were made there for the purpose of economy. Well, there were thirty-two employees in all, and he has twenty-eight at present. He discharged every one of the old employees but two. He discharged thirty without inquiring whether they had been active partisans or incompetent or not. He altered a policy that has been pursued in this country ever since confederation. The lockmen on the canal were always appointed by Order in Council, and the same men kept on from season to season. We even took over from the Imperial Government all those who were on the Rideau Canal, and I am glad to see that the common sense possessed by my hon. friend from North Leeds (Mr. Frost) prevented his advising the dismissal of these

Mr. BLAIR.

men, for he knew the feeling that would be caused in that section if those old soldiers, who have been some forty or forty-five years in the employ of the Government had been treated in the supercilious manner in which the Minister of Railways treats employees from one end of the country to the other. Such a disgraceful condition of affairs never existed before—taking the bread from the mouths of the poor men in this country, who were appointed on the understanding, an understanding which has always been adhered to previously, that they would be retained during good behaviour. This gentleman, however, sends a letter to each of his political supporters, notably the hon. member for North Leeds (Mr. Frost), inclosing a list of every man employed on the canal, in his country, and gives him the option of either dismissing them or keeping on as many as he likes. Is that the policy which should be pursued by the head of a large department such as the Railway Department? The country will remember it. There is no advantage to be gained by conduct of that kind. Never was there any question raised by any previous Minister of Railways and Canals whether a man was a political partisan or not, so long as he did his work well. He owed his appointment, no doubt, to the fact that he was a political supporter of the party in power, but wholesale dismissals such as the hon. gentleman has made are the first in the history of the country, and I venture to say that no such disgraceful episode will again occur in its history as the dismissal of these men.

Mr. DYMENT. I know something with regard to these new appointments on the Soo Canal, and why the old hands were not taken on again. I am very much surprised to hear gentlemen of the long experience of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), who had a list of these employed in front of them, get up and make the bald statement that there are only two of the old men kept on.

Mr. HAGGART. I take it from the list furnished by the Minister of Railways and Canals. On that list there are twenty-eight new appointments on the canal and two of the old hands kept on. If there is anything wrong, it is in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, which the hon. gentleman can see for himself.

Mr. DYMENT. To begin with, Superintendent Boyd is still there.

Mr. LISTER. He should be removed.

Mr. DYMENT. The next one I see is Mr. Taylor, the chief electrician. The next is Mr. Hill, the assistant electrician. I come down to John Gilbertson, the diver. These are the important positions with the big pay. Further on is Mr. McRae.

Mr. SPROULE. Look at McRae and see if the initials are the same?

Mr. DYMENT. In the one case it is C. W. McRae and in the other it is C. McRae. Then there is Breckman and J. Arnold. That, I think, makes seven or eight of the old hands retained. These are all I see here. There are two others who are not here, who were put on by the superintendent. There were five struck off. The staff was reduced by five. But recently it was found absolutely necessary to put on an oiler at night. So that makes four less than there were last year. These four and the nine still there make thirteen. Several of them, as the Minister of Railways and Canals says, were strong partisans.

Mr. SPROULE. Who ?

Mr. DYMENT. Mr. Brown, for instance, who attended the convention. And when he was asked to support Mr. Hearst, who was a great friend of his, he almost weepingly said: William, I would like to vote for you at this convention, but I must vote for George. George had the patronage. Mr. Williamson is another case. And there is another one who is not on this year, but who held the important position of chief foreman on the canal last year. I took the trouble to inquire in the Marine Department to-day, and I was told by the official in charge that this man was a defaulter to the Government in about \$1,300

Mr. SPROULE. Was that put in against him ?

Mr. DYMENT. I think it is a sufficient reason for not continuing him in the employ of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it brought to the attention of the Government ?

Mr. DYMENT. As a matter of fact, the Marine Department was going to prosecute him and he skipped to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it because he was a defaulter or because you recommended his dismissal that he was dismissed ?

Mr. DYMENT. I think that a defaulter to one department of the Government should not be continued in the employ of any other department.

Mr. SPROULE. But was that considered.

Mr. LISTER. Would you have taken him on again ?

Mr. DYMENT. Another man who was on last year but is not on this year has been suspended several times by the superintendent, Mr. Boyd, and another man had been suspended by Mr. Boyd a couple of times for drunkenness. I do not think that such men should be taken on. Ten of them never applied to me or to anybody to be employed. They recognized that they were employed for the season and did not expect to go on again. It seems to me, hon. gen-

tlemen opposite who are so solicitous for their friends in the matter of mail contracts ought not to find fault with us if in the case of these who were not permanent employees, we recommended those whom we preferred. I do not think the Minister of Railways and Canals has done wrong. A number were left on, because it was thought that there should be enough of the old hands to ensure the efficient running of the canal; and I am informed by the officials here that it never worked better.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What about the man referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who had only one limb out of the four ?

Mr. DYMENT. He was night-watchman, and I do not think he was a fit man for that position. He could not run and tell anybody if a fire occurred. The mere fact that he is a cripple was not a sufficient reason for keeping him in a place the duties of which he could not perform efficiently.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymont) has made a painful exhibition of the use of the authority he possesses, a painful exhibition for a young man—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be a laughing matter to men who are well off in the world; but, when a man has to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow and has lost one limb out of the four, for that man to be kicked out by a man who has got plenty in the world and is operating on the timber belonging to the country and practically filling his pockets, I say is inhuman. Now, with regard to the statement that the hon. gentleman made that some of the men who were dismissed were guilty of partisanship, one of these was Mr. T. A. Brown. I have known Mr. Brown for twenty years, and I would take his word as ready as I would take that of any man in the country, and I have his emphatic denial that he took any part in the election. Would it be reasonable, I would ask the hon. gentleman himself, considering that the election took place on the 30th of June, a week after the general elections, when the Conservatives were defeated—would it be common sense for these men to take part in the election knowing that they might be dismissed? Mr. Brown tells me that he did not take any part in the election, and that he was dismissed without any charge being made against him so far as he knows.

Mr. LISTER. They were not dismissed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon gentleman (Mr. Lister) is merely quibbling. Men had been on the canals in this country for forty years and the custom of the country had been to re-employ them, but at the open-

ing of one season when they were prepared to resume their work, they are told that their services are not required. If that is not dismissal, I do not know what it is. I think the hon. member for Algoña (Mr. Dymont) is exercising an authority that it would be well, in so young a man, not to exercise. He is just commencing his political career; he is just building a reputation for himself which will not be to his credit. He complains that I did not give the number of those appointed. I say that I had not an opportunity of seeing that list. Information is retained until the very moment it is required for the discussion of items before us, and then it is thrown at us. I say that it is unfair to the members of the House that they should not have an opportunity to get the information that is necessary in order to defend their friends who are unjustly assailed and dismissed without inquiry. The leader of the Government (Sir Wilfred Laurier) stated in my hearing that no man in the public service would be dismissed without having a fair chance to defend himself against any charge brought against them.

Mr. LISTER. They were not dismissed.

Mr. SPROULE. I say they were dismissed. There is no other word in the English language that will describe the treatment they received. They were dismissed without trial.

Mr. DYMENT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. If the tables were turned, and his side was in power, would he recommend the re-appointment of these men?

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly I would.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. members laugh. They are laughing in a sneering way that is not becoming. I have been in this House for nineteen years, and when pressure was put upon me—now I am giving a personal history—to dismiss some of the postmasters one of whom hounded me throughout the riding and abused me on the platform, I never asked for his dismissal. I went to Sir John Macdonald and asked him what was the custom, and he said that so long as a man did his duty as an officer it was unusual to ask for his dismissal. And he remained 12 or 14 years longer in that office until he resigned it voluntarily. I refer to Mr. Middleton, of Dundalk. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) knows him. I can give two or three instances of the same kind; but in no case did I ever ask for the dismissal of a man in my riding for political partisanship or any other reason, so long as he did his work faithfully.

To pay Contractor Archibald Stewart for loss caused by stoppage of work on sections 1 and 2 of the Soulanges Canal.... \$17,345

Mr. SPROULE.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to add the following words to that item:—"Notwithstanding that the said amount is not legally recoverable by the contractor under the strict legal interpretation of the contract." Now, with regard to this item, I may say that it is the sum which it has been concluded that Mr. Stewart is entitled to by reason of actual loss caused him by stoppage of the work upon sections one and two of his contract on the Soulanges Canal. A very strong opinion was given by the engineer in charge of that work, that the stone which was being supplied by the contractor was unfit for use on the canal, and did not properly comply with the specifications of the contract. This occurred before I entered upon the duties of the department, and, upon the opinion of the engineer being received by the gentleman who was acting as Minister of Railways at the time, instructions were given to stop the work. It was felt that, if the opinion of the engineer was correct and this stone was unsuitable, it ought not to be allowed to be put into the work any longer; and it was thought proper to have an immediate investigation into the whole matter. Opinion, I believe, was invited. Experts were sent down for the purpose of examining the stone. Some of them reported favourably, and some condemned the stone. Other experts were sent, a good deal of delay occurred, and a great difference of opinion was found to exist among those who were supposed to be competent to form a judgment upon a question of that kind; and it became a very serious question as to what ought to be done. It would, of course, be a most disastrous thing if stone which was unfit for that work, should be allowed to be put into it. Naturally, a good deal of delay occurred in reaching a conclusion as to whether the engineer in charge of the works was right, or the chief engineer of the department, who pronounced in favour of the stone. Ultimately it was determined that the engineer in charge of the work was not justified in condemning the whole stone. Some of the stone, it was decided, was unsuitable for the work, and some of it was suitable. The quarry itself did contain, it was decided, proper stone for use, while, of course, it contained a good deal that would not answer the purpose. The decision arrived at, therefore, was, that the general condemnation which had been pronounced by the engineer in charge, was too broad, and that the work ought not to be stopped, that a portion of the stone which he had got out could very properly be put into the work, and the ultimate decision was in accordance with that view. Before the final conclusion had been reached and the contractor was notified, he had been delayed a long period. I think some three months elapsed before the matter was ultimately decided. His machinery was kept idle, and a number of his

hands were kept unemployed. A good deal of expense was incurred, and, as a result, a claim was preferred by him against the department for a very large sum, as damages resulting from the stoppage of the work. That claim was looked into by the chief engineer very closely. I think the gross amount of the claim which he preferred, was \$51,000. He gave items showing upon what he based this claim. After a careful investigation of the different items, it was ultimately decided that he could properly ask for \$17,345 as the loss which he personally sustained resulting from the stoppage of the work during this period. The matter was referred to the Governor in Council, a report of all the circumstances of the case was presented to Council, who concluded upon recommending that this sum be paid to him.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no doubt that the claim is a just one. The question arose when I was Minister of Railways, as to whether the stone was suitable for the work or not. The engineer in charge of the work objected to the stone. I told the deputy of my department, the chief engineer, to inquire into it particularly. He got an expert from the Intercolonial Railway, a man who had been a bridge builder for a number of years on the Intercolonial Railway, and several other parties, to inquire as to the character of the stone. They also got a technical report, either furnished by the contractor himself, or furnished directly by an expert in McGill College, where the stone was tested. The consensus of opinion was, that the stone was of an excellent quality and fit for the work. I know the engineer in charge of the work objected to it, but he had not sufficient reason for objecting to it. I think the Minister was perfectly right in his course, and the application is a just one. I think the stone is probably as good as can be found in Canada for that work. But what I object to is, that an officer in charge of an important work, like the Soulages Canal, when the stone was cut under his direction, where he had a report of every day's stone cutting, although he objected to the quality of the stone in the first instance, he never made any objection afterwards; and that, on account of the crassness of this gentleman, the country is put to an expense of over \$17,000, by reason of delay caused the contractor in putting into his work material which was as good as could be furnished, perhaps, in Canada.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think the engineer should be condemned in the language that my hon. friend has used. He must not forget that other men, experts in that sort of thing, examined this stone and condemned it.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know who they are.

Mr. LISTER. Men who have been working in stone for years and years; and there

is still grave doubt, after all the examination, whether the stone being put into that canal is proper for the purpose.

Trent Canal—Construction..... \$250,000

Mr. BENNETT. The importance of this undertaking must be my excuse for addressing to the House a few remarks at this late hour and at this late stage of the session, on this question. I do not propose to go into the Trent Valley work as a whole, it has been so often dealt with in this House. But I do complain that the Minister has not dealt with the construction of the work in that generous spirit, in that fair spirit, that we, who reside along this route, hoped and desired he would do. Now, of this work, as I understand it, two sections are under contract. There is, first, the section between Lakefield and Peterborough; then, going west, there is the section between Balsalm Lake and Lake Simcoe. Last fall, when the Minister pursued the very commendable course of going over the route and seeing it for himself, I will not say that he led those who heard him in the town of Peterborough, at the banquet given in his honour, to believe that the section between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe would be proceeded with at once. But I rather think that the statement which was made on that occasion inclined people to the belief that that would be undertaken this year. Now the position of the matter is this. To-day there is an uninterrupted water communication from a point about fifteen miles from Lake Ontario to the town of Peterborough. After leaving Peterborough there is this section of nine miles under contract, and part of the amount of \$650,000 which is placed in the Estimates for this year is to be applied to the final completion of that section. From there to Balsam Lake there is an uninterrupted water communication and under the contract which was let in that vicinity by the late Government there is water communication to within six miles of Lake Simcoe. That is when this Kirkfield section shall have been completed. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals fairly led those people who heard him last year to believe that the construction would be completed to Lake Simcoe from Kirkfield. There is water communication from within fifteen miles of Lake Ontario clear through to Lake Simcoe, and yet there remains seven miles of that uncompleted, and we are disappointed to find it that the Minister is not asking that the remaining portion should be placed under contract this year. I think in view of the large grants that are being made from one end of the Dominion to the other that the Liberal members who have constituencies along the route of this canal, and who are deeply anxious to have this work completed, should have pressed upon the Government the necessity of providing for the completion of the work between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe. There are along

the route of the canal half a dozen constituencies represented by supporters of the Government, and while they would spend millions in Quebec and British Columbia they sit quietly by and are not able to exert the influence which ought to be brought to bear upon the Government in order to secure the necessary grant for the completion of this work. I do not intend to deal with the work as to its national or local importance, but so much money has been spent and as the late Government as well as the present one have acknowledged the desirability of the construction of the canal there can at this late stage be no looking back. I think that members from Ontario have been remiss in their duty in not asking the Minister to insist upon the Government making a further appropriation this year. I know that some years ago it was a matter of some difficulty to prevail upon the then Administration to undertake the commencement of the work. There had been portions of the work connected locally, but the late Government having undertaken the construction of the sections between Lakefield and Peterborough and Kirkfield and Balsam Lake it would be a small matter to go on and complete the remaining sections between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe. In the Main Estimates there is a sum of \$650,000 and in the Supplementary Estimates \$150,000. Is the \$150,000 included in the \$650,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The \$150,000 is to pay for that portion of the work that we expect will be completed before the end of the fiscal year. The amount in the general Estimates for 1897 is for the work that will be completed under existing contracts.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Then no new contracts are being entered into in the year 1897, and the money that is appropriated is simply to complete contracts now in existence for the sections from Lakefield to Peterborough, and from Kirkfield to Balsam Lake. I can only express my regret that the Government supporters in Ontario have not prevailed upon the Government to undertake the completion of the interesting space between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe and place it under contract this year. We know that it is too late now to ask the Minister to do anything in that regard. I believe that the Minister is favourably impressed with the importance of the work and I hope that we may expect to see next year the remaining space between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe placed under contract.

Mr. **WALLACE**. The Minister of Railways and Canals has not stated to the committee what his programme is as to this Trent Valley Canal. He has not told us whether it is his intention to complete the work from one lake to the other, nor has he said anything as to what the duration of the work shall be.

Mr. **BENNETT**.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not in a position to inform the committee as to what will be decided upon in respect to that. If I were to express my own view it would be that a very great deal of time would not be permitted to elapse before we would ask Parliament for an appropriation sufficient to complete that portion of the work between the two lakes. I am not now stating any conclusion which has been arrived at by the Government on this subject. Of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows that no matter what may be the view of the Minister all he can do is to present his view to Council and Council may or may not authorize an application to Parliament for a further appropriation. Until that view has been accepted and a conclusion arrived at I would not be in a position to make an authoritative statement.

Mr. **WALLACE**. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals is hardly treating us fairly in coming to Parliament and asking for a large vote. That vote is part of a well considered programme adopted years ago.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not asking for any vote at all to authorize new contracts to be entered into. I am asking only for sufficient money to complete existing contracts.

Mr. **WALLACE**. What is the object of completing existing contracts if it is not the intention of the Government to prosecute the work from end to end. To construct all these small sections without continuing the work I think would be very little better than undertaking a useless expenditure.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I presume there would be no way in which the Government could escape its liability to complete the contracts that were actually entered into when they assumed the responsibility of government. I would judge that the most that could be expected of the Government would be that we would as soon as we felt that the time was ripe for the purpose of coming to some conclusion as to the entering upon of new contracts, cause a further contract to be made.

Mr. **BENNETT**. I understand the Minister to state that he is personally favourably disposed to the completion of the intervening space between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman has not caught my remark correctly. I said that if I were to state my own personal view it would be that the work between the two lakes would be completed.

Mr. **BENNETT**. That is between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, between Lake Simcoe and Balsam Lake.

Mr. **KENDRY**. I may say that I am sorry that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not seen fit to put into the Estimates a sufficient amount to prosecute the construction of this canal. We have expended a great deal of money in the centre of this canal. We have seen just now that the appropriation is some \$650,000 to prosecute the work from Peterborough to Lakefield. This work will be of hardly any use at all until the end sections of this canal are completed. Unless there is something done on the Simcoe division, the work so far as the canal is concerned, will be of no use, and I am sorry to see the Minister has not seen fit to make provision for that. We have spent \$2,000,000, or about that, already on this canal, and the advantage of that expenditure cannot be reaped until the canal is opened up to the lake. Even at this late day, I trust the Minister will see his way to make provision for that.

Mr. **BENNETT**. What is the estimate for the uncompleted portion of the Balsam Lake—Lake Simcoe section, from Kirkfield north of Lake Simcoe?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The Estimate made for me in the department is, that it will take in the neighbourhood of \$4,000,000 to build the whole canal, beyond that which is now under contract.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Four millions more?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, \$4,000,000 more. The whole work was estimated to cost upwards of \$6,000,000, and we have already expended and provided for something in the neighbourhood of something over \$700,000. It will take at least \$4,000,000 to complete the whole canal.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What depth?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Six feet.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What will be the length?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There will be sixty-two miles of artificial canal works.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It is stated in the newspapers that the Minister proposes to use other than the Portland cement in these works. The Government has previously tried the native cement in some of the canals along the St. Lawrence, and every engineer of the department has reported that Portland cement is the only cement that is fit to use for this work. Some cement works have been established, and they pretend that they can make cement equal to the Portland cement. But if the Minister

uses any cement manufactured in this country, I hope he will see that it is equal to the best Portland cement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows how strongly the opinion of the chief engineer coincides with his on this subject. He may rely upon it, that no cement will be used which it would not be safe to use for the purpose. There will be portions of the work where probably the native cement can be used without any disadvantage, and I think the officers will be alive to that.

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. I think it is rather unfair to the Canadian cement to condemn it off-hand. Cement is an article that can be tested by experts, and if it is not up to standard, it need not be used. We all know that there is a prejudice in favour of an article that has given great satisfaction and has got a name, and it may be true also that some of the Canadian cement—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Native cement.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There is a Portland cement made in this country which may be equal to the imported, but there is a cement called native cement, which is a different thing.

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. In the early stages of the manufacture of cement in Canada, some of the tests made might not be up to the standard of imported cement, but experience in manufacture has improved the quality of cement used here, and we have tested it in our section of the country in water works and the abutments of bridges, and the engineers are satisfied that some of the cements manufactured in Canada are quite as good as the imported article. Of course, if our cement is not up to standard, it would not be proper to use it in important works of this kind. But it should not be refused on account of any prejudice that exists. It should be given a fair test by the department. I think it is only due to our own manufacturers that they should have that opportunity. Of course, if their cement does not come up to the standard, nobody would ask that it should be used. But if they can manufacture an article of as good a quality, and supply it to the Government and to contractors at the same price, or at a lower price than the imported cement, I think the preference should be given to it.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The hon. gentleman has, I believe, received tenders for about 85,000 barrels of cement. Would he tell the House what he got it for, and from whom he got it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We divided it among various tenderers. I could not, at the moment, state accurately the portions which went to the different tenderers. The Rathbun Com-

pany, manufacturers of Portland cement, were awarded a contract for some 10,000 barrels. We gave a Belgian tenderer a contract for some 8,000 barrels. The manufacturers of native cement got contracts for 25,000 barrels. There were parts of the work for which we thought we could safely use the native cement. The balance was divided among the various tenderers for the Portland cement. The average price was in the neighbourhood of \$2.10.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the size of a barrel ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We insisted that it should contain 400 pounds.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the price of the native cement ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be about half the price of the Portland. It takes a great deal more of the native cement than of the Portland to do the same work ; so that there is not much difference in the cost ; but we felt that wherever we could use it safely, we should give the native cement the preference.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not the Portland cement come nearly all from the same firm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the larger portion would be imported.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this bought by tender ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Had you any tenders from the Owen Sound firm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and we awarded them a contract for a considerable quantity.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman require the same standard from the native cement, as to contraction, pressure power and expansion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is required to stand the same test as the Portland.

Beauharnois Canal—

To pay Joseph Julian \$275 and Francis Grenier \$10 for damage to crops by overflow.....	\$ 285
Replacing cope stones at Nine Locks....	1,000

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman give us some statement with regard to these damages paid to Julian and Grenier ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These are two cases of several, in which it was concluded that damages might fairly be awarded for injuries caused in the winter of 1890 by an overflow from

Mr. BLAIR.

the blocking of a culvert. Mr. Brunet was awarded \$45, Mr. Poirier a small sum, Mr. Julian \$275, and Mr. Grenier \$10. These matters were referred to the Department of Justice in 1895, and they advised that the Government were liable for the damage. Two of the parties accepted what the Government offered, and the other two refused to accept, and the matter remained over ; but now these two parties express their willingness to accept the sums of money originally awarded to them.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is stating what he has been told, but that is not at all, I think, what happened. The two parties mentioned, Brunet and Poirier, live near Valleyfield, and their claims were for damages caused by water breaking through the bank of the canal and getting into their cellars. Julian and Grenier live seven or eight miles from there, and they have claimed damages, but from an entirely different cause—from water which had come down through a culvert, and which, through the bad management of the canal, had gone around the barn of Julian and caused damage for which, at the time, he claimed, I think, \$500. Some exception was taken to that, and he was offered an amount which he refused. The others took their money, but I may remark that the damages were paid through a notary, and the payment was registered in the registry office of the district of Beauharnois. As Julian has accepted this amount, I would suggest that it should be paid to him by a notarial deed, and the deed registered ; otherwise the same claim for damages might be made again upon the department at some future time. I also see a vote here for \$1,000 for replacing copestones at Nine Locks. I do not know whether this is a revote, as we voted the same amount last year for the same purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. Last session we voted the money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then it was not expended

Mr. BERGERON. Then this would be a re-vote.

Mr. QUINN. I understand that tenders were accepted for the cement at \$2.10. They were the lowest, I presume.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer. There may have been two or three tenders at the same figure, and if so the contracts were divided among them.

To pay damages to R. S. Snider in connection with his mill.....	\$1,000
---	---------

Mr. BRITTON. Will the hon. Minister explain this ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. His land was taken and he claimed a very much larger sum, but the valuator recommended the payment of \$1,000, which he has agreed to accept.

Mr. **BRITTON**. Long before I knew anything about Parliament from personal experience, there was a discussion in reference to the Tay Canal, and it was said that the mill of a man named Snider was ruined, and that we would have to pay a large sum of money to him in addition to the cost of the canal.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There was no amount paid on account of the Tay Canal. This man's water power was destroyed by the dam which took away from the height of his water power. No doubt, he has a fair claim on the Government, but what it is I do not know.

Baie des Chaleurs Railway—Operating and maintaining..... \$18,500

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. I understand that this is to pay the operation of the railway during this year. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to continue operating it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, it is not; we have already handed over the possession and control of the railway, and are not now operating it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Will my hon. friend tell the committee the circumstances under which he took over this work of operating a road for which no appropriation was granted by Parliament, which had never been submitted to Parliament, for the taking over of which and operating it at the public expense there was not a tittle of authority. If the hon. gentleman could take this road over and operate it, he could take the Grand Trunk Railway over and operate it without asking Parliament at all, and then ask Parliament to reimburse the expense.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There would be a great deal of difference between our taking over the Grand Trunk Railway and operating it and our operating this road.

Mr. **FOSTER**. There is no difference in principle.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This does not involve a very considerable sum. We found ourselves in this situation that we were called upon by gentlemen connected with the South Shore or the Great Northern Railway, which it was proposed to construct on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and which it was contemplated would strike the Montreal, St. Lambert and Sorel road and then

connect with the Baie de Chaleurs at the terminus at Gaspé Basin, to carry out the policy of the late Government. This company had a great deal of encouragement from the ex-Minister of Finance. They had gone to Europe to float their undertaking upon the strength of some communication which had passed between the Government then, and certain endorsement of the Finance Minister. They had pressed upon us that we should take up the engagement which the other Government—

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does my hon. friend mean to say that anything ever occurred in connection with the late Minister of Finance which bound him to take over the Baie de Chaleurs road?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It would be too much to say they were bound, because if they were, I apprehend they would have endeavoured to carry out their engagements. But there were relations of a very close character between the company and the Government, and the hon. gentleman will probably recall that he gave a certain guarantee in connection with the payment of interests upon these bonds. They took home the hon. gentleman's guarantee to the London market, and attempted to finance upon it, and after they had proceeded a certain distance the hon. gentleman either notified them that they were not using his name by authority or that he had withdrawn from any assurance he had given. At all events their financial arrangements were brought to a standstill, and they were put probably to a good deal of expense and disappointment in not realizing their expectations and the whole undertaking was brought to a sudden termination. One of the consequences was that the Baie de Chaleurs Railway ceased to be operated. The winter was coming on, and the people along the coast were going to be deprived of railway accommodation. This company was urging us to ask Parliament to take it up in the line on which it appears to have been taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite. After considering the matter in Council very carefully, we concluded that we could not hold out any expectation to the company that this House would endorse their project, as they said it had been endorsed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We thought the principle was entirely false.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What principle?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The principle of giving a Government guarantee for interest for any term of years on the bonds of a railway company. That principle was unsound. We considered that was unsound and did not want to encourage useless expectations. But, the representatives which they made to us, fortified, I am bound to

say, by a good deal of evidence, were to the effect that the Baie des Chaleurs Railway would be a good paying property, that it could be run to advantage, that it was in litigation, having been taken possession of by the sequestrators of Quebec, or was in some way in the courts under proceedings then pending, and, as a result, it would not be operated during the winter. Upon consideration we concluded that it would be a proper thing, under all the circumstances, to run the road for a short time, for the winter at least, and see whether or not it had merit, whether it would be a paying piece of property in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. We tried it under these circumstances with the result that the balance turned out to be on the wrong side of the account. We closed down the operation in the month of May.

Mr. FOSTER. When did you commence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In January, I think, on the 1st of January. It ran through January, February, March, April and May—five months, and at the end of May we handed it over having concluded that it would not pay.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it running yet ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not being run by us.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is being run by the company.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any money paid out over and above the receipts for the operation and maintenance of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I apprehend that the charge and expenses of operating were paid out of the Intercolonial Railway fund—I presume they were.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) know ? Cannot he say whether that was done or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) might fairly infer from that—

Mr. FOSTER. Now, the hon. gentleman comes to a fair inference. I ask him a fair question, why cannot he give me a fair answer ? He "presumes" and "supposes" and "infers" and goes around and about and athwart the question. But why cannot he come on squarely and say, not what he "apprehends" but does he know whether any sums were paid out, and, if so, out of what vote ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt they were.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend tell me under what legal construction of the Act he presumed to take money which Parliament had voted for the running of the

Mr. BLAIR.

Intercolonial Railway and devoted to the running of an alien line entirely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a road connected directly with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. But a man may live next door to the hon. gentleman without being related to him. A road may run parallel with the Intercolonial Railway, it may butt up against it and still be an entirely different road. I say the hon. gentleman had no more business to take money voted for the Intercolonial Railway and devote it to the running of the Baie des Chaleurs road, than he had to take \$18,500 of public money and use it to run a road in Russia. I would like to ask him if the sum of \$18,500 has been paid out, and, if so, was it paid out under audit by the Auditor General ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not followed the actual fact of the payment. I have said to the hon. gentleman that I have no doubt that it is paid, and if so, it has been paid on the strength of an Order in Council which was passed, and, of course, the responsibility of which we must assume. I take it that it was quite within our province in the exceptional circumstances I have stated relying upon being justified by Parliament in making these payments. At all events we have done it, and we ask Parliament to make the amount good by this appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend the Order in Council before the House authorizing the running of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that is on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it simply an Order in Council authorizing the Government to take over, or to operate for a certain length of time this road, or has there been an Order in Council passed appropriating certain sums from any source towards the payment of this amount. Or has the hon. gentleman simply paid it out of a credit and now asks Parliament to vote this sum in order to put the amount back into the credit ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ask this vote so that the amount may be recouped to the Intercolonial Railway fund. As to the Orders in Council, they authorize the Department of Railways to take this road over and operate it for this limited period on the conditions I have stated. I would be very glad to bring the Order in Council down.

Mr. FOSTER. I fancy they do not raise the question at all as to whether that would eventuate in the Dominion having to pay a certain amount of money, but simply authorize the Minister of Railways to operate the road without mentioning whether he was

to find the money for it, but assuming that it would come out of the road.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We assumed from the first the possibility that the balance might be on the wrong side of the account. But the Order in Council, I think, makes no distinct provision for the payment of money, but authorizes the road to be run as part of the Intercolonial Railway, those who were running to pay wages and other expenses incident to the operation in the same way that they pay the charges of the Intercolonial Railway.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Will the hon. gentleman state whether the Auditor General objected to the payment of this amount, and if he objected, was there an Order in Council overruling his objection?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have heard a good many objections from the Auditor General, but I do not know that I have heard any on this particular point. I do not know whether the matter had reached him or not.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend cannot tell whether the Auditor General has reached it or whether it is hanging around the purlieus of the suspense account of the Intercolonial Railway. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has been wily enough not to have it brought before the Auditor General.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman must know that I am anything but wily.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** I desire to ask under what statutory authority such an Order in Council could be made. I have been looking at the Act of the Department of Railways and also the Government Railways Act and I cannot find in these statutes any authority for the Governor in Council to make such an order. Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain that.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Borden's) assurance that no such authority can be found.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** I do not like to detain the committee at this hour, but I am sure that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guité) must have been disagreeably surprised when he heard it announced that it was the intention of the Government not to continue to run this road. One of the principal reasons for the hon. gentleman's election was that his friends, if not himself, promised that the road should be run by the Government. They held this Government up to the admiration of the people down there. Look at this good Government. As soon as they come to power our railroad begins to run; and if you vote against Mr. Guité the road will cease running immediately. The

promise was held out that not only would the road continue to be operated if the hon. member was returned, but I heard the hon. member himself make a speech on nomination day at Caplin in which he said that not only would the road continue to be operated by the Government, but that he had no doubt that if he was returned he would get a subsidy of about three millions to continue the road down to Gaspé. I am sure that the hon. gentleman is much disappointment at what he heard from the Minister of Railways this evening.

**Mr. GUITÉ. (Translation.)** It is likely enough, I may say, that on nomination day I may have told the voters of the Bonaventure county that should I be returned to this House, I expected to see the Government operate the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and further, that the Government would go on with the work on that railway. But I did certainly not give any pledge to the electors that the Government would prosecute the completion of that railway, nor did I tell my constituents that I had received from the Government any pledge to the same effect. I merely told them, on nomination day, as I already stated, that I had good grounds for hoping that the Government of the day would assist us and push the railway works to completion, not only in my own riding but also in that of Gaspé. I deeply regret, I must say, that the Government have not seen their way to going on with the building of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and even reaching the county of Gaspé. I am sorry to see that the work has been stopped. But before long, I hope the Government of the day will deal fairly by the Gaspé territory, and will make arrangements with one of the companies or otherwise for the purpose of prosecuting the work; and still better, the Government, I hope, will take to their own charge the building of that railway which is bound to so largely benefit the whole Gaspé section.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I myself heard the hon. gentleman on the day of nomination at Maria, when he was far more keen than he is to-night. He told the people there that the good Government that we have now in power, the best Government we ever had since this country existed, had taken hold of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and it would be a calamity to Canada not to vote for him because then the Government might get discouraged and stop the railway. But he said if he was elected not only would the Baie des Chaleurs Railway then existing be operated by this good Government but, more than that, he would obtain over three millions of dollars to take that railway down to Gaspé Basin; that the steamships coming across the ocean would come in the basin of Gaspé and there would transmit the mails to that railway, and that altogether it would be the greatest boon for Gaspé that could be

imagined. Promises like these were made at every meeting. He promised it in the French language, which he has spoken to-night, and he also promised it in English, and I was surprised that he did not speak English to-night, as he speaks that language very well. Well, he was elected by an immense majority. We were not surprised. I do not see why the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) does not get up and say something in favour of his county. He was not there himself, but his namesake was there, the member for Bonaventure in the local. He went a great deal further than the present member in the Commons (Mr. Guite) : he said that this railway would be such a boon to the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé that the whole question in that election was the railway question. He went further than that and he said things so profane that I scarcely dare repeat them here. He said : If the bishops and the priests send the Liberals to a certain place, we will go there like gentlemen, in cars on this railway ; we will no longer have to go there on foot.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.  
A very clever idea.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose that is where my hon. friend wants to go. We told the people then that this was purely and simply an election promise. We told the people then not to believe the member for Bonaventure, who was probably sincere in what he said, because it was purely an election scheme, and that as soon as the object of the Government in carrying that county was attained, the road would come to a standstill, and it has come to a standstill.

Mr. GUYE. (Translation.) Allow me to say again, Mr. Chairman, that I do not regret having made to this House the statement which my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has just animadverted upon, and that I still feel confident, as I was before, that the Government of the day will mete out even-handed justice to my constituency. I had good grounds for complaining of the late Administration, in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway matter, on account of their having for so long a time ceased to operate that line. I did certainly place more confidence in the present Government, and I still cherish the hopes, in concert with the electors of Gaspé, and, still more, I do feel satisfied that we have much more to expect from the present Government in connection with the building of this railway than we could expect from the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand why this Baie des Chaleurs Railway matter stirs up to such a degree the wrath of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I do not suppose the reason is that, when the hon. gentleman went down to Bonaventure, with his hon. friend of Montmorency (Mr. Cas-

Mr. BERGERON.

grain), he had to come back to Montreal over this railway line, looking quite sheepish after the defeat he had sustained there. The hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be under the impression that this road has been operated in view of the federal election which took place in that county, but, as everybody knows, the Government had been asked to operate the road long before the death of the late member (Mr. Fauvel) had occurred. Mr. Fauvel, accompanied by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), Mr. Lemieux, the member for Bonaventure in the Quebec legislature and myself came up to Ottawa in order to interview the Government, and ask them to run this road, in order to give to the people of Gaspé the railway facilities they had so long been waiting for. The Government complied with our request, and the road was run all through the winter. True, there is, this year, a balance of \$18,000 on the wrong side of the account, for the running of this railway ; but it is only fair to add that the Government have operated it through the worst season of the year. Were they now to run it through the summer season and the winter, the receipts would cover the expenditure. As a matter of fact, I may say the late Government never dealt fairly by the people of Gaspé in connection with this railway matter. They handed over the road to schemers, men whose names are far from conveying the idea of honesty and uprightness, and this is why the road is now on the verge of bankruptcy. But, as I said, were the road to be run on a business basis it would pay its operating expenses. As I said here, last night, when speaking about the steamer's service between Quebec and Gaspé, from now until this Parliament ends, I shall never cease with my hon. friend from Bonaventure agitating this railway question. The county of Gaspé is the oldest county in the Dominion, the first one to be discovered in this country, and still, it is the only one that is deprived of railway communication with the other portions of the country. This is the first time that a Government grants to that county an appropriation enabling it to establish communication with the civilized world. It is the bounden duty of the Dominion Government to deal fairly by this portion of the province of Quebec that has been so long ignored. When the line of the Intercolonial was surveyed, it was agreed upon that this railway should be extended down to Gaspé Basin ; but we all know how, on the suggestion of some of those wealthy merchants mentioned by my hon. friend the late Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), like the Robins, who wished to keep the population of that county in a state of bondage, the Intercolonial was not extended down to Gaspé Basin. As I said, the Baie des Chaleurs Railway was handed over to some well-known jobbers of the province of Quebec.

Mr. TALBOT. Armstrong.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) That is the reason why the road was not extended further down. I appeal to my hon. friends from Montmorency and Beauharnois to say whether I am not within the mark in stating that the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure are the most picturesque and the most renowned for their natural wealth and capabilities throughout the whole Dominion. Tourists who have visited that part of the country have been loud in their praises, calling the Baie des Chaleurs the Mediterranean of America, and saying that the Gaspé region recalled to their minds the picturesque scenery of Switzerland and the Alps. Notwithstanding that small deficit of \$18,000, I hope that before long this railway will be operated successfully, once the line has been extended to Gaspé Basin, its natural terminus.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised to hear the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), it has evidently been prepared for a St. Jean Baptiste celebration. My hon. friend might make that speech on the hustings, but he cannot do it here. He forgets that if there has been built that piece of railway, some eighty-five miles, in that most beautiful country which I acknowledge to be among the finest in the Dominion—

Mr. LEMIEUX. The finest.

Mr. BERGERON. I will say the same thing, it was not very nice in the month of March when I was there, but no doubt it is in the summer time. But if a railway has been built there it is due in great part to the Conservative party and to the Conservative Government who have given immense subsidies to that railway. Now, if some of those subsidies have not found their way to that railway, it certainly is not the fault of the Conservative party or Government who granted the subsidies. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) mentioned the name of Armstrong. I think Mr. Armstrong can defend himself, and he would do it if he were here. But there is one other name, although I will not mention it. About \$100,000 found its way in to somebody's pocket, and it was not spent by the Conservative Government or party. The hon. gentleman knows what I mean. When he goes on to speak in that way, he must give everybody his due. But as a matter of fact, there would never have been an inch of railway built in that part of the province of Quebec were it not for the subsidies which have been granted to that part of the province by the Conservative Governments.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Baie des Chaleurs Railway matter, I may say that having upon several occasions, visited this section of the country, I may be allowed to offer a few remarks to the House about the item

now under consideration. I think the remarks just fallen from the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) as to the natural resources of that section of the country, are quite within the mark. Let me, however, offer a few words of explanation in connection with the deficit in the operating expenses of the road. The House should bear in mind that the road was run in the winter season; in fact it was in January that the Government took over this work of operating that portion of the road. Now, it is a well-known fact by all who are conversant with the way in which business is carried on in the province of Quebec, and chiefly in that remote section of the province, that all the merchants in the Gaspé peninsula and the county of Bonaventure had already made their purchases for the winter season and shipped their goods before the road was put in operation, as late as the month of January, too late, in fact, for the road being enabled to pay its running expenses. The fact is the road should have been operated during the summer season. All those who took part in the election made necessary through the death of Mr. Fauvel, are well aware of the fact that all through the electoral campaign which lasted three weeks, petition upon petition was sent to the Government, asking them to continue operating the road. Those are some of the grounds on which may be explained the deficit in the operating expenses of the road last winter under circumstances which could not well be remedied as the merchants of those localities had already had their goods shipped unaware of the fact that the road was going to run. In my opinion, under such conditions, the deficit is easily accounted for. All those who have visited that section of the country cannot help agreeing that the county of Bonaventure from the standpoint of the fertility of its soil, is one of the finest in the Dominion. Undoubtedly, had the appropriations voted under the shape of subsidies by the Dominion and the Quebec Governments to this railway been expended as they should have been, we would now have in that section of the country a road brought to its completion and in full operation. All those, among the Conservatives as well as among the Liberals, who have visited that section of the country are unanimous in saying that this is undoubtedly one of the finest sections of the province of Quebec, and even the whole Dominion. Should the Dominion Government think it their duty to take steps to have this road operated by some company, so as to secure the prosecution of those works, they will only be dealing fairly by the Gaspé peninsula. It is not only a mining country, and one noted for its fisheries, but it is also an agricultural region, and one equal to, if not superior to any other section of the province of Quebec. With an excellent climate, and a soil of unparalleled fertility, there is certainly, from the standpoint of farming operations, a brilliant

future in store for that section of the country, which will become an important factor in the general prosperity of the Quebec province.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Railways and Canals give the receipts of the road for the period during which it was operated, and the operating expenses?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The operating expenses will be \$17,298.40. In putting the amount in, we placed it at \$18,500, not having all the particulars. The receipts were \$7,267.36. The actual loss on the five months' operation being \$10,031.14.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, when he was recommending the scheme to his colleagues, make any estimate as to what the cost of operating the road, over and above the receipts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I doubt if I made any estimate. It was, of course, problematical. We had these representations made to us. They said that the business would be likely to be well sustained, although, during the winter season, the results would not be as satisfactory as during the summer; yet they did not anticipate that there would be any considerable balance on the wrong side of the account.

Mr. BERGERON. I am surprised to hear that the railway did not do more, because when I was down there, the cars were always crowded. There were a great many people travelling. It is true, that somebody said that nobody paid, but there were a great many people there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the resolution is adopted, I would like to emphasize one point. It is perfectly apparent that unless there is some authority under the statute for making this Order in Council, there was no authority at all for the operation of this railway by the Government. I understand the Minister of Railways to state that there is no authority under the statute. If that be so, the result is, that an Order in Council has been passed without any authority whatever, for the operation of this road, and the country is asked to pay \$18,500 for an unjustifiable and illegal act. I may be wrong in this, but if I am right, this is the result. I do not think that this is a matter which should be passed over with a word or a laugh. It strikes me, that this is an extraordinary condition of things. If the Government can pass an Order in Council in this way, providing for the operation of a railway, they can pass an Order in Council for the operation of a sugar refinery or a cotton factory, and come to this Parliament afterwards and ask Parliament to vote the money which has been lost by the operation of that particular institution. I think it is extremely desirable,

Mr. TALBOT.

before the item is passed, that the Minister of Railways and Canals should state to the House under what legal sanction the Order in Council was made, because it is apparent the expenditure has been made under some pretense of authority, and I would like to know what the pretense of authority was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is no doubt correct. We passed the Order in Council, assuming the responsibility, and trusting that, under the circumstances, Parliament would indemnify the Government and furnish us with the amount which would be sufficient to cover the expenditure which has been made. The people were in need of railway accommodation and we were being strongly pressed by them to take this thing up and to ask Parliament to make a grant in aid of the undertaking. They asked us to consent to a guarantee in the way in which they had for a time induced hon. gentlemen opposite to guarantee the interest upon their securities in the London market. We could not do that, but we did the next best thing under the circumstances. We said: If you are not able to carry it on by reason of the proceedings pending in the courts, if you are so confident that it is such a valuable property and one that we would be justified in asking Parliament to give some assistance to, we will undertake to operate the railway for a short time. At all events, we have done so, and we have found that the road had not at all the merits claimed for it. If it had turned out as these gentlemen represented it to us, if it had proved a valuable property, which would have become a valuable feeder for the Intercolonial Railway, I have no doubt that Parliament would have felt that it was desirable to take some steps to have the road permanently assumed by the Government. But as it is, after the experience which we have had, we have not felt justified in asking Parliament to extend any further aid to it or to assume any further obligations in respect to it. We have tried the experiment and become assured that it has not been successful, but we have probably satisfied a good many people who have been pressing us to make a proposal to Parliament looking to the assumption of further liabilities.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is one of the most singular transactions that I ever heard of in Parliament. The Minister of Railways has made no defence of it at all. He has acknowledged that the Government undertook a thoroughly illegal and unjustifiable expenditure. It turned out so bad that it involved a net payment of nearly \$11,000 out of the public chest. The Minister of Railways and Canals admitted that they had no authorization by law, no authorization by this Parliament in any way at all by the previous discussion of it. He simply undertook a la New Brunswick methods to set

the law in defiance. He asked his colleagues to consent to this undertaking, and they adopted his suggestion and committed a completely illegal act. What is there to justify it? Nothing at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was perfectly right when he stated that you might just as well undertake to put a sugar refinery or a cotton factory into operation without any appropriation. The Minister of Railways tried to draw me into this matter as affording by my previous action an excuse for himself. That company wished to raise money, and there was an arrangement by which that money could be raised by them, with the guarantee that my hon. friend talks so glibly about and it was this. They had no guarantee of the scheme in the least. We were to accept the money to be placed in our hands, and we were to pay it out, as trustees, on the well-understood condition that we did not guarantee or authorize their scheme, and the reason why that authorization was withdrawn was because we thought that on the London market they used that in order to guarantee their undertaking to the public. As we did not intend to guarantee it. This is what the Minister of Railways and Canals tried to bring in as an excuse. But there is no connection between the two arrangements at all. The fact is that the Minister of Railways has undertaken an altogether illegal expenditure. This House has no right to vote it. The Minister and this Government should ask the House to indemnify them for having done an illegal thing. But there is a worse side than that. The whole thing was conceived and carried out as a political matter, to tide over a little difficulty in the Baie de Chaleurs counties, and to assist in the election of a Liberal; and these hon. gentlemen, and the Minister of Public Works himself said it was a cute thing. It was simply political, it was not legal. If we had done a thing like that when we were in the Government, I imagine how the welkin would have resounded when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) stood upon his legs to show how we prostituted the public service, and took the people's money without warrant of law in order to carry out our schemes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is mute to-night. The Minister of Railways attempts to justify this by saying that the amount involved is not very large. I say the Government have as much right after this House prorogues, to operate the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, and to pay the expenses of it, as it had to operate that road and foot its expenses. There is only difference in amount. A more unjustifiable thing has not been done by this Government and they have done a great many unjustifiable things. It seems to be thought by some members of the Government that they are superior to law, that they have a subservient majority behind them, and that

all they have to do is to come to that majority in order to have the wrong which they have done made right, so far as a vote can make it right. I do not believe there is a single member behind the Ministry who will justify this conduct of the Government. Even the Minister of Railways apologized for it from beginning to end. There is no common sense to base it upon, and as far as I can see it has no legal standing either.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The question before the House has been entirely blurred by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). It is all a question of reasonableness, and he knows that very well. The House is not here to discuss whether there is a technical statute authorizing you in so many words to enter into this contract. The Minister of Railways stated here that the enormous expense that has attended the operation of the Intercolonial Railway would be lessened if we took under our control certain of these branches. The members of the Government did not know whether the facts stated with regard to the Gaspé road were correct or not. They thought it was reasonable that they should take the best means of testing these statements, either by appointing a commission or by taking over the road as an experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. Without authorization.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To take it over for a short time and see whether the statements made with regard to the earning-power of that road were correct, in order that, before entering into a contract, they might know the facts from experience. The question before the House is whether it was reasonable to do that or not. My hon. friend has shown that the loss upon the experiment was \$10,000, and the question is whether it is not better that should be done rather than to have asked the House to plunge into a contract, without data, without inquiry, and without proper evidence as to whether that road should be taken over in the public interest or not. We made a practical test to see if it was desirable to take over the road. We have run the road for five months, and we have shown the country what it would cost to run it and what its probable receipts would be, and we have the evidence upon which the House can form a judgment if they are ever asked to. The Minister of Railways has told us that he has handed the road over to those who owned it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would lead people to think that this cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, whereas, as a matter of fact, we went into a scheme which would not cost as much as a commission roving from one end of the road to the other. We have taken the best means of ascertaining the facts, and I believe the course we took was a pru-

dent one. We are now in possession of the best evidence in the world to show the country what the result would be if we took the road over. Whether there is a technical law justifying it or not, is not the point before the House, but the point is, whether the Government took a reasonable course in trying the experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad I spoke, because I drew forth this reply from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is weaker even than the statement made, by the Minister of Railways and Canals. These two hon. gentlemen stand together on that, and I am glad to know that they have made out the best defence that can be made. The Minister of Marine proposes to simply make Parliament a tool to register his acts, and in this case to recoup the bad results of experiments with which the Government chooses to try without authorization. What business has the Government of the country to carry on large experiments involving the public funds unless they first come for the authorizing power of Parliament to discuss the question, and to receive its sanction. If the hon. gentlemen can do it in one case he can do it in the other case. Why do they not make a nine months' experiment with these fast line steamers, to demonstrate whether or not it is possible to make it a paying concern, so that afterwards they might come to Parliament and say that we can or we cannot operate a fast Atlantic service. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) cannot possibly justify this action on any constitutional grounds. Another thing this has brought out is that it has discredited the Minister of Railways and Canals. It was on his recommendation that they did this; it was one of his schemes. He either knew the facts or he did not know them, but he led the Government into an expenditure which the Government would not have gone into unless they had been pretty well advised by him that it would turn out all right. It has turned out all wrong. If he is discredited on that, it is one of the best reasons why the House should not take the lead of the Minister of Railways on the Drummond County deal, and on the Grand Trunk Railway deal, and on these airy schemes which he proposes to substitute for them by the vote he is going to ask this House for tomorrow. The man who leads the country into loss in reference to a small scheme, without constitutional or legal right for it, is a man whom you ought to be careful in following in a large scheme, which will have the effect of involving the country in greater loss.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will no doubt be comforted by the reflection which he has just given expression to. If the Minister of Railways is discredited by this operation, no doubt it will

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

be eminently satisfactory to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and it will occasion him no end of delight. I am quite willing that he should enjoy all the satisfaction which the circumstance gives him.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two of us delighted then.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was giving us the idea that he had no information as to what would be the result of working the railway. Did the Minister of Railways and Canals conceal from him the amount of the receipts and expenditures?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The receipts and expenditures were not known.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How could we know the receipts and expenditures of a road that had been running only five months?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. The reports of the working of the road for a couple of years are in the department, and the Minister of Railways and Canals knows to a dollar the amount of the receipts and expenditures. Was he not in possession of all the facts? Was not a report of the receipts and expenditures made by his own deputy? Was not a report made by Mr. Pottinger on the question of taking over the road? Did he not know that the expenditure was \$2,000 more than the receipts—that the receipts were in the neighbourhood of \$17,000 or \$18,000 and the working expenses in the neighbourhood of \$18,000 or \$19,000? What other information does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries want? Has he not the sworn statement of the officers of the road? If he did not know the receipts and expenditures, he ought to have known them, because they were in the department.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And a nice thing it was to recommend to the English market—to try to mislead the English market by the amount of about three million sterling.

Mr. SPROULE. The act was either legal or illegal. The Minister admits that it was illegal. He knows that he broke the law, and he admits it. It is a very unenviable position for a Minister of the Crown to put himself in. It is strange to me how the Auditor General, who is supposed to be the guardian of the expenditure, allowed the account to be paid. At some time in the future we may get a little more information on this subject from the Auditor General's Report. The hon. Minister told us that he was about to try an experiment in connection with the Drummond County Railway. I would like to ask him whether, in view of the disastrous consequences which attended

this first experiment, he had not better let the other alone.

Mr. QUINN. I would ask whether there was no question as to the legality or illegality of the Act, and no opinion given by the Department of Justice?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the feeling was that it would be necessary to come to Parliament and ask for an indemnification for any outlay that might be incident to the operating of that road.

Mr. QUINN. My idea is that where any doubt exists, it is the duty of the department which intends to pass an Order in Council, to get the opinion of the Department of Justice as to the legality of what is to be undertaken. I have not the law before me, but I remember there is some such provision. If a department can undertake any matter it likes, without submitting the question of its legality to the Department of Justice, it is leaving to any Minister the right to do almost anything he likes. I think this is a most serious position, and it strikes at the very root of the rights of this Parliament if a Minister of the Crown can get the assent of Council to a proceeding which is not declared legal by the Department of Justice. The Minister might as well do it of his own free-will without applying to Council at all, and we have no guarantee that that is not done every day.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that this vote be struck out.

Mr. BRITTON. This does not seem to me to be such a very serious matter. Perhaps I am wrong; but put a case like this. Suppose certain harbour improvements were asked for, and the Government thought it worth while to make an examination of the harbour and to make soundings before venturing to submit to Parliament a proposition for the improvements; does my hon. friend think that he would find a statute which would authorize the hiring of a tug and the employment of persons to make the soundings and to estimate in a general way what the improvements would cost? Or suppose another case. Suppose it was thought proper to enter into negotiations with a railway company to take over a part of their line, and it was said to be in a certain condition in which the Minister of Railways said it was not. Does my hon. friend think he would find a statute which would authorize the hiring of a car and the travelling of a hundred miles with the engineer of the department and the deputy head? I do not think he would find a statute of that kind; and unless they were prepared to pay the expenses of these things out of their own pockets, they would have to come to Parliament and ask for a vote to cover the expenditure. In a matter of this kind, if the Government make any arrangement that can be considered permanent or quasi per-

manent, they would have to get the authority of Parliament to do it; but merely to make an experiment, to see what is in the road for a short time, and then to come to Parliament and ask for a vote to cover the expenditure, does not, I think, involve such a violation of the constitution as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see the slightest application of the illustrations the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) has put before the committee, and I will hardly waste the time of the committee in going over them. I think that hon. gentleman will see that no government or company can operate a line of railway in this country except under statutory authority. It has been conceded by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that no such legal authority was possessed by the Government, so far as this railway is concerned, and the Government operated it without statutory or any other authority. What would have been the result if one of the trains had killed some people or set fire to a building or did some other damage? If the railway was operated without authority, very serious consequences would have resulted. It does not seem to me a good principle for any Government to attempt to operate a railway or any other public work without statutory authority and then ask Parliament to vote the money which had been lost in operating it.

Mr. SPROULE. The other illustration which the hon. gentleman gave was just as bad. He cited the action of the Government in spending money on a public harbour, but we have never spent a dollar on a harbour until voted by the House. This contract was, however, entered into and the work carried out before Parliament was asked to vote a dollar for it.

Deepening St. Pierre River..... \$40,000

Mr. HAGGART. On what principle is this vote asked for the deepening of that river?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My engineers advise me that this expenditure is required. The St. Pierre River was deepened and straightened by what is known as the Lachine Drain, which cost something like \$140,000. To make that river useful and get the proper depth, I am told it will require \$40,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a part of the navigation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the first place, we will require to purchase 20,000 superficial feet of land. The excavation will cost \$12,000; masonry of the culverts, \$520; masonry in the bridge, \$19,000; revetment wall, \$175; value of land, \$3,600; contingencies, between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Will the hon. Minister state whether that expenditure on the St. Pierre River is between the Lachine Canal and the St. Lawrence ?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think it is at the mouth of the canal—from the mouth to this river.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The ditch from Lachine down to the St. Pierre River is completed. There is a culvert under the Lachine Canal for the purpose of carrying that into the water of the St. Pierre River, and if I do not mistake it, this is for the deepening of the St. Pierre River between the Lachine Canal and the St. Lawrence.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That will be north of the canal.

**Mr. HAGGART.** No, south of the canal, not on the canal at all. It is for the deepening of the river between the Lachine Canal and the St. Lawrence. The river that we do not interfere with at all by the canal. The reason assigned for the building of the ditch from Lachine down to the St. Pierre River, which goes under the canal, was that we interrupted the flow of water by the construction of the Lachine Canal. It was a very poor justification for the expenditure of \$140,000 but our Government were responsible entirely for it, but to ask for the deepening of the river between the canal and the St. Lawrence is to ask what I do not think there is the slightest justification for. It can have only one object, the draining of the land of parties situated between the Lachine Canal and the St. Lawrence River, whose property is not interfered with by the construction of the Lachine Canal. The river is carried under the canal.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Perhaps it is to facilitate the flowing way of the water.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Yes, but the natural stream is there. We have provided a channel under our own works, and after that there is the river in a state of nature.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** What was the \$140,000 spent for ?

**Mr. HAGGART.** To build a ditch to drain the village of Lachine down to the St. Pierre River, and provide a culvert to allow it to flow under the canal; and from the canal down to the St. Lawrence the river St. Pierre runs in its natural bed.

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** I know the locality well. This river has been filled in by this canal and by this ditch coming from Lachine and by the overflow of water within the last five or six years, and the health committee of Montreal have been making application to the Government to abate the nuisance. The people around there have complained, and have applied to the provincial board of health, and it is probably

**Mr. BLAIR.**

on account of the representations they have made that this vote is asked for now. But I must say that I think that \$40,000 will be sufficient not only to deepen this river which is a small river, a mere brook, but also to cover it, so that the nuisance created by the water flowing into it from Lachine shall cease. I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) especially to that so that before spending any money, he may see whether it would not be advisable under the recommendation of his engineers to entirely cover this portion of the River St. Pierre.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** My engineer stated to me that \$140,000 was expended for the purpose of deepening and straightening the St. Pierre River in the upper part, that would be north of the canal, I suppose.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Yes.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am advised now that \$40,000 more is required in order to complete that job from the south side of the canal to the mouth of the river. I confess that I have no personal knowledge with regard to it; but it has been represented to me that this amount is required. The method in which the money is to be spent, has, of course, been detailed to me by the engineer.

**Mr. HAGGART.** No doubt, it will take \$40,000 to deepen the St. Pierre River from the canal to the St. Lawrence. But what justification is there for such an expenditure? We have already spent a large sum to provide a clear channel for this river notwithstanding the presence of the Lachine Canal, and now we are called upon to deepen the river all the way from the canal to the St. Lawrence.

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** But that is made necessary by reason of the work that has been done, and the deepening of the river alone will not suffice; it will be necessary to cover it up and make a regular sewer of it in order to protect the health of the inhabitants there. There is the municipality of St. Paul and also St. Gabriel ward of Montreal that are specially interested in having that work done as soon as possible, because, as I have stated, the health committee of Montreal and the provincial board of health, will certainly take steps to force the Government to do what is necessary.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What is it that goes into the ditch above the canal ?

**Mr. PREFONTAINE.** I understand that the sewage of Lachine goes into it, and that it is discharged into what remains of the St. Pierre River, which is really an open ditch running through a thickly populated part of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole thing is as plain as daylight to me, although I do not know the locality. We are spending \$40,000 in addition to what we have already spent to make a system of drainage for the people of Lachine, who should be expected to do that work for themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. The reason the Government made the expenditure in the first place was that, on account of the building of the Lachine Canal, some of the water was backed up nearly to Lachine. We drained it into the River St. Pierre, which passes under the canal. The people of Lachine utilize that channel to drain their village. We have already done more than we were called upon to do, and there is now no interference with the flow of the river as it was in the state of nature. But the river does not afford a sufficient flow for the drainage of the whole of that country, and we are now called upon to build a system of drainage for the whole section by deepening the river from the canal to the St. Lawrence.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It must be understood that it was the discharge from this ditch which causes the trouble. The water is no longer clean, and there is a larger quantity of it. The river has become a nuisance on account of the Government work, and it must be attended to. I knew nothing about this vote being put in the Estimates, but I know that complaint has repeatedly been laid before the city council of Montreal, and that the two boards of health have been asking that something be done in the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it the board of health at Lachine that has complained?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, the complaint comes from the municipality of Cote St. Paul and St. Gabriel village which is now a ward of the city of Montreal. The people there hold the Government responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the water no longer clean?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Because the village of Lachine has drained into it.

Mr. FOSTER. Whose fault is that?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Why did you build a ditch for the Lachine people to drain into?

Mr. FOSTER. The difficulty arises from the fact that Lachine requires a system of drainage and it has built sewers and has emptied them into a certain channel. When the outflow of the water through the channel was impeded by the canal, there was some ground for grievance. But we remedied that at a cost of \$140,000, and provided a channel under the canal, to a point where the river remains as it was. But the dirty water comes from the sewers of La-

chine and not from the canal. Now, because their sewage system is not perfect they are asking \$40,000 to make it perfect.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a misunderstanding as to the situation. It is not the people who are draining into this ditch who are complaining, but you have built a ditch for the people of Lachine, and you have allowed him to drain into it, and you have polluted all that part of the little river which runs through St. Gabriel Village, and you are imperilling the health of the citizens there. They would have no objection to have a stream of clear water running through the village, any more than to the canal itself. The village of St. Gabriel is under control of the city of Montreal, and there is no drainage from the city of Montreal running into that river. It is the sewage of the town of Lachine which has been allowed to run into that ditch by the Government, which is doing the mischief now; and the late Government is responsible for this \$40,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Forty thousand dollars will not begin to build and cover the ditch.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is only a short piece, not more than three or four acres.

Mr. SPROULE. The Government cannot be responsible for having built the ditch for the purposes for which it was required; but the village has afterwards made their sewer to that ditch and drained into it.

Mr. QUINN. It was my intention when this item came up to ask the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Public Works if they had heard anything from the Board of Health of the province of Quebec concerning this River St. Pierre. The portion of the River St. Pierre which was complained of as having been interfered with by the Lachine Canal, is seven miles at least away from the point where it crosses under the Lachine Canal. It was complained of by the citizens of Lachine that when the canal was widened there, the River St. Pierre was dammed up to a certain extent, and consequently the surplus water which ought to have been carried away from the neighbourhood of Lachine through this river under the old canal, was allowed to flow over the properties adjoining Lachine, that is some miles away from where it goes under the canal. Now, the Government, recognizing that there was something in the claim of the Lachine people, constructed a ditch for the purpose of carrying away the surplus water, and deepened the River St. Pierre at the point where it went under the canal in such a way as to allow it to perform its natural functions, that is, to carry the surplus water away from the surrounding country under the canal and into the River St. Lawrence. That was all very well in its way, but some people, probably Lachine people, turned their own private

drains into this ditch, or the people living on the border of the River St. Pierre kept throwing all sorts of refuse into the River St. Pierre. The consequence is that the last three or four weeks, as I am informed, the River St. Pierre is no longer clean water at all; and it spreads over the country on the other side of the Lachine Canal, and a little on the north of the canal, that is in the village of St. Gabriel, or St. Gabriel ward and Cote St. Paul. So that this water spreads over there and has become stagnant water, dangerous to the health of the community. On this account the Board of Health has intervened. I understood it was the intention of the Board of Health to apply to these surrounding municipalities, of course, to establish the liability somewhere. But where the liability exists, I do not know, it is difficult to say. But certainly it is a menace to the public health there, and if the Government considers that it is responsible in any way for the condition of things which exists there at present, it would certainly be a very beneficial thing to remove the nuisance at once. I do not wish to say that the Government is responsible, but I merely put the facts before the committee in order that the Government may have some idea of the position of the matter. Has the Minister heard anything from the Board of Health?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not. I rather wondered that I had not heard from the Board of Health when I learned that they were complaining. The matter was brought to my attention by the chief engineer of the department, who represented that it was a natural consequence and a necessary result of the previous expenditure that had been made. He reported to me that it was necessary, in order to make a complete job of what already had been done, and which involved an expenditure of \$141,900, that this work should be extended, and that the deepening from the south side of the canal should be made at the mouth of the river.

Mr. QUINN. I was probably not quite accurate in saying that the Board of Health had undertaken to communicate with the Government. I do not know that the agitation has reached that point. The distance between the Lachine Canal and the River St. Lawrence at that point is somewhat more than the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Prefontaine) has stated it. It is over a mile, I think, from the Lachine Canal to the river at that point, so that if it is the intention of the department to undertake the deepening of that canal, it would be well to provide also for covering it, not only there, but on the northern portion, that is, north of the canal, in order that it may not be filled up as it has been latterly. If it is left open, all sorts of refuse will be thrown into it, and there will be a continual difficulty in keeping it clear.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is quite evident that Lachine wants drainage, and I think this vote is clearly for the purpose of giving Lachine drainage. Now, I do think that some good, sensible reason should be presented for this vote before we are asked to pass it. The engineer merely reports to carry out what has been done before, that this vote is necessary. If the people of Lachine are using that stream for the purpose of draining their places and they have caused this nuisance to arise, it is the town of Lachine that are responsible for it, and not this Parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. I think I was asked to report upon the subject to Council, and I made a report. Anyway, it was urged strongly upon me that I should report to Council in reference to the matter. I forget whether I put in a written report or reported verbally to Council on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another important point here. Some hon. gentlemen say that the distance is nearly a mile and that \$40,000 is not at all sufficient.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is a covered drain it would not commence to do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have the matter looked into very carefully before any portion of this expense is incurred and unless I am thoroughly satisfied that this is a matter which we might fairly be expected to deal with in respect to the appropriation we have made here I will not have any portion of the money expended.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The city council of Montreal will certainly contribute an amount should the \$40,000 not be sufficient to make it a covered drain, and there is also the municipality of Cote St. Paul. The vote is absolutely necessary to give relief to these people.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite evident that this is purely a provincial matter, but if the province can get out of it and get the Dominion Government to bear the cost they will be quite well pleased to have this money expended.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is altogether fair to assume that this is a purely provincial work. There are a great many nice questions as to the construction of drains along our canals in small towns and it is not clear that there is no responsibility resting upon the Government in regard to the making of this kind of drainage. However, if the committee will give the amount I will repeat the assurance that I have referred to.

Mr. QUINN. Do I understand that the whole item is to be passed or whether there will be some question about dismissals.

**Mr. FOSTER.** We have held over an item on which my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) may bring up this point.

Resolutions to be reported.

### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 147) to amend an Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the province of Quebec (from the Senate)—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 25th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS.

### SATURDAY SITTING.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Saturday at eleven o'clock a.m., and that Government measures have precedence on that day.

Motion agreed to.

### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of fifty per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression "cost" used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and upon the report of the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway; the lines of railway being as follows, that is to say :—

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for 35 miles of their railway from St. Jérôme, in the  
162½

province of Quebec, to Hawkesbury, in the province of Ontario.

To the Drummond County Railway Company, for 42½ miles of their railway from Moose Park to Chaudière River, provided that the amount of the said subsidy shall be refunded to the Government of Canada in the event of the company's railway from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière River being purchased or leased for a term of years by the Government.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, the balance remaining unpaid of the subsidy for the last 5 miles of the company's railway; the eastern terminus to be either at the village of Bancroft or some point near the Hastings Road, in the township of Herschell, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 56 Victoria, chapter 2, not exceeding in the whole \$16,000,

To the Great Northern Railway Company, towards the construction of a railway bridge over the Ottawa River at Hawkesbury, 15 per centum upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$52,500.

For a railway and traffic bridge over the Ottawa River at Nepean Point, between the city of Ottawa and the city of Hull, 15 per centum upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$112,500.

3. That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, which agreement the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

4. That the granting of such subsidies respectively shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council determines.

5. That the said subsidies respectively shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments, on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister, or upon the completion of the work subsidized—except as to subsidies with respect to which it is hereinbefore otherwise provided.

6. Any company receiving a subsidy as aforesaid, in excess of \$3,200 per mile, shall be bound to carry Her Majesty's mails for a term of ten years free of charge over the portion of railway subsidized.

Motion agreed to.

R

### ABSENCE OF MEMBERS.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read a paragraph that appears on the editorial page of the Montreal "Gazette" of yesterday, which is as follows :

Something like a trap appears to have been laid for the Conservative members at Ottawa. It is usual, towards the close of a session, and when all the Government business is done, for the Speaker to issue an order to pay the members their full indemnity. Speaker Edgar, it seems, gave instructions that all who had made a full "pair," should be paid, but no others. With the Government's large majority in the House of Commons, the Liberals could pair off with most of the Conservatives and still have more than a quorum to run through their deals.

I think it is due to you, Mr. Speaker, that I should say that if there is any blame to be attached to any person, none whatever can be attached to yourself. You have simply followed the course of your predecessors in years gone by. As I stated the other day, when the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition thought they saw the end of the session, they approached the Speaker, and asked his consent to allow the members to go in pairs. You, Sir, consented, as the Speakers in former years have done when the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition agreed, and pairs were made and certified by the Whips. This year, when you were spoken to, the Bill allowing the twelve days had not passed the Senate, and you declined to give your consent until the Bill had passed the Senate. When that was done, you allowed the members to go. So that I think the papers should not comment on your action, for if any one is to blame, it is not you.

Mr. FOSTER. If you would allow a suggestion on this matter, I think it would be well for this House to come to the conclusion at once to obey the law. The Speaker is continually getting into trouble, there is dissatisfaction on both sides of the House, and this practice has the effect of depleting Parliament at a time when it is important that members should be here. I know that members are anxious to get away, but the public business should be the paramount consideration, and I suggest whether it would not be better for us to take the dignified course and obey the law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What was the practice under the old Administration ?

Mr. FOSTER. The practice under the old Administration was this. Two days, or about that, not more, before it was certain that the House would prorogue, members were allowed to draw their indemnity.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was several days before.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if my hon. friend wants to discuss the question, we will take it up. I was simply making a suggestion which I think is in accordance with the dignity of Parliament and in the public interest.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to state to the House that what was done by former

Mr. MULOCK.

Speakers and has been done by myself, as explained by the Whip of the Opposition, has been for the convenience of members and at the request of the leaders on both sides. It was done on this occasion at the request of the leader of the Opposition before he left. So that there is no difference, so far as I know, in what has been done on this occasion from what was done on former occasions. It is to a certain extent irregular, and I was not anxious to do it, and did it largely against my own wishes ; and I made up my mind, as I stated the other evening when the matter was spoken of unfavourably by a couple of members in Committee of Supply, that it would not occur again. I made up my mind to that course, and I am strengthened in that decision by the observations which have just been made.

### LOAN OF \$15,000,000.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider a certain resolution respecting the raising by way of loan such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$15,000,000.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This resolution calls for authority to be given to the Governor in Council to raise from time to time by way of loan sums not exceeding \$15,000,000. Of course, by the House and by those familiar with questions of public finance, the nature of a Loan Bill is well understood ; but there is a tendency outside to confuse it with an Appropriation Bill, and to regard a measure of this kind as an authority to expend so many millions in excess of what has already been agreed upon. It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that a Loan Bill is not an Appropriation Bill, and this measure will not in itself give the Government authority to expend one dollar. Parliament from time to time, in addition to the ordinary expenditures of the country, which are payable out of revenue, votes sums of money for the public service which are chargeable to capital account ; but at the time these appropriations are made, provision is not made for raising the money. That has always to be dealt with as a separate matter, and hence the passage of the Loan Bills from time to time. It is not expedient to have loans passed every session, and consequently these Bills are only introduced at intervals and for a sufficient sum to meet the wants of the Dominion for a reasonable time. The last Loan Bill was passed in 1888. At that time there was an outstanding authority to borrow to the extent of \$26,082,681, as shown by the Public Accounts of the 30th June, 1887. Some change in the borrowing power took place between that time and the session of 1888, but substantially the position was the same. In 1888, however, an Act was passed granting borrowing powers to the extent of \$25,000,000, which, adding the \$26,000,000 already outstanding, raised the borrowing powers of the Government to \$51,000,000. We do not think it is necessary that we should ask for any such authority, but we

ask for a sum which we think will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the Dominion for a shorter period than was contemplated in the Loan Bill of 1888.

I have here a statement showing the borrowing powers held by the Government in a series of years from 1887 to 1896 :

Borrowing powers, 30th June, 1887....	\$26,082,681
do do 1888....	48,926,607
do do 1889....	37,764,954
do do 1890....	40,219,325
do do 1891....	37,421,597
do do 1892....	34,161,212
do do 1893....	29,714,379
do do 1894....	22,932,721
do do 1895....	13,121,015
do do 1896....	8,613,422

It will be seen that the borrowing powers of the Government have now fallen to a comparatively low amount and that it is necessary, in view of the expenditure of the Government which has been authorized by Parliament, that we should ask the sanction of the House to a Loan Bill giving us authority to borrow what may be required from time to time, not exceeding a total of \$15,000,000, which, added to the \$8,000,000 outstanding, will give the Government a borrowing power of \$23,000,000, as against \$51,000,000 in 1888, when the last Loan Bill was passed.

As to the matters to which these \$15,000,000 may be applied, there are outstanding temporary loans to the amount, in round numbers, of £1,000,000 stg., or \$5,000,000. Of these, \$2,000,000 were contracted by my predecessor shortly before his retirement, and \$3,000,000 by myself shortly afterwards. There are therefore \$5,000,000 of temporary loans to meet in the first instance. The appropriations on capital account for the coming year are very considerable. The largest of them, of course, is in relation to canals, for which we ask a very considerable sum owing to the desire of the Government to prosecute these great enterprises to an early completion. Taking the items chargeable to capital account in the Estimates, we have \$7,052,214 as the amount. Then the Crow's Nest Railway will call for \$3,630,000, and the treasury Bills to which I have referred amount to \$5,000,000, making an aggregate of \$15,000,000, besides which there are railway subsidies, some portion of which will be called for. Of course, the expenditure on Crow's Nest Railway will not all be called for in the first year, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that we will require \$15,000,000 within the next two or three years. In view of the figures I have mentioned, it will, I think, be seen that the proposal of the Government is altogether a moderate and reasonable one.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no intention of making any prolonged discussion on this. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that borrowing power is not synonymous with appropriation, but it is equally right

to say that borrowing power is the natural result of making appropriations, and I have no doubt at all that my hon. friend has based the borrowing power he is asking for upon that and nothing else.

The large borrowing power which the hon. gentleman has said existed in 1888 would be, of course, misunderstood unless the fact were taken into account that a large proportion of that was limited to conditions which made it practically unavailable, for instance in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. However, the general assumption is, of course, correct, that a Government is not to be judged by the borrowing power it takes, but by what it actually expends. I understand that the total borrowing power which the Government will have, if this passes, will be \$23,600,000 in round numbers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these temporary loans running?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are all contracted in London. Although a portion was contracted with the Bank of Montreal, it is really a London transaction, and a portion of it is with an English bank.

Mr. FOSTER. What bank?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The National Provincial Bank.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the loan contracted with the Bank of Montreal under the condition that the Bank of Montreal may associate with another bank in London?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The condition respecting the association with other banks has relation to the floating of permanent loans and not temporary.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman undertaking to make temporary loans with other banks than the Montreal Bank?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have made a temporary loan with a bank other than the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would be kind enough to bring down a statement with reference to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can tell the hon. gentleman. We have £400,000 stg. of these loans, roughly speaking, \$2,000,000, with the National Provincial Bank. The remainder, \$5,000,000, is entirely with the Bank of Montreal. We are arranging now to renew the loans, but as the transaction is now pending I do not think I can state the rate, but it is a very profitable rate indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to put a loan on the British market this year?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. A portion of the \$10,000,000 probably will be placed on the market this fall.

**Mr. FOSTER**. \$5,000,000 as a temporary loan is a very large amount to be running for any length of time. I quite appreciate that the time for putting on a loan must be a matter for consideration by the Finance Minister himself. It is sometimes better to run a large temporary loan than to take the market at a disadvantageous time; but if the market is in a favourable condition, it is better to have the loan in permanent form.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I quite agree in the views expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and the course he has indicated is that which will probably be pursued. But I may say that the rate at which we are borrowing temporarily at the present moment is a very favourable one, indeed.

On resolution 2,

2. That the sums of money hereby authorized to be raised by way of loan shall be so raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt and the raising of loans authorized by Parliament; and the sums so raised shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada: Provided always, that the rate of interest to be paid on any loan to be raised hereunder shall not exceed four per centum per annum.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I do not see why my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) cannot make that 3½ per cent. I think he will be perfectly safe in doing so. Keeping it in the statute at 4 per cent really does not put the credit of Canada where it ought to be. I cannot conceive of any circumstances that can arise to prevent the Government from borrowing at 3½ per cent or less than 3½ per cent. I just throw out the suggestion whether it would not be wise to bring down the maximum credit limit of the country now to 3½ per cent. It would certainly strengthen us in this regard.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I rather think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster's) suggestion is a good one. We have always put the limit at 4 per cent, not as indicating the actual transaction but as a margin. I think we should be quite as safe at 3½ per cent as at 4. so I accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and move that the resolution be amended accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

### FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) authorizing the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the public service.

**Mr. FOSTER**.

### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 146) to authorize a subsidy for a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On paragraph (i),

**Mr. FOSTER**. In passing, I call the attention of the committee to an innovation made by this business Government. It seems it now proposes to put through its Acts in two sections, one contained in the Bill itself, and the other important ones contained in the resolution. I commend that as a very business-like operation. But what I want to call to the attention of my hon. friend is: If "the company, or any other company with whom it shall have any arrangement, by constructing the said railway or any part of it," it shall become entitled to get the lands, and then the Dominion Government shall have 50,000 acres of those lands. That is all conditional. It is possible then, so far as you can translate the language, that the Canadian Pacific Railway may get none of those lands, and if it gets none of them, then of course they cannot carry it out.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Then they do not get any subsidy.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Is that stated?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is absolutely the case.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I do not think that it is stated. The matter is so worded that the getting of 50,000 acres of land is entirely contingent, but there is no contingency about the payment of the \$11,000 per mile as a subsidy. That may be in my hon. friend's mind, but it would be well to translate that into a binding Act of Parliament.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Among the conditions which are imposed upon the granting of the subsidies, is that an agreement shall be entered into providing for all these things that we have not embodied in these resolutions, all the terms, all the details of the agreement which is to be entered into. It is provided that the agreement shall contain, inter alia, the covenants not herein stated. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company thoroughly understands that they do not get one dollar of subsidy unless the land provided for shall be acquired by them and shall be made over to the Government. They understand that, and that will be embodied in the agreement.

**Mr. FOSTER**. My hon. friend must see this: Once you have passed the law the Minister of Railways is bound by the law just as much as the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way. Now, this starts out by saying: "Subject to the conditions hereinafter mentioned, the Governor in Council" may grant so and so. Now, one of the conditions is this one in paragraph (i), and it is purely a contingent condition. The Bill commences: "Subject to the conditions hereinafter mentioned," subject to these conditions the \$11,000 is to be paid. Now, the conditions may be absolute or they may be contingent; if they are absolute, of course the company is bound to carry them out to the letter; if they are contingent, then of course they are not absolute, and the company is only bound to carry that out provided such and such takes place; and the proviso in this is that if the company get any lands, then 50,000 acres shall go to the Government. When this is passed, if the Canadian Pacific Railway does not become possessed of those lands, there is nothing in the Act at all which would debar the company that built the road, from getting \$11,000 per mile; that is absolute. What does my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works say now? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is going to France, and to Germany, and all over the world to view public buildings—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I have not gone yet.

Mr. FOSTER—so that he may become an architect skilled in plans and the like of that. My hon. friend may go and have his visit, and it may be paid for by the country, but I would not give the snap of a finger for his architectural knowledge, even as well developed mentally as he is. Now, my hon. friend is not a lawyer, and I leave it to the lawyers in the House, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if conditions are attached to a grant and some are absolute and others are conditional, if this railway company carry out the absolute ones absolutely, and the contingent ones contingently, then, so far as the Act is concerned, if the company does not get possession of these lands, as that is a contingency, and the lands are not given by it, it has a right to demand the subsidy and must get it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The passing of this Act is only permissive. It only authorizes the Government, if they choose to do so, to enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purposes of the construction of the road. It in no particular imposes an obligation upon the Government to do it, and it confers no right upon the Canadian Pacific to come to the Government and say, "You must enter into an agreement and you must give us a subsidy for the construction of this road. It is entirely optional, absolutely discretionary with the Government whether they should do it or not. The terms embodied in the Act are the result of a long discussion. It was impossible for the

Canadian Pacific Railway Company absolutely to agree that it should hand over these lands, because they do not know absolutely that the lands will be theirs, but it is clearly and explicitly understood that unless the Canadian Pacific Railway do acquire these lands they will not be entitled to receive one dollar of subsidy from the Government, and I state most emphatically to this committee that such a clause will be embodied in the agreement, should we, in the end, be in a position to enter into an agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has acknowledged the whole principle and basis of my contention. He has explicitly stated that in the contingency of it being impossible to get the land the company cannot hand over the 50,000 acres. But the Minister says that this Act does not oblige him to enter into any contract. We are placing \$3,630,000 in the hands of this Government and we are voting that money under certain conditions. The Minister says that one of the conditions is that unless the company is in a position to hand over the lands, no agreement will be entered into. That is a contingency. I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, is it absolutely understood that if the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot guarantee 50,000 acres of these lands that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway will not be built subject to these conditions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Crow's Nest Pass Railway will not be subsidized by this Government, at all events, unless Parliament shall again be referred to, upon these terms, upon the terms of giving \$11,000 a mile, unless the Canadian Pacific Railway put themselves in a position to assign to the Government, 50,000 acres of coal lands.

Mr. FOSTER. I think Parliament, if it is going to affix the conditions at all should make them absolute and that they should not be left to the Minister of Railways and Canals. This is an important matter we are considering, and we should lay the conditions down straight and plain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the hon. member (Mr. Foster) propose? The subject to which he has referred has been very much discussed, both by the Canadian Pacific Railway and ourselves. However, if the hon. gentleman has any words which he would suggest, let him propose them, and I will consider whether I will consent to adding them to the Act. But I may say that the addition of any words which will vary the terms of the proposal as they are submitted might involve the contingency as to whether or not the Canadian Pacific Railway will be in a position to comply with them.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister of Railways and Canals brought this proposition down and recommended it to the House, of

granting \$11,000 a mile there were no ifs nor ands nor buts about it. The great recommendation of the Minister was that we would get 50,000 acres of land and that this would preclude all possibility of a coal monopoly. Now, it seems that this is only a condition. To leave the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to arrange the conditions outside of Parliament would be giving to him the right, ultimately, to grant the \$11,000 per mile without getting these 50,000 acres of coal lands which was to be one of the chief compensating conditions.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is perfectly right in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee, but the substance of these resolutions was arrived at only after a great many consultations were held between the lawyers on both sides and the managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every word of these resolutions was thoroughly weighed, and I am not able to conceive at the present time, any other language which could be used to express the meaning. The Canadian Pacific Railway have not yet, in a legal or technical sense, possession of these lands.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They have not even a contract with the British Columbia Southern.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. But they state that they will be in a position to carry out the agreement, and we say that the whole condition of granting this subsidy is that 50,000 acres of land shall be placed under our control.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If they cannot get that land they cannot get the subsidy. I for one would never consent, never have consented, to an agreement voting so much money to the Canadian Pacific Railway unless it were made conditional upon our securing such a portion of these coal lands as would obviate the possibility of any monopoly in future. It strikes me that no other language could be employed in the resolutions to better express the meaning. I could suggest words in plain English which would carry out the intention, that it shall be a condition, absolute, to the granting of \$11,000 a mile that 50,000 acres of these coal lands shall be handed over.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is a very simple matter to suggest words and propose their incorporation in this proposal, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not been through the negotiations. The situation is this: The Canadian Pacific Railway had an agreement with the British Columbia Southern Railway Company under which the Canadian Pacific Railway were entitled to receive 5,000 acres of land, and only 5,000 acres.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

When they came to negotiate with us, and to hear the terms we imposed upon them, they said: "We have not 50,000 acres of land, we have only 5,000 acres." We said: "You can get an agreement for 50,000 acres of land, and unless you undertake to give us 50,000 acres, you will not get this subsidy." They said: "If you incorporate that in the agreement now, the Canadian Pacific Railway will be wholly in the hands, and under the control of the British Columbia Southern."

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Minister of Railways and Canals has stated absolutely, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has echoed it, that unless 50,000 acres of land are given, this contract will not be signed. With the declaration of the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which is the declaration of the Government wafted to the ears of the British Columbia Southern, the Canadian Pacific Railway are just as much in the power of the British Columbia Southern Railway as they would be under any agreement made absolute in this contract. But now all this certainty of getting this 50,000 acres of land is involved in contingency, and it must be approached with fear and trembling because this British Columbia Southern will hold the Canadian Pacific Railway at their mercy. I would like to know what kind of a meal this British Columbia Southern Company is going to have. They build no railway; they get 250,000 acres of land of invaluable worth; they toil not, neither do they spin, and, up to the present moment, the Minister of Railways and Canals is in grave doubt as to whether they will not hold the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation under their thumb, in respect to getting this 50,000 acres of land. All the explicitness and definiteness of the Minister of Railways and Canals when he was proposing this vote to the House has vanished in thin air, and this British Columbia Southern Railway Company, with its enormous privileges, and its concession of 250,000 acres of valuable coal lands is going to hold the Canadian Pacific Railway in its tetracles.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I wish to ask the Minister, what is the necessity for putting in the requirement with regard to the disposal of the balance of the land, at such price as the Governor in Council shall decide; if, as the Minister says, they were only to get 5,000 acres a mile and that was to be passed over to the Government. There will be evidently no balance of land to dispose of, and this regulation is misleading to the House and the country, because the impression would be created that they were getting the 450,000 acres, whereas in reality they are only getting 5,000 acres a mile, which is passed over to the Government. I object to this, in the first place, because it is not in the Act. We have only one por-

tion of the Act as an enactment, and then we pass resolutions that are not in the Act, but which are to be added to it when it leaves this House. That is an innovation in the usages of Parliament which this House should not consent to. It is unfair to us, and it is very irregular. It was evidently contemplated by a provision in the resolution that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not get the full amount which it was represented they were likely to get from the British Columbia Southern Railway. It seems to me that the deal is this: whoever own the British Columbia Southern Railway, whether it be Jaffray and Cox as we are told by the press, they have made a capital bargain with this Government, and a capital bargain with the British Columbia Government. They first get 250,000 acres of coal lands from the British Columbia people for the construction of this line, and then they make a bargain whereby they relinquish 50,000 acres, and keep 200,000 acres to themselves. Then they have got this Government to provide the balance of the subsidy necessary for building this road. The British Columbia Government gave them 250,000 acres believing it was necessary to give that to get the railway; but the parties having control of that company, have succeeded in a deal by which they pocket the proceeds of 200,000 acres of these coal lands, and get the railway built by giving 50,000 acres. There is some one behind this deal who is operating it very nicely, and if it is not a grand steal, it will be at least a grand speculation for them, out of which the country does not get any benefit at all.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** What do you refer to in that connection?

**MR. SPROULE.** I say that the provision is that they get 250,000 acres of land from the British Columbia Government if they build the railway.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** A great deal more than that.

**MR. SPROULE.** That is the mineral land.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** There are 250,000 acres estimated as coal lands.

**MR. SPROULE.** Out of the coal lands they are receiving, they give us 50,000 acres, and they have 200,000 acres for themselves, and are certainly making a good deal. The Minister tells us that he is determined that we shall not enter into an agreement for the building of this railway, without the express understanding that this land shall be given to us. However, the Act only provides that they shall give the land to us if they get it. If this Government were defeated, or if the Minister of Railways died, and some one else took his place, we would have nothing to fall back

upon but the bare Act of Parliament, and the Act only provides, that if they do not get the lands they will be under no obligation to give us any. We would nevertheless be called upon to pay \$11,000 a mile all the same. Under these circumstances the provisions which the Government say they have made to prevent a monopoly of the coal lands, is not worth anything at all.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has failed to grasp the facts in connection with this transfer, or otherwise he would not have passed the criticism which he has. He appears to be under the impression that 250,000 acres only, or whatever the quantity is, of coal bearing lands are to be earned as a subsidy by this road. The facts are entirely otherwise. The subsidy which has been promised to be given by the British Columbia Government to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, amounts to 20,000 acres per mile, and for 300 miles that would be 6,000,000 acres.

**MR. SPROULE.** I understood that included in that, there were 400,000 acres of mineral land.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Included in the six million acres would be the coal lands which are estimated to amount to about 250,000 acres.

**MR. SPROULE.** And out of that 250,000 acres the Government is to get 50,000 acres.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** And out of the coal bearing lands, whether they amount to 250,000 acres or less, the Government is to get 50,000 acres. The balance of the lands which are referred to here, and which the Government will take power to regulate the sale of and fix the price of, are largely timber lands, and perhaps might be described as mineral lands other than coal. We have taken these powers with a view of preventing these timber lands, or mineral lands, from being held by the company as a monopoly. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company get the British Columbia Southern Company, under their arrangement, all the lands except the coal bearing lands. Therefore, assuming that the area of coal bearing lands would be 250,000 acres, they would get the six million acres less the 250,000 acres. Now, of these 250,000 acres, they have engaged with us that they will get from the British Columbia Southern Company 50,000 acres, instead of 5,000 as was first provided for, and these 50,000 acres they will make over to us. The ex-Minister of Finance says, that this agreement does not contain an explicit statement, that the giving of these 50,000 acres shall be a condition precedent to the company getting its subsidy. That subject was very fully discussed between the representatives

of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and those who were acting for the Government, myself among the number; and it was said by the Canadian Pacific Railway people to us: If you insist upon incorporating in this memorandum the condition, that the 50,000 acres must be given by us at all hazards, whether they are earned or not from the British Columbia Government, or whether they are received or not under the agreement with the British Columbia Southern Company; you will enable the British Columbia Southern Company to impose any terms which they may choose upon us, because they will see that we are under obligation to the Government absolutely and they will say: Yield these terms to us or we won't move a peg. We said in reply to that: That is reasonable on the face of it, but nevertheless you must consider yourself as absolutely bound when this agreement is entered into, to agree to the condition that 50,000 acres must be acquired by you, and must be made over to the Government, or otherwise, not one dollar of subsidy will be paid. They agreed to that.

The hon. gentleman says: You are making that public now. True, so we are; but many days have elapsed since these conditions were agreed upon, and I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company immediately set themselves to work as soon as we came to an understanding, and I have no doubt that at this moment a new contract has been executed between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the British Columbia Southern; so that any announcement now made, and which may be communicated to the British Columbia Southern, is not likely to be attended with any of the consequences which I mentioned a little while ago, and with which it would have been attended at the period when these negotiations took place. As to whether the British Columbia Southern is getting these 200,000 acres from the British Columbia Government without a sufficient consideration, that is a matter with which we are not concerned. We came to the conclusion, after mature consideration, that we would not be justified in disallowing the Act, and, seeing that the British Columbia Government chose to give to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company all these privileges and this land grant, it was not a question for us whether they were giving them improvidently or not. All we thought we were in duty bound to do, having regard to the general public interest, was to see that we exercised sufficient control over these lands to prevent them being held as a monopoly. Beyond that we have not felt that we were called on to go, and it is entirely beside the question to say that the British Columbia Southern Company are getting 200,000 acres of coal lands for nothing. I do not know whether what they say is correct or not; but they say that they

Mr. BLAIR.

have expended \$100,000 in connection with their charter, and in the way of developing those lands, and in connection with railway building. Whether that is correct or not I do not know. I have been informed by Mr. J. D. Chipman that the British Columbia Southern Company, of which his brother-in-law, now deceased, of Toronto, was a member, had paid \$100,000 in cash into this enterprise. So that they are not getting the land for nothing, as the hon. gentleman says. I do not know whether that is a fair consideration; I am not concerned in that. All we are concerned in is, so far as our power lies, in seeing that no monopoly shall exist in coal lands or in any other lands gained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I think we have accomplished that object.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say I think this is the most extraordinary presentation of a case that I have heard from a Minister of the Crown. In the first place, the hon. gentleman tried to saddle on me the responsibility of placing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the mercy of the British Columbia Southern Company. Why, Sir, who put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the mercy of the British Columbia Southern Company? The Minister of Railways himself ten or fifteen days ago, when he stated positively, over and over again, that this subsidy would not be given until 50,000 acres of these coal lands were negotiated for by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and were handed over to this Government. His whole argument was based upon that. Having taken that basis, his argument went, not upon an assumption, but upon a certainty. What did he say?

I am not quite familiar with the details of the arrangement concluded between the British Columbia Southern Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I am well aware, from the information I have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that they will be in a position to carry out the terms of the proposal which we make to them, namely, the condition which we impose upon them before they can get any subsidy for this road, to give us a title in fee of 50,000 acres of these coal lands.

The Minister's statement pledged the Government. The wires are all up. The British Columbia Southern managers, even if they were farther away than Toronto, could very soon get the Minister's declaration; and if they wanted to squeeze the company, what better instrument as a squeezer would they need than the declaration of the Minister of Railways and Canals made in Parliament in the face of the whole country that 50,000 acres of land were to come before this contract was settled? It was the hon. gentleman himself who put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company into the hands of the British Columbia Southern Company, if it has been done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member is saying that

I stated in this House that 50,000 acres would be received by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before the contract was let. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. Before any subsidy was given

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is another thing.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend as a business man willing to state that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will undertake to construct the road without having a hard and fast arrangement that they will get \$11,000 a mile?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they want a hard and fast arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, will my hon. friend let the contract before he makes these conditions with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am complaining of your attributing language to me different from what I used.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman let the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before he gets that condition fulfilled in black and white?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. Five minutes ago he declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should not get a dollar of this subsidy until they made it clear and absolute that they would get these 50,000 acres, and would hand them over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say so still.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). You do not listen to his statement, and then you go on arguing, assuming that he made a statement which he did not make. He has told you that he would have the provision in the contract which you are referring to.

Mr. FOSTER. And then he states that he will make the contract without the provision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, he did not say anything of the kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will be in the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend stated that on the 18th of June. Then, my hon. friend made the statement which puts the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as he states, in the power of the British Columbia Southern to be squeezed with reference to those 50,000 acres of land. There is no getting

out of that. The trouble has all arisen from the fact that on the 18th of June the Minister of Railways put before this House as a certainty what he states to-day as a contingency; and now, to get himself out of the difficulty, he again represents it as a certainty. He says that since his statement on the 18th of June, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been at work, and he has no doubt that the arrangement has been made by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made sure that they will get these lands; and now he says you must not put the condition in, because it will put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company into the power of the British Columbia Southern to be squeezed with reference to these lands. These are the difficulties which the hon. gentleman gets himself and his party into by making statements from time to time which are diverse from each other. When the hon. gentleman was in British Columbia, there were no words too strong for him. He stood before admiring crowds and declared that the British Columbia Southern Company had an infamous franchise attached to their charter, and were getting all these valuable lands for nothing. To-day my hon. friend is not concerned with the British Columbia Southern, and declares that he has nothing to do with that. He says they probably paid \$100,000 for all that block of 250,000 acres of valuable coal lands. When among the British Columbia mountains he roared like a lion; but when he is back here he is as tame as a sucking dove.

When the hon. gentleman was in the mountains, he inspired in the heart of every miner and prospector and ardent British Columbian the hopeful feeling: Here is a man who is bound to have a Government railway constructed. But when he comes back, he is taken by the collar by his colleagues and quietly told that the road is to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway at a subsidy of \$11,000 per mile. What consolation will the hon. gentleman give the Rossland Miner out at Rossland, which has some admiring correspondent here—probably the hon. gentleman is not present in the House now—who every day sent a wire as follows:—Blair stands firm; Blair will not talk with Shaughnessy and Van Horne; Blair is bound to see that British Columbia gets her rights. The other night a strong meeting was held at Trail, which sent telegrams to the man who was to stand firm by British Columbia, and see that she got what she wanted, asking why the Heinze proposal was not carried out. The hon. gentleman was in favour of it, body and bones, but now the people of Trail have ample opportunity to repent for the implicit confidence they reposed in this man who was to stand so firmly by their rights. And yet, no doubt to-day and to-morrow these same telegrams will go forth: Blair will stand firm; Tupper got roasted.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Notwithstanding all that has been said, I still hold we should put some provision in the Bill that would make it compulsory that we should get these lands.

That if the company, or any other company with whom it shall have any arrangement on the subject shall, by constructing the said railway or any part of it, as stipulated for in the said agreement, become entitled to and shall get any lands as a subsidy from the Government of British Columbia which, in the opinion of the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada (expressed in writing), are coal-bearing lands, then the company will cause to be conveyed to the Crown in the interest of Canada a portion thereof to the extent of fifty thousand acres, the same to be of equal value per acre as coal lands with the residue of such lands.

That is the plain simple wording of the resolution, and that will be binding if this Bill is passed. No matter what additional contract the Governor in Council may enter into with the company, this is the plain wording of the resolution, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would claim a fair interpretation of it. It seems to me before we pass this measure, we should make a provision stipulating that this land must be handed over to the Government.

There is another feature to which I intend to refer. The province of British Columbia gave a certain quantity of land for the construction of the railway. The company agreed to build it for that consideration, and what other assistance it could get, and that consideration was supposed sufficient by the British Columbia Government without any additional assistance from the Dominion. The Dominion Government, in making the contracts for building a railway through British Columbia, should take into account the consideration which British Columbia has given. The amount given by the province is 250,000 acres of coal lands, and of that we will only be entitled to 50,000 acres. The company may retain 200,000 for themselves. But do we get that 50,000 absolutely? We do not. The Bill provides that we shall get this land only provided the Canadian Pacific Railway get it. If they get it, we get it. The Bill does not provide that we shall get it absolutely, so that the Dominion Government may get none of the coal lands whatever. Now, we understood that the coal lands had passed over and that the Canadian Pacific Railway had an absolute right to them.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** How could that be possible when the land subsidy would not be earned until the railway was built?

**Mr. SPROULE.** This Act provides that it shall be built. The assumption is that the road is going to be built in order to earn the subsidy given by the British Columbia Government. We assume that the Canadian Pacific Railway will build this

**Mr. FOSTER.**

railroad, but they may not build it to the satisfaction of the British Columbia Government and may only get the subsidy given by the Dominion Government. In that event, we will get no coal lands, and there would be no provision to guard against monopolies, because the people who own the British Columbia Southern charter would open coal lands all over. I would like to have the names of the hon. gentlemen who hold the British Columbia Southern charter to-day, so that we might see who they are and might know what influences are operating to prevent the country getting its rights. We should know if it was a fact that the "Globe" newspaper is manipulated by this company and if the Canadian Pacific Railway is being manipulated by this company. We should know who are negotiating the deal and who are behind it. And if we had the information we might find that some of the members of this House or the Upper Chamber are the men negotiating the deal.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways if the Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition of getting the timber and land of these 6,000,000 acres gets the mineral rights over the area as well?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The mineral rights upon that area will, no doubt, pass to the grantee of the soil, subject to the mining regulations and other conditions that are imposed by the British Columbia Government—that is, save and except the royal metals, gold and silver. Other minerals are subject to a commission or royalty to the British Columbia Government, and I think there is a condition which applies to all the lands which are given by way of subsidies, this condition being that the land must be sold on application, and, I think, at a price not exceeding \$5 per acre. That is my impression.

**Mr. WALLACE.** Then we understand it that the Canadian Pacific Railway, or British Columbia Southern, or whoever may have these six million acres of land, are getting not only the land and the timber, but they are to have the exclusive right to ten thousand square miles—because that is the area of a grant of land of 20,000 acres for 330 miles—of the richest land in British Columbia, and they are to have the power to exclude a miner or prospector who may come—

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I do not think so.

**Mr. WALLACE.** But the hon. gentleman has told us so. He has told us that they become absolute owners, subject to the same regulations and conditions as the miners who go there and take up a claim.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** No, I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said that they would be subject to the British Columbia regulations with regard to mines. Those regulations provide that the miner may go and take up a claim and then he has to fulfil certain conditions afterwards. The British Columbia Southern, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or whoever may have these six million acres of lands, stand in the place of the British Columbia Government, so far as ownership is concerned, and no one can have a right to go in there and take those mines, because the right of the British Columbia Government is transferred. So that 10,000 square miles of what is now known to be a most valuable mining property—the most valuable in the world, I believe—is to be handed over absolutely to these parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has not anybody a right to go in and stake out a prospect in any part of the Crown lands?

Mr. WALLACE. I presume it cannot be done in these lands if the fee simple is transferred—the fee not only in the land and timber, but in the minerals as well.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Gold and silver always excepted.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not go with the land.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. Minister has told us that the mineral rights are transferred with the land.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Except the royal metals, which are reserved under all grants—that is my impression.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister can only tell us his impression. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked the Minister to say who were these British Columbia Southern people, these favoured children of fortune, who have, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has said, acquired an immense franchise and property without doing anything for them. The Minister of Railways and Canals has said a great deal about this mythical company and its having spent \$100,000 in development and in starting to build a railway. I do not believe they spent a dollar in building a railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Government do not care about whether this money has been spent or not, they are in the same position as when they had the power to disallow a most iniquitous Bill, a Bill which the Minister of Railways and Canals himself, in British Columbia, declared to be an infamous one—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. WALLACE. Was not that his language or was it stronger?

Mr. FOSTER. It is only just to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) had a locum tenens who used a good deal of the strong language.

Mr. WALLACE. He had a wicked partner, as it were.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Who was a little too many for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Quite true. Virtue is not always triumphant.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Railways and Canals said that these gentlemen have expended \$100,000. He has repeated that many times.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I said, if he can succeed in quoting me correctly. I have said that I was informed that these people had spent that amount of money. But I did not say of my own knowledge that they had done so.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman made that statement without being asked on this side, and he has claimed it as a virtue of these men.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is quite mistaken.

Mr. WALLACE. How could they have put \$100,000 into this scheme? They were doing no work. They simply stepped between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are constructing this road, and who are going to enjoy, apparently, an enormous share of the benefits that are to be secured. Now, with reference to the general question of building the road, the Minister in his speech introducing this measure to the House dilated upon the necessity for this line of railway. He told us that the mineral products of British Columbia last year were over \$7,000,000, that they had more than doubled within the last three or four years, and that the greater part of the increase was from the West Kootenay country. And he said that it was essential to the development of that country that railway communication should be provided. Therefore, the argument was that this Crow's Nest Pass Railway must be built and must be built at once. But when does he propose to build it? He proposes that 200 miles of it shall be built by the end of 1898. And when will the other 130 miles be built? I would like to ask him if he has made any calculation as to the completion of that part of the road?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Nothing has been concluded with regard to the building of any portion of it. The time has not been fixed by the Governor in Council for the completion of any part. I said I anticipated that the first 100 or 110 miles would be built by the end of the current year, and that the line to Kootenay Lake would be built at the end of the next year. As to the balance we have not come to any conclusion.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is the terminus of the road ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. At Nelson.

Mr. WALLACE. That is on Kootenay Lake ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It will be some sixty or eighty miles, perhaps 100 miles, from Nelson. It will be built along the shore of the lake for a considerable distance.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister said the first 100 miles would be built by January 1st next, and it is proposed to complete to Kootenay Lake, 200 miles, by the end of 1898.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is the expectation.

Mr. WALLACE. Then where do the 330 miles come into Nelson ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My impression is that it is about 210 miles to Kootenay Lake; then the rest of the mileage is made up between Nelson and that point where the Kootenay Lake is first touched.

Mr. WALLACE. There cannot be 100 miles nor anything like it, because Kootenay Lake is not more than fifty to sixty miles north of Nelson.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is south of Nelson.

Mr. WALLACE. That makes it worse still; because it is certainly not 100 miles from Nelson to the boundary line. There should be some calculation made more accurate than that which the hon. gentleman has given to the House. The hon. gentleman has dilated upon the absolute necessity of building this Crow's Nest Pass Railway and his whole argument would lead the House to believe that there was no other means of communication. He has referred to other means of communication incidentally later on, but his whole argument in the opening part of his speech was that there must be a railway built if that country is to be developed. I will read one or two sentences that he uttered :

You cannot look for development to precede the construction of railways and the providing of transportation facilities. One is consequent upon

Mr. WALLACE.

the other, it is true, but the development is consequent upon the providing of these necessary facilities.

And further :

We must have the railway, if we are determined that we shall have that country developed in respect of these resources, which, I am led to believe, relying upon authoritative data, are practically inexhaustible.

Well, it will be a surprise to a person reading his speech to find that that country has been developed very largely by the constructing of railroads and by the utilization of two magnificent water stretches, the Kootenay Lakes on the eastward, running north and south, and the Arrow Lakes and the Columbia River westward, parallel to these two, furnishing lines of communication for the conveyance of traffic at a lower rate than railways can carry it, reaching points where roads cannot so well be constructed. So we have in these two lakes filled with lines of steamers promoting commerce, facilities for transportation to-day which the hon. gentleman never alluded to. We have a number of lines of railway there. From Spokane on the American side we have one line of railway running to Nelson in British Columbia, tapping the southern portion of the great silver district of British Columbia; we have a line branching off to Rossland, which is the centre, perhaps, of the gold-bearing district west of the Kootenay Lake. We have this, it is true, from American sources, carrying trade largely into the United States, still it is opening up and developing that country by railway. And what more have we? We have that short line from Trail to Rossland, and we have a longer and useful line from Kaslo into Slocan City, and into the very heart of the silver mining country. Now, these lines of railway are each connected either with water communication or with other lines of railway opening up and developing that country. This railway may be considered necessary to be built for other reasons, for putting trade into Canadian channels, and for furnishing a supply of coal for the opening up and the development of the country, still it is to-day being very rapidly improved with railway facilities. In addition to that, what more have we? We have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves developing that country by lines of railway and a steamship company which they have acquired. Starting from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Revelstoke, they have a line down to Arrow Head. Then they have water communication down to Nakusp over a deep water lake, then they have a line of railroad from Nakusp into the silver-bearing country, thirty or forty miles long, and they are continuing that line down to connect with another line there. From Robson to Nelson by building one or two links in the chain, they will have a continuous railway

communication not only into the silver-bearing district of the Slocan country, but right into Rossland. If this line reaches Kootenay at the end of next year, we may consider that it will be built on to Nelson to connect with the railway system, so in the year afterwards, that is in 1900, we will have this railway connection by the Crow's Nest Pass. But we can have it during the present season with a little energy and a little expenditure on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the lines that they are building to-day; and we can have these short links that will connect the Canadian Pacific Railway from Revelstoke on the main line, with Rossland, the centre of the gold-bearing district. We have now connected that silver country to Slocan, and we can have the Canadian Pacific Railway with a little expenditure of money, getting into those two great centres of the gold and silver country of British Columbia without the enormous expenditure which would be entailed upon the country by the bargain which is now before the House. But when you come to examine that bargain, what do you find? You find, first, comparing that with the bargain made a year or more ago, by the Government of that day, that the present one is less advantageous, though the Minister of Railways and Canals told this House that he had made the best bargain he could possibly get, that no better terms could be got from the Canadian Pacific Railway. The terms that were submitted to the House a year ago by the late Government, I may say the House was not committed to, the Conservative party were not committed to, because they were not really submitted to the House for their consideration, but were on the Order paper as the proposal which, I presume, both the Government of that day and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had agreed to. But what is that bargain? Was it \$11,000 a mile, as the hon. gentleman proposes to-day? Nothing of the kind. They were to give a subsidy of \$5,000 a mile, or \$1,650,000. There was a loan of \$20,000 per mile at 3½ per cent, the Government taking out of that transaction \$33,000 a year, or in twenty years \$660,000. So they were building this complete at an actual cost to the Government of a trifle less than a million dollars, as against the \$630,000 of saving by the latter proposal. Sir, I say that this bargain cannot be justified. It is true they say: We have railway possessions; and I will refer to that later.

Now here is another estimate: \$1,650,000 at 3 per cent would be \$49,500. The saving that we would make on the \$6,600,000 which is the amount of the late Government's proposed loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway at ½ per cent would be \$33,000, so that the former agreement would be just \$16,500 a year as against the interest at 3 per cent on \$3,630,000, which equals \$109,-

000 a year, or a saving by the former plan in interest of \$93,500 per annum. This is the difference between the two bargains with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Railways tells us that this is the best bargain we can get or that they would consent to. The Government says: "Look at the terms we have made in regard to freight rates." If you calculate it at so much a bushel for so many bushels it is an enormous saving to the people of Manitoba and British Columbia. The Government say that the freight rates on this railway have been brought under the provisions of the General Railway Act. In my opinion that part of the bargain which says that the Crow's Nest Pass Railway shall come under the provisions of the General Railway Act is not worth five cents to this country. Can any hon. gentleman in this House tell me where the Government ever interfered and fixed the rates charged by any railway company in this country? I have no knowledge of that ever having been done, and I would like some one to inform the House whether there is a case in which the Government have stepped in and said: "The rates you are charging are too high; we will fix them." The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have to compete for trade. If they are to take the produce of the Northwest Territories into British Columbia they will have to do it at certain figures to meet the competition of the southern lines of railway which go into that country. One hundred miles to the south of British Columbia, in the United States, in the fertile Colville Valley they raise wheat which a few years ago they were selling at 17 cents a bushel, although the price is higher to-day. They are raising farm produce at prices with which people who live like civilized men cannot compete, because wheat cannot be grown in Canada for 17 cents a bushel. Competition with the United States will largely regulate the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway and will bring them down. Last fall the Canadian Pacific Railway announced a reduction of from 25 to 35 per cent on many articles carried on the railway and the line of steamers on the lake connection into this country. They did this of their own motion as a business transaction. Recognizing the demands of trade and of competition they reduced their rates from 25 to 35 per cent on all freight going from the eastward into this part of British Columbia. I say that the bringing of this new company under the control of the General Railway Act is a concession which in my opinion is of no practical value whatever to the people of this country, but that the rates would be fixed by other considerations and that the Government will not be called upon and will not exercise any power in regard to the freight rates upon this line. One of the advantages claimed for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is that it will secure for the people of British Columbia

the benefits of the coal fields in the Crow's Nest Pass. In my opinion coal is not a very important matter because there are unlimited quantities of timber all through British Columbia, and the coal would simply come into competition with the timber. What is necessary for the smelting works and for the development of the country is that there should be a plentiful supply of coke at a low rate. The Minister of Railways and Canals has not stated to the House, nor have I heard any hon. gentleman on that side of the House state whether the coal of the Crow's Nest Pass is a coking coal.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it is.

Mr. WALLACE. If it is it is satisfactory, but if it is not then this reason which was strongly urged would fail.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot speak with absolute knowledge, but the question was repeatedly put to the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway who had made diligent inquiry into it, and they informed us that it was good coking coal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the opinion of the Geological Department, and they give us a positive assurance as to the quality of certain of the extensive seams of coal for coking purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is first-rate for coking purposes.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

## Second Sitting.

FRIDAY, 25th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE presented the second report of the select committee to supervise the official report of the Debates; as follows:—

Your Committee recommend that Mr. George Simpson who has, from the 14th instant, acted as a temporary substitute on the Official Reporting Staff in the place of Mr. Geo. B. Bradley, Chief Reporter, who, owing to illness, has become incapacitated for the present from performing his

Mr. WALLACE.

official duties, be paid for his services at the rate of \$15.00 per day during the time he is engaged in the above capacity.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this merely a temporary appointment and just for the present session?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the report says \$15 a day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Yes. Mr. Simpson replaces Mr. Bradley, who is very ill.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Simpson will not be on the staff after this session, of course.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Oh, no; Mr. Bradley will be better, and will take his place again.

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

### DEATH OF MR. POULIOT, M.P.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is my painful duty to announce to this House the death of one of our colleagues, Mr. Pouliot, the member for Temiscouata. He was not an old member of this House, and owing to the state of his health it was not my good fortune to enjoy his intimate acquaintance; but there are circumstances connected with his decease which must appeal to every hon. gentleman here. I observe that Mr. Pouliot was barely in his 40th year, and he had a long life of usefulness apparently before him. As the House knows, it is not the first time in this Parliament, short as its duration has been, on which we have been called upon to lament the decease of one of our colleagues. If my memory serves me no less than three have passed away from our midst. As I said, I had not the pleasure of a sufficiently intimate acquaintance with Mr. Pouliot to speak as fully as I could wish of our deceased friend, but those who did know him assure me, that in him we have lost a friend and colleague who promised to be of extreme service, both to the political party to which he belonged and to the country at large. I can only say, and I am sure that both sides of the House will unite with me in this statement, that I extremely regret that a gentleman of such promise should have been cut off at this early age, at the very outset of his career in the Dominion Parliament.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to join in what the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated in reference to the loss which we experience in the death of Mr. Pouliot. Owing to the bad state of his health, we have not had the opportunity in this House to appreciate the high gifts and talents with which this Mr. Pouliot was

endowed. He took a prominent position at the bar in Quebec, had distinguished himself at Laval University, and if his health had permitted, he would have been a most useful man in the House of Commons of Canada. I am quite certain that I voice the feeling of members on this side of the House, when I say that his loss is deeply regretted by those who had the advantage of his acquaintance, and I am sure that we all join in tendering to the family of Mr. Pouliot our deep sympathy in the sad loss which they have sustained.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) It was my privilege to enjoy the friendship of our deceased colleague, whose loss we all mourn. I had occasion to appreciate his merit, his virtues as a citizen and his qualities in social life. He had a kind heart and was an upright and honourable man. He studied law and was admitted to the Bar. In the practice of his profession, he rose to a prominent position, through his untiring industry and his unimpeachable integrity. Endowed with an ardent temperament, he was fond of public life. He sought parliamentary honours and was returned to the Quebec legislature, where he played an important part. At the last general elections, at the particular request of the Hon. Mr. Laurier, who held him in high esteem and reckoned upon him for future struggles, he consented to come forward as a candidate.

Before leaving the Capital, Mr. Pouliot wrote to me a feeling letter, in which he heartily thanked me for some small favour I had shown him. He added that the labours he had imposed upon himself in the interest of the Liberal party to which he had always belonged, had "drained his vitality." I take my last farewell of Ottawa, said he.

Mr. Pouliot was a sincere Christian; and he awaited fearlessly the summons of death. He took his departure for the unknown region, with the peace of a good conscience, which is the fit reward of all those who have passed through the world in doing good.

I have but one word to add: let our departed colleague rest in peace in the bosom of our common mother, the earth, the last abode of us all.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty, under the circumstances, to contribute my share of encomium and to pay a last tribute to the memory of our departed colleague. The death of our friend is a loss not only to his family, to his friends and to the constituency he represented here, but also to our province and to this House in particular. Under a modest and unassuming appearance, Mr. Pouliot possessed a noble soul. Owing to his uprightness and integrity, and his great legal mind. Mr. Pouliot commanded the respect of all those who were acquainted with him. Mr. Pouliot had a great many friends in this House and

out of it. His characteristic feature, was, in addition to his kindness of heart, that he was earnestly devoted to his friends and to the constituency he represented in this House. In fact, the electors of Temiscouata, when they returned him to this House, were quite satisfied that they would find in their representative a man who would fearlessly advocate their interests on the floor of this House.

The words of comfort just fallen from the acting Prime Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Sir Adolphe Caron) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), will alleviate, in some measure, the sorrow of his friends and of his family in the sad loss which they have sustained.

#### BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The House resolved itself into committee on resolutions (page 4653) respecting bounties to iron and steel.

In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This resolution has been the subject of discussion already in connection with the tariff, and I do not imagine it will be necessary to go into it to any length. The argument of course in favour of the resolution is: That Parliament had adopted a system of bounty as a means of aiding the iron industry, and in connection therewith the higher customs duties which hitherto prevailed. Under the new order of things the present tariff has considerably reduced the duties on iron and it was therefore thought expedient to assist the iron industry temporarily by giving it bounties to a larger extent. The object is, to some extent at all events, to make amends to the iron interests for the loss they will undoubtedly sustain by the lowering of the duties. I have no doubt there are in the minds of many hon. gentlemen objections to the system of bounties, but we have thought that as these interests were established and large capital invested in them, it was only reasonable that we should give them a chance to see what development might be possible for a few years longer. We have therefore come to the conclusion, in lieu of the higher duties which they formerly received, to ask the House to grant them increased bounties to the extent stated in the resolution. In all probability, we shall have to increase the payments to the various iron industries in the way of bounties, to the extent of over \$100,000—\$119,000 is our estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. What production do you estimate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Assuming the production to be the same as in 1896, our estimate is 70,000 tons of pig

iron produced from native and foreign ores in equal parts. You will observe there is a distinction of the rate of bounty on the iron from the native, and the iron from the foreign ore. Seventy thousand tons at \$2.50 per ton amounts to \$175,000. Upon iron puddled bars, we estimate 4,500 tons at \$3 per ton making \$13,500; and on the steel ingots we estimate 15,000 tons at \$3 a ton making \$45,000. That will be a considerable increase on the amount paid in bounties in times past.

Mr. FOSTER. That bounty then, that my hon. friend bases on that estimate, will amount to \$233,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any change been made in these bounties from the time they were introduced subsequent to the lowering of the duty, up to the second bringing down of the tariff?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister does not think it is necessary to explain to the House how, if the bounties were meant as an amend to the iron industry for the reduction of the duties, and if, when the iron products were placed at a certain duty when the tariff was first brought down, it was the opinion of the Government that the proper compensation was figured out at that time, how it comes that when you reduce the duty on the iron, there is no corresponding increase in the bounty, in order to get at what the Government declared was the principle of compensation. Did anything occur between these two periods to render the position of the iron-makers any more advantageous, and does not my hon. friend think that if he was just at the first bringing down of his tariff, and only just, he is less than just if he does not revise these figures when he revises the duties on iron? It would be interesting to note the solidity of the conversion of the great Liberal party to the principle of paying bounties, which was so long a subject of horror to them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On the contrary, it is most objectionable to them.

Mr. FOSTER. This worst form of protection; but then it is only one of a piece with the many points of conversion. I do not know whether there is anything left in the whole round of fiscal policy where my hon. friends have found a hunting ground for change.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I thought you regarded this as an extremely free trade tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. It is pretty difficult to tell what kind of a tariff it is, I acknowledge. But has my hon. friend taken into account

Mr. FIELDING.

this fact—and this is a serious criticism. I believe there is a kind of iron made, notably in the province of Quebec, which is of a superior grade; different from the iron made in Nova Scotia. It is what is called charcoal iron, the large market for which is inevitably found outside of Canada; and when the condition is put down that you will not pay the bounty except on iron which is consumed in this country, the question is whether or not it is fair treatment to a very extensive industry, the distribution of labour in which is peculiar. The bog iron ore, which is the basis of the manufacture, is scattered over large areas, and is not mined by companies with company labour, so to speak, but is a source of labour to the farmers and inhabitants of large sections of the country who get out this bog iron ore just as in other sections of the country people get out pulpwood or cordwood. We have also the widely distributed industry of making charcoal, not by companies on an immense scale, but by every person who has suitable wood on his farm, and within fair distance of the mines. That utilizes a wood which is otherwise of very little profit, and is consequently a double benefit. In such an industry as that there must be much to commend it to the attention of the Government, as compared with an industry which you might call monopolistic, that is, in the hands of a great company. There is quite a difference between the two, as my hon. friend will see; and it does seem to me that when you impose the export condition, you are not giving even treatment, but are rather discriminating against an industry of that kind. You are making it a sharer in this advantage only so far as it can find a home market, which is necessarily limited for iron of that kind, but because it has to go abroad, it is punished in so far as it does not get the bounty. Again, it seems rather inconsistent to say to a manufacturer of agricultural implements, who imports iron and puts it into his machines, or, if he uses iron made here in Canada, getting it cheaper to the extent of the bounty, that he will get a rebate of the duty if he exports. I have no doubt that my hon. friend has thought of all these things. He knows now that there are more difficulties in tariff-making than he thought, when criticising the late Government. However, I put the case of this charcoal iron strongly to my hon. friend, and I think that if anything can be done to make the conditions more even for that great industry, it would be well to do it. After all, coming down to broad principles, is not the main object of giving this bounty to get the iron manufactured in this country—not so much that you want it used in this country as that you want it manufactured? Take all your bounties and duties off, and you would still have as much iron used in the country as before, perhaps more. You want to get it made in the country, simply because it is a

great employer of labour; and what difference is there whether it finds a home market or a foreign market, so long as you accomplish that which is the only object for which you give a bounty? So long as you get the iron made in the country, do not put a disability upon the man who, by energy, enterprise, capital and skill in his manufacture, gets for himself a market in a foreign country for a very important Canadian product. I do not see, reasoning from these principles, why you should keep the condition in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the first question of the hon. gentleman, whether anything had occurred in the iron industry which had enabled us to make a reduction in the duties without compensation in the way of bounty, we did reach the conclusion that in the adjustment of the duties to the bounty in our first schedule we had not been as exact as we should have been. We have to consider the relation of one duty to another. It happens that one or two of these concerns, one notably, uses all the processes—raises the ore, makes it into pig iron, and converts the pig iron into steel billets; and it became necessary to consider these processes as separate industries for the purposes of our calculation. Treating them in that way, we came to the conclusion, having reference to the changes made in the duties, that we were a little too generous in the scale of bounties, and the change we make adapts the bounties to the scale of duties. We discussed that with gentlemen interested in the iron business, and I think we have satisfied them on that point. Whether in the main we are giving them sufficient bounties, is another question. The general principle of paying bounties on goods exported is open to very grave objection, and it would require a very strong case to justify it. But before the final stage of this matter is reached, I shall be happy to consider that question, and perhaps the wording may be so changed as to leave it to be dealt with on its merits in the light of further information.

Mr. FOSTER. I would just suggest to my hon. friend that if he considers this matter and comes to the conclusion—and I do not see anything in the way of his coming to a conclusion—to take off the condition, he would simplify the matter very much. Do not simply leave it for the Governor in Council to do, but let us make it, as we do all other conditions, a straight letter of the law. I would strongly counsel my hon. friend to take away the condition. I do not see a single argument on fair, broad ground that can be urged provided you look at what the bounty is really for. It is not so much to obtain the consumption of the goods at home as the labour and production; and the larger foreign market you can get, the more labour you will have in production.

Mr. CLANCY. If there is any object whatever in giving bounties, it is that the manufacturers may have some compensation for the reduction of their protection against foreign imports. If you give bounties in lieu of protective duties, you do it to attain the same result. If there is any possibility of making iron cheap to the consumer, it is by encouraging a large output. I am leaving out of the question the important feature of the labour that would be employed, but the hon. gentleman is no doubt well aware that the only chance of producing cheap goods is to afford the largest market to the manufacturer, so that he may not depend upon a large profit and small output, but upon small profits and large output. If our manufacturers are able to double their output, they will produce iron, not only for competition in the foreign market, but correspondingly cheap in our own country. I hope the hon. gentleman will decide not to narrow his bounty down to the iron produced for home consumption, but give it in the broadest sense.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I trust that the hon. Minister of Finance will see his way to meet the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) not to limit the payment of bounty to iron produced for consumption in Canada. Everybody realizes the importance of Canada producing at home the raw pig iron and steel she requires, and no doubt we all realize also that it is absolutely impossible in a country like ours, where the market is limited, to compete with other countries where the conditions are more favourable, without considerable assistance from the Government. It is pretty generally admitted that the foundation of nearly all our interests lies in the production in our factories of iron and steel, and it seems almost essential, if the policy of the Government is to be successful in securing production of this great material, which some people say is the raw material of almost all industries, that we should remove this restriction and place our iron producer in a position to compete in every market in the world. Our population is only 5,000,000, and, therefore, the home consumption is comparatively small, and if we cannot, at this stage, produce iron and steel in Canada without the assistance of bounties, it follows that in order to realize the full advantage from these bounties and get the advantage of the outside markets, this restriction should be removed. At present, I am informed by the iron producers of the county of Pictou that with the assistance of the bounties they are enabled to compete with British products, but that it is impossible to compete with the great iron-producing interests in the United States. The reason is that the operations in this country must be conducted on so limited a scale, so long as we are confined to the home market, that they can-

not compete with the enormous industries of foreign companies, notably in Pittsburg. There is a single furnace in Pittsburg which has ten times the capacity of the furnaces of Ferrona in Pictou. It would be absolute waste of capital to erect such a furnace in Canada so long as our manufacturers are confined to the home market. Therefore, it strikes me if we are to drive this interest on from point to point until it is equal to meet foreign competition, we must in addition to the home market give to it the benefit of the world-wide market and not restrict in any way its output. I am very much pleased to hear from the Finance Minister that the Government will take this matter into their consideration. Then, as to the proportion which the bounty bears to the decrease in the duties, the hon. Finance Minister must admit that in some cases the reductions made in the duties are far more injurious than the bounties are beneficial. Take the duty upon steel billets, reduced from \$5 to \$1 or a reduction of 80 per cent. I am sure that the increase in the bounties does not offset that remarkable reduction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You forget the reduction on the raw material which makes a difference.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I do not forget that. After all, admitting all that can be said, I think it is impossible to show that the change in bounty would offset the reduction of 80 per cent in the duty. But so far as the results of the production of pig iron in this country are concerned, and so far as such an institution as that in Pictou county, where they manufacture from the raw material, the ore, the flux and the coal, you do not have the production of pig iron on the scale desired. Put that issue out of the question. It strikes me that, altogether, the industry is not in as good a position as before the Government made the change. I suppose that the purpose of the Finance Minister is, to protect these industries, to enable them to continue. I presume also that he is prepared to go further and say that he wishes them to progress. I cannot assume that this Government is going to be satisfied merely with sustaining these industries at the level which they have attained, that they merely wish to avoid destroying the work of the preceding Government. I am bound to assume that if the Government adopts this policy of protecting these industries, it does so with the hope of accomplishing more in the future that has been accomplished in the past. Therefore, I would urge the hon. Minister to take into consideration this question and give to the industries the advantage of the greatest possible output, so that the great object of developing these industries may be realized by having cheaper prices. The rule is inexorable that a small quantity can only be produced at a

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

high price, and if you wish to realize a low price such as will give the people of Canada the real benefit of this industry, you must put the manufacturer in a position to produce on the largest scale.

Referring to charcoal iron, I may say that a plant has been put up in Pictou county for the manufacture of this article. I understand that owing to certain changes in the manufacture of car wheels, the limit of the home market for this article is largely impaired; and if these charcoal iron interests, either in Quebec or Nova Scotia, are to continue, it is imperatively necessary that they should be permitted to export their product. I would urge that in the question of charcoal iron as well as of charcoal steel, the Government would consider the value of results that would flow from treating this industry as liberally as the warmest friend of the iron industry could wish.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to add a word to the very able plea made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance particularly to that branch of the iron industry which is known as the charcoal steel and iron product. As a matter of fact, this is a form of iron and steel which is not produced in the British Empire at all. The continent of Europe, as I understand from information I have received, is supplied from Sweden and Norway. The reason of this, of course, is that elsewhere the wood is too expensive to be used for the production of iron and steel. In this country we have both the iron and the wood. In the district in which this industry is carried on, the wood is collected by the farmers, who, having cut their cordwood, use the refuse of the cordwood to make charcoal, which is then used in the furnaces for the purpose of making charcoal steel and iron. The market is altogether in Europe, I understand, particularly in England and Germany. In order that our producers may ship to those countries, it is necessary, of course, that arrangements should be made beforehand and that the producers should know in what position they stand as regards the customs duty in this country. You will see at once, Mr. Chairman, if they are to be met with an export duty on this product, it will be impossible for them to continue their work, whereas if they are allowed the benefit of the bounties on the iron which they export, the consequence will be that they will find a large market, even as they do now in Europe, where they are able to compete with the Swedish manufacturers. By a little industry, by a little pushing of their trade, they will be able to get rid of a very much larger output, and consequently, they will produce the article at a very much cheaper rate. The consequence will be that we shall not only develop a very large industry in this

country, but we shall produce the article at a lower rate, and thus consumers in this country will benefit directly from the manufacture here to a far greater amount than the bounties given by the Government. But I will also say that if there is no certainty that these bounties can be given on the goods which are to be exported, it will be impossible for the manufacturer to continue the production. It will be impossible for them to manufacture on speculation, that is, on the possibility of receiving some benefits or some bounties from the Government. It will be necessary for them before they begin the manufacture, to know that they will receive the bounties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. First, as to the point made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) where the manufacturer makes both the pig iron and the steel billet, I may say that is very easy indeed to become confused as to the relation of the bounty to the duty; and I frankly confess that at the first stage of these resolutions, we went astray ourselves. My hon. friend points out that where the duty on the steel billet was \$5 and is now reduced to \$2—he said \$1, but that is a mistake—there is a loss of \$3, and, as there is not an increase of \$3 in the bounty, therefore the maker of the steel billet suffers to that extent. I thought this to be the case myself, and the first resolutions gave expression to that error—

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The duty was \$4.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in the first instance. The particular company for which the hon. member for Pictou naturally speaks—a large enterprise in his own county—makes the pig iron and billet both. In thinking of them one naturally does not stop to consider what amount they make by the reduction on the duty on pig iron. They would at once say that they are not gainers but losers by that. But, for the purpose of considering the matter properly, we must treat these as two distinct industries, one being the making of the pig iron, and the other the making of the steel billet. Looking at it this way, we see that they have not suffered the serious loss that my hon. friend thinks. Dealing with the matter roughly, the position is as follows:—The maker of the steel billet has a protection of \$5, now reduced to \$2. Therefore he has lost \$3. But he makes his steel billet out of pig iron which has been cheapened by the change of these duties. Formerly, it carried a duty of \$4; it is now reduced to \$2.50. Therefore the man who makes steel billets saves \$1.50 on his pig iron by reason of the lower duty. Then he has an increased bounty of \$1 on the billet. Therefore, between what he saves on the pig iron, \$1.50 and what he gets in the form of increased bounty on the billet, \$1, he makes a total of \$2.50 on one

side of the account as against a loss of \$3 on the other. So, at the worst, there is only a loss of 50 cents. But in reality it is not so great, because we propose, as a more convenient form of paying these bounties, to pay them on the ingot rather than on the billet, and as the ingot is cheaper than the billet, he gets an advantage there. It will be found that the maker of the steel billet is very little worse off than before. I am not surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) thought otherwise, because I thought so myself at first. But if he will separate the industries, and treat them as two industries, he will see that account must be taken of the cheapening of the raw material of the billet, in the shape of the pig iron. So far as that is concerned, therefore, I think, on careful examination, it will be found that the scale of bounties is adapted to the scale of duties. I have already intimated that on a particular point of this question to which reference has been made, as to whether we shall limit the payment of bounties to consumption in Canada or pay bounties on exports, I am willing, before the matter passes its final stage, to give that question further consideration. But I would like to point out to my hon. friends that if they want to understand the effect of giving bounties on exports, they would do well to put themselves in the place of somebody else. Suppose the United States Government were giving a bounty on exports, on the manufacture and export of some particular article, and that that article was being shipped into Canada, what would happen? The Canadian manufacturer of that article would come before us and say: "Look at what they are doing, they are making an attack on our industry, they are giving a bounty, they are actually sending their goods in here under what we call the slaughter market system. We do not mind fair competition, but we cannot compete with these goods on which bounties are paid by the American Government." If the American Government were to do that in the case of any article being shipped into Canada, the maker of the Canadian article in Canada would feel that he was badly treated, and he would come and demand that we should increase his protection in order to offset that. However, there are exceptions to all rules. I only want my hon. friend to look at the question of a bounty on exports from that point of view. When we are told that the German Government puts a bounty on sugar which comes into Canada, the Canadian refiner comes to us and tells us that he suffers from the illegitimate competition.

Mr. FOSTER. From the export?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bounty on exports, not an export duty.

Mr. FOSTER. A bounty is different.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all, if we pay bounty on an article.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that if Germany puts an export duty—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they pay a bounty on sugar that is exported, and to that extent it is held by the Canadian manufacturer of sugar that it is an illegitimate competition, and that Canada should preclude them from that. Now, if it is a wrong thing for a foreign country to pay a bounty upon things which come into our country to compete with our native industry, would it not be equally wrong for Canada to pay a bounty on iron and send it into some other country to compete with the industries of that country?

Mr. CLANCY. Then the hon. gentleman's argument resolves itself into this, that it is only so far as it may arouse the hostility of other countries and induce them to do the same thing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I have already said that I do not wish to pass a final judgment in the matter, but I wanted to set my hon. friends thinking in the right direction; that if we were to pay a bounty on iron and it could be shown that the iron was being shipped to a country which produces such iron, we would immediately be told that we were attacking the industry of that country, that we were doing exactly what the Canadian sugar refiner complains of to-day in relation to the German refineries. However, there are exceptions to all rules, I do not want to commit myself too hastily, but I would like my hon. friends to think it out on that line. There ought to be a strong case to justify the Government in paying bounty on goods which are to be exported to foreign countries in competition with the industries of those countries.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not putting it quite in that way. You are not paying a bounty for export to a foreign country, but you are paying a bounty to the maker of goods in this country. Now, there is every difference between simply paying an export bounty on an article and paying a bounty on an article made in the country when you get it made. The German Government does both; it protects the home industries inordinately, as we think; and in addition to all that, when the German sugar producer exports his sugar, they give him an actual bounty for the mere export itself. I must say that I have allowed these resolutions to be before the House all this time, and not until my hon. friend called my attention to that, did I dream of such a thing as this Government putting an export duty on iron that a manufacturer might wish to send to a foreign country. Now, I enter the most solemn

Mr. FIELDING.

protest I can against a policy of that kind. Why, look at the injustice you are doing to work. You simply say to one large industry of that kind, the charcoal iron industry: I will punish you in the first place by not giving you a bounty on the manufacture of your iron, because after you have manufactured it and employed labour in this country, you are going to find a market for it in a foreign country. There is one punishment you put upon them. But you go further and you say: You shall not only have no bounty for manufacturing it in this country, but if you dare to find a foreign market for it, we will punish you by an actual export duty. I think the thing is preposterous.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is the proposal. It is enabling you to provide "that the foregoing bounties shall be payable only on iron and steel for consumption in Canada." That is one thing, and that language carries its own meaning. "And that the Governor in Council may at any time by proclamation, impose export duties on such iron and steel if the same shall be exported from Canada." I really do not believe that there were ten men in this House that had noticed that. I must say that I had not noticed it. I had read it over two or three times, but not looking for a thing of that kind. When I saw that the bounties were not payable for exports, I dropped the resolutions thinking that I was at the end of them. Now, I ask my hon. friends opposite, and the Minister of Finance especially, to think over the consequences before putting a thing like that into operation. What reason is there for it? Have we to look after every other country in the world as well as our own interests? My hon. friend justifies it because they give an export bounty. But we are not giving an export bounty. We simply say to every man who manufactures iron in Canada: If you will manufacture iron in this country and employ labour here, and make the iron, we will give you a bounty on every ton that you make. Find your market where you like. But then you go on and say: If you have the misfortune to find a market in a foreign country we reserve to ourselves the right to put an export duty on every ton that you export in addition to the first fine. But what is the ground upon which you justify that? The Finance Minister says: We might be exporting iron into some country and that country might feel sensitive because our men went in there with this iron, and they might retaliate. Let us look after our own country and not after the others. Besides, we are not giving an export bounty in order to help the manufacture of this article in our own country. But what stimulus is there to an industry, what reason is there that you

should hold this threat over an industry? Why should you fine the industry in the first place? Because when it employs all the labour in this country and makes the article, there is full justification for a bounty, or why do you give the bounty. You first fine them because they find a market in a foreign country by refusing to give them a production bounty. Then you hold over their head, over their investment, over their capital, you hold 'over them a threat that the Governor in Council at any time may decide to put an export duty on every ton that they send to a foreign country. There is no doubt you would entirely depress the industry, make it non-progressive and keep it from enlargement by a policy of that kind. I earnestly implore hon. gentlemen that they will not put a disability like that upon the iron industry of the country. I cannot see how a policy which is based upon that idea can succeed, and I do say it is fraught with great danger.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Referring to the remarks of my hon. friend (the Finance Minister), I suppose it is necessary that he should take a wider view of this matter than I am required to do, because to a certain extent I look upon the question from the point of view of the county which I represent. I speak particularly in reference to the great iron-producing industry of that county. Of course the hon. gentleman had to take into consideration the interest and welfare of those who are not the most important class, but who are engaged in manufacturing certain more finished products of iron. The reduction of the duty on pig iron is a gain to the man who is producing steel billets or steel bars only, but he cannot apply the argument to show that it is in the interest of those who are producing the raw material out of which all steel must be manufactured, and which is pig iron. The intention of these bounties is to encourage the production of what is the raw material of all other irons, pig iron. That is the great purpose of the bounties. I am entirely in accord with extending that system to the production of steel but I am sure that the Finance Minister will agree with me on again looking carefully into the matter that the reduction of the duty on pig iron is not an advantage to such a concern as that at Ferrona in Pictou county, nor to any similar concern wherever it may be in Canada. The position of those men who are producing pig iron is just where it was. They had a bounty of \$1 a ton on their product made out of half home ore and half foreign ore. They got \$2 a ton upon iron made out of home ore, and nothing at all upon iron the product of foreign ore. They had a protection of \$4 a ton. The total of the two is \$5. Now the duty is reduced to \$2.50 a ton, and the bounty may be held to be increased to \$2.50. If we suppose

that they are producing iron from half home and half foreign ore, therefore, in that case they have a protection of \$5. In so far as any argument based upon the fact that they are getting iron cheaper is concerned, I think it falls to the ground because the position in which they stand is exactly the position in which they stood before. Although I admit that it is important and necessary to encourage those persons who are engaged in producing steel billets and steel bars, still the great purpose of giving iron bounties must ever be to develop the production of pig iron. Without pig iron we could not have any other iron products. Every person familiar with the working of the iron trade knows that it would be impossible to apply it with the best results to any great resultant business producing iron unless we produced our pig iron at home. It may be that to a certain extent steel may be produced out of imported pig iron, but that never can become a great interest until the beds of ore and the coal mines are opened up and the fluxes procured in the country under favourable circumstances. The imposition of the bounty is intended to have this effect. It is intended to encourage the iron industry from the very foundation steps. My hon. friend says that the duty on steel has only been reduced by \$2. That is true if he applies it to steel billets only. But the reduction on scrap steel I think is to \$1.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. That is in their favour; they use it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). So far as these great concerns go they do not start out with the presumption that they are going to use steel scrap or imported pig iron. And these are the only industries that we are really interested in promoting. You cannot develop the iron industry as a great national industry if you start with the assumption that the work is going to be carried on with pig iron, and scrap steel imported from abroad. The purpose of the bounty is to develop the production of the coal and iron of the country, and, therefore, I maintain that it is not a fair argument to turn to a man who has invested over \$1,000,000 for the purpose of establishing this industry on a solid foundation on the ground floor in Canada and say that the principal things that are required by the producers of the more highly finished products are always to be brought from abroad and that the services of the men engaged in the manufacture of these products may be dispensed with. This, it strikes me, is an unjust and an almost cruel thing. I am sure no one will admit the cogency of such reasoning. The fundamental principle of the granting of bounties is that it is desirable to induce our own people in Canada to utilize our own ores, our own coal and our own flux, and to carry out the process from the beginning. I hope the Government will view this matter from that standpoint, and that their course will be

such as will result in the continuance of this industry and promotion of its prosperity in the future.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to one point. The Radnor Forges, which are operating in the district which I represent in Parliament, are manufacturing car wheels and to a great extent their markets are in England and Germany.

Mr. QUINN. The United States also.

Mr. BERGERON. And Belgium.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand that their export trade, so far as Germany is concerned, has increased considerably. As I understand the measure of the Minister of Finance they would get a bounty upon the product manufactured here, but an export duty would be charged upon the iron which was exported to a foreign market.

Mr. BERGERON. He says it may be.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me that that would absolutely destroy that industry. They have no protection from the large amount of manufactured goods which are sold in Canada in the shape of car wheels and other things. I do not know exactly how the measure of the hon. gentleman will affect this industry. I think the Minister of Finance will agree that this is a valuable industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), I think, is in error when he claims that there is no advantage in the reduction of the duty on pig iron. My hon. friend looks upon that matter from the point of view of the single industry in his own section. We must forget, for the moment, that there is one concern making all these things, and separate them into distinct industries. There is a concern making pig iron, and a concern making steel from that pig iron. They do not all make steel, but we are bound to assume that the effect of the reduction on pig iron was to cheapen pig iron in Canada, whether it was imported or whether it was made here, and inasmuch as there was a cheapening of pig iron to the extent of \$1.50 per ton, this other man who makes steel from that pig iron, has a cheaper raw material. My hon. friend says it is no advantage to the particular company he names because they make the pig iron and do not want the reduction, but you cannot look on it from the point of view of one single company. I wish to call attention to an error which the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) made, and which he persisted in after I tried to correct him. I do not think these words in the resolution are capable of meaning what he said they did, and if they do, then they undoubtedly should be changed. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that we first refused to pay the bounty on the iron

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

made in Canada, and then that we punished them a second time if they exported. That certainly was not the intention and I do not think the resolution means it. What the resolution means is, that we should not pay them a bounty on iron except for home consumption, and if we pay them a bounty on iron for home consumption, then if they exported it we should have a refund of that bounty. If the resolution does not read in that way, it should be changed to make it mean that. There may be difficulties in determining what is iron for home consumption. Perhaps we could not know it was not for home consumption until they exported it. There is a phase of the question which it is somewhat difficult to meet, and it is that while we, if we enforce that regulation, would impose a duty on iron when exported, if they should go a step further and convert that iron into a manufactured article such as car wheels, then, under the terms of the resolution you cannot impose an export duty on the car wheels, but you could on the iron. I admit that leads to confusion and I am quite willing we should consider it again, as I am not prepared to commit the Government on that matter. The resolution simply means, that if we decide we shall only pay the bounty on iron consumed in Canada, then there must be some method of determining what is home consumption, and you might have some difficulty in determining that. That is the intention of the resolution, and there was no intention in our mind of having that double punishment which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to hear that, and probably in the ardour with which I was pursuing my argument, I did not fully understand the meaning of the hon. gentleman's interruption. I quite understand now what he means. I do not think that the language of the resolution, when one reads it without knowing the inside view, would carry that out, but the Finance Minister will no doubt make the language carry it out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we adhere to it, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I again hope—and I have not abandoned hope until the thing shall have ultimately passed this House—that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will treat all this iron alike, and no matter where a man may find his market, let us give that impulse to enterprise and the extension of our foreign trade. The whole object, it seems to me, is gained when we have the thing made by our own labour in our own country.

Mr. QUINN. With reference to one argument made by the Finance Minister, I would like to say that I do not think the manufacturers of charcoal iron or the Government, would be open to the same imputation, as is the German Government which gives

bounties for sugar exported. I believe that we could extend this bounty to iron manufactured in the country for the purpose of exportation, and yet this bounty could not be looked upon as a bounty for the purpose of encouraging the export of this iron to other countries. I do not think any country would look upon it, as in any way calculated to injure its own manufactures of its own particular article. I would, therefore, ask the consideration of the Finance Minister to that view of the question, and I am sure he will arrive at the conclusion that it is not at all the same as the export bounty which is given by the German Government for the export of sugar.

Resolution reported, and read the second time.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 149) to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding.)

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Amount required to pay the British American Bank Note Company for printing and engraving Dominion notes..... \$33,656 15

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The explanation of that item is that last autumn the circulation was somewhat larger than usual, and it became necessary to have a larger issue of Dominion notes, so that, under ordinary conditions, we would have been obliged to have brought in a supplementary Estimate for the current year for the amount of \$20,000, by reason of the increased demand on the circulation. In addition to that, in view of the change that was about being made from one company to the other, it became necessary we should have a supply of these notes in advance to guard against being short. Therefore an order was given to the British American Bank Note Company for a supply of notes beyond the requirements of the current year, which will come off the outlay for next year, and make a difference of about \$15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the new company in a position yet to do work in the new building?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The new company are doing the work of the Post Office, but they have not yet actually commenced work on Dominion notes. I think they will do so shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if the Jubilee stamps are being printed by the new company in its building at Ottawa?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose they are not all struck off yet?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not quite.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee why he did not think it would have been a courteous thing, at least, to have given the old company the work of the Jubilee stamps. I believe there were some negotiations and for five or six weeks, my hon. friend kept the old company on the string. I believe they considered that they had as good as had the arrangement made; and they were very anxious, not merely for any profit which it might bring to them, before the business was taken out of their hands, to have the honour, as good Canadian citizens, of striking off the Jubilee stamps. But, after toying with the Burland Company and leading them on he suddenly broke off the communications and gave the work to the other company. I think it might very well have been given to the old company. The difference in rates surely was not much. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he can say whether there were any insuperable reasons which intervened between him and the carrying out of that policy?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to tell the hon. gentleman the reasons that caused me to place the contract where I did. When I decided to make an issue of Jubilee stamps, it was during the existence of the contract with the British American Bank Note Company, and I contemplated giving the contract to that company. But having first of all to prepare a design involving a great deal of detail and trouble, I consulted gentlemen of taste. Without having myself invited Mr. Burland to offer his services, that gentleman called upon me. He seemed to know what I was contemplating, and I told him. He then asked me where the design was. I told him that there was no design up to that moment, but that a gentleman of taste was engaged in sketching it. He then asked me if I would have any objection to his calling on that gentleman to see the sketch. I said I would have no objection, and he called. As I had not received the sketch after some delay, I applied to the gentleman who was making it for an explanation why he had not sent it to me, when he informed me that the president of the British American Bank Note Company had got possession of it, saying that he had received orders from me to get it. I was somewhat surprised at that turn, and endeavoured to get back the sketch, which I ultimately did. But before I had decided upon any design, the company seemed extremely anxious to force their methods upon me—in fact, were trying to prevent me adopting such a design as I thought would meet

the approval of the public. This was my first acquaintance with any gentleman connected with that company, and I would as a matter of course have given them the contract but for the further incident which I have referred to, which put me upon an inquiry in the department. I then ascertained in the department from those who had to do with the issuing of stamps that there was an inequality, an unevenness, in the work that company did—that they would furnish a sample of colour for a stamp, and then would not print true to sample, a very serious defect in the case of particular work such as we had in hand. I was further informed in the department that the company had furnished paper not up to the standard, that their gumming was not first-class, and that their perforation was not true—in fact, that their workmanship was not as it ought to be. The unsatisfactory report of their workmanship which I received was what ultimately determined me in the course I pursued. I did not decide it all at once, but it gradually forced itself on my mind, that the workmanship by Mr. Burland's company would not be equal to what we desired, and further that they would not be as prompt in the issue as the circumstances demanded. In the meantime, time was drifting along. I was not, as the hon. gentleman suggests, toying with Mr. Burland in bad faith. When he called upon me I spoke to him in good faith. But this I will say, that I never sent for the gentleman, and I did not invite his assistance. He simply volunteered it; and, while his contract was on, until nearly the 22nd of April, the date at which I think it ended, I discussed the matter with him, feeling that I would be under an obligation to give him the work during that period; but, as I say, my experience, and the interviews I had with him, led me to the conclusion that we would get more satisfaction by a change. As a matter of fact, I did not come to a conclusion to make the change until about the time it was made—some time towards the end of April. At that time the contract had about expired. It had been in my mind for a few days before that to employ the new firm, but I really had not decided upon it until the old contract had expired. I am more than pleased with the workmanship of the new firm. The mechanical work has been reported to me by Mr. Stanton, the head of the department, as exceeding anything he had ever expected. He has reported the workmanship, the material, and the completeness of the work as something he had never had in his relations with the old company.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend can scarcely justify himself in not giving the work to Mr. Burland, on the ground that negotiations went on until the 22nd of April, and then the contract expired; because we have already a vote brought

Mr. MULOCK.

down by the Finance Minister to pay Mr. Burland for work which he is now carrying on, and which he is going to carry on until the 1st day of July or longer, if the other company is not ready to do the work. My hon. friend says that he did not run after Mr. Burland, but that Mr. Burland ran after him. I take it that that is the rule. The Minister does not have to do much running, so far as this kind of activity is concerned; his running is at a different time and of a different kind. There was a very strong reason why Mr. Burland should have got the work. He was the contractor during all the time we have had this work done. It was a matter of some pride for him that he had established this industry and carried it to perfection, and he was very anxious to have the credit of striking off the Jubilee stamps. My hon. friend says he consulted some one else, but anybody knows that no one but an expert in the matter of steel engraving could give a sketch to be worked in steel engraving, and the gentleman to whom he referred would not be considered an expert.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I consulted persons of great taste and experience before deciding. I received advice from disinterested people, and acting upon this I asked the gentleman to give us the benefit of his taste in that preliminary sketch. I had confidence in my advisers and in the taste of the gentleman whom I was consulting, and having decided that he should prepare the design, I did not intend to allow Mr. Burland or any one else to force another design upon the department. Of course, Mr. Burland could have been induced to print according to the design, but it would have been perhaps an ungrateful work for him. But the thing that determined me ultimately was the statement I have referred to before as to the relative character of workmanship and material.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman consulted this gentleman as to the sketch, who was not a steel engraver and not an expert. He had in the meantime referred Mr. Burland to some of his colleagues. I hold in my hand the design that Mr. Burland made, and though not an expert I see enough to convince me that it is a very neat and I think a very true design. I shall send it over to the hon. gentleman because it will bear inspection. The Postmaster General seemed to acquiesce in the arrangement that Mr. Burland was to get the work because he sent him to one of his colleagues.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not send him to anybody.

Mr. FOSTER. At least he had a letter from the Postmaster General to one of his colleagues, and the colleague approved of Mr. Burland's design. The Postmaster General appealed to one of his colleagues as

an arbiter in matters of taste. It was the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), and the Postmaster General, feeling that his colleague was superior to him in such matters, appealed to him for a decision. His colleague initialled the design as being very true to Queen Victoria, and a very fine design it was, and Mr. Burland thought he was certainly going to print off the Jubilee stamp. Ultimately, however, all negotiations were broken off, and the work was given to the alien firm, so that in this jubilee year, when we are pluming ourselves and joining together closer the bonds of Imperial federation, we had to get a gentleman from New York to print off our Jubilee stamp. The hon. gentleman says that they stick better than the others, and that the paper is of better quality. But that was all in the hands of the hon. gentleman's own department. No work need be taken unless the hon. Postmaster General sits on it, and after having sat on it, consider it takes the pressure well, and is up to the desired quality in every respect. It is really no argument that because it might not stick as well or because the paper was not up to quality, the hon. gentleman could not trust a gentleman who has been doing that same kind of work for twenty or thirty years. The hon. gentleman could have seen himself that the Queen's obverse would adhere to the envelope when placed upon it, and I am sorry indeed that in this jubilee year, with strong patriotic sentiment pulsing through the veins of Canada, we have to go to an alien to strike off the Queen's head.

Amount required to recoup the vote for unforeseen expenses.....	\$3,000
Further expenditure in connection with the Tariff Inquiry.....	6,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a sum of \$3,000 taken from the unforeseen expenditure for the purpose of the tariff inquiry and this is to recoup that amount and cover further expenses. This will cover everything. This pays the expenses of Ministers who conducted the inquiry, travelling expenses, and also the cost of stenography and typewriting, which was very considerable. The evidence had to be taken down by shorthand writers and typewritten.

Mr. FOSTER. Does any part represent payments taken out of unforeseen expenses to meet the cost of these partisan official investigators? I notice in the unforeseen expenses a sum of nearly \$3,000 which was used to pay the expenditure incurred by these travelling commissioners. I am not a lawyer, but I want to put this view before the House. If you appoint a commissioner simply to investigate as to whether a man voted or worked in an election, you have no authority from Parliament to

pay for a service of that kind. You have a right to pay for the investigation of an officer's conduct so far as concerns malfeasance in office, neglect of duty or anything of that kind. The officer who does not perform his duty is, of course, subject to discipline. But here is a case in which a new crime has been read into the statute, that crime being active participation by a civil servant in an election. That is to say, if a man who is a civil servant is an active partisan—whichever one of the different interpretations that is given to that term—you hold that that constitutes an offence and you appoint somebody to take cognizance of that offence and to try the party upon the charge. But you cannot find ground for such a charge in any statute law in this country, provincial or Dominion. What right has the Government to read into the law of the country crimes which have never been made crimes, to appoint commissioners to investigate them, and to take public money to pay for this investigation? I do not believe that the Government have any right to use the public moneys for this purpose. They have appointed commissioners to investigate the conduct of civil servants, not with reference to their performance of their duties, but with reference to their political belief and their political action. They have themselves created a crime, and have then taken out of the public funds money to pay judges to investigate and either to condemn or excuse as the evidence may decide. I think that before they use one cent of money for that purpose, they must get the authorization of Parliament; and I believe that this is as much a misuse of the public money as was the Baie des Chaleurs business, which was acknowledged by the Ministers to be a misuse of public money last night when they cried peccavimus.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said that he was not speaking by the book because he was not a lawyer. If he had been a lawyer, I venture to say he would not have raised the question as to whether these commissions were properly issued or not. An official who is an active partisan disqualifies himself for the performance of his duties, and the statute gives the Government authority to inquire into the discharge of the civil servant's duties. My opinion as a lawyer is that in so doing they acted not only within the spirit but within the very words of the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. As a man of common sense and not a lawyer, I would put a case. Suppose a man has not neglected the duties of his office, but has done everything that was required of him in this respect, and has been always at his post when required, but that when not occupied with the duties of his office he has used his right as a citizen

to vote for A, B or C, and to work for him—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman supposes and supposes. But I will not take suppositional cases; I will take the class of cases that are really investigated. Take, for instance, the large class of fishery officers who were charged with having prostituted their offices to advance their political party, who intimated to those who received licenses from them—not in express terms, but in a practical way known to fishermen—that unless the fishermen yielded and voted in the way desired by the fishery officers certain results might follow, in fact, used their influence as officers to influence the votes of those over whom they had a certain control.—would the hon. gentleman question the Government's right to investigate that?

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is a case of dereliction of duty, it is malfeasance in office, it is the use of their office for a purpose not contemplated by the law. But let me give the hon. gentleman another instance. There was one case which the commissioner was sent to try. I do not know how many days he wasted over it, but I can understand that he did not hurry it through in an hour. He tried it, and tried it, and tried it, and could get no evidence, and actually had to report that the man was entirely innocent.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. Did the commissioner get his money?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I have no doubt he did.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Was the man sacked?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I believe not.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There were dozens of cases of men not sacked.

Mr. **FOSTER**. There were dozens of cases of men not guilty.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. How can you know whether they are guilty or not until you try them?

Mr. **FOSTER**. But my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) started on the assumption that there was a political crime, that where a man departed from the even tenor of his way and actively recorded his views, he committed a crime for which he could be tried, and, if found guilty, executed—and they have executed lots of them. And they have taken the public money to try persons charged with a crime which is not a crime under the rule of reason or under any law in this country, and in this they are in just as bad a hole as they were on the Baie des Chaleurs business.

Mr. **LISTER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) can turn double back somersaults as quickly as any man I ever saw. What have he and his friends been charging the Government with this session and last ses-

sion? They have been charging them with dismissing officials without investigating the charges against them. And now when the Government asks that the commissioners who have been investigating these charges shall be paid, the hon. gentleman says that the Government has no right to investigate.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) want me to show wherein the difference lies?

Mr. **LISTER**. You can show anything to your own satisfaction.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I can show anything that is right. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would only listen quietly and in a calm and non-partisan spirit, he would be convinced. What did we find fault with last night?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). Everything.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But I refer to one particular instance. We found fault with the Government taking over the management of a railway when they had no legal authority to do so and spending \$19,000 of the people's money, and then coming here and asking the people's representatives to give them a certificate of good conduct. If the Government had come and asked a vote of Parliament to pay for these commissions, to try political offences, the money could have been voted and the thing done regularly. But the virus of unconstitutional doctrine is in the veins of hon. gentlemen opposite. Unaccustomed to the responsibility and the constitutional limits of office, they think that if they wish to do a thing, they have only to do it, and get the authority afterwards. But the proper constitutional way is to get the authority first and do the thing afterwards.

Mr. **LISTER**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) talks of a railroad; we were talking about civil service.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But the principle is the same.

Mr. **LISTER**. The hon. gentleman has said that no dismissals should take place on the ground of partisanship unless the charge was investigated and the officer given an opportunity to answer. How is it possible that these charges can be investigated unless some person be authorized and appointed to investigate? And if men carry on these investigations, surely they are entitled to be paid. The hon. gentleman cannot demand an investigation and then, after the investigation has been carried on, refuse to pay the commissioner—unless, as a friend behind me suggests, there is a conviction. The hon. gentleman says that in case of acquittal there should be no pay. So far as the power of the Government is concerned to issue these commissions for the trial of these offences, there can be no doubt about

Mr. **FOSTER**.

it at all. I do not believe that any lawyer sitting behind the hon. gentleman, after investigating, will take the position that the Government has not the power and perfect right to do what they have done.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give my hon. friend the article in a moment. I believe the fast line service was necessary and useful to this country. But as a member of the late Government I did not go to work and put on a fast line service, and incur bills, and then come and ask Parliament to pay the bills. We got the authorization first, and so should the hon. gentleman. The whole point is not as to whether an investigation should be made, but as to whether the hon. gentleman had parliamentary authority for the expenditure of a cent; whether they should not have come to the House first and got authority before going on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must protest against my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the ex-Finance Minister, and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) talking of all these criminal matters in connection with this little item of mine. What has all this to do with the investigation of crime? The only crime that we investigated under this item was the crime of National Policy.

Mr. FOSTER. And they found it innocent, and made the whilom criminal their chosen friend.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We did not find it innocent. Unless my hon. friend can discover some crime in this item for the tariff investigation, all this talk is out of place, and I must ask you, Mr. Chairman, not to permit the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and other members to go so far afield.

Mr. COCHRANE. All the fault I find in paying that bill arises from the fact that when the late Government appointed a commission to investigate the same subject, the hon. gentlemen then in Opposition said it was not necessary, that the Government should know all about it, that it was an insult to members of Parliament that such a commission should be appointed. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was very loud in his denunciations. But when those hon. gentlemen got into power they do just what they said we were wrong in doing, and they have spent \$6,000 in doing it. What I object to is paying the expense of these hon. gentlemen doing what they said the late Government was wrong in doing. But they do not seem to have any compunction of conscience in doing what they so loudly declared was wrong. I feel like supporting a motion to strike out the item.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). What is the total cost of the tariff commission?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item of \$6,000 will cover all the expenses so far as I can estimate. There are some accounts remaining unpaid which are subjects of investigation, but I think this item will cover them.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the chief items of expense in that? I may say to my hon. friend that it is a large sum, that the tariff investigations which were carried on have cost us a large sum of money. I thought \$3,000 of that was for these political-partisan-offender commissioners, and I am not sure but what it is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend has been making a speech under that impression, it is time that he should repent, because I can assure him that not a cent of it is for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Roughly speaking, about one-half the amount will be for the payment of the travelling expenses of the Ministers, secretaries and the officials who went from place to place investigating. About the other half, in round numbers, will be the expenses of the stenographers and typewriters, whose very voluminous reports we have carefully laid aside for such future reference as may be necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. If Parliament pays \$6,000 for that work, it belongs to Parliament, and my hon. friend will have to bring all that stuff down. Was there expert testimony?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no expert testimony. If my hon. friend seriously wants these documents to be printed, we will have to expend a few thousands more in having it carefully printed, and collated, and fixed up for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the members of this travelling commission? Was the Minister of Public Works included in that commission?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the Minister of Public Works gave us the light of his countenance on several occasions, but so far as I am aware, this item does not include one cent for his expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Therefore, when he went across the continent in a private car, with a coloured porter, and ate like a bird—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does not come in this item at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Under what item is that covered up?

Mr. LISTER. Tell us something about the temperance commission.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend about the temperance commission. This

Government was very hard worked, so hard worked that when one of its members, to wit, the leader, went away, no more hard work could be carried on, no more important measures were to be brought down. The plebiscite could not be gone on with, because it was an important measure, and the Premier was to be present. The plebiscite left with the Premier. But \$3,600,000 are being voted for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; and equivalent of \$7,000,000 is sought to be added to the public debt for Intercolonial extension; \$8,000,000 for canals have been put through; we have before us a lot of railway subsidies, amounting to three or four millions, and other important measures, but the Plebiscite Bill could not be carried through. If my hon. friend wants to know anything more about that temperance commission, there are some other things that we might talk about. But seriously, with reference to this tariff commission, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that himself and the Controller of Customs spent \$6,000 going about the country asking for information, when, for eighteen years, they declared, wherever they were, in this House or out of it, that they knew all about the tariff, they knew just what the country needed. What the country needed was to have the fetters unbound from its limbs so that this fair maiden of Canada could be made free to go on and prosper. Yet when they came into power they were so enamoured of the jaunting tour that, not for information—they knew it all before—they spent this \$6,000 of the people's money. I never heard of such extravagance on the part of an economical Government. Where is the hon. member for North Wellington? Where are the Patron leaders? The member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) is still left, but he will not raise his voice against it.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Finance Minister collated this evidence and put it into shape so that it could be analysed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood him to say a few minutes ago that it was typewritten and might be of advantage some time in the future, but not for the present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said if the hon. gentleman desired it, we could have printed so much of that information as was not given to us confidentially, by spending a few hundred dollars. Of course, the information that was given to us in confidence would have to be separated from the other evidence. All that matter now is in the form of two huge volumes of typewritten pages which have been carefully considered. I would not like to swear that I have read every line of it, but I have heard every word of the testimony, and read a great deal of it over the second time.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware when the hon. gentlemen were going around get-

Mr. FOSTER.

ting this information that they held their examinations in private. I thought they were open to the public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not aware now that these examinations were held in private, because I have not said so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that there were portions of the information which were private. These must have been of a confidential character. If the sessions were held in public they could not have been confidential.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is probably well aware that the investigations were held, so far as the Government were concerned, in the most open manner. Our desire was that they should be open, but if any gentleman who came before us expressed a wish to make a confidential communication he was permitted to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one important part of the evidence that I would like to have brought down. There was one occasion upon which the consumer was heard, and that consumer was Mr. Alfred Jury, who was present, I understand, by special request of the Finance Minister himself. I would like to have his statement brought down, so that the House will have an opportunity of seeing it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot claim the credit for having specially secured the attendance of Mr. Jury. I may say that Mr. Jury desired to come before the commission at a time when it was not possible that we could hear him, as we had already made several engagements, but I informed him that when we returned to Toronto we would be glad to hear him. When we returned to Toronto he was informed that we would be prepared to hear him.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another part of the evidence that might be interesting, and it was that part where a protest was made against the virtue and general good qualities of the Controller of Customs' biscuits.

Mr. WALLACE. This is an excessive amount to pay for such services. The Minister of Finance has stated that about half of the amount is for stenographer's services. When the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) and I conducted such an investigation a few years ago we went through Ontario pretty fully seeing the people who were desirous of laying their views before us. We took our private secretaries, who did all the work of stenographers without one dollar's additional expense to the country. In that case that \$3,000 item was saved to the public. As I understand it, the private secretaries of the Ministers accompanied them, and as they are all competent steno-

graphers, I think that \$3,000 expenditure was nothing more than the throwing away of public money. In regard to the other \$3,000 of the expenses of the commission, I am quite sure that under a Conservative Government it would not have amounted to one-tenth of that. I know that for myself it did not cost the people one dollar, and we travelled pretty fully through Ontario. I think this is an unjustifiable expenditure of \$6,000 of the people's money.

Amount required to make good the ascertained losses to the Post Office Department caused by the defalcations of the late postmaster at St. Johns, Que., between the 3rd November, 1890, and 9th July, 1896..... \$4,718 31

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this item?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The explanation is this. That postmaster died about July last, and after his death it was discovered, on auditing the books, that he had been falsifying his returns for some five or six years. I think there were small stealings or embezzlements from time to time. Attempts have been made to recover the amounts from his sureties, but I am advised that they are not good for them and it will be a total loss.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the inspector of that district? Surely the inspector is responsible for allowing it to continue five or six years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the state of affairs as we have found it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Postmaster General propose any change in this matter of securities of these postmasters in the line of having a guarantee company furnish the security?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have considered the matter, if you will allow me to mention it, in connection with a Bill which is under consideration. These defalcations were in respect to the money of depositors. It seems that he received the money from the depositors and took their pass-books, which he sent to Ottawa, and got them back again. I think he made changes in the pass books, crediting persons with more money than he had remitted to Ottawa. He entered in the book an amount deposited by the depositor, but which amount he did not charge himself with on remitting here. I discussed the matter with Mr. Matheson, and he told me that it was one of those cases of frauds against which no provision could be made. I asked him whether a repetition of this fraud could not be prevented by the department sending the books direct to the customers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The books are sent here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but if these books were returned direct to the customers the postmaster could not falsify the entry before delivering the books to the customers. But Mr. Matheson gives me an explanation which seems a reasonable one, that in a case where a postmaster intended to commit a fraud he could possess himself of the book in transit. If he will commit a fraud he will not hesitate to adopt means to possess himself of the book. In regard to the question of security, I have a plan in view to provide for better security. It is proposed to have a company insure the officers, but not by name. I find that a company will issue a policy insuring whomever may be discharging the duties for the time being, and by giving a large number of officers to the company we will get a lower rate of insurance. Forty cents on \$100 is the rate collected now from postmasters by the companies. The department can get the same amount of insurance for 25 cents on \$100, and the remaining 15 cents on \$100 will be a general fund covering any loss over the amount of the insurance. Unless you have a special fund to provide for any shortage or loss if you insured each man separately, you might not have enough to cover whatever possible loss there might be. While frauds can never be prevented, I believe that this scheme of insurance will be of great advantage.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to ask the Postmaster General if a distinction is drawn between the case of a postmaster committing a fraud such as has been mentioned and that of officers of the post office, because instances have occurred in which clerks in the post office have made use of the books in the way it is suggested was done in this case. I do not know whether the post office assumes liability for the loss in a case of that kind. I understand they do not assume liability in the case of loss of registered letters. The loss of a letter containing money must nearly always be through negligence of some officer of the department, and if the department admits liability, it is hard to see where any distinction can be drawn between the fraud of postmasters and the negligence or fraud of other officers of the department. I know of instances in which loss of money has occurred to persons in the post office savings bank by reason of fraud, not of the postmaster, but of another official, and I would like to know whether it is admitted as a liability by the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When money is delivered to an officer of the Government, the Government could not repudiate responsibility even if the officer is dishonest. You would never have people trust their money in the savings bank if the Government were not responsible the moment the money left the depositor's

hands. It never has been the practice of the Government to assume responsibility for the loss of registered letters. It is of course possible for the public to cast the responsibility on the Government by purchasing a money order, wherever there is a money order office, and in that case, the Government is responsible as it receives the money. There have been propositions made to me since I have been at the head of the department, that the Government should become responsible for registered letters.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That never would do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been suggested to me, but I have not formed any opinion on it.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not let us get into a discussion on that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do I understand that it is customary for postmasters to send the books of the depositors to the department in Ottawa?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, if the money received did not correspond with the amount in the book, some official in Ottawa must have been negligent or he would have detected that fact. There is no use sending the books to Ottawa to be checked if they are not properly examined.

Expenses of commission investigating the charges in the North-west Territories..... \$750

Mr. FOSTER. This is the item upon which the commission business is to be discussed. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) be able to tell me, how much has been voted altogether for these different smelling commissions?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not it at hand now.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Railway Department it amounts to about \$6,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is for the railways and for the canals. There is one item there of \$6,000 under the head of railways, which I have moved to reduce to \$2,500.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) proposes to make an expenditure of \$6,000 for partisan commissioners in the railways and canals, and there is altogether about \$10,000 for these commissioners in the Estimates. For what purpose does the Government ask for that money? Simply for the purpose of getting excuses for turning out Liberal-Conservative office holders, and putting Liberals in their places. It is called a commission to investigate partisan political offences, and the principle upon which it is supposed to be based is that we should entirely delete partisanship from office holding in the country. But, the strange

Mr. MULOCK.

thing about it is, that in most cases that I am cognizant of, a pronounced partisan has been named as the commissioner or the judge. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has appointed a gentleman by the name of William Wilson of the city of Fredericton to conduct four or five commissions, and to investigate all and sundry of a lot of political offences in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. The only thing I can find in the papers brought down is, that this gentleman has been persuaded to undertake the work, and that authority has been given to the Minister by Order in Council to pay for that work, a sum not to exceed \$25 per day, independent of actual travelling expenses. It does not appear from the papers brought down what amount Mr. William Wilson is paid, and what I want to know now is, what is the amount allowed to Mr. William Wilson per day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Wilson has not received a farthing as yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. William Wilson is not living on air and he is not a millionaire, and I venture to say, that he is not travelling about the country and paying his expenses. If I mistake not, in some of the papers brought down it appears that \$500 has already been advanced to Mr. Wilson, My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is, I fear, not correct in saying that Mr. Wilson has received nothing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to mean, that after having asked me a question, and after I made the reply, he does not believe the statement I made? I do not understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) recognizes as the rules of propriety. I said to him, that Mr. Wilson had not received one farthing, and I ask the hon. gentleman to accept my statement, if he knows what propriety is.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman knows what propriety is. The hon. gentleman is bound by the rules of propriety and he bows to them when appealed to. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) was good enough to turn the back of his head to me the other night, like a whipped school boy, in defiance of all the rules of decency and courtesy in this House. In defiance of all rules of decency and courtesy, he presented the grossest insult that a man could present, not only to a gentleman who was addressing him, but to the whole of this side of the House. And yet that hon. gentleman pretends to lecture me and gentlemen on this side upon what the rules of decency and courtesy are. When the hon. gentleman states that Mr. William Wilson has not received anything, and states it as a member and a Minister, I am bound to accept that; but I said, and I say again, that Mr. Wilson

is not a millionaire, and it seems strange to me that he has been travelling about the country from November, 1896, to the present time, and has been paying his own travelling and living expenses. Now, Sir, will the hon. gentleman answer me this question: What is it proposed to pay Mr. William Wilson outside of his travelling expenses?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as Mr. Wilson and the other persons connected with these investigations are concerned, I propose to look into the character of the work they have done and the reports I receive from them, and to make a proposal to Council as to what, under the circumstances, I think it would be reasonable and proper to pay. The Order in Council provides that the amount shall not exceed \$25 a day. I do not propose to allow Mr. Wilson that amount; I think that would be excessive; but there might be occasional circumstances in which that sum should be allowed. I have not decided what amount I will recommend in the case of Mr. Wilson. He has not yet received one farthing, directly or indirectly; neither have any of the other commissioners. I had no means of paying them until Parliament has appropriated the money, and they were advised that they could not receive anything from my department until an appropriation had been made for the purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite satisfactory. I am very glad to hear that they entered on the work with the understanding that in the meantime they should pay their own expenses; but I think my hon. friend ought to state to the House what he proposes to pay Mr. Wilson.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say how much. I do not propose to exceed the amount named in the Order in Council. My present expectation is that it will not come up to that. I propose to consult with the members of the Government on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any Order in Council been passed other than the general order which has been brought down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The maximum amount was simply stated?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The maximum amount.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has employed some half-dozen persons on commissions; he has had these gentlemen at work, some from October, some from November, some from January, some from February; and he has not yet come down to the business point of defining what their remuneration is to be. My hon. friend con-

fesses that, with his men working all along the Intercolonial Railway for the space of two or three months, he has not yet any understanding with them as to what they are to be paid, or fixed the remuneration they are to have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think my hon. friend has again demonstrated his business ability before the House. Now, Mr. William Wilson is a political partisan of the strongest type.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is a very decent and honourable man.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Wilson is a political partisan who has been hand in glove with my hon. friend and with his political fortunes for all these years. The man who is appointed to try partisan offences, and who ought at least to have the recommendation of judicial qualities, is scarcely to be found in a man who has been a pronounced and bitter partisan—I say that advisedly. Then there is Mr. McAlpine, who has also been appointed. He is also a strong and bitter partisan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was not appointed by the Railway Department.

Mr. FOSTER. He was appointed by the Government. He is known all over the province of New Brunswick as a very strong and bitter partisan. Is the appointment of men of this stamp in accordance with the doctrine on which hon. gentlemen stand, that what we want to get out of the service is the partisan feeling in it? There is a sense of injustice when you send a well-known and pronounced political partisan to sit as a judge in the case of an officer of a different political faith from himself. All I want to say, as a criticism on this proceeding, is that it would have been far better if the Government had selected men of moderate views, even though belonging to their own party; I would not say anything against that. But when they select men who have mingled in all the elections, who have gone all over the province with the hon. gentleman in his political contests, who have been connected with the inner work of the party for years, there is a feeling from the outset that justice is not going to be done; and when you add to that the fact that these gentlemen are not obliged to hold open court, but may carry on the investigation privately, that the instructions of the Minister of Railways are that they are to take these men and question them, and if by questioning them they do not come to a sufficient conclusion, they may then summon witnesses, but no counsel is to be allowed to these men; I think all these things put together show an inquiry which from the first must

be looked upon as somewhat of a farce, and as not giving any reason for expecting fair treatment and fair trial.

Mr. McAlpine went in one case to a place in the county of King's where there was a lightkeeper whose brother was a very pronounced political partisan. Palmer, the brother, is a friend of my own, and an active politician, but the light-keeper himself is a man of altogether a different type. He is a quiet, unassuming man, who takes no public part in any political matters but attends only to his own business. The commissioner gave this man only two or three hours' notice and conducted an inquiry in his absence. In fact, he had witnesses brought up in his absence. He did not give this man a fair chance, as I am informed. I am not sure what report the commissioner made, but it is stated that the report is favourable, but that this light-keeper has been removed and some one else appointed. Now, I do not think that a man should be punished because his brother is a partisan. This gentleman has been dispossessed of his office, and he declares—and I believe him—that he was guilty of no partisan act at all, either in the last or the preceding election, and my knowledge of the man goes to prove that he is one of those quiet men who never take any active part in elections. So far as the appointments of these partisan commissioners are concerned, they defeat the very aim which hon. gentlemen opposite profess to have in view, and that is to give a fair and impartial court of inquiry.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not plead guilty to the charge of appointing partisan commissioners at all. When the matter first came before the House last session and the consensus of opinion was that those gentlemen who denied the charge of offensive political partisanship should have an investigation before being dismissed, the Controller of Customs and myself got together and we determined to appoint a gentleman as commissioner for the maritime provinces, who would be unexceptionable, so far as political proclivities were concerned. We appointed Captain Bloomfield Douglas, who has always been a strong Conservative, and has been in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for many years. I examined his record and learned that he had been stipendiary magistrate for years in Australia, and had vast experience in matters of this kind, and, having been brought into contact with him, I considered that he would do the duty impartially.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I believe that was a good appointment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made the appointment, and there was a chorus of indignation on the part of my friends, because I did so, but I felt it desirable that we should have a man who would hold a fair, open, impartial and

Mr. FOSTER.

honest investigation. Captain Douglas was to have gone all over the maritime provinces had he been able, but as time went on, it was found that he could not get over the ground, and we appointed as commissioner for Prince Edward Island, Mr. J. H. Palmer, who is stipendiary magistrate in Queen's county, P.E.I., and who is a Liberal, but of a very mild type. He is a gentleman who attends to his business and who, from his very position of stipendiary magistrate, is not involved in political conflicts to any extent. He was appointed for Prince Edward Island, so that, so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Customs are concerned, the investigations have been made in Prince Edward Island by Mr. Palmer and in Nova Scotia by Captain Bloomfield Douglas. Mr. McAlpine did make a few investigations in the province of New Brunswick. I do not think it would be proper just at present to discuss the different reports because they are not before us, but I would say to my hon. friend that the practice I have pursued has been not to ask these gentlemen to pronounce judgment themselves, but to take the evidence down, and I take the responsibility of determining and reporting to Council whether that evidence shows active partisanship.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it an abstract of the evidence, or the evidence in full?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All the evidence is reported to me in full, and I have reams and reams from Captain Douglas in every case. Of course, that evidence is obtainable by members of the House at any time. Upon that we pass judgment. Knowing that Captain Douglas was not a professional man, although he had had a quasi-professional experience, and as he was to be employed for a length of time, I did not deem it fit that he should be paid at the rate of professional men. I therefore agreed with him on \$4 a day besides expenses, which is the total amount he is to receive. The expenses of all these commissions will be exceedingly moderate, and I can promise hon. gentlemen that every fair-play has been given.

Mr. ELLIS. With reference to the observations of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) regarding Messrs. Wilson and McAlpine, I do not think he is correct in describing these gentlemen as strong and bitter partisans. They are strong but the application of bitter is rather unjust.

Mr. FOSTER. I have personal knowledge in one case.

Mr. ELLIS. There may be, of course, always an exceptional case, but I know both gentlemen; I know Mr. McAlpine very well indeed, and I would not say that he is a man who could be bitter at all. He is a man of an exceedingly humorous and kindly nature, indeed, and I am quite satisfied that

all his reports will be very fair. There is a strong streak of kindly human nature in him that would prevent him being bitter when sitting as a judge.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suggest he would be bitter as a judge, but I said he was a strong, bitter partisan—I mean in political contests. I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman as to the kindly nature of the man, and can bear testimony to that as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. ELLIS. The same is true with regard to Mr. Wilson. I am not so well acquainted with him personally, but I may observe that he is a man who takes the world as it goes largely, and would be reasonably fair in any case. My hon. friend will find that he would have good reason to withdraw that application of the word "bitter," as it might seem to the House and the committee that these men would be so bitter that they would no be able to do justice.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been pleased to promote two investigations in my riding, one in reference to the fishery inspector and the other the light-keeper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What are their names?

Mr. BENNETT. Smith is the fishery inspector and Little the lighthouse keeper. I do not propose to make any remarks with reference to these two particular cases. The charges against them are in connection with the last June election and not the by-elections; but if the hon. Minister is going to have investigations in that riding, I trust that he will also look into the case of a very pronounced Liberal lighthouse keeper, whom I do not ask to have removed on account of any officious interference in elections, but by reason of the fact that in the winter of 1895-96 he harboured in the Government lighthouse three men who were guilty of illegal fishing. The statement I have made will be borne out by the records in the hon. gentleman's own department. He will find that this very strong Liberal lighthouse keeper was convicted of having harboured these men and of having fished illegally, and was very properly fined \$50. Of course it will be a matter of curiosity to hon. gentlemen opposite to know that I made no complaints against this man at the time, nor asked for his removal, as I might properly have done under the circumstances. However, he was a man with a family, and I thought it would be very poor gratification to myself to see a man turned out in that way, and I permitted the case to go by with a warning. However, if the Minister does propose to investigate the action of a few men simply because they exercised the right of voting on my behalf, I trust he will look into this case of permitting to be kept in the public service a man who, according to his own

record, has been a law breaker in the past. I do not propose to name the man. But if the Minister does go on with the investigation against the other two, then I will afterwards call his attention to this case. If the hon. gentleman hides his political friends on that ground, I am afraid that he will have to condone the acts of this political law breaker, because the protest would be so strong from his large Liberal connection, that the hon. gentleman will think twice before dispensing with his services.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not recollect any investigation having been held against the parties my hon. friend refers to. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I have not appointed any commissioners there except the inspector of the province of Ontario, a gentleman who was appointed by my predecessors in office, and whom I do not know personally at all. But he holds a position with reference to fisheries, and I appointed him where I had occasion to investigate any matters. Although he was appointed by the previous Government, I must say that he appears to have discharged his duties very well. I have sent Mr. Cunningham from the department on one or two lighthouse cases, but I have not appointed a legal man at all. In fact I have discouraged these investigations as far as possible.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have not anything to say about the appointments which have been made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The two men he has appointed would seem to be, from what he says, perfectly able to conduct the investigations with which they are charged and who, so far as appearances go, at all events, until proof to the contrary is given, will no doubt conduct these investigations with impartiality. But it seems to me that what my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated now, is a distinct condemnation of what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did in the district of Quebec; and also a condemnation of what the Postmaster General did in the same district. These men who are appointed to investigate such cases have a very serious duty to perform. Sometimes they are sitting in judgment upon men who have no other resource in the world than the salary which they draw from the Government. Now, it seems to me that these investigations should be carried on by men who are not in active political life, who are not partisans, sometimes indeed they are more violent than the men upon whose cases they are sitting; but they should be gentlemen who are, to a certain extent, removed from the political arena and who could judge with impartiality the conduct of men which they are to inquire into. Now, in the district of Quebec two gentlemen have been appointed to investi-

gate charges against public officials in the Railway Department and in the Post Office Department. These two gentlemen are Mr. G. A. Bedard and Mr. Marcell Chabot. I am not going to say anything against Mr. Bedard further than that he is one of the most ardent political supporters of my hon. friend; that he is actively engaged in politics so far as a man can be who has not actually run for the House of Commons or for the provincial assembly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will hardly find anybody who is not, who is worth anything at all, even perhaps among those on the bench.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did not expect to hear a Minister of the Crown throw out that imputation against the bench in the province of Quebec; he probably means the bench in the district of Quebec. I may tell him that he can find on the bench of the Superior Court and of the lower courts, gentlemen who would be perfectly able to conduct this investigation with impartiality. I do not think that it is right for a Minister of the Crown, especially after the rebuke we got from the Chair the other day, to make any such imputation against the bench as has just fallen from the lips of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Now, as I said before, all I have to say against Mr. Bedard is that he is a violent partisan; I will not say anything further than that now, or until I have before me the reports which he is called upon to make on the different cases that he is investigating. The other gentleman I mentioned is Mr. Marcell Chabot. I do not know what fees are paid to Mr. Chabot, but I will say that he used to be a lawyer. His name, however, has not appeared upon the roll of lawyers for a long time; he has not had any occupation or calling of any kind for a long time, he has not been before the courts for a very long time. He was occupied during the last provincial elections, and for some time previously, in editing a very violent newspaper in the district of Quebec called the "Clairon," in which every day he said as much against his political adversaries as it was possible for him to say. At intervals he used to go stumping, and when he had nothing to do in stumping or editing his paper, he was sitting in judgment upon political opponents in the district of Quebec. It seems to me that such a man as Mr. Chabot is not qualified, in the first place, to occupy the position to which he has been appointed by the Government; and in the second place, being a violent partisan, he certainly cannot make an investigation which would meet the ends of justice. I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the whole evidence was taken in the investigations which were made by the commissioners appointed by him, and he answered that all the evidence was taken.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Well, I may say that in some of the investigations which I attended and which were held by Mr. Chabot, that gentlemen distinctly refused to take evidence that was given by the witnesses, and dictated the evidence in his own words to the clerk of the commission.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was specially referring to appointments in the maritime provinces.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But why was this same kind of conduct not followed in other circumstances? My question only applied to the commissioners who were appointed by my hon. friend. I say the rule laid down by my hon. friend is not a safe rule for those who are brought up before these commissioners; and I say the other rule under which a commissioner may be of the political proclivities of Mr. Chabot, is not a safe rule either, and not a just rule for those who come before his court. Now, the question has been raised by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as to whether these commissions were legal. Now, I will give the committee an example of one of the commissions which was issued, and which I know something about, because I defended the man who was accused. A commission was issued to inquire as to whether a certain official had meddled in the last Federal elections which took place on the 23rd of June. Now, it seems to me reading the statute as I do, that no authority is vested in the Government under that statute; a commission such as that to make this investigation. It may be said that it is within the statute, it is within the right of the Government, to issue a commission to inquire into any official act of a public servant, that they may appoint a commission to examine into the acts of a public official which he has committed in his official capacity. But can the Government, under the statute, appoint a commission to find out whether a man has engaged in political conversation with one of his neighbours, as was tried to be proved in the case where I defended a man who was accused? The circumstances were these: A commission was issued to Mr. Chabot authorizing him to inquire whether a certain postmaster had been guilty of offensive partisanship, and evidence under that commission was taken as to certain conversations which had taken place between this postmaster and one of his neighbours on a certain day, and I protested against that sort of examination. Now, I say that these commissions are wrong, that they do not come under the statute; that it was nothing but persecution in the case I refer to; and it seems to me that a Government which calls itself a Liberal Government should not descend to the appointment of such commissioners as they have appointed in the district of Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, because a few moments ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that there was no doubt, on his side of the House at any rate, of the power to issue commissions; and he doubted very much whether any lawyer in this House would dispute the power of the Government to issue a commission for the purpose of inquiring into charges of political partisanship during an election. The hon. gentleman from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has just voiced my opinion. I am not a lawyer, although I have studied law; but I venture to say that the opinion of that hon. gentleman is in accordance with the law. These commissions are appointed upon the report of the Minister. I will give an example which I have extracted from the report of a committee of the Privy Council approved by His Excellency on the 18th of November, 1896:

On a report, dated 18th November, 1896, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, stated that charges of active partisanship in the last general election for the Dominion Parliament have been preferred against many officials and persons in the employ of the Government upon the Government railways, and statutory declarations have in many cases been received by the Minister of Railways and Canals, affirming and supporting such charges. The Minister deeming it expedient—

I will not read the whole of it.

—to appoint one or more commissioners, under the said Act, to investigate and report upon the said charges.

The Act referred to was chap. 115 of the Revised Statutes, under which the commissioners were appointed to investigate and to report. Well, let us look at the Revised Statutes of Canada to see whether there is any authority such as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that there is no doubt about:

The Minister presiding over any department of the civil service of Canada may appoint at any time, under the authority of the Governor in Council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business or any part of the business of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

I would like to hear the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon that statute, I would like to hear the opinion of the Solicitor General as to whether a charge preferred against a party of active partisanship in the last general election, comes within the provision "any person in such service so far as the same relates to his official duty." That is the clause upon which this commission is appointed. I am only giving what I think is a common sense interpretation to this clause; it is the interpretation of one who has been sitting

in this House for twenty-four or twenty-five years, and who has been listening to lawyers in this House; and I venture to say that nine-tenths of the lawyers will not defend the view that this statute covers the commissions that have been appointed by the Government. If the case was brought up before one of the Superior Court judges, it would be held that the Governor in Council had no power under that statute to issue any such commission. Look at the absurdity of it. The intention is to inquire into a person's official duties. Does the phrase "official duties" include the act of a party having voted at the last general election, or perhaps taken some action which may be termed political? How can that interfere with his official duties? In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred what is called political partisanship does not interfere with his political duties. The Government state that they have authority under the statute of issuing a commission, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very coolly says that there is no doubt upon the subject, that no lawyer in the House would venture to offer an opinion to the contrary. I was very glad to hear the late Solicitor General of the province of Quebec (Mr. Casgrain) get up and give the same interpretation to the statute that I have given.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think that the late Solicitor General of Quebec will adopt your interpretation of the statute, nor any other lawyer.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

### After Recess.

### YUKON MINING, TRADING AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. MORRISON moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company be concurred in.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give an account of the amendments made in the Senate before we pass the second reading.

Mr. MORRISON. I may say that the amendment in this case is a legal amendment. There was a misapprehension as to the wording of the preamble. The company was registered in the province of British Columbia, and the word "incorporation" was used interchangeably with the word "registration," and at the instance of the law clerk an amendment to section 3 of this Bill was inserted which seems to overcome the apparent objection, and we have consented to it. I will read the clause as amended:

This Act, and "The Railway Act," so far as it is applicable, shall apply to the company and its railway instead of the said Acts of British Columbia and the British Columbia Railway Act, provided that nothing in this section shall affect anything done, any right or privilege acquired, or any liability incurred, up to and at the time of the passing of this Act, to all of which rights and privileges the company shall continue to be entitled, and to all of which liabilities the company shall continue to be subject.

The other amendment was as to the distance west which we could go, limiting us to the 133rd meridian. That, of course, puts it beyond peradventure that we shall not interfere with other charters which have been granted.

Mr. BERGERON. Does it not interfere with a charter granted the other day in this House?

Mr. MORRISON. No, because their charter names a certain meridian, and we are not able to go further west than another meridian. These amendments were made at the suggestion of the other parties. They were suggested to the Senate, and we consented to them.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not offer any frivolous opposition to this Bill, but it seems to me that there are many amendments here, in fact, more than what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) says, so much so that the Bill that went to the Senate does not come back in the same way in which it went. It is very hard to see the changes as they are brought down here.

Mr. MORRISON. I might explain very shortly that there have been a number of words and one or two paragraphs cut out, but that follows necessarily from the introduction of the amendment which I have read. The insertion of that clause obviates the necessity of these other clauses remaining in. So you cannot say that these are amendments in the sense of altering the intent of the Bill or changing the powers given by it. They have simply been necessitated by the introduction of the amended clause. For instance, section 2 has been entirely struck out. This has been necessitated by the introduction of the amended clause which I have just read. It is the same with clauses 4, 5 and 6. They follow as a matter of course, but these changes were made at the instance of the people from whom any objection would come or ought to come. We considered that the Bill was sufficient as it was, but rather than have any trouble or delay we accepted their suggestions. We thought that they were harmless, and I think that they are harmless. The very fact that the amended clause has been put in obviates the necessity of having the others. The others would be simply surplusage. Lines have been cut out so as to conform to the amended clause. The word "incorporated" is cut out. It simply adheres more closely

Mr. MORRISON.

to the petition as filed. The objection raised in the Senate committee was that by having the word "incorporated" there, to that extent it differed from the reading of the petition, and that by cutting out this word it brought it more in keeping with the petition as presented. We had no objection to that. We were quite willing that these words should be left out, and they having been left out it does not alter the meaning of the preamble in the slightest. It simply makes it less cumbersome.

Mr. SPROULE. You contended very strongly in the Railway Committee that it would never do to leave out the word "incorporated."

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, but we did not have the amended clause in then. At the time that these objections were raised the amendment was not suggested. It was a legal question, and I was quite willing to leave it to the law clerk of the Senate to confer with the law clerk of the Railway Committee, and they were both, as I am informed, quite satisfied with the amended clause. I was quite willing it should be left to the opinion of these gentlemen who are specialists. I have the greatest respect for the opinion of Mr. Creighton and Mr. McCord in matters of this kind. I think that they are quite competent, and more so than I am to judge as to what amendments should be or should not be made in a case of this kind. With these exceptions there are no other amendments made. As to the other provisions which go to the root of the matter they were left intact, and they follow the line of the charter which has been granted.

Mr. BERGERON. The objections which seem to apply to this Bill are these, as far as I can see them. The first is a change in the title of the Bill. It was originally entitled "The Yukon Mining and Transportation Company (Foreign)."

Mr. MORRISON. That change was made in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. It was one of those West Virginia charters of which there are a great many in British Columbia now. I belong to a company which had a charter of that kind, and it was changed in the Ontario legislature. It came from British Columbia, and it was incorporated under one of these West Virginia charters.

Mr. FOSTER. It was registered in British Columbia.

Mr. BERGERON. They changed it in the Senate, and they have called it "An Act to incorporate the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company." The other day we passed a Bill entitled "An Act to incorporate the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company," very nearly the same title. I am told that there

are some privileges granted to this company which were refused to the other, and without any reason.

Mr. MORRISON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) specify them?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine the discussion to the amendments, and not discuss the Bill in its entirety.

Mr. LISTER. These amendments that you propose now, are amendments made in the Senate.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Was the Bill opposed in the Senate?

Mr. MORRISON. It was very vigorously.

Mr. LISTER. By whom?

Mr. MORRISON. On behalf of the British Yukon Company, which got a charter through this House for that locality or vicinity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you accept the amendments made in the Senate?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the controversy about?

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has been making certain inquiries which I have been endeavouring to answer, but I do not understand that he is opposing the Bill.

Mr. LISTER. These amendments which you now accept were made in the Senate by those opposing the Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Then, why is the Bill opposed?

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would allow me to say a few words he would find out. This is one of those Bills which sometimes goes hurriedly through the committee and of which we afterwards find out what we should have seen at first. I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) may be correct about the amendments, but that is not the information I have, and it is but natural that if these Senate amendments were carried at the instigation of the opposing company, the other company would be opposed to passing them here. Now, my information is as follows:—The petition alleges incorrectly that the company is incorporated in British Columbia. The genesis of the company is wrong and powers have been got under false representation. It is now distinctly stated that the company is an American company registered in West Virginia. If hon. gentlemen will look at name on it, and as we know usually the names of the incorporators appear in the

Bill. It would appear that when they came before the House of Commons they simply asked powers to confirm them in these privileges which were granted by that West Virginia charter which was registered in British Columbia, but when they went to the Senate they took a different course entirely and asked for the ordinary incorporation and it was granted. This is now what they are asking to have sanctioned by this House and that is why we oppose it. My information further is: The powers of this West Virginia company are set forth in the British Columbia "Gazette," page 1414, 1897, and allow the company to do anything. In the committee of the House of Commons it was expressly stated that the company did not wish to trade and this was given as a reason why the charter should be granted. Under these circumstances is it the intention of the House to concur in the amendments of the Senate without recommitting the Bill. It is quite evident from the alterations made in the Senate that the Bill went through committee very hurriedly and the terms of it were not properly digested. The Bill gives powers to a trading, mining, navigation, &c., &c., company to build and operate a railway. In view of the strong objection taken to these powers being granted to the British Yukon Company, is the House prepared to grant such extensive privileges to a company purely American and one whose promoters are not known even by name?

Under clause 7, the company has powers to build to a point on Teslin Lake, not further west than the 133rd meridian. It also has powers to build to a point on the northern boundary of British Columbia. The limitation in the former part of the paragraph is therefore no limitation at all and the clause means that if this American company chooses it can build absolutely to the spot and over the route of the British Yukon Company, and as this charter is avowedly being got not for the purposes of the promoters building the line, but for the purposes of being sold. Is it not fair to assume that it would be used for the purpose of forcing money out of the pockets of the British Yukon Company, and thereby hampering their negotiation and work. As clause 25 has been struck out none of the controlling clauses mentioned in the Company's Clauses Act can be brought to bear against this American company which is only limited by the terms of its own West Virginia or Delaware charter, and although it is true that the transportation business is to be under the supervision of the Governor in Council, the trading, mining and other business outside this is subject to no control at all. And more especially does this relate to dealing with lands, because here again the Canadian Government cannot dictate to a company formed in West Virginia as to its powers. As it is quite clear that this foreign com-

pany is not controlled by the Railway Act. under clause 14 it can undoubtedly hold land to such an extent as to most seriously hamper any other undertaking operating in that region. At the present time the business on the Yukon is absolutely monopolized by the North American Trading and Transportation Company and the Alaska Commercial Company, both of which companies have steamers on the lower river and are most anxious to keep the approach from the south from being opened up. The former company controls the Indian packers over the Chilkoot Pass, the difficult pass now used from the south, and it is an absolute fact that whereas they have been charging from \$14 to \$17 per 100 pounds for carrying a distance of less than 20 miles, on it being ascertained by them that the British company was seriously intending to open up communication through the White Pass, they reduced these extortionate charges of \$14 to \$17 per 100 pounds to from \$6 to \$8 per 100 pounds. It is freely asserted in the city that this West Virginia Company is neither more nor less than an off-shoot of the North American Trading and Transportation Company, and it is well known that this company has been using its utmost endeavours, in the first place, to prevent the British Company having a charter granted to it, and in the second place to obtain a charter for the West Virginia Company. This shows that the passing of the other charter a few days ago had the result of reducing those charges more than half; and if this Bill passes in its present form, these reductions will be simply wiped out. There is an opinion growing—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that this company is really for other purposes than the building of a road and the carrying on of trade in that country. I think, not to delay the House too long, that it would be a great deal better if we had this Bill printed as it came from the Senate. This has been done very often here, and I do not see why we should not do it again. If the Bill is reprinted, we shall have an opportunity to read it, and if it is correct, my hon. friend will not lose anything, and it would be more satisfactory to the other members of the House to deal with the Bill according to the customs and usages of Parliament. I will not make a motion, but I would suggest to my hon. friend that the Bill be reprinted before he asks the House to agree to a second reading of the amendments.

Mr. MORRISON. I appeal to the hon. gentleman to allow this Bill to go through. I assure him that his information is absolutely and entirely wrong, and I know the source from which it emanates. Under the circumstances it is manifestly hard lines on the promoters of this Bill and every one connected with it that at this stage it should be arbitrarily opposed and blocked. We have been opposed by the other company

Mr. BERGERON.

which wants monopolistic powers out there, but this Bill has gone through both Houses, it has been fully and amply discussed before both Railway Committees, and I would appeal to the hon. gentleman to let it go through.

Mr. FLINT. I understand that this Bill, with the amendments made in it by the Senate, is altogether or very largely different from the Bill which passed this House some time ago.

Mr. MORRISON. I assure the hon. member that that is not the case. There is no material alteration in the Bill. Any alteration that has been made in it is to the advantage of the other company. This opposition is entirely evoked by the opposing company. I have not time, even if I had the inclination, to go into the details of the matter; but I intend at the proper time, and under proper circumstances to refer to that.

Mr. FLINT. If the amendments made in the Bill would have the effect which I stated when I rose, any person would be justified in making a searching inquiry into them. But on the assurance of my hon. friend which I have, of course, to take and do take with perfect satisfaction, that the amendments do not change the Bill materially from what it was as already accepted by the House, I will refrain from making that inquiry which, under ordinary circumstances, it would be my duty to make. To a certain extent, we are in duty bound to listen carefully to objections, even though they may be made by rival promoters, and to weigh them fairly and candidly. But, on the assurance of my hon. friend, I refrain from what, under ordinary circumstances, I would feel it a duty to do, namely, to insist on these amendments being printed and laid before the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have not the least desire to block this Bill, and even if the hour for private Bills expired before this discussion concluded, there would be ample time to consider it next week.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How many days do you intend to stay next week?

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are three days for private Bills next week. Seeing that the Bill has been subjected to a great many amendments in the Senate, we should know something about those amendments before we can discuss the Bill in an intelligent manner. The only way in which I could find out what the amendments were was to read the "Journals" of the Senate yesterday, and which I had not been able to get until very late this evening. I will read to the House some of the amendments made by the Senate in the Bill, to show the House how impossible it is for us to consider this Bill in an intelligent manner without hav-

ing studied the amendments and compared them with the original Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. May I ask the hon. member—I hope he will not take offence at the question—if he intends to talk out this Bill?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not at all.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. member knows that if he talks much longer, that will be the result, whether he intends it or not. Understanding the Bill as I do, and knowing the advantage that it will be to the province of British Columbia, I am anxious that it should go through; but if the hon. gentleman intends to talk it out, I might drop it now and save the time of the House. I have tried to explain these amendments, and I think the hon. member ought not be actuated by a missionary desire to reform things as they appear to be, or to rescue the country from anything that might happen from the passage of this Bill. In all fairness, I must say that I am a little alarmed when I see these hon. gentlemen evincing an interest in this Bill. I have seen a good many Bills go through, and I have not seen anything of this kind happen before—one hon. gentleman getting up with a brief carefully prepared—I do not blame him for it—and right on his heels the other hon. gentleman getting up and deliberately quoting the amendments. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take my word that in my opinion those amendments do not materially alter the Bill and were made at the instance of people who oppose it. I would like the hon. gentleman to remember that these amendments were made at the instance of those who are opposed to the measure and we did not object. I would appeal to the hon. gentleman to allow this Bill to go on in the usual way. I give my word that the brief which was put in the hands of the hon. gentleman who spoke recently (Mr. Bergeron) is entirely misleading. I would not for a moment say that he wished to mislead the House, but the information received by him is altogether wrong. I again appeal to hon. members not to arbitrarily oppose this Bill which has been amply discussed and criticised and amended by the committee of both Houses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would take the hon. gentleman's word certainly, and I hope he will take mine, when I say I do not want to block this Bill, for he is the last man in the House to whom I would do an injury of any kind.

Mr. MORRISON. I am not personally interested.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But I have a duty to perform, and having taken great interest in the railway legislation this session, although the hon. gentleman may be fully convinced that these amendments are all

right, he may be mistaken. It is not fair to members of this House to have to look at Bills amended in this manner, when the proposed amendments are only found in the Orders of the Day, which come down at the very minute the Bill is to be discussed. There is something wrong somewhere. I would be sorry indeed if it should happen that on account of this the Bill was blocked, but that is not my fault and perhaps not the fault of the procedure of the House either. I do not know why this very important Bill, containing the largest powers Parliament can give, and giving them to a foreign corporation, should come in this shape before the House.

Amendments concurred in.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would like to have a word with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Several members from both sides have come to me and expressed the strong and not unnatural desire to know whether we could not arrange to close the business of this House to-morrow. So far as the Government are concerned, the thing is practicable, provided a *modus vivendi* can be arrived at between the hon. gentleman and myself. I think we could give him all the time he requires, if it were possible for him to tell us how many hours he wants to talk on the various subjects.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask me an easier question.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All the items that remain for discussion are the ones connected with the Railway Department. The others are of small importance, or ones like the special sum voted to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, reserved specially at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite. I was going to suggest that if he preferred it, we could allow these resolutions to pass on the express understanding that he shall have the fullest power of debating them on concurrence as in committee. If the hon. gentlemen, for reasons of their own, want to hold the House two or three days, let them say so, and we can fight it out according to the rules of the lists without any great inconvenience either to ourselves or themselves. I do not care a straw, but if it is equally convenient to the hon. gentleman it would be a very considerable number of members on both sides if we could come to a practical understanding that, so far as this House is concerned, our business should terminate to-morrow night. If we can come to an understanding, well and good,

but if for reasons of state we cannot, let the hon. gentleman say so, and we will understand each other.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has put a question in which no doubt hon. members on both sides are very much interested and in the object of which they no doubt sympathize and that is to shorten the session. So far as my own talking is concerned, I am willing to abridge that as usual to the greatest possible extent. Speaking for myself, and I do not know but that I may speak for hon. gentlemen beside me, so far as the remaining items are concerned, there is nothing which should provoke much debate, provided the Postmaster General would bring down that little return he promised.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What return?

Mr. FOSTER. I have often heard that question from the hon. gentleman, but he knows very well the return I mean. I do not see anything serious in the Estimates that need take any very great length of time, but my hon. friend must recollect that when he speaks of closing the business by to-morrow night, he is only allowing us one day. There is the Crow's Nest Pass road up for debate.

Mr. LISTER. We will drop that.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Lambton seems to have a strong desire to work behind the Government and have it dropped. Whether he is in the confidence of any member of the Government in expressing that desire, I do not know, but so far as I am personally concerned, I want to see it put through and will facilitate its passage as much as possible. I do not see why we should not finish the Estimates practically and get through the Crow's Nest Pass road to-night and possibly some of the other Government measures. I do not know how long the item with reference to school lands in Manitoba will take, if the hon. gentleman presses that. If he does not, he will remove a contentious matter out of the arena and greatly shorten the debate. Suppose that be done, the only important matter that remains is the railway subsidies, and the most important of those the proposal to carry out, by way of estimate for nine months, what has been debated in both Houses and has not obtained the consent of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On that of course the hon. gentleman has a perfect right to expect full debate. But I was going to suggest that if convenient to him and the hon. gentlemen beside him, we could take that pro forma and have the debate on concurrence just as fully as if sitting in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. That is on Monday?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To-morrow. I do not know what length of time the hon. gentleman may wish to debate it. They have the right to take any length they please.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is very generous with the time. Of course it belongs to us too, and we have no desire to prolong the session one moment beyond what the interests of the country demand, but when the hon. gentleman asks us to close all the railway Estimates and that item as well by to-morrow night, I am afraid he is asking too much. I will do the best I can, and I am sure hon. gentlemen on this side have no desire to prolong the session indefinitely, and I think that perhaps we might get through the business by Monday night. Now, as to the resolution on the Manitoba school fund, does my hon. friend intend to press that?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not to-night, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose we could come to what is a fair arrangement to close this business, as regards this House, by Monday night?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall be in a position, perhaps, to give my hon. friend an answer to that question on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. That is indicative at any rate, of the fact that you cannot close to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, no, we cannot close to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how you could possibly do so, giving the Opposition the freedom that they desire with reference to that very important matter and the railway subsidies. I will do the best I can, and I think hon. gentlemen on this side will second me, to close on Monday. But that will depend somewhat on what is to be done with the above mentioned resolution.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know when the Crow's Nest Pass Bill will be brought up again. I had a few remarks to make which were cut short when the Bill was up before.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps it will be brought up to-night.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we pass this item, I desire to say a few words. I understood that this was the item upon which we might express our opinion as to the commissions of investigation that have been appointed, and I imagine, after the courteous words that have passed between the two chiefs, that the business will be rapidly concluded, so I might as well say what I

have to say on this motion. We have heard a great deal this afternoon about the investigations that took place against civil servants who were accused of offensive partisanship. Like my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), I am one of those who thought it would be cruel to dismiss a public servant for any cause without having an investigation before which he could defend himself. But I am ready to say now that, having seen the result of the investigations that have taken place, and the way they have been carried on, I am entirely opposed to their continuance, and I think that the sooner we stop these investigations the better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, it will be money saved, and hon. gentlemen opposite intend to carry out their policy of dismissing right and left anyhow, and an investigation does not amount to anything. I know of only one case where an investigation has prevented the Government from dismissing a man.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know of two dozen.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not question what the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) says, but I say that I know of only one such case, and that was the case of a postmaster in Ontario. I will give some cases within my own knowledge where there was an investigation and some where there was not. And in every case the result was the same. I have come to the conclusion that the fact is that hon. gentlemen need positions for their supporters and they must have them. The other day some reference was made to the employees on the canals, and some gentlemen stated, among them the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) that the lockmen on the canals were appointed purely and simply for the season. That was the first time I ever heard anything of the sort. These lockmen were appointed, as the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said the other night, during good behaviour. They are supposed to hold their positions all their lives, if they do their work properly as lockmen. The best proof of that is that some of the men employed on the canal have paid and are still paying to the superannuation fund, men who were appointed twenty or thirty years ago. Some of them were superannuated since I came to this House. They have been replaced by men who, it is true, do not pay to the superannuation fund, but they took their offices under the impression that they would hold them as long as they did their duty. But not only were men of this class dismissed, but in the county of Beauharnois, men were dismissed who were permanent employees and who have paid to the superannuation fund for eighteen years. And they were dismissed simply on the ipse

dixit of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) without any investigation at all. For instance, there was Mr. Danis, who was employed eighteen years as collector of tolls for the Department of Railways and Canals. He was dismissed without investigation. He had paid to the superannuation fund for eighteen years. He was also the collector of customs. He was dismissed after paying to the fund.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). He will be refunded what he paid.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope so. I am mentioning these things as an answer to what was said yesterday. I am not complaining now—I have done that before—but I am making a comparison between what was said and the facts that are within my own knowledge. Mr. Lefebvre, a permanent employee was dismissed without investigation. There were the lockmaster, Mr. Mathieu, Mr. Ruffauge and Mr. Cardinal. They were employed all the year round. They did not pay to the superannuation fund because they were appointed since ten years ago. They were not only paid but they were also housed by the Government. Then there was a man named Monette, a lockman who was in the same position. He was dismissed. The point I want to make is that whether there is an investigation or not the conclusion is the same—the dismissal of the employee. The Government dismissed the postmaster at Beauharnois, a man who had a salary of about \$500 or \$600—a good postmaster against whom nothing could be said as a postmaster. He was dismissed on the ground that he was an active and offensive partisan, but no investigation took place. Mr. Cardinal, in the parish, was dismissed without an investigation and was replaced by one of the strongest Liberals in the parish, or for that matter in the county of Beauharnois. There was an investigation held in Valleyfield. When an investigation was held there, why was not one held in Beauharnois or in St. Stanislas de Kotska? The man who held the investigation was Mr. Mercier, a lawyer of Montreal, a rabid Liberal, who has been working in every election in the county for the last five years, and who, in fact, was working in the election when he was holding the investigation. He was judge, Crown prosecutor—everything. The men brought before him had not the right to have a lawyer to defend them; they were called upon to answer his question, and if they dared to open their mouths to give explanations they were told to shut up. He carried on his investigation and made his report, which has been laid before the House. My own opinion is that this investigation was held simply to gratify Mr. Mercier. He was paid \$10 a day and expense, and since then he has been appointed to do the same work at St. Ann's

lock. As to investigations, I want to tell my hon. friends of something of an investigation which took place under the old Government to show the contrast with the tyranny of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are now holding an investigation in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary—or rather they are holding an inquisition, for it is not an investigation. They have put out the warden of the penitentiary: he remains shut up in his house and is not even allowed to go around the penitentiary. The commissioners talk to the convicts and to the lowest class of employees about the place, and have them say what they want, privately, and then they bring them before their court and question them. Then, by and by, they go to the warden and say: Do you not remember such a thing as happening? The man has got no books or memoranda, and perhaps they ask about things that happened five or six years ago. He can only say: I do not remember; but if I had my books I could answer your question. Then they cross-examine him. Now, contrast that with the investigation held in Beauharnois in 1880. The late Government appointed a commission they appointed a lawyer to act as attorney for the prosecution and they appointed a lawyer to defend the accused. The late Hon. Mr. Mercier was appointed to defend Mr. Beique against the charge made against him in 1880. The investigation was carried on under all the rules of procedure, the same as in a court, and Mr. Mercier was paid his fee by the Conservative Government at Ottawa, and the report was sent to Ottawa and was adjudicated upon. And when somebody asked the Government: How is it you pay the lawyer for the other side? what was the answer given by Sir Charles Tupper? His answer was that when an officer was accused, the Government was bound to stand by him and defend him until he was found guilty. But this Government has a very different theory. They look upon a public employee, if he has the least tincture of blue around him, as a criminal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. The men are given no chance to defend themselves. These investigations are not investigations at all, and they are a waste of public money. My impression is that they are simply carried on in order to give some lawyers \$10 a day and expenses.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. And when all these expenses are brought down next session, when they all appear in the blue-books, my hon. friend there (Sir Louis Davies) will be astonished to find how much these investigations have cost. And with what result?

Mr. BERGERON.

With the result that if there had been no investigation at all, the civil servant, if he is a Conservative or has ever voted Conservative, must go out and give place to a partisan of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine spoke about his own department. Why, there was an employee, a minor employee, an overseer in Beauharnois, Mr. Kelly, a respectable man, who was dismissed without an investigation and without a word of accusation against him. He received a note from the Deputy Minister that his services were not needed any more.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The whole district was re-organized.

Mr. QUINN. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly: nobody was appointed to succeed Mr. Kelly. He was not accused of partisanship.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister of Marine said he would not allow any man to be dismissed for partisanship without an investigation unless on the word of a member of Parliament—that is, a Liberal member of Parliament. This man, Mr. Kelly, was given no investigation at all. Now, I repeat that a vote for these investigations is purely and simply a waste of public money, as the investigations are now carried on.

Mr. QUINN. I should not have spoken—because we have not been favoured in my district with any of the investigating committees—but for a word or two that fell from the lips of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) who, I am sorry to see, has gone out of the House. That hon. gentleman, speaking about the commissioners, who ought to be appointed to investigate in Quebec, said in an undertone, but sufficiently loud to be heard by members of the Quebec bar who happened to be here, and who entertained a respect for their judges not exceeded by that of the members of any provincial bar for the judiciary of their provinces, that it was impossible for him to find in the province of Quebec, either on or off the bench—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). He did not say Quebec.

Mr. QUINN. He was alluding to Quebec—that he could not find men qualified to sit on these commissions of investigations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He did not refer to Quebec.

Mr. QUINN. I am glad to hear the Postmaster General deny the accusation. That is what I would expect from a Minister of the Crown. It was not what I would expect from a Minister of the Crown to hear an hon. gentleman in that position to

speaking so slightly of the judiciary of any province.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I heard the Minister of Railways and Canals make the remark, and it had no reference, so far as I understood, to the judiciary of Quebec; and when the hon. gentlemen opposite condemned the remark, the Minister of Railways and Canals attempted to correct him, but the correction was not accepted; the hon. gentleman who was speaking did not allow the Minister to interrupt him in order to correct him. However, I heard his denial that his remark had not any application to the province of Quebec.

**Mr. CASGRAIN.** Well, I did not hear the Minister make any correction. Otherwise I would have sat down and listened to it.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It was when you were speaking.

**Mr. QUINN.** I was labouring under the same mistake as my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and perhaps was more willing to believe it, because I have heard of it being made more than once by hon. gentlemen opposite. However, I say we were not favoured in my district with the investigating commissioners at all. We had meted out in that district to these poor men working on the Lachine Canal, that cold justice which I believe is usually meted out by the Government to those who do not give it any support. From the fact that in that district the voters were found so cold towards the Government candidate, I suppose it was only proper that they should be treated with cold justice, and they were not considered worthy of an investigating committee into their conduct. The system seemed to be adopted there that was adopted in the case referred to the other day by the ex-Finance Minister, who read a letter concerning a gentleman employed in the Post Office Department, I think, and whose great crime was that his father-in-law, or his great grandfather, or some one else had been a wicked Tory. Now this is the course that was adopted on the Lachine Canal. There was one young man, bright and intelligent, occupying the position of storekeeper for years, against whose character there was not the slightest complaint, a permanent employee to all intents and purposes, although not appointed by Order in Council; yet because his father happened to be a Tory, and voted for me at the last election, although this young man had never himself exercised the right of voting, the sin of the father was visited on the son, and he was dismissed from his employment. There was no investigation held, of course, it was too trivial a matter. This was only a poor young man receiving a salary of \$55 a month, and such a man was not worthy of any consideration by hon. gentlemen opposite, except about election times. He was not entitled to any consideration, according

to their ideas. A man receiving \$55 a month was a man who could be dismissed summarily—not by the Minister, because I venture to think that the Minister of Railways and Canals never heard the name of Michael Bahan until I mentioned it in this House. Now, how was he dismissed? He was dismissed on the order of a committee appointed by a number of Liberal heelers in the district of Montreal, into whose hands were given the life and death of the men employed on the Lachine Canal? Why, I have heard it said that members of the Liberal party in this House refused to have anything to do with the dismissal of these men. It became such an onerous duty to decide as to whether men should be dismissed from their employment, it became so disgraceful a service, I am glad to say, that the hon. member who represents Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) in this House, would not have anything to do with it, and it was consequently handed over to a committee of which, I understand, the gentleman whom I had the honour of defeating at the last general election, was one of the ruling spirits.

Now, what do we find from the report which has been put upon the Table of the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals in connection with the Lachine Canal? It does not give all the information that I asked for, I regret very much to say, but it tells us who were employed on the Lachine Canal last year, and how they were dismissed, or rather who supplanted them. It does not give the names of the men who recommended the dismissals. It does not give any of the particulars. There were no papers; I am quite sure there are no papers, but this commission did the work. All that was necessary to do was for this committee to give notice to the superintendent of the canal that So and So must walk the plank, and walk the plank he did, in every case. It was not necessary that there should be any investigation; it was not necessary that the man should have committed any offence; he was only a poor devil getting a salary of \$38 or perhaps \$55 a month. The only time when he was required was when it was necessary to vote, and because he did not vote right when the time came he had to be thrown out. It was not necessary to know whether he had done right in the performance of his duty, or whether he was an honest, sober and steady man. He was only a poor labourer and, according to the doctrine laid down by the Minister of Railways and Canals last session it was not necessary to hold an investigation in his case. He is not a permanent employee, he is not an officer of the civil service; he is not a man who can be of use to any of the Ministers for the purpose of rooting out private correspondence of his predecessors, and thereby gaining an extra salary. He is a poor unfortunate labouring man; conse-

quently, he gets cold and summary justice, the justice that is meted out by the committee of heelers. He gets justice meted out to him, not by the member in this House writing to the head of the department, and or not at the request of the defeated candidate. It is not necessary to write for he is only a poor man, and if the committee of heelers say, "off with his head," off it goes. I find the first name on this list is that of John Conway, who is called superintendent of the canal. Last year his salary was \$1,800. He is still an employee, but he is employed at the rate of \$3 a day. As the canal is open about six or eight months in the year that means a salary of \$720 a year; a permanent employee reduced from \$1,800 to \$720 a year without any reason, without an investigation and without any report because I have asked for the papers, and I presume there are none. I have been told that there is nothing of the kind. Here is a man whose salary is reduced from \$1,800 a year to a minimum of \$720 a year, and a maximum of about \$900 a year for over 300 working days. But, giving him 365 working days he is reduced from \$1,800 a year to \$1,100 a year and no reason given. Of course, he is not a member of the civil service, he is only the superintendent of the Lachine Canal, and that is the cold and summary justice that is meted out to him. The second name is that of Francois Corbeille, who was a wharfinger. The return here shows that he received a salary of \$700 a year under the heading of "Names Present." I do not know that there was an investigation. I have asked that any papers should be brought down showing an investigation, and as I have got none, I assume that there was no investigation. Corbeille was only a poor wharfinger who was getting \$700 a year. There was no necessity for an investigation. Chop off his head. I have placed in my hands just now the instructions to the commissioners from the Minister of Railways and Canals:

I must again point out that cases of daily labourers, or what we call temporary employees, men who are not required to have any special training or experience, can be and will be dealt with ordinarily, without resorting to an inquiry in this form. I allude to such men as section-men and persons in that grade of the service.

Of course, men such as labourers, poor labourers, who are too insignificant to be taken into consideration by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or by hon. gentlemen receiving \$7,000 a year and \$1,000 sessional indemnity.

Mr. TALBOT. You forget the mileage.

Mr. QUINN. You never do that. These men are too insignificant to demand any thought or to be considered at all by the Minister of Railways and Canals. They are to be dealt with in a summary manner, with no investigation into their case. They are to be dismissed and, consequently, act-

Mr. QUINN.

ing on this wholesome doctrine of the Minister of Railways and Canals, the commissioners, or the committee of heelers, operating in Montreal, thought they would stretch the line a little further and that they would call Mr. Corbeille, the wharfinger, a labourer, and of course his head was chopped off. Then there is the name of Michael Bahen on the list. Mr. Bahen was in receipt of a salary of \$55 a month and was dismissed. In this case, Mr. Bahen worked assiduously in the discharge of his duties until the 30th of April. At six o'clock he went home intending to return to his duties on the 1st of May, but at nine o'clock in the evening he received from the superintendent of the Lachine Canal a notice that on and after the 30th of April his services would be no longer required. I am satisfied that no gentleman occupying a seat in this House—I dignify every member of this House by the title of gentleman—I say that no gentleman occupying a seat in this House would assume the responsibility of that act before a committee of gentlemen. Well, that is what was done by the superintendent of the canal. Will anybody pretend that Mr. Marceau, who is a gentleman of education and refinement did this of his motion? Will any hon. member from Montreal get up in this House and assume responsibility for that cowardly act? Not one. I do not charge it against any of my hon. friends except thus far: I charge against them that while sitting in this House they allowed it to be done without entering their protests against it. I charge against them thus far, though I do not make them responsible for the act itself. The act is attributable not to members of this House but the committee of Liberal heelers who hold in their hands the political life or death of every man who works within the district of Montreal. The next name on the list is that of Felix Larose, dockmaster, who was in the enjoyment of the princely salary of \$1.50 a day. Larose was not entitled to an investigation; he was not entitled to any consideration. He was only a dockmaster. He was dismissed summarily and in his place was put Jacob Julien. Then we come to John Cunningham, the assistant electrician of the Lachine Canal. Cunningham, according to reports I have heard and seen was certainly a good electrician. But according to the doctrine of the Minister of Railways he was a labourer, notwithstanding the fact that he had been employed regularly each year on the canal for a number of years, and, of course, this wise committee of Liberal heelers having decided that a wharfinger was a labourer, they could not stop to consider whether an assistant electrician was a labourer or not. You will mark, Mr. Chairman, the fine distinction they drew between the electrician and the assistant electrician, and so Mr. Cunningham was obliged to walk the plank, and Mr. J. Prendergast was appointed in his stead. Then we come to Mr. James Gavin,

patrol man, who was enjoying a salary of \$1.25 a day, and who was replaced by Mr. Euclide Legault. I do not think that any one will say that a motorman is a labourer, yet Mr. James Johnson, the motorman, came within the designation of labourer, laid down by this committee. They called him a labourer because their object was not to make a proper distinction, even on the cruel lines laid down by the Minister of Railways, but to make a distinction in favour of themselves and for the purpose of rewarding their own political friends. Mr. Johnson was summarily dismissed and Mr. Arthur McKeown was placed in his stead. Théophile Martin was replaced by Alex. Lalonde. Redmond Blackburn was replaced by John Craven, Wm. O'Brien was replaced by John Hagan, Thos. O'Keefe was replaced by Dennis Brennan, David Murphy was replaced by James Meehan, John O'Brien was replaced by Ant. Filion, Barney McGurn was replaced by John Hardgraves, James Walsh was replaced by Wm. Flanagan, Ed. Heffernan was replaced by Michael Cooney, James Cardiff was replaced by Paul Furlong, John Duffy was replaced by Wm. Daly, Louis Donnelly was replaced by Patrick Murray.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. QUINN. Gentlemen on the other side say "hear, hear," and I suppose they think I have finished, but no doubt they will be surprised, and perhaps as much disgusted as they ought to be, when I tell them that all these men have been dismissed on only two locks. That was the list on two locks, dismissed to satisfy the party heelers. Lest there might be some suspicion that these dismissals were for the purpose of economy, I may state to the House that the Minister has been careful not only to give the same salary to the new men in every case, but in some cases to increase it, and also to increase, by two hands, the former number of employees on this part of the canal. Then we come to Bridge No. 1 of the Lachine Canal, and on Bridge No. 1, Joseph Hickey, the assistant keeper, was replaced by Thomas Barrette, Patrick Stanford, replaced by John Holden, and John Gallagher replaced by John Bell. These three men who were dismissed received \$38 a month each. The greed of these heelers and their friends was so great, that they craved for the blood of the poor man who was receiving \$38 a month. I can understand Liberal politicians wishing to elevate their friends or themselves to exalted positions, but I cannot understand politicians descending so low in the social scale, as to deprive a poor man who received \$38 a month, of his bread and butter in order that one of their low menials may occupy his position. Now with regard to the waste weir on the canal. You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that there is not one branch on the Lachine Canal that has not been attended to by these gentlemen. Not

satisfied with the men employed on the canal, and on the locks they go even to the bridges and the waste weirs, and the outside sheds. They have very properly described themselves as ferrets or foxes, because there is nothing too filthy for them to have resort to. On the waste weir, John Slattery, the water watchman, was dismissed and John Allan was appointed in his place. I do not know much about any of the other gentlemen who have been placed in positions by this committee of heelers, but I do happen to have some knowledge of Mr. John Allan. Mr. John Allan, the object of their solicitude on this particular occasion, is a man who occupies a unique position in Montreal. It is unique from the fact, that he has probably been convicted more frequently before the courts than any other man in that city. It is unique from the fact, that his criminal attempts have not been confined to strangers alone, but that he has been very generous in distributing them to his own family. His wife has been obliged to fly for her life in the dead of night, and his father-in-law, who died only a short time ago, received such a beating, that general report says it somewhat hastened his departure from this world. His wife and children were thrown out in the streets in the middle of the night, and exposed to the inclemency of the weather in order that Mr. John Allan might enter upon possession of the premises to remove what little furniture there was, to sell it and buy whisky for himself. Mr. John Allan has been so often in jail that when he goes there now, there is no question asked, but he is taken to his old cell. You see, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. John Allan occupies a unique position in the social life of Montreal. Nevertheless, he is the man who was chosen to replace Mr. John Slattery, a respectable citizen, a man who toiled day and night to bring his family up decently, who has struggled hard to educate them properly, and who has raised himself from the position of a common labourer on the Lachine Canal at 60 cents a day, to the somewhat respectable office of water watchman, receiving \$38 a month, and he has been occupying the position for 35 years. This is the man who is ruthlessly thrown out by the Minister of Railways and Canals, because, although the hon. gentleman possibly did not sign the fiat which cut off this man's official head, yet from the words he used when he issued that mandate to his commissioners, he is responsible for every act done under it. I say under the orders of the Minister of Railways and Canals John Slattery, an honest, respectable, God-fearing citizen, is put out of his position, and a blackguard and ruffian is put in his place. Then we come to the Wellington Bridge, where Thomas Godfrey is replaced by James Clark, Charles Burns by Pierre E. Emard, James Shields by Dan Donnelly, and Michael Enright by Martin Dolan. I have not gone

through the list; I have only gone as far as St. Gabriel's Lock. I would like the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) to take this list and go through it. I know he does not know much about it; but he will get a good deal of information from it. He does not know what this committee in whose hands he gave up the patronage of the district, as I am informed, have been doing; but I ask him to continue the list from St. Gabriel's lock to the end of his division, and see what this brilliant commission have been doing in the way of displacing Conservatives by Liberal heelers. Mr. Chairman, this would be a very amusing subject if it were not one fraught with the greatest injustice to poor struggling humanity. I am glad to see two representatives of knighthood, members of the present Government, on the floor of the House while I am addressing the House on this subject. I have always understood that it was a distinguishing characteristic of knighthood to protect the weak. I have always understood that it was a matter of battle with a man who would dare to tax a knight with having stood by while a weak man was being oppressed. I have always understood that it was the greatest reproach that could be cast upon a knight to be told that he stood quietly by while a weaker brother was being oppressed. Yet in this case, I am obliged to believe, it is forced upon my conviction, that two belted Knights stood by while poor brothers were being oppressed in this matter by common political heelers. This is the conclusion which I am forced to; there is no escaping from it. Now, I sincerely congratulate the two hon. gentlemen who have received the honour of Knighthood lately; but I would ask the other Ministers to look well to their conduct, and to see that they are as worthy of Knighthood as the hon. gentlemen who have received it. I am glad to know that the hon. Knight who spoke to-day would not commit himself to the doctrine that was laid down by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals; but as our statesmen are always willing to accept and properly look for honours, I would warn the Minister of Railways and Canals that if he wishes to achieve that rare distinction, and to occupy in this House the exalted position of his leader and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he can never earn the right to it by oppressing the poor and weak, as has been done in his department of late. As I said at the beginning, it is not my intention to address the House at any great length on this subject. I could not refrain, however, from expressing my indignation at seeing this item in the Estimates which are brought down: "To pay expenses of investigation on Government railways and canals, \$3,500." Now, in as much as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not thought fit to bring before

Mr. QUINN.

this House any information as to the investigations which have been held, in as much as he has not thought fit to state the personnel of this commission of investigation in Montreal, who have acted with peculiar ferocity, I might say with incomparable atrocity, I cannot but express my indignation that he should ask for a vote to pay for their services. As these gentlemen do not work without remuneration, they must be paid, and if we are to vote the money to pay them, why should we not know who they are? As this is merely for the purpose of voting a certain sum of money, to be used by the Ministers as they think fit, without any account rendered by them, I think it is not only our right but our duty to ask, and to insist until we obtain, the names of the men who have been appointed to make these investigations. I therefore shall oppose with all the force I possess the vote which is now under consideration.

Mr. MADORE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, some hon. gentlemen opposite have, upon several occasions, complained of the dismissals that have taken place on the Lachine Canal. This is the first opportunity I have of describing to the House the character of the grievances these hon. gentlemen complain of. I do not think the hon. gentlemen can pretend on good grounds that civil servants have been dismissed from the Lachine Canal, since the present Government came into power. Bridge tenders and lock-keepers and shopmen cannot exactly be called permanent employees, as just stated by my hon. friend from Ste. Anne (Mr. Quinn). Those men are employed during the navigation season, every year, on the locks, but no further than the month of November. Therefore, they are liable to be dismissed from the works at the end of each year, under any Administration. Under the late Government, it often occurred that men were dismissed from the service of the canal, being told that their services were no longer required. They were replaced by other followers more devoted to the party interests, without anybody having ever dreamed of creating a scandal out of such dismissals.

When the present Government came into office, about the month of July last year, navigation was about in the middle of its term. Now, had the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches followed the same course as their predecessors in office, all the bridge tenders and lock-keepers would have been right away thrown out of employment and their places given to others; but, on the contrary, they deemed it more humane to allow them to fulfil their engagements, being satisfied with notifying them that, at the end of the season, their services would no longer be required for the following year. Such was the course pursued by the present Administration, and when they were called

upon to engage new men, in the month of May last, for the opening of navigation, they did not re-engage their political enemies for this service. Such is the offence they are guilty of. It strikes me that if the hon. gentlemen opposite believe that it was so greivous an offence for us to follow that course, they never thought, for the eighteen years during which they were in power, to act differently, having, at the very outset of their administration, applied the brush to all the public offices and dismissed the old civil servants and given their places to their own friends. I should think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentlemen opposite, after such a long lease of power, and after having dealt so unfairly by us, should not expect any favours at our hands. I fail to understand why they raise such a hue and cry whenever we happen to appoint some of our friends to office. After having been so overbearing when in power, they ought, at least, in my opinion, to accept their defeat gracefully, as well as submit to the consequences of their downfall. When we, on this side, were occupying seats opposite, we never made such an outcry as the hon. gentlemen now do, when our friends were dismissed from the service and thrown out of employment. I think they ought now to allow us, when we are acting up to our rights, and chiefly when we do not unjustly dismiss anybody, to give to our friends the rewards due to their services to our party.

Now, this is not the only issue of importance in the case now under consideration. Even supposing that the men, over whose dismissal the hon. gentlemen are weeping and lamenting, were permanent employees, I hold that our action in dismissing them was justifiable on very good grounds. For over fifteen years, I have taken an active part in the electoral contests in the counties of Hochelaga and Jacques Cartier, which are crossed by the Lachine Canal; and I may state, as a matter of fact that, for the whole period mentioned, the offices on the Lachine Canal were used as political laboratories where caballers and heelers were being manufactured and where politicians took up their general quarters, in order to work in the interests of the Conservative Government. And it is, no doubt, out of a feeling of gratitude that the hon. member for Ste. Anne was prompted, to-day, to speak in such heated terms about those so-called dismissals. He has not forgotten, that if he occupies now a seat in this House, as the representative of that electoral division, and if he defeated the Hon. Mr. McShane, it was owing to the fact that the employees on the Lachine Canal worked tooth and nail against our candidate, and in favour of the member for Ste. Anne. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the men in question openly worked at the election. He is also aware that two employees who are now in the service of the canal, signed his nomination paper, and that two other

men also in the service of the canal acted as his agents at the polls, on the 23rd June last. Now, in view of these facts I have just alluded to, the hon. gentlemen cannot complain on good grounds that we are persecuting them, whenever we dismiss from the service, or rather, when we decline to continue in the employ of the Government men whom we were quite free to dismiss, as their term of engagement had expired. At all events, I am satisfied that the Government will not allow themselves to be deterred from their course by the outcry raised by the hon. gentlemen. Now, I may as well intimate to my hon. friend from Ste. Anne that he had better prepare for the next session one of his philippics, because, since the hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to give us credit for our generosity, and the more we keep their friends in our employ, the louder they complain and reflect upon our course; and, the more we give them, the more they exact from us. I warn him, I say, that in our capacity as members for the division of Montreal, we will unite and insist upon the Government and the Minister of Railways and Canals, applying the brush for good to all the offices on the Lachine Canal, and dismissing all the bridge-tenders, the lock-keepers and the men working in the shops. I hope this will effectually put an end to all those debates about dismissals, which have taken so much of the time of this House during this session. My hon. friend from Ste. Anne will thus be enabled to ventilate all at once, his grievances on the floor of the House and we will be in a position to justify the dismissals made at our request. I think such a course would also enable the Government to reward the services of their friends and to deal fairly and justly by them.

Mr. QUINN. I could not allow the eloquent and vehement statements of the hon. gentleman to pass without one or two words in reply. What struck me as particularly good and clever politics was the threat of the hon. gentleman that he would continue and his friends would continue to urge the Government to clean out the whole Lachine Canal. I can only say to the hon. gentleman: "More power to your elbow." and I can cite the authority of one of the former leaders of the Liberal party as sustaining the position I take. The Hon. Mr. Laflamme, of sainted memory to the hon. gentlemen opposite, when speaking to a friend of his about the distribution of patronage, declared that it was the curse of a public man's life, and that, in his opinion, whenever he gave a public office—particularly with injustice to anybody else, I may add in parentheses—he created one ingrate and ten enemies. I can only hope that my hon. friends will receive the reward which their former leader prophesied was sure to follow conduct such as they are now pursuing.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will take the responsibility.

Mr. QUINN. But the hon. gentleman went a little further and threw a little side light on the manner in which these things are done. Since hon. gentlemen in opposition are not satisfied when only a few of their friends are dismissed from office, he threatened that the members from the district of Montreal supporting the Government would now unite and insist upon the Ministers cutting off the heads of all the Conservative employees. Are we to conclude that these hon. gentlemen have not been insisting already, and that it was by the pure volition of the Minister of Railways and Canals these men were thrown out? Now, however, they are going to insist, and we will see the results between now and next session. Well, I am glad to see members of Parliament and gentlemen glorify in such conduct. I am glad to hear members of Parliament belonging to the Liberal profession, and who have received the distinction of being elected to represent bodies of the electorate in this House, make these public declarations, and I only hope that the men who returned them to Parliament will look at their conduct in the spirit in which such conduct ought to be regarded by respectable and self-respecting men; and if they do, as I confidently believe the electors of the province of Quebec will look at such conduct in its proper light, these gentlemen will receive the reward they deserve at the next general election.

My hon. friend has told us that we ought on this side to accept gracefully the consequences of our defeat. Well, I was not defeated. I am not taking with bad grace any consequences. The consequences of my victory is that I am a member of the House of Commons, and I have nothing to regret, but I cannot say as much for hon. gentlemen opposite. There are some of these gentlemen—men who have been guilty of these acts—in whose shoes I would not stand to-night for all the wealth of a Golconda. Those men on the other side who make themselves responsible for these things, are men whose position before the public I do not envy. They say that I should not feel cast down. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that I am interested, as far as self interest is concerned, in the appointment or dismissal of poor labourers of whom I know nothing; and I wish to assure you, Sir, that out of the list I have read, I have not come in contact with six of these men. It is no humiliation to me personally that these poor men should have been thrown out of employment. But it is a humiliation for gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches; and it is a humiliation for us all who have the interests of our country at heart that gentlemen occupying high positions in the State should

Mr. QUINN.

descend to such conduct. I regret such conduct, not from any personal interest, but because I regard it as a stain on the public life of Canada. As far as my own personal interests are concerned, instead of its being an injury to me, I am confident it will ensure my election on the next occasion by a very large majority.

My hon. friend from Hochelaga said that two gentlemen who represented me at the polls are still in the employ of the Government. I was not aware of it, and am very glad to hear that the public service contains two such respectable men, and if my hon. friend will give me their names, I will congratulate them.

Mr. GUAY. You ought to know your friends.

Mr. QUINN. My friends are so numerous that I cannot possibly know them all.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) The hon. gentlemen opposite will, no doubt, think that I should not interfere again in the debate on those dismissals, after all I said on this matter the other day; but I cannot allow the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to pass without a word or two in reply.

Our hon. friends opposite regret, they say, to see the Government cutting off the heads of the Conservative employees. Now, have they already forgotten what they did in 1878, when they assumed the reins of Government? Have they forgotten what took place in the county of Rimouski, which I have the honour of representing in this House? Do they forget how in 1878, they dismissed from the Intercolonial Railway, without any trial, not only the Liberal employees but even those who were suspected of being Liberals.

Mr. QUINN. I was not here in 1878, and I do not remember what took place then.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) You do not remember what then took place, but we do remember it and the county of Rimouski also.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) That was bad policy, and you should not follow bad examples.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) We want to do justice to our friends, by reinstating them in the places you took away from them.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) The men who acted in that way have since got their reward for it.

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) If you are not satisfied with our present course, you ought to remember that you first set an example to us, when in power.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) That was a bad example.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) Here is what the Hon. Mr. Huntingdon said about the dismissal of Régis Cardinal, who was employed on the Beauharnois Canal, at the time of his dismissal—

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) No, he was on the Lachine Canal.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) You are right, he was employed on the Lachine Canal, when the Conservative Government cut off his head. Here is what the Hon. Mr. Huntingdon said, on the 19th March, 1879, addressing himself in this House to the Conservative Government, then in power :

We shall be indebted to the present Administration for the inauguration of the American system : to the victors belong the spoils.

You inaugurated that system in 1878 ; and you ought not to feel surprised at our insisting upon the Government of the day rendering justice to our friends. We are not clamouring now, as you did in 1879, for the heads of civil servants, saying : to the victors belong the spoils ; no, but we want justice done to the men who were then unjustly treated. Had not the Government, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in particular meted out justice to the electors of Rimouski, at least, to a certain extent, I could certainly not be able now to meet them. But I am glad to say that it is not so, and I fully concur in the views given expression to by the hon. member from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), when he said that we ought to continue the system inaugurated by our opponents. I do not say, to their own credit—a system which has enabled them to cut off the heads of so many of our friends. I hope that the Ministers will see their way to rendering justice to our friends and acquiescing in our demands.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) If the Ministers decline to yield to your demands, it is because they understand very well the character of that system.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) Now, your friends also understood it in 1879, to such a degree that, without any inquiry, without any trial, they ruthlessly threw out of employment a large number of our friends. In your time, you did not require any investigation.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) And what happened since to the men who acted in that way ?

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) What do you mean ?

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) What became of that Minister ?

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) He has been relegated to private life, where he now is.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Exactly so. Is that what you are after ? It was

perhaps owing to such dismissals as you speak of, that he was sent there.

Mr. FISET. (Translation.) At all events, the public deemed it fit to dispense with his services. If, to-day, the Government does not continue rendering justice to our friends, we will not be able to go before our electors. The American system : to the victors belong the spoils, was set up by the Conservative party in 1879, in the county of Rimouski in particular. If that system is to prevail, it is not the Government of the day which will be responsible for it, but our opponents who began to enforce it in 1878 and 1879.

Intercolonial Railway—To pay salaries and expenses to pay investigating commissioners..... \$6,000

Mr. POWELL. I do not propose taking up the time of the House at any length on these dismissals. The executive have taken the responsibility and upon them the responsibility lies. However, there are one or two respecting which I desire to question the Minister of Railways and Canals. There is the dismissal of some four or five young men from the public offices in Moncton. I shall ask if these young clerks had the benefit of an investigation or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no investigation in their case.

Mr. POWELL. Were they dismissed on account of having been guilty of what is known as political partisanship ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Mr. POWELL. Were they not among the six to which the hon. gentleman referred ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were among those who were included in that list. They were among the five in the county of Westmoreland. I think I stated that the list included not only those set aside on political grounds, but on other grounds.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman's telegram read : " Please send me list by mail at once of the employees of the Intercolonial dismissed at the request of members of Parliament, and the name of the riding where they belonged to." You can scarcely conceive that the general management of the Intercolonial Railway is placed in the hands of members representing the different constituencies in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec. The only ground on which these parties can have been dismissed is the ground of political partisanship. It would be absurd to say that these gentlemen are allowed by the Minister to usurp the functions of the general superintendent.

I am not going to dwell upon these cases except the case of one young man, a clerk by the name of Simonds, who was

a very good official indeed, and who, on being dismissed, applied for a certificate of efficiency. There was no question about the manner in which he discharged the duties of his office. Yet this certificate was refused. Whether there was cause to dismiss him on account of political partisanship or not, I am not going to discuss; but when a young man starting out in life has been for some years a faithful public servant and then is discharged for political partisanship, he is certainly entitled to some fair-play. I appeal to the honour and good-sense of this House whether a young man against whose character there is not the slightest charge, who has rendered faithful and efficient service for many years, and who was dismissed simply from political motives, is not entitled to a certificate of efficiency and whether it is not an outrageous abuse of justice to refuse to give him one. Now with regard to the policy of issuing commissions, there is one phase of it that has not been dealt with in this House, and to this I wish to direct attention for a moment. In the first place, I challenge the whole policy of this commission business as an immoral policy. I challenge it on this ground: The public funds should not only be used for public purposes, and if the Minister of Justice or any other member of the Canadian executive applies public money for unquestionably party purposes, that is an immoral use of the public funds. What is the case before us? There is no question but that, so far as the public service is concerned, a man is neither a better nor a worse official because he is a Liberal or a Conservative, or a neutral, or a follower of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. FOSTER. He is deceased.

Mr. POWELL. At any rate he has not been here much this session. The Government issue a commission, on what ground? On what they claim to be a constitutional ground that a man who takes an active part in politics is disqualified from being a public servant. Well, I accept that. But if hon. gentlemen opposite are going into this thing on purely constitutional motives they should have their commissioners to investigate all cases of partisanship, whether Liberal or Conservative. But this talk of constitutional principle is merely a thin gauze thrown over a vicious system. What do they use this money for? Not to advance the interests of the country but to advance party interests; not to dismiss men who are not fit for the position they occupy, but to get rid of occupants of positions who happen to be of one political stripe, in order to give those positions to men who are of a different political stripe. Instead of boldly and manfully dismissing a man because they think he ought to be dismissed, for political reasons and political reasons alone, they take this means of getting rid of him. I shall not speak at length upon this point.

Mr. POWELL.

but I will say that this policy of issuing commissions to inquire into charges of offensive partisanship is nothing more nor less than a subterfuge on the part of the executive to shirk the responsibility attending on executive acts. I say that this policy is unprecedented in Canadian history, it is subversive of public honour, and is a violation of the sanctity of public funds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) complains that some young man in the service, who was dismissed, was refused a certificate of character or competency—

Mr. POWELL. Or even of service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the hon. gentleman has not stated by whom he was refused, nor the circumstances under which the refusal took place. I now hear of it for the first time, and I do not understand that the hon. gentleman suggests that any application was made to me. If he does say so, I shall have to rub up my recollection of the case. I have not the slightest memory of any such circumstances occurring. I should be sorry to give directions which would result in any person being refused a certificate of service or good conduct if he had conducted himself well in the employ. There must be some rule under which the general manager has acted, and I am sure he would be ready to justify his conduct in the matter. If the hon. gentleman will give the name I will inquire from the general manager and get that information, and if there has been any injustice done I will see that that injustice is remedied.

Mr. POWELL. I am glad to hear that statement of his intention from the Minister of Railways. I may say that this gentleman's name is Simonds. He applied to the chief superintendent of the road, and failing to get the degree of justice he thought he was entitled to, he applied to the gentleman who fills the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, and wrote to that gentleman twice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you are in error on that point.

Mr. POWELL. I have the correspondence in my room, but I am not going to worry the House with going over the points of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will thank the hon. gentleman if he will refer to the correspondence and see whether application is made to me for a certificate of good conduct or of tenure of office. For, now that he mentions the name, I do remember to have received a letter or two from this gentleman, but my memory does not serve me as to his having been refused a certificate such as he has spoken of. I think the gentleman asked to be reinstated or wanted to know why he had been set

aside. I presume that he may have applied to the general manager for information upon that point and may not have got it, and so applied to me. But I am sure that the hon. gentleman will find on referring to the letter that the subject to which he calls attention is not referred to in the correspondence.

Mr. POWELL. It may be that he did not apply to the Minister of Railways and Canals for a certificate of character; it is hardly likely he would do that. But he complained of the treatment he had received.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be very sorry to refuse, so far as any authority on my part is concerned, to direct that any employee should not receive a certificate, unless it were against the rules or unless the general manager had some special reason for refusing to give it.

Mr. QUINN. Now that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has once more graced the committee with his presence, I would ask if he would be good enough to give the names of the investigators who had charge of the cases of individuals who were dismissed on the Lachine Canal or if any were appointed? Also, what papers are in his department in connection with these dismissals?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) exactly what papers relating to this matter are in the department. But I will have a research made and if there are any papers interesting the hon. gentleman, I am willing that he should have copies made of them. As to the names of persons deputed to make investigations, I am not at the present moment aware that any were appointed to investigate the cases on the Lachine Canal. If I were to make a statement positively, it would be that there had been none. There may have been, but I do not recollect them.

Mr. QUINN. Then I was asking the Minister to furnish particulars of the investigations held on the canals referred to in the item under consideration, as I understand that we are discussing the whole of item 73 at the same time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been investigations into cases of persons employed on several canals, the Grenville Canal, the Murray Canal, the Trent Canal, and I am under the impression that there was an investigation or two on the Cornwall Canal. These investigations were in reference to persons who were in the civil service, who were holding positions that would entitle them to a superannuation allowance, who were holding offices of a permanent character; they were not persons who are employed to-day and possibly may go out to-morrow. I cannot now undertake to give the hon.

gentleman any positive statement as to all the canals.

Mr. QUINN. I do not wish to ask for anything more than would be easily obtained by the Minister, but I would like to have on concurrence, copies of any papers in connection with the dismissal of persons from the Lachine Canal, that are in the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there are any, I will be glad to furnish them.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a question that we discussed yesterday in relation to the dismissal of Mr. Geo. B. Pickett from the Oak Point lighthouse. What he tells me is this: He has been dismissed from the office of lightkeeper at Oak Point on the St. John River, on the 1st of March last. And he says:

On the same date I received notice of my dismissal, I got a letter from Mr. E. H. McAlpine, of St. John, informing me that charges of partisanship had been preferred against me, and that he would shortly come my way and grant me an investigation. That investigation he now declines to make, from the fact that the department has already dealt with my case. No more untruthful charges can be made against any man than those in my case, and I ask for the same privilege conceded to Mr. Palmer and Mr. Williams, adjoining light-keepers, namely, the privilege of meeting my accusers face to face.

That is the statement of the young man of whom I spoke yesterday, who was dismissed. He says that the officials just beside him received an investigation into the charges against them. He denies the charges of partisanship, and asks that he shall have an investigation as well; and I understood the hon. gentleman to say yesterday that in such cases he would grant an investigation. The other is in reference to Mr. Beverley Palmer who was keeper of the light at Palmer's Point, on the St. John River. He says:

On the 3rd of March, I received a letter from E. H. McAlpine, commissioner, saying that he would call on me soon to investigate charges of partisanship preferred against me. That same evening, at 8 o'clock, I received a notice to appear next morning at 9 o'clock at Mr. Jenkins's—

Who is a very strong party organizer for the party of my hon. friend.

—to answer to said charge. I appeared, according to notice, and asked for time to get witnesses and counsel. He told me that counsel was not allowed, and refused to allow me time to get witnesses, but wanted to take my evidence and go on with the investigation. To this I objected, saying those who had charges to make against me, should do so first. He overruled in this matter, saying that Col. Donville, member for the county, had charged me with organizing and being an active worker in the election for the Conservative party. I was then sworn, and made the following statement:—I never assisted in any organization, never asked any man to vote or

how he voted, or took any part in any election in any way whatever, since I was light-keeper, except giving my own vote. I then had David Mills, Valentine Vanwart and G. W. Palmer sworn. They all testified that they had never known or heard of me taking any part in any election, except voting.

One of those was his brother, and the other two lived close beside him and knew him intimately.

I then told the commissioner that I could bring 25 or 30 to swear to the same, if he would give me time to get them. This he refused to do. There were several men in an adjoining room. I said to the commissioner: Have not those men got evidence to give? If so, bring them in; I should like to hear what they have got to say. He went in where they were, stayed a short time, came back, and said they had no evidence to give. But there were parties in the woods that had evidence to give, but would not be there till after dinner. He then suggested that I go home to dinner, and that he would adjourn the investigation until 2 o'clock to give me time to get back. He promised to take no evidence in my absence, but that I should hear what they had to say against me, and have an opportunity of cross-questioning them. I got back at twenty minutes to 2 o'clock, taking with me five persons that I picked up on my way—

And he gives the names.

—But notwithstanding his promise, he had taken the evidence of four persons in my absence.

And he gives the names of these persons.

Now, three of these were the very men that I asked him to bring in, and he said they had no evidence to give, and the fourth came in before I left for dinner. So, you see, I did not hear their evidence, nor have an opportunity of cross-questioning them, for they had all left before I got there. But he read to me what he said they testified to.

Then he gives the evidence, but I will not trouble the House with it. But I am informed that the commissioner, Mr. McAlpine, in the end reported that the charges were not sustained. I do not know how true that is. Now, there is his sworn testimony which he said he gave; it can be easily looked up by my hon. friend if he wants to see what was said in that case. The charges were not proven, and I rely upon my hon. friend, from what he said yesterday, to do justice in that case, and not allow an injustice to be perpetrated, because my hon. friend has taken the ground that if there has been no active and offensive partisanship the official ought not to be discharged.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot recall the names of the parties at present. The reports of Mr. McAlpine of course are in the department, and I can produce them at any time. With respect to Mr. McAlpine's conduct I think it would be rather unfair to take the ex parte statement of the incriminated party as a fair representation of what took place. I should doubt it extremely, for this reason: When Mr. McAlpine was appointed

Mr. FOSTER.

I gave him the same instructions that I gave to the other two commissioners appointed, and told him that although I was averse to allowing counsel to appear, either for or against the party, because it involved a long delay and a great deal of expense, still he was to take special care that the party should be allowed to be present and have the fullest privilege of cross-examination of every witness; that every facility should be given him to produce witnesses on his own behalf, and that the investigation should not be closed while he desired to produce any further evidence. The instructions were very explicit, and of course I have every reason to believe that Mr. McAlpine carried them out. I shall take a special note as to the hon. gentleman's letter, and see whether Mr. McAlpine made a special report upon him.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will take the "Hansard" remarks that there are upon it, and then have one of his officers refer to Mr. McAlpine's report he will find something that will corroborate the statement or the reverse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will do that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is only fair to say that Mr. Palmer wrote me very much to the same purport and effect as he has written to the ex-Minister of Finance, and I wrote to Mr. McAlpine stating what was alleged as to his conduct of this investigation. Mr. McAlpine wrote me in reply, that the statements were quite inaccurate, and that on the contrary he had afforded every facility to Mr. Palmer in the investigation. He added that as a result of his investigation he did not find Mr. Palmer guilty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not recall that.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that this is a strong corroboration of what I said.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am bound to say that I do not feel myself in any way bound by the finding of this commissioner. I did not appoint him to find whether the man was guilty or not. I appointed him to take the evidence down, and upon it I shall find whether he was guilty or not. He may have formed an impression about the evidence. If he did find the man not guilty I would probably accept that without looking closely through the evidence. But in almost every case I take the precaution to carefully read the evidence myself knowing that I shall be held responsible in this House for the conclusion reached.

Mr. FOSTER. In that the hon. gentleman is quite right. I do not want to press my objection unduly, but I want to say

that if the finding in the commissioners report is that this gentleman is not guilty of offensive partisan conduct he should be put back in his place.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will give it the most careful consideration.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That brings the whole point up, and upon the decision of a point of that kind depends the bona fides of the assertions of the Government that they are only trying to root out offensive partisans, because, if it is clearly proved that this man is not a partisan and he was allowed to be dismissed on the recommendation of the member that will go far to controvert any position which hon. gentlemen have adopted.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I would like to remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that in some of those cases, so far as the returns brought down show, the evidence has not been returned by the commissioners but only a summary statement.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Can the hon. gentleman mention a case to me?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes, that is generally done.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I have seen cases like that myself, though it may have been in some other department.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). In many cases the evidence has not been returned at all, but simply a summary statement as to what the evidence proved and the conclusions arrived at. In a case of that kind I think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will say that it is going rather far to override the decision of the commissioners without having the evidence before him. There is this, also, that I might add, in regard to the issue of these commissions. With all deference to what the Minister has said, I am not able to see that the language of chap. 115 justifies the issue of a commission for the purpose merely of investigating a charge of political partisanship where it does not involve some inefficiency or want of discipline in the conduct of the party's office. The language of the statute is this, omitting the unnecessary words:

The Minister may appoint at any time a commissioner to investigate and report upon the conduct of any person in such service so far as the same relates to his official duties.

Take the case of a man who has certain hours during which to perform certain duties. During the rest of the day he is his own master. If he attends faithfully to his official duties during the time prescribed by the rules of the department and if during the hours, in which he is his own master, he canvasses an elector he would

be guilty of active and offensive partisanship within the rule as laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite. But I venture to submit with a great deal of confidence to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that conduct of that kind could not be a subject of investigation under the words of the statute which I have just read. But for the apparent opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the contrary I would not have thought for a moment that the question permitted of a doubt. That, however, is not perhaps a matter of very much moment as possibly there might be jurisdiction under chap. 114 to issue these commissions, although as a matter of fact in the Orders in Council I have examined, chap. 114 has not been mentioned at all, but simply chap. 115. It is true, however, that some of the Ministers have in their instructions to the commissioners gone beyond the terms of the Order in Council and directed the commissioners to proceed under chap. 114 as well as chap. 115.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. I am afraid you will deprive us of a fee.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is very little difference between my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and myself for this reason, that my hon. friend looks upon offensive partisanship as a venial offence not inconsistent with a proper discharge of an official's duties. I do not. He says there is no harm in it at all. He can be an offensive partisan and it is no breach of official discipline. I say it is. But it is not so that we differ as to the construction of the statute. It is a question of fact. If I am right in my conclusion as to what is offensive partisanship, then he agrees with me in the construction of a statute. If he is right in his view that offensive partisanship is only a venial offence then he is perfectly clear on the construction of the statute.

Mr. **FOSTER**. To show that there does not seem to be a consistency running through the instructions given by the Ministers, I may point out that an Order in Council is found on the 19th of November, 1896, and in that Order in Council it is stated that the Minister of Railways and Canals gets authority for issuing a commission under chap. 115 of the Revised Statutes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Does that prevent him from issuing a commission under chap. 114?

Mr. **FOSTER**. When he comes to send the letter, he gives the commissioner authority under chap. 114 and 115.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He has a perfect right to do that, because chap. 114 expressly authorizes him to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be as to the summoning of witnesses and the like of that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two provisions of the statute. One gives the Minister power to issue a commission of his own accord without resorting to Council at all and the other one, chap. 115, requires him to go to Council to get authority. He may go to Council and get authority and conjoined with that authority is the other power of acting without reference to Council.

Mr. FOSTER. In this case he has gone to Council and got authority under chap 115.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was perfectly right.

Mr. FOSTER. And then in his instructions he has acted under chaps. 114 and 115.

Mr. LISTER. That is all right.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not, however, the point that I am raising, particularly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In my view that is a proper thing to do.

Mr. FOSTER. My legal friends who are here tell me that you should get the authority of the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What legal friends told you that?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did.

Mr. FOSTER. What I find here as instructions to the commissioner, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, is this:

I do not suppose that it will be at all necessary in very many cases to hold anything like a formal court of inquiry. On the contrary, I wish you to proceed with the work in an expeditious way, notifying the person charged that you desire him to attend before you at a time and place to be named, and then having interrogated him and in an informal manner (not under oath) ascertaining whether he can successfully deny the charge of partisanship which has been preferred against him. If, after this informal inquiry, you are satisfied, from the party's own statement, that he is guilty, you will proceed no further.

That is no court at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The man may say he was guilty, as was done in many cases.

Mr. FOSTER. In some cases the man may do that, but in this case you make the commissioner the judge of the man by looking him over, and putting certain informal questions to him and he need not carry the inquiry any further at all, no matter how the man may declare his innocence.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

You can make a minute of the report and that with others of your cases, report to me the conclusion at which you have arrived. If, however, the person denies the charge against him entirely and insists upon proof, it will then be necessary for you to proceed in a more formal way, requiring the witness, doubtless, to be sworn, and if the party himself desires to make a statement, put him also upon oath. In this class of cases, you might make a brief synopsis of the testimony.

The evidence is not to be reported, but the commissioner may make—he is not required even to do that though—a brief synopsis of the testimony.

Make it as brief as it possibly can be made. Insist that it shall be to the point, and decline to wander off into outside or irrelevant issues.

Mr. LISTER. I wish that rule could be enforced in the House.

Mr. FOSTER—

This evidence upon oath you will, of course, return with your report upon it and the conclusions arrived at.

That does not seem to me to coincide very much with what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated to be his definition of what an inquiry should be. I commend the difference in this respect, and in regard to the character of the commissioners to be appointed—a difference as wide as the poles assunder—between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Railways and Canals. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has surrounded it with some official decorum and character. He has taken Captain Bloomfield Douglas who is in every way qualified, from circumstances which we need not go into here. I would as soon trust him as a judge. He has taken the stipendiary magistrate, and that gives a tone and character to it at once; but the Minister of Railways and Canals has simply taken the heelers and given them those instructions, and he has put any man's future entirely into the balance of the prejudices or wishes of irresponsible parties who in some cases he has appointed to make the investigation.

Post Office Department..... \$685,447 03

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Postmaster General is not here at the moment, but I can state briefly what this is. They are the accumulated deficits of the post office for the last 20 years. It appears that they have always been outrunning the constable in that department, and they have been consistently paying out of one year's appropriations, sums which were due in the last year, and adding thereto from time to time. They have finally run up to this large sum, and the Postmaster General thinks it is time that should stop.

Mr. FOSTER. We will accept that explanation. We knew that hon. gentlemen

opposite were going to bring down enormous appropriations, and we suppose we will have to let them pass.

Amount required to enable certain increases of salary payable under the Civil Service Act, and accruing on 1st January and 1st April, 1897, which were temporarily suspended, to be continued during the year ending 30th June, 1898..... \$1,397 50

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to provide for an increase of \$50 each for six first-class clerks, two second class clerks and forty-two third class clerks, and \$30 each for seven packers and messengers. I would add these words to the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. We had the authoritative statement made here by the leader of the Government and by the Minister of Finance, and I think by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that the Government had come to the conclusion to do away with statutory increases.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As a matter of course.

Mr. FOSTER. Now it is stated that the statutory increases were merely temporarily suspended. The Government at first told us that there were great abuses in giving the statutory increase, and as this was the year that was to be signaled by economy, the Government have come to the conclusion that they would do away with statutory increases, and statutory increases have gone holus-bolus in most of the departments, and only in a few individual instances have they been given. Now, the Postmaster General comes down at the end of the session, and he knocks that policy all into pie.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How?

Mr. FOSTER. Because he brings down a vote here to ask that 57 of his clerks shall have a statutory increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give his explanation again, then?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yesterday I asked the House to vote that item. The hon. gentleman took exception to it, stating that in the way it was worded the whole money might be given to one clerk. The item stood over for me to give particulars. I stated then that I intended, when the session was over, to consider the cases of deserving members of the staff, taking them up on their merits, and not in the perfunctory way which had come to be the practice by which every one received an increase of salary as a matter of course, and not for merit. I suppose it is quite possible

to give a man an increase of \$50 per annum if he deserves it without thereby giving it as a statutory increase. The increase will not be more than \$50 in any case. It is a mere coincidence that it happens to be the same sum as is mentioned in the Civil Service Act; but because the department chooses to ask for that discretionary power, it does not follow that it is the affirmation of a right to an increase, as heretofore claimed and conceded under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not got out of it in that way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, it is all I have to give you about it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must recollect that he has to be courteous.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You have to be fair.

Mr. FOSTER. I am fair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are putting a wrong construction on it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply giving the figures my hon. friend gave. These first class clerks he is going to give a statutory increase of \$50 to—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not a statutory increase at all.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend cannot get out of it by dropping the word "statutory." Is he not giving increases varying from \$12.50 up to \$50 to fifty-seven of his clerks? Are not these what have heretofore been given as statutory increases? Have not the Government declared that their policy was to do away with these small increases called statutory increases, and is not my hon. friend coming down and asking for authority from Parliament to give these small increases, which he does not dignify by the name statutory, but which take the place of the statutory increases? Is the Government going to be run on a basis of unity and agreement, or is each man going to run his own department in defiance of principle and in defiance of the general will of Council? Either we ought to have a principle adopted with reference to the civil service, which will hold through all the departments, or there ought to be an explicit statement that in this respect there is to be no general principle, but that each man is to do what seems right in his own eyes. Do that, and immediately you have all coherence and all unity in the civil service done away, because civil servants who are not fortunate enough to be in the department of my hon. friend will get no statutory increase, while those who have that good fortune will get the equivalent of the statutory increase. In the Finance Department there are just as faithful and honest men as in the Post Office Department, and men who do as much work, and there are no statutory increases given in the Finance Department—why? Be-

cause they were informed by the Finance Minister that statutory increases were done away. To-morrow morning they might meet their Minister, if they would dare to go into his august presence, and ask him what this meant. How is he going to meet them? I might take the other departments in the same way. I say we ought to have some authoritative statement as to what is going to be the rule and practice. If you are to have any uniformity or any kind of subordination or discipline or ambition in the civil service, you have to treat all alike in the different departments. You propose to make the clerks in one department the recipients of favours equivalent to the statutory increase, and refuse to do the same for equally worthy clerks in another department—why? Because in one department the Minister keeps loyally to the decision which the Council has come to, while in the other the Minister flies in the teeth of the decision of Council. That is where the Government stand to-night. They may settle that among themselves; it is their quarrel. But as a member of this Parliament, I have something to say of the rights of the civil servants all the way through. I have friends in those departments, and I know the value of men who have worked under me, and who have as good a right to an increase as any man in the Post Office Department. Why do they not get it? Because the Finance Minister agreed to the decision of Council in that respect, and stood by it loyally. But the hon. Postmaster General has taken the bit in his teeth and says he is going to do what he likes. He may do it, and his colleagues may submit to his imperious will, but he has no right to disorganize the civil service in doing it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There can be no doubt that the item which now appears in the Estimates, though it may be called by a different name, is the annual increase which has been paid up to the present. But if there could be a doubt on that point, the hon. gentleman's own words in this very Estimate indicate that he must have meant exactly this, because it reads: "Amount required to enable certain increases of salary payable under the Civil Service Act, and accruing on 1st January and 1st April, 1897, which were temporarily suspended." What does "temporarily suspended" mean? It must mean the old increases which for some reason were suspended temporarily. Now, I fully endorse everything my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has just said. It is quite impossible that there should be in one department one rule, and a different rule in the other departments. As I have stated already, I consider the whole policy of the hon. gentleman, as evidenced by the Bill he has introduced, and by his making Parliament to give him a certain amount of money to distribute among the clerks whom he will select, is a departure from the rules and precedents which have

Mr. FOSTER.

been invariably followed in such cases. It is not sufficient for the hon. gentleman to come down and say that he is going to give increases to a certain number of clerks. I think the rule which has always obtained up to the present should be still followed, and the names of the clerks who are to get the increases should appear in the Estimates. That has been the invariable rule in every department, and the reason for that rule is self evident. Some hon. members may have ground for opposing the increase in any particular instances, and in any case it is a subject for parliamentary criticism, and which should be laid before Parliament for its opinion. The Minister is entitled to decide what clerks in his department are entitled to the increase, but Parliament is equally entitled to know who these clerks are.

Mr. FOSTER. This item reads: "Amount required to enable certain increases of salary payable under the Civil Service Act and accruing on the 1st of January and 1st of April, 1897." My hon. friend set me down very curtly when I said that these were statutory increases. Will he point out anything that is an increase of salary payable under the Civil Service Act and accruing on the 1st of June and 1st of April, 1897, which is not a statutory increase provided for by the Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is quite right. When I spoke, I was not aware of the phraseology being as it is. I had refused to accept the item worded in this way, and had ordered these words to be struck out and supposed they were. I now ask to have the words struck out "payable under the Civil Service Act." They were not put in with my approval.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they are either statutory increases or the equivalent. I for one will insist that the names be given of the clerks to whom these several appropriations are made, and even when that is done, I will protest as long as I can against the injustice of having one department carried on in this way and equally deserving clerks in the other departments deprived of their increases. I must do that for the sake of the civil service, if for nothing else, and my advice to my hon. friend would be to let this item stand and go on with the Estimates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated to the hon. gentleman that it was impossible to give the names at present, and then the hon. gentleman said he would insist on opposing this item until he had the names. That being the case, since that hon. gentleman is so solicitous for the welfare of the service and declares his intention to obstruct the conclusion of the work of this House, I move that the item be struck out of the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I did that in the interests of harmony on the other side. You can thank me for getting you out of a pretty bad box.

Item dropped.

Intercolonial Railway—To provide additional rolling stock ..... \$100,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this for the Drummond County Road? This goes out now, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not by any manner of means. This is only to provide for the carrying out of the intention of the Government to operate the railway from Chaudière to Montreal as part of the Intercolonial Railway. It would be quite impossible for the department to do that without procuring some additional engines and cars and ordinary equipment, and this sum will be necessary for that purpose. The amount is made up by six engines, three first-class passenger cars, three second-class, two baggage and express cars and two mail cars. These are the cars it is proposed to provide out of this fund. If after the experiment, it should be ultimately determined that the result is not satisfactory, there will be of course no loss at all because this equipment will be available for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this needed unless to operate the Government line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would not be asking for this appropriation unless we intended to make this experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. That throws a very important light on the whole matter. We had a basis of arrangements submitted to this House and certain costs and charges. Directly following on the heels of that comes this item of \$100,000 for additional rolling stock, rendered necessary entirely by the acquisition of power to run over the Drummond Road and the Grand Trunk Railway into Montreal. My hon. friend, as was shown last night, was not very happy in the experiment he made on the Baie des Chaleurs Road, and he should have been guided by that experiment. He had the history of that road and its working for two years, and could have told pretty well what the result would be. Now the proposition he submitted to this House in the first instance was not carried in Parliament, and my hon. friend is undertaking to make an experiment for nine months, and the very first item, as necessary to that experiment, is \$100,000 for extra rolling stock. It does seem to me that that is not businesslike. If the hon. gentleman could make an experiment on a line of road at a fair rental into Montreal, and without the large expense, which otherwise need not be incurred even for nine

months, there might be something said in its favour, but when the initial step of the coming nine months experiment, doubtful at the best, is a vote for \$100,000 for rolling stock, nothing could more clearly show that it would be better not to try a costly experiment of that kind. We must reiterate again that we have not very much faith in the basis on which the hon. gentleman expects to get a return from that road. Any man connected with the railway interests of the country who will estimate 600,000 passengers and 500,000 tons of freight as an addition because of the road being extended to Montreal, taking no account of its relation to the whole of the passengers and the whole of the freight carriage, any man who makes that estimate in order to induce this House to accept his project, and will give no data on which he could reasonably form an estimate that there would be that increase, with all the probabilities against it, is hardly one whom we should follow into an experiment for nine months, the results of which are doubtful, except that we have to pay at least \$100,000 for rolling stock besides the rental for the road to enable us to get into Montreal. I shall certainly advise my hon. friend to hold this item over until the project is discussed as to this nine months' experiment. If the House approves the whole project, very well; but if it is not pushed through, as I still hope it will not be, we shall not need to take this vote. I think he had better allow this to stand until we have discussed the other.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have no objection.

Item allowed to stand.

Beauharnois Canal—To construct drainage culvert under the canal at Valleyfield... \$25,000

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. Minister please explain this item?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) is perhaps aware that a good many years ago an arrangement was made between the Government and the people then living in the village of Valleyfield under which a fixed amount was agreed upon to be paid by the Government in lieu of the construction of drainage works at that point. The location of the canal absolutely cuts off the village from its proper drainage, and it was deemed not unreasonable at that time that the sum of \$500 should be offered from the department, and it was, under protest, I believe, accepted by the parties concerned in satisfaction of their claims. Afterwards, however, it was found the arrangement was inadequate, and pressing demands were made to the department for some supplementary grants, and I have been very strongly pressed by demands of the municipal authorities that we should either agree to pay them an increase in the yearly allow-

ance or that we should ask Parliament for some provision to enable us to execute necessary works. The question has become a very serious question. The board of health authorities are remonstrating very strongly against the continuation of the existing state of affairs, and, owing to the health conditions, we are confronted with a great problem as to whether we shall absolutely refuse to take any further responsibility in connection with the matter, and thereby endanger the public health, or whether we shall recognize the obligation which, they claim, rests upon us to provide some adequate relief. I have reports in my department from the engineers who have examined into this question, and they have estimates that to construct the proper ditch and culvert under the canal would cost from \$25,000 to \$30,000, and I am asking now an appropriation to enable me to do the portion of the work which is directly connected with the canal—not to extend the works at all beyond the point of conveying the sewerage across our canal, but strictly limit it to that. I am not able to state with positiveness just when the work will be undertaken. Since Parliament opened perhaps the hon. member may know, several delegations have visited the city representing the municipal authorities and the board of health, and have made very strong representations, and I felt that the case was so serious a one, as they presented it, and involved such serious consequences, that I would not like to take the responsibility of refusing at all events to ask Parliament to put me in the position that the necessary work should be done at once, and not to allow delay under conditions which would be likely to endanger the health of the people of the locality. Under these circumstances, the grant is being asked.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no doubt, in my mind, that the Government is responsible for taking care of that sewer, and I base that upon the fact that in the past the Government have done so. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has intimated, formerly the Government capitalized the amount of money it should spend on these works and allowed the interest at \$500 a year. Since then the town has grown a great deal, and a work which was sufficient at that time is no longer adequate now. The hon. gentleman says that delegations have been here. I have seen them, and they were here before then. But I am glad that the Government have put this item in the Estimates. The hon. gentleman said that he did not know yet how he was going to do this work, and perhaps he would allow me to make a suggestion to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps I failed to make myself clear when I stated that I was uncertain. I intended to propose to the com-

Mr. BLAIR.

mittee that some words should be added to that grant to enable the Government, if we concluded that it would be desirable, to offer to the town a fixed amount of the grant, or if it were necessary, the full amount of the grant, to be accepted by the town under an agreement that the amount so accepted should be taken in full satisfaction for all time of any claim that they might have upon the Government in respect to this matter of drainage. It might be that that would make a more satisfactory arrangement in that way than by undertaking the work ourselves. That is a matter for consideration, and I thought I would ask the committee to enable me to take the grant in an alternative form so that in looking into the matter, if the conclusion were reached that it would be better to effect an arrangement of that kind, we could undertake the work in that way.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to take the money and then not do the work neither in one way or the other. I was about to say that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) when he was Minister of Railways and Canals, had decided to do that work. Unfortunately we were not allowed to vote the Estimates, and it was not carried on. The way I think it should be done is to carry it under the canal, this is the part for which I understand the hon. gentleman is asking this money. His predecessor would not allow any company or any person to pass under the canal, and so he decided to have that work done by the Government, because the hon. gentleman will understand how important it is that that work should be done properly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should only allow it to be done under the control of our engineer.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Lanark thought it was better to have it done by the Government and under their supervision. Now, for the part that is in the town and for which the Government is absolutely responsible, in my opinion, the amount of money which was paid, \$500 a year, was supposed to represent a capital of about \$10,000. The late Government had decided to give \$12,000 for that part to the corporation, and then carry under the canal that work for which the hon. gentleman is now asking \$25,000. I make this suggestion to the hon. gentleman, because that was looked upon by the delegations at the time as the cheapest way of doing the work in a permanent form. There is no doubt that to-day that sewer is in a terrible condition. I passed through Valleyfield the other day and I found that the people are very anxious about it. The provincial board of health have notified the corporation that they must do something, it is in a dangerous condition. I would ask my

hon. friend to have that work carried out as soon as possible, and I think the way that I have suggested would be the cheapest and the most effectual. I want to congratulate the Minister of Public Works upon having kept his promise. He promised the electors of Valleyfield a day before the last provincial election that the work should be done, and I am glad to see that he has kept his word.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never made any promise of the kind, I only promised to deal fairly with them.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems this estimate is brought into Council by the Minister of Railways and Canals without his engineer being able to say how much it would cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that there are reports in my department based on the engineer's estimate, that it would cost in the neighbourhood of \$30,000 to \$35,000. We have that information in the department.

Mr. SPROULE. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they have not yet decided how this work is to be done, whether as a public work or otherwise. It seems to me that a decision ought to be reached by Council before the item is submitted to Parliament, because it is only by placing such data before the House that we are able to judge whether the grant asked for should be given. I think the hon. gentleman has not furnished definite information in this case. According to his own statement he is not in possession of it himself. Were it not that the urgency appears so great, and that the public health is likely to suffer, I would say that it would be better to hold over the item until next session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought I was making it clear to the committee that the urgency of the case had been presented to the department since the sitting of the House, and I felt it would be assuming large responsibility if we should determine not to take it up for the want of the information which would be necessary, and should decide to defer it until next session. If there is any objection among our hon. friends opposite because we have not reached a conclusion as to the mode in which this work should be done, I will not say that I would refuse to drop it.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me suggest to the hon. gentleman a plan by which it might be completed. The subject came before me when I was Minister of Railways. We are paying at present \$500 to the town of Valleyfield, and I suggested that that amount could be capitalized at 5 per cent and the money given over to the town, which should give the Government a discharge in full for the future of any pay-

ment to be made. Our canal runs between the town and the place where the best drainage can be made. I think we are entitled to put a culvert under the canal. We ought to make that expenditure entirely ourselves. Give them the amount capitalized and let them build the ditch from the exit of the culvert to the river.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have represented to me that they were given to understand that they would get a further grant of \$1,000, making \$1,500 a year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there was something of the kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they may not have been warranted in assuming that that was intended, but at all events, they presented the case to me in that light. It did not appear to me, with the knowledge I had, that it would be a judicious thing for us to assume for all time obligations made at \$1,500 a year. I would much prefer that we should make the outlay ourselves, and have an end to it. If there is any serious objection likely to prevent the estimate being adopted I would prefer to drop the item rather than to press it under the circumstances.

St. Peter's Canal—Repairs..... \$1,350

Mr. GILLIES. Would the Minister please state what repairs are to be made to St. Peter's Canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am advised that two snubbing posts will be required and other repairs which go to make up the total.

Mr. GILLIES. Is there any intention of straightening out the west side of the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not this year.

Mr. GILLIES. Has the Minister ordered any survey to be made of the west side of the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. An engineer whom I sent down there has gone over the ground and given the full report upon it, but I am not in a position to ask for a grant this year.

Mr. GILLIES. Does the engineer's report state the necessity of the repairs being made to which I draw his attention now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am free to say that I have not studied the report at all, and I would not be able to say at the moment whether it has covered the ground the hon. gentleman refers to.

Rideau Canal—To pay land damages on Kingston Mills level, and legal expenses in connection therewith..... \$1,300

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the land damages at Kingston Mills are about finished now.

Mr. BRITTON. I would ask the Minister to explain this item, and perhaps he will be able to say how much is land damages and how much legal expenses.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) is pretty well acquainted with the history of these claims for land damages. The claims, which are embraced in this sum, are alleged to be due to some ten different persons whose lands were flooded at the time. These are the remaining claimants with whom settlements have not been effected. Settlements were made with others whose lands were flooded, but these parties refused to accept, and as a consequence the matter has remained in suspense. They have now declared their willingness to accept the sums offered to them; that is to say, that they are willing to accept the settlement which was made with others at the same time.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister must understand that that canal has been built since 1832. There has been no increase in the height of the Kingston Mills dam, and there could be no more damage now than then. If there is damage, at all, it has occurred more than sixty years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may be a continuing damage. You voted an amount a short time ago for the same purpose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), the Minister of Railways and Canals in 1892?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because these are not new claims. The flooding occurred prior to 1892. The damages were valued by Mr. Wood, the Government valuator, in 1892. All the persons whose property was damaged entered into an acceptance of the valuation excepting these persons whose names I have on this list. We are proposing simply to pay the people whose damages were then settled, but who declined to accept the sums awarded to them, but which they are now willing to accept.

Mr. HAGGART. It is possible that the damage may have been done in 1832. It must have been done in the building of the original canal. The dam is the same height at Kingston Mills as when the canal was built.

Mr. BRITTON. The damage did not arise from any difference in height of the Kingston Mills level, and it arises from some improvement on some of the lower waters below Kingston Mills. I knew that there

Mr. BLAIR.

were damages as a matter of general public knowledge, but I thought they were settled or else I should have heard of it.

Mr. HAGGART. All I know is that there has been no damage from Kingston Mills to Poonamalee dam. That was raised and Mr. Snider was awarded damages on that account. It is possible that this was caused by the piers on the Rideau River.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was in 1887 the damage occurred.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Compassionate allowance to the undermentioned, who were passengers and seriously injured in an accident on the railway:—

Mr. J. F. Robertson.....	\$1,500
Mrs. J. F. Robertson.....	500

Mr. HAGGART. Were these damages awarded upon the recommendation of officers of the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were a number of persons injured at that time and several claims were made upon the department. The position was taken that they had no legal right to recover if our officers were not guilty of negligence, and if they were under the law there was no liability attached to the department. Certain persons injured took legal proceedings with the result that in some cases, though not in all, verdicts were recovered against the Government and very large damages were awarded—in one case, I think as high as \$25,000. These were paid. The two claimants here, Mr. and Mrs. Robertson, were advised by their counsel that the law as it stood did not make the Crown liable for damages, resulting from negligence on the part of its officers. They did not take any proceedings but they appealed to the department, and the department did not entertain their claim, but stood on what was considered their legal right. After considering the matter, I thought it would be proper to have some person investigate it, and a gentleman was appointed for the purpose of taking evidence upon oath of persons who were familiar with the circumstances. I concluded from the examination of that evidence, that a compassionate allowance of the sum named might fairly be made. The amount is small considering the serious damages which these people sustained. I am not informed that they will accept this sum in full satisfaction of their claims, but unless they do we would not feel justified in offering them any larger sums.

Mr. HAGGART. I believe, perhaps, these people are entitled to the money, but I think the court holds that although we were morally liable we were legally exempt. I think we took a vote for those damages, and that the officers of the department apportioned it amongst them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These people never were settled with.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I draw the attention of the Minister to the case of a man who was injured on the Prince Edward Railroad. He was an oiler on the Cape Traverse branch, and while in the performance of his duty he had to put his arm through the wheel of the carriage and the driver having started the engine without warning, the man lost his arm. He is a young man with a wife and family depending upon him, and if the person named in this vote is entitled to a compassionate allowance, there is a great deal more reason why this poor man should get one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is his name ?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) His name is Sweeney. I believe if the Minister looks into his case he will see the justice of making some allowance for this poor man.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When did this happen ?

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) It is not more than two years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will make a note of it.

Williamsburg Canal—To pay three months' salary, as retiring allowance, to ex-Superintendent Hickey..... \$450

Mr. BRITTON. Does this simply mean, three months from the time of Mr. Hickey's dismissal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Hickey's case was one of some hardship, because we reorganized the staff so as to dispense with the necessity of having a superintendent as well as an engineer, and under the arrangement, Mr. Hickey had to retire from the service. There being no means of providing for his case, I had some correspondence with him, and he thought he would feel very well satisfied if he had an allowance of this amount. I think it is only fair it should be given to him.

Mr. BRITTON. The point I wish to make is that his year will expire on the 30th June, and in last year's estimates we have provided up to that date for his salary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We could not pay this officer at all after he had ceased to be in the service.

Mr. BRITTON. Will this retiring allowance pay him to the 30th June ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This retiring allowance will pay him for three months subsequent to his retirement. It may be beyond the first of July, but it may not be up to that date.

Mr. BRITTON. I think that Mr. Hickey ought to get his pay up to the 30th June, and I hope the Minister will see that he gets it.

Public Buildings..... \$5,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I move that the item for St. Martin's post office be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister indicate what other striking out of post offices he is going to do ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After having considered the matter again, having found that the revenue of the post office at St. Martin's last year reached only \$615, I thought it just as well not to insist on going on with that building, and I move that it be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman know what the revenue was before putting it into the Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say frankly that I did.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman indicate what is his general policy with reference to all those that stood over ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The general policy in future will be to exercise a great discretion.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be a great advantage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is always time to improve ; but in this case I think there will not be very much room for improvement, because, after all, I am not asking much this year. But, seriously speaking, I quite agree with what has been said in the House on both sides. We have been going on building too many post offices. This year I will ask that all the other items be voted, but I may say at once that I will not spend one dollar more than I am now applying for.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with Montmagny ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will stand also.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue of Montmagny ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The figures placed in my hands show that the postal revenue last year was \$1,743.19, and the money orders issued, \$8,623. The population of the town and the parish included—

Mr. FOSTER. Not the parish.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the same post office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There are two post offices—

the one in the town of Montmagny, and another called Casault for the parish.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that the post office in the town supplies most of the parish. The population of the town is 1,690, and the population of the parish is, I think, about the same.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The population of the parish is 2,849.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood the Minister to say the other evening that he would drop St. Martin's, Berthierville and Rat Portage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I said was that, having listened to the sentiments expressed on both sides of the House, I thought it was just as well to bring matters to a conclusion; and I made a motion, which was not agreed to, to strike out St. Martin's, Berthierville, Montmagny and Rat Portage. There were protests on both sides of the House, and it was agreed that those items should stand. After having considered the matter again, I made up my mind to ask the House to allow me to strike out St. Martin's post office, but to allow me, at the same time, to go on with the post offices at Berthierville, Montmagny and Rat Portage, pledging myself faithfully not to ask the House in future to vote amounts of money for small places.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What will be the limit?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it would be reasonable to ask any Government to lay down any iron rule; but, at the same time, I think I have heard enough from both sides of the House, and especially from this side, to give me wisdom, and I have no doubt that next year I shall not be accused of asking the House to vote for any useless sum of money on this account.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would repeat partly what I said the other evening. I think the Government are making a great mistake in putting these votes through the House. If the Minister understood the feeling all through Ontario with regard to the extravagant expenditures in which the former Government indulged in building post offices, he would never have put these items in the Estimates; I am satisfied of that. I am glad to know that he has decided not to make any such expenditures in the future. I think it is in the interest of the party, as well as in the interest of the country that such expenditures should not be made. These post offices erected in these small villages are not of service even to the party itself. I think a man must be a very unimportant man indeed if he requires to have a post office erected in his riding in order to get himself returned; I think he cannot amount to a great deal. I also think that

Mr. CASGRAIN.

the erection of these post offices in small places leads to endless expenditure. After the post office is erected, we must have a caretaker, and in some cases a fireman; and we are continually having small amounts put in the Estimates for fences, pavements, and repairs; whereas, in all these small towns, buildings could be rented for at least one-fourth of the expense. I am glad to know from the Minister of Public Works that he has put his foot down, and that, notwithstanding the pressure that may be brought to bear upon him by members who want these public buildings erected in their constituencies, more for ornament than for utility, he will refuse to concede to these men any grant in the public estimates for these purposes in future.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I must enter a mild protest against the Minister putting his heavy foot down in New Brunswick, and keeping it up in Quebec and all the rest of the country. If he is going to put his foot down, let him put it down all through. Let him put it on Montmagny. Is Montmagny any more important than St. John? The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Tucker) is away fighting the battles of his country in London, and you are putting your foot down on the post office in his constituency—in this Jubilee year especially.

Berthierville public building..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population and revenue?

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. The one post office serves both the parish and the town. The population of the town is over 1,500 and of the parish over 1,800. The present post office is placed at the most inconvenient part of the whole place. It is on a corner at the very limit of the town, and is very small, consisting of two small rooms, one of which is used also as a telegraph office. There is not thirty feet space in the whole office to serve so large a population. It has been a scandal for years that no better accommodation was given. Last year I presented a petition to the hon. Minister, signed by a large number of citizens, irrespective of party, asking for a new post office, because the old one was not satisfactory. The Government considered the question, and came to the conclusion that a post office was necessary. I have no personal interest in the matter, I never required any post office or other building to be erected in the county of Berthier to secure my election. I could be elected without the help of the post office, which will be situated in the most Conservative town of the whole county. There are no politics in this. It is a matter of necessity, and I thank the hon. Minister of Public Works for having granted the petition and done the county a small measure of justice.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is not fair to Ontario that post offices should be erected in small villages in Quebec and the maritime provinces, while the large towns of Ontario, containing 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants, are neglected.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am surprised at my hon. friend objecting to this, because he was a staunch supporter of the late Government, which spent money from year to year on post offices in similar places. He was one of the supporters of the late Government who voted to build an expensive post office in Laprairie, where the total receipts only amounted to \$400 per year. I think the late Government did wrong in this, and I think the present Government are committing an error if they follow the same course. But there is nothing in the present Estimates that can be at all compared to some of the votes of the preceding Government, which my hon. friend supported.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not object to this. What I object to is that after the Minister of Public Works supplies post offices to these little villages in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec, he is not going to give us any in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. In my opinion you ought to drop all the small ones. The one at Kentville ought to be dropped. The St. Martin's, Montmagny, Berthier and Liverpool should be dropped.

Montmagny post office, custom-house, &c.. \$7,500

Mr. CASGRAIN. I believe the hon. gentleman is going to purchase a building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know yet.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was stated by the hon. member for Montmagny, who prevailed on my hon. friend to put this in the Estimates, that the Government were going to purchase a certain building in the town of Montmagny, which had been erected on purpose as a post office some years ago. My hon. friend says at this moment that he does not know whether he will purchase the building or not. I may tell the hon. gentleman that five or six years ago the building was sold at sheriff's sale for \$3,000 to the Quebec Seminary. The Seminary had a mortgage on it and nobody would bid. The mortgage was \$3,000.

Mr. TALBOT. \$7,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No one would bid, and the Seminary had to put in a bid for \$3,000.

Mr. TALBOT. But the mortgage was \$7,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What of that. They lent \$7,000 on a building which was only worth \$3,000.

Mr. TALBOT. It cost over \$10,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not care what it costs: I am giving the value of the building now and I will tell the hon. gentleman—

Mr. LAVERGNE. How do you estimate the value?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) not to get excited. I say the Quebec seminary loaned a certain amount of money upon this building at the time it was built or shortly after. Some time after the building was sold at sheriff's sale, and it was bought in by the Seminary at \$3,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What kind of a building is it?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was a cottage; it was erected as a private dwelling.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Has it been improved since then?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am not aware. Of course I am speaking en connaissance in this matter, because I go there to attend court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Is it not agreed that the loaners considered the property well worth \$7,000?

Mr. CASGRAIN. But that was 10 years ago. At that time probably they had certain hopes that the property would bring \$7,500. But it is well-known that these institutions sometimes loan money on property on which they cannot recover. But as I say, it was sold at sheriff's sale and bid in at \$3,000. Ever since then, nobody would touch it, and it has remained in the hands of the Seminary of Quebec, except for a certain time during which the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) occupied it as a printing establishment for his paper.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I have been asked by my hon. friend from Montmagny to say a few words about this matter. First I must assure the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) that I am not at all excited. I am as well acquainted with the facts of this locality as he may be. I claim to come from Montmagny myself. It is no argument to say that because a property is sold by the sheriff for \$3,000, therefore it is only worth that. We understand very well the Seminary being bound to bid it up to the amount of the loan, nobody was anxious to increase the costs of the sale, which would be 3½ per cent to the sheriff. I myself have bought property from the sheriff for \$4 which was worth \$1,000, because nobody would bid against me.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But when the property is bought in the mortgage disappears.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Of course; who denies that?

Mr. CASGRAIN. What you say is no evidence that the property was worth more than \$3,000.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I say that nobody was anxious to bid against the Seminary because the Seminary would be bound to bid up to the amount of the mortgage, and nobody would want to increase the payment to the sheriff. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) is a lawyer, and he knows about sheriff's sales as well as I do. Now, I will just put before the committee the figures my hon. friend from Montmagny has given me. The revenue of this post office is \$1,743.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is the gross revenue; what was the net?

Mr. LAVERGNE. The net income is \$1,043. The population of the town and parish is about—

Mr. COCHRANE. Give us the population of the town.

Mr. LAVERGNE. That would not be fair, because all the farmers of the parish go to this post office. The population is about 4,600. As I am informed, also, this is a centre of distribution for several other places including Grosse Isle, where there is the quarantine station. I may say also, on behalf of my hon. friend, that this post office has been promised both by the Conservative Administration and by the Liberals for a number of years. As my hon. friend says, it is not so easy to get rid of these promises made to the people, more especially where candidates have made these promises on the hustings on the authority of some gentleman in the administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAVERGNE. In the last administration. Hon. gentlemen must remember also that our judicial districts are not organized as in Ontario and some other provinces. This is not only the shire town of the county of Montmagny, but it is the judicial centre for the district composed of the counties of Montmagny, L'Islet, and Bellechasse. All these people have to repair to this town for their superior and criminal court cases. Thus it will be seen that it is a very important centre.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to Montmagny getting a post office, if the town and parish is entitled to it, but I do object to putting a sum in the estimates for the purchase of a property. If the Minister wants to erect the building, let him ask for the money to erect it. But this property is owned by somebody, whether by the Seminary or by the hon. member for the constituency. The information I have is that the hon. member (Mr. Choquette) is the owner.

Mr. TALBOT. That is not true. He had the promise of sale, but that expired about

Mr. LAVERGNE.

two years ago, and the property has gone back to the Seminary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I do not pledge myself to buy it, and I do not know that I shall buy it.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) informs the committee that this property was sold for \$3,000 five years ago. It is altogether likely that the party who mortgaged this property for \$7,000 mortgaged other property with it, or if this was sold for \$3,000, that they have a claim still against the party for the balance.

Mr. CASGRAIN. They took the best security they could get at the time for a bad debt.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here we have \$7,000 put in the estimates to buy a second hand property.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not stated that it is to buy it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it is a job of the worst kind. It may be an election pledge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether I will buy it or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then amend the vote, and state that it is for the purpose of erecting a building, and not for the purchase of one.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Public Works does not know whether he will buy the building or not. I can tell him that the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) knows that he will buy it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then he knows more than I do.

Mr. SPROULE. Usually in country towns where they want a post office they give the land for the site. Now, the Minister ought to tell us what kind of a building he is going to erect, he ought to give us some kind of an estimate before he asks the House to vote the money without any knowledge of what he is going to do with it. The general impression is that it is to purchase this building, and that directly or indirectly the hon. member for that constituency is interested.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think when the statement was made the other day during a discussion of this item that the member for Montmagny was interested, he denied it positively, and I think the hon. gentleman should accept his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not questioning his statement at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman says that the member for Montmagny is interested in it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not, I beg your pardon. I said it was currently rumoured

and the impression is abroad in some minds that it is so. I was going to say that there is urgent need for the Minister of Public Works to give full information to the House as to whether he intends to erect a new building, in order to disabuse the impression that there is a job connected with it. If he intends to buy this building he should be frank enough to tell the House so; otherwise let the vote stand over for another year.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** If I do not buy the building I will certainly not spend one dollar more than I am asking now.

**Mr. SPROULE.** You mean for this year.

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** No, I will never spend it.

Rat Portage public building..... \$5,000

**Mr. BERGERON.** What is the hon. gentleman going to do with this \$5,000?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** I cannot possibly build a post office there for this sum of money. I may buy a site with it, and I will be obliged to come down next year for more money.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Has the hon. gentleman any request from the Post Office Department for a building here?

**The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** The requests do not always come from the Post Office Department; sometimes they come from my hon. friends here.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** With regard to this item I may say that representations were made to the Post Office Department by the citizens of Rat Portage that the accommodation there was wholly inadequate. I think I sent the inspector up there, and I have a report from him on the subject. The town has grown very rapidly, and I endeavoured to see whether the postmaster could acquire better premises under the existing arrangements for which a direct yearly allowance is made. But evidence came to me that owing to the rapid growth of the town it was impossible for him to get a place, I believe that there is not a fit place to be had. The want of a building is certainly a grievance in Rat Portage. Now, I thought that as the town is growing so rapidly, to rent a building that would be satisfactory for three or four years, would probably be a better plan than to erect a building now, because at the rate that that town is growing it may have a population of 25,000 in the near future, and a building that might be erected in a year or two would be quite insufficient in a few years to come. However, circumstances are such that something has to be done in the town of Rat Portage immediately.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) said a few moments ago that in Ontario they generally made the Government a present of a site. In Rat Portage they have presented a site, but that rule is not applied to the maritime provinces. A few years ago Gananoque made application for a post office, and one condition of their getting it was that they should give a site, and they did present the Government with a site worth two or three thousand dollars. Gananoque furnishes a revenue of several thousand dollars, and has a population of over 4,000; yet they had to present a site before they could get a building.

**Mr. ELLIS.** The hon. gentleman has a habit of making references to the maritime provinces of such a character that he ought to revise his speeches before he makes them. Now, here are \$300,000 being voted for public buildings, and \$500 for the province of New Brunswick. Out of the whole \$300,000 the hon. gentleman is not satisfied to give New Brunswick \$500. Now that I am on my feet, I would suggest that, as the Minister of Public Works has withdrawn that grant to the post office at St. Martin's, he should put a grant in his estimates of \$10,000 for a drill hall in St. John, where it is very much needed indeed, and that will make the thing square.

**Mr. BRITTON.** It is no doubt owing to the popularity of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that the town of Gananoque has a post office there and a custom-house, a very valuable property, worth in the neighbourhood of \$30,000, in a place having a population of 3,500. If all the towns in Ontario were treated as well as Gananoque, I do not think the province would have much reason to complain.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would suggest that we go on and finish the Crow's Nest Pass business to-night.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Some reference has been made on the other side of the House to the subject of the Crow's Nest Pass Bill and the suggestion is offered that we might proceed with it. The debate which took place this afternoon presented this matter from the Opposition standpoint probably, at all events, presented it in such a way that I feel that the statements which have been put forward ought to be met.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Well, we will listen to you now. It is only half-past twelve, and if we are going to get through on Monday we must do something.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I shall not move the House into committee upon it to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I would certainly say to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government (Sir Richard Cartwright) that probably prorogation is further away than we agreed upon. If we undertake this debate to-morrow, we will put in the whole day upon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know the hon. gentleman professes a great desire to expedite business, but he and his friends have made an attack upon the Government by reason of its policy in respect of the Crow's Nest Pass and upon the details of that policy, and we do not propose that these statements shall go uncontradicted.

Mr. FOSTER. We are here to listen to you. I have rather a suspicion that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has something behind this, and that he wants us to help him to burk the business.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who took part in the debate on this question I desire to say that after looking over it very carefully since, I agree with the Minister of Railways and Canals that it does not necessarily follow that this road will be built without the Canadian Pacific Railway giving the 50,000 acres of land because that not only applies to them but to any company that is interested in the project.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the question now.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was due to the Minister to say that after looking over the matter I believe he is correct in his interpretation of it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 26th June, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask if to-day is to be a single sitting?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We might have it understood, I presume, that the sitting be interrupted from one to three.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not quite so long as that. We might have reasonable intermission for an hour.

### IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

Bill (No. 149) to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I propose to omit the last clause which was the subject of discussion, and with this understanding the Bill may be passed.

The Committee reported; Bill read the third time and passed.

### SUPPLY.

The House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—To purchase additional rolling stock..... \$100,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I propose to ask the consideration of the committee, in the first place, to the resolution appropriating a sufficient sum to enable us to make arrangements with the two railway companies, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway, for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and the running of trains as part of the Intercolonial Railway until the expiration of the current year. If we are able to dispose of this question—the two votes probably will be considered together—in sufficient time to enable us to take up the Crow's Nest Pass Bill and advance it a stage and deal with the subsidy resolutions to-day, we will be disposed to do that. That will be the order in which the leader of the House proposes the business should be taken up.

Mr. FOSTER. The rumour has been circulated for some days that the Government proposed to join the fortunes of these two measures together, that unless they could get the consent of Parliament to the passage of the Intercolonial Railway extension project, they propose to hold back and ultimately not pass through the Crow's Nest Railway resolution. I would like to have from the hon. gentleman a denial or confirmation of that current rumour, to which some impressiveness has been given by the peculiar course taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals with reference to the Crow's Nest Pass Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman could expect that an answer should be

given by me or any one on behalf of the Government to the question he has raised. The conduct of the Government with respect to these measures, must be judged by the manner in which we deal with them, and the course to be taken in respect of any one of them will, in a measure, depend upon the treatment these receive from the House. I propose to take up the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, if time afforded for the purpose, immediately after the disposal of the present motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Why the provisos "if time allows"?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because we propose to regulate the order of business by the progress made, and will exercise our choice as to the order in which these various measures are submitted for consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend answer me one question? Is it the intention of the Government to press the Crow's Nest Pass resolution this session? That is a fair question and easily answered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will be enabled to judge, from the progress made with regard to these matters, as to what can be done. The Crow's Nest Pass could have been through yesterday were it not for the discussion prolonged by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. It could have been through last night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Crow's Nest Pass Bill was brought up yesterday in the first session, at eleven o'clock, and bearing in mind the fact that the leader of the Opposition had endorsed the measure and that the hon. gentleman himself had also endorsed it in a measurable degree, it does strike me that we are not to blame if it did not go through committee. We gave it the whole sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend understands, that the House was ready to pass that last night, so far as this side was concerned. I gave the opportunity, and with the full assent of my hon. friend himself we would have taken the opportunity to pass the measure, if my hon. friend could have persuaded his colleague, the Minister of Railways, to do as he wanted him to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is evident that the Government were disposed to give the House every opportunity of passing the Crow's Nest Bill yesterday, but that hon. gentlemen opposite, who were "intensely anxious" that the Bill should be pushed through, at the same time, apparently, were more anxious to pose before the country as opponents of the Govern-

ment's proposition, and thus get a certain amount of credit with those whom they thought would favour that position. As one member of the Government and of Parliament, and as the one having charge and direction of these Bills, I am not disposed to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to assume any such attitude before the country. I am not willing that, while they are heartily in favour of the Bill, they should be allowed to pose before the country as opposed to the Crow's Nest Pass measure, at all events without our having an opportunity to meet the attacks that are made upon us with regard to this Bill. I think that that is not an unreasonable proposition at all, and I do not think any person will say that I am claiming too much when I claim an opportunity of meeting the attacks that have been made on the Government policy from the opposite side of the House. Had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and those who are co-operating with him, been disposed to be candid in the treatment of the Bill, had they either said that they were in sympathy with the measure or said nothing at all, the Bill would have gone through without question. But they thought that some little advantage could be gained by pursuing a different course, and I am not willing that they should gain that advantage. I am not moved—of course, how could I be—by any feeling of opposition to the Crow's Nest Bill, but I am disposed to pursue the order of business which, at all events, will prevent our friends opposite from getting any advantage, politically, out of their strange attitude upon this question.

Mr. FOSTER. I had supposed that the Government were here, and the Opposition were here, to do what was for the advantage of the country and not merely what was for party advantage. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) must not, in his generosity, assume to define the functions of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman says that if the Opposition had said nothing, the Bill would have passed. But the hon. gentleman is too fresh in assuming that any Opposition which knows its duty and intends to do it is going to keep its mouth shut on the Bills brought before the House. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise, to suggest, to amend as far as possible, and that duty the present Opposition intends to perform. We may approve a general policy, but not be satisfied with all the details. While the majority of us are in favour of the policy embodied in the Crow's Nest Pass Bill, we intend to criticise the details of the measure. And, further, the hon. gentleman must not confuse himself as an individual Minister with the Government, nor must he confuse the general policy with the details. And the hon. gentleman must remember this—that nine-tenths of the criticism that has been passed upon him has been on account of his tortuous course with respect to this Bill—

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may as well say to the hon. gentleman—I have no doubt that he desires to get through with the business of the House that he may be able to attend to his own, as are myself and others—that there is no use in flinging taunts of this kind across the floor of the House. It will not help us on with business.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) was out when his colleague (Mr. Blair) was flinging his taunts across the floor of the House.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Let us have an armistice.

**Mr. FOSTER.** We are quite ready to observe it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that I did not complain as to what the Opposition had done in the way of criticism. I do not pretend to place a limit upon their right to criticise. But I venture to think that they cannot expect to take the attitude of being heartily in sympathy with the Bill while, at the same time, complaining of our course in regard to it, and not, at all events, allow us the right to meet these criticisms in the fullest possible manner.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Nobody objects to that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is the course that I claim I have a right to pursue, a course which, I think, the House will justify me in pursuing.

**Mr. SPROULE.** In connection with the statement—

Some hon. **MEMBERS.** Order.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I am quite in order.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Why, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has the floor. How can two address the House at the same time?

**Mr. SPROULE.** I understood that these remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals were preliminary to his explanations of this item, and that a discussion arose following the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. Now, I wish to say that I refuse to be put in the position before the House and before the country of being intensely anxious for the passing of this Bill and, at the same time, opposing it. I opposed what I thought was wrong in it, while, at the same time, I state frankly that I believe there is some merit in the measure and some justification for passing it. Still, with all the objectionable features in it, I am not intensely in favour of passing it; I am not in favour of it at all; and, while saying that, if we let the measure pass, I

**Mr. FOSTER.**

hold that it should be only after trying, as far as possible, to perfect it and making it workable. That is the position I hold.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Let the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals make his statement and then criticise.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I want to remind the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) that my remarks are quite in place in view of what has passed between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the leader of the Opposition.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I think it only just to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to say that he was fairly criticising the Bill and that I had not him in mind in the remarks I made. I am bound to say that he has not evinced any intense desire that the Crow's Nest Pass Bill should go through.

I was moving the committee to the consideration of the vote of \$157,500 for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. I shall not detain the committee with any lengthened remarks upon it. The Government have, after due consideration, come to the conclusion that it is in the public interest that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended to the city of Montreal. Having decided upon that policy, we desire, if we can get the sanction of Parliament through this vote, to carry that policy into operation. And, while we are not pretending to dispute the right of the other branch of Parliament to take any view of that subject that may seem best to it, with regard to the conditions upon which to carry out the arrangement, we request this House to place us in possession of the funds to enable us to put the plan into, at all events, experimental operation. I have no doubt in my own mind, and I may say that the Government has no doubt whatever, as to the ultimate success of its policy. It is a policy which in the interest of the country will surely be adopted. The Intercolonial Railway must find its terminus in the city of Montreal. Now, that being the case, we are confidently asking Parliament to put us in possession of such funds as are necessary to extend the Intercolonial into Montreal as soon as the necessary agreement is come to and the other roads are equipped for the purpose during the current year. I hope to be able to operate it for nine months. At the expiration of nine months—

**Mr. FOSTER.** Beginning when?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We hope to be able to begin the 1st of November, possibly the 1st of October.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Are you sanguine of that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Quite sanguine upon it. After we shall have been running it for a while,

we shall find it necessary, no doubt, to ask Parliament for a further grant to enable us to continue it for another year, and by that time all opposition to the proposal will have absolutely died out, in my judgment. I venture to predict that.

This idea that the arrangement which we proposed with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Drummond County Railway was a job will have been fully exploded by the investigation which is going to take place. We invite this investigation; we do more than invite it, we defy it. We challenge hon. gentlemen who have been building their opposition and their obstruction to this measure upon the ground that this agreement has its base in jobbery—we defy them to proceed with an investigation and unearth the transactions which have taken place in connection with the Drummond County Railway from its inception, and their dealings with this Government. We have nothing to fear from such investigation. I can affirm with confidence that the result which will take place will be to rob these people who have been opposing this project of the slightest pretext for any opposition. I have every confidence that when we meet Parliament, say two years hence, in the second session from now, all opposition to this proposal will have disappeared. At all events, the more the subject is inquired into, the more it is thought over, the more it is considered, the more strongly will it take hold of the public mind—that is my conviction, at all events. The idea has come here to stay, and it will take more than the opposition which has so far developed to it to occasion any permanent delay. Now, we ask the committee with confidence to make this grant, and I am sure that the results will justify our action.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it possible that we are asked to pass a vote of \$157,000 on five minutes of combined declamation and prophecy?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Haven't you had this measure before you for some time?

Mr. FOSTER. We have never had this measure before us; we have had a measure for entering into a contract for ninety-nine years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The greater includes the less.

Mr. FOSTER. The greater sometimes does not include the less. There is a great difference between making a nine months' trial with a company like the Grand Trunk Railway and making a ninety-nine years' lease with the Grand Trunk Railway. My hon. friend knows that there is every difference between subsidizing the Drummond County Railway and then paying them a rental for their road for nine months to

experiment with, and giving a sum to the Drummond County Railway after it had itself completed its forty-two miles, giving them a yearly rental for 100 years, and then holding and owning the property. The propositions are as different as possible. The hon. gentleman comes down with a vote for \$160,000, and he gives us a few minutes of prophecy, a few minutes of defiance and a few minutes of declamation, and sits down and asks us to vote the proposition. Now, we want the hon. gentleman to tell us how he proposes to use this \$160,000. I think the House would stultify itself if it voted this money without having some explanation as to what the hon. gentleman thinks he can do, and how he is going to do it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It bears the explanation on its face. This money is wanted to pay rental to the Drummond County Railway and to the Grand Trunk Railway in the same proportions as we originally asked.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is giving us part of the information that the Minister of Railways did not give, that it is in the same proportion. The Minister of Railways did not say so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The resolution says so. The hon. gentleman can make the computation.

Mr. FOSTER. Can any one take up that resolution and make a computation as to whether you are proposing to give the Grand Trunk Railway anything for terminals, anything for improvements and enlargements of terminals, on the basis of a 5 per cent interest upon half the cost? How far can we compute when we have no knowledge of the basis upon which the computation can be placed? The hon. gentleman wants us to give him \$160,000, and he has not laid before this committee one single item of information as to what he proposes to do and how he proposes to do it. Is he going to ask the House to vote money in the gross to be followed by another large sum? Because the very minute he makes his agreement, the next minute he has to go to a large expense for rolling stock and material. More than that, he has to go to expense with reference to the road, if the road is to be put into a fit condition with which to make a fair experiment. He has not vouchsafed to us the least information as to whether the Drummond County Railway is to make the necessary improvements along the line, or as to what he and his Government propose to do. I say this is simply a bare proposition to give money for a project in the air, without the least basis of information upon which we may guide our conduct, and that is not right treatment for this House. The hon. gentleman must give us the details of the scheme as he has them worked out in his own brain.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am really surprised to learn that the hon. gentleman has not had any information on this subject, because I was under the impression that I had stated to him the other day, when notice was given and in answer to his own inquiry, that we had not made the arrangements, but that we expected to be able to make arrangements on the basis of the agreements that had been entered into between the Government and these parties. We have asked for a sum which absolutely corresponds with the amount of rental under those leases, and we hope to be able to complete the temporary arrangements with those companies upon the same lines. We certainly will not be authorized, nor do we propose to offer them any rent in excess of the sums which we agreed to pay them under those contracts. We certainly do not propose to assume any obligation of a permanent character. We do not propose to lay out any money in a reconstruction either of the Grand Trunk Railway or of the Drummond County road. The whole arrangement will be contingent upon the Drummond County road being built up to the proper standard to enable us to run the trains of the Intercolonial Railway without our having to incur any expenditure upon repairs or additions to or reconstruction of that railway in any particular. We are not asking for one farthing for that purpose. We are asking sufficient to pay the rental, we are asking sufficient to equip ourselves with proper running plant for the purpose. Beyond that we are not asking anything: and the fact that we are not asking anything for any other purposes than those that I have stated I think should afford conclusive evidence to the hon. gentleman, as I am sure it is satisfactory to the great body of this committee, that we have not in contemplation to make any expenditure whatever upon the roadway of either of these railway companies. I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman any further information which he requires, and which he does not already possess. But I think I stated these things fully to the hon. gentleman the other day. I think if he were at all in an agreeable mood, if he were willing to be satisfied, he would have been satisfied without any restating what I assured him of a day or two since. Now, I do not complain at all that the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with our proposal, I do not complain that the hon. gentleman criticises our proposal; because I quite understand that it is his duty to criticise, and it is a duty which I am bound to say he discharges to the full. I have listened very patiently to the hon. gentleman throughout this whole session, and I have observed that it has scarcely been possible for a suggestion to emanate from this side of the House that did not receive the unqualified condemnation of the hon. gentleman. I am willing to assume that in all this he

**Mr. FOSTER.**

is but discharging the duty which he feels rests upon him as leader, or assistant leader of the party, and therefore I do not complain, but I do complain that when the hon. gentleman's objections are of one kind that he states them as being of another kind. When his objection is against our taking the authority of Parliament, to enter upon a policy to which we are absolutely committed, and in which this Government will persist to the end, I do object to his putting his objection in another way, and upon another ground, and saying that we have not given him information. I think the hon. gentleman has no sufficient basis for complaint. We had given him all the information which he can reasonably expect, all the information which is in our possession, and all the information which it is possible for me to supply him with.

**Mr. SPROULE.** There are several features of this transaction that suggest themselves to my mind as being worthy of consideration at the present time. The first is the proposal made by the Government to this House, and debated at considerable length, in this House, which after receiving the sanction of this House, notwithstanding the strong opposition given to it by a number of members, went to the other Chamber and was there thrown out. That was the expression of the will of Parliament and the will of Parliament was that this Bill should not be carried through because Parliament thought that it was not in the interest of the country to carry it through. The rules of parliamentary debate here do not permit us to accomplish in a roundabout way what we cannot accomplish in a direct way. It seems to me that this proposal is to accomplish in a roundabout way what the hon. gentleman opposite failed to get through Parliament in a direct way. Parliament refused its sanction to the proposed deal, and now an effort is being made to accomplish the same thing in a different way.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, no.

**Mr. SPROULE.** If the words of the hon. Minister who has just spoken are worth anything it must be accepted as so because his words were to this House that "We are determined to carry it out." The objectionable features of this proposal seem to be these. They say: "This Parliament has refused its sanction, but we can accomplish it in another way. We propose that Parliament shall grant us a certain amount of money for the purpose of making an experiment of this deal to prove to the country that we were right in our surmises of what the benefits would be to the country. For the purpose of enabling us to carry out this extension we require \$175,000, and we also require \$100,000 for the purpose of buying rolling stock." The \$157,000, however much we might be disposed to al-

low that to pass, involves an additional outlay of \$100,000 for rolling stock which we cannot dispose of at the end of nine months.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It will be very useful; we will need it all.

Mr. **SPROULE**. There are a great many things in life that we would find useful if we diverted them to some other purpose, and it is very possible that this rolling stock may be used on the Intercolonial Railway for another purpose. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that if this expenditure is indeed to carry out this deal, it is intended to commit the country to a lease for 99 years. This additional \$100,000 is required for that purpose. If the \$157,000 is only to try this experiment, there is no urgent need for a further expenditure of \$100,000 for rolling stock. Now the question to my mind is whether Parliament would be justified in sanctioning this expenditure for an experiment. Parliament is not a deliberative body that commends experiments to be made at the country's expense. Schemes are proposed to it from the other side of the House after deliberation and investigation and after the Government can satisfy themselves of their ability to carry it through in the interest of the country. They lay those schemes before Parliament accompanied by explanations sufficient to convince Parliament that the schemes are sound, and if Parliament refuses in view of the explanations given in the interest of the country to sanction them I think they ought to fall to the ground. And so ought this proposal. Since Parliament has decided against it I think it ought to be allowed to remain in abeyance for the present. The Minister of Railways and Canals was kind enough to say with some degree of warmth, "We invite investigation," referred to by another Chamber. "We invite it; we challenge it," and he used the words, "We defy it." I do not know whether that meant, "We defy their right to make an inquiry."

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, we invite inquiry.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understood that it meant, "We defy them."

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, no, we invite inquiry.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to make my own explanation, and if I am wrong he may put me right.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misstate the case. He has misunderstood me. My defiance was of their investigation, not of their right to investigate. I think it would have been better and a very proper thing if they had

done that before they bowled out our measure, and I think it is better late than never.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I admit that, and I was only referring to it to enable the Minister of Railways and Canals to supplement his explanation by such further explanations as would make his meaning clear to both sides of the House. The Minister of Railways and Canals is wrong if he defied them to do what they did, but if he only defied them to show the country that there was anything wrong in it then he was quite proper. I fully recognize the right and I also recognize the wisdom of it. I confess that to my mind it would have been a proper thing if these hon. gentlemen had done it before passing upon the measure. But the question is this: Had they time to do it? One of the reasons why we object to this measure being proposed at such a late stage is because it may be impossible during the remainder of the session to make such further inquiry as is justifiable in my opinion under the circumstances. For that reason I think it wrong to submit this proposition at such a late period. But you may look at it in two lights. Some people regard that rather as a bluff to cover up the suggestion that there may be something wrong. So far as that might be regarded as a bluff I do not think it will go down.

Mr. **LISTER**. We do not know anything about bluffing on this side of the House.

Mr. **SPROULE**. There is no hon. member who knows more about it than the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and no hon. member has been so long perpetrating it upon the House.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I never bluff.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I am pleased to know that of the hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair); but I am only referring to it to show how it is regarded by some people both in and outside of the House. Whatever doubt there may be, I think it was unwise in him to make a statement that might be regarded more as a bluff than as an invitation to hold an inquiry into the matter. If it were to be inquired into and it is found that there is merit in the proposition it would be possible to satisfy Parliament and the country of the fact, so that I think, the matter might reasonably be deferred for nine months until after an inquiry is made and, then, if all parties are satisfied that there is merit in the scheme, there would not be any reasonable objection to it, and it would go through without further delay. That is one reason why I think it is unwise to make this expenditure now. I do not think Parliament has a right to experiment to the extent of \$257,000.

I also think, in view of the fact that the original scheme was thrown out by Parlia-

ment. that we ought to have some further explanation as to how this \$157,000 is going to be expended. A portion of it is going to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the privileges we get from that company, and a portion of it is going to the Drummond County Railway Company. The House ought to know how much of it goes to the Grand Trunk Railway and what privileges we get from them during the nine months; and how much goes to the Drummond County Railway, and what we get in return for it. How are we going to get an advantage from the Drummond County Railway when a portion of their line is not built at the present time. I suppose we must assume that the 42½ miles will be completed before the 1st of November. I object to this vote further, on the ground that it involves an additional expenditure of \$100,000 to buy rolling stock that may be of little value to us, and of which we cannot divest ourselves at the expiration of the nine months, in the event of the experiment proving a failure.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS** (Mr. Tarte). A short time ago the Government brought down to this House a measure providing for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. That measure was fully discussed, and this House of Commons by a majority of 44 declared in favour of it. The Upper Chamber, acting within their rights I may say immediately, rejected the measure. As I have said, the question was fully discussed here, and I need not go into all the details again, but I feel bound to say a few words to-day, because of the reasons that have been advanced in the press, and in this Chamber, and outside of this Chamber, for the rejection of the Government policy. I happen to know the bottom of the reasons of the opposition we have in Montreal. There are rival schemes—more than one—by which the Intercolonial Railway could be extended to Montreal, and I hold in my hand now, a map of these schemes. First, here is, as has been before pointed out in this House, the Grand Trunk Railway running from Montreal to Quebec via Richmond. I suppose that nearly every member of the House has travelled over that road. It will be readily admitted, that it would be out of the question to make satisfactory arrangements to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal by the Grand Trunk Railway. A bargain, of course, requires two parties to it, and it has been found impossible in the past to make any arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in that direction. Now, there is another scheme. The South Shore scheme, part of which is now completed from Montreal to Sorel. It is a railway which has been built by Mr. Armstrong and which to-day is in the hands of Mr. Beauchemin, Mr. Fortier, the Leduc estate,

**Mr. SPROULE.**

and the Tourville estate. Those parties acquired the road between Montreal and Sorel from the creditors of Mr. Armstrong, who failed in this enterprise as in every other enterprise to which he has attached his name. From Sorel to Lévis there is a prospective scheme in the centre of which Mr. Armstrong has a charter which has been renewed during this session. At the end of this prospective road in Montreal, there is a scheme to build a bridge between Longueuil and Montreal, a scheme with which Mr. Armstrong is connected and the soul of which is, I say at once, that he has interested in that bridge scheme a certain number of parties in Montreal, amongst others, the owner of "La Presse" newspaper. They are to-day the possessors of \$100,000 of snares in that scheme, and that is the reason why they are so strongly opposed to our policy. In one word, the policy of the Government is confronted by schemers and by interested parties who have knifed our policy with the expectation that later on they would put the pistols to our throats.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** They have done it already.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** As my hon. friend the leader of the House says, they have done it already. Now let the country know what has taken place in the past. That man Armstrong came before this Government a few weeks ago, and he asked us to buy the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, or to give him a guarantee of a few million dollars. The Government investigated the case. I will take the House into our confidence. We have been blamed for operating the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. That scheme failed; Armstrong had been in it. But that vast district of Gaspé has and is still in bad need of railway communication. We made up our minds that it was necessary to see if we could not accommodate them, and we tried that experiment and at the same time we investigated it. What did we discover? We discovered that Mr. Armstrong had issued two million dollars of bonds, that he had pledged these two million dollars of bonds to the extent of \$800,000 in the English market, and we found the Baie des Chaleurs Railway mortgaged for that large amount, on account of which there has been no money or scarcely any money spent. We made up our minds not to touch that man with a ten foot pole.

**Mr. FOSTER.** You have to go closer to it than that if you are going to touch a man.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.** Let my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who has been unfair to me, who has not acted towards me as he should have acted, who has thrown out here and there unfair insinuations about me; let him hear me at any rate before he says anything more. I have a right to vindicate what we have done, and what I have done especially. Now, what did

happen? That man Armstrong having failed to force us to go into his schemes, went to the Flynn Government in Quebec, and he got a guarantee of eight millions of dollars to back up the scheme I have before me. In other words, the credit of the province of Quebec has been pledged for eight millions of dollars to another wild scheme of Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong has been here during the first days of the session canvassing against us, and trying to turn public opinion against us. I am only surprised at one thing, that my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, and some of the hon. gentlemen of the other Chamber, should have listened to the poisoning calumnies of that man. Let us have a full investigation of the whole matter. My name has been connected with improper transactions in relation to this. Sir, I consent to go in disgrace into private life if anything can be proved against me. My hon. friend, who is a strong man, should, if he thinks I am guilty of anything wrong, have asked for an inquiry before this Chamber. The subject of my private accounts in the bank has been raised; my signatures on some notes have been photographed. Let an inquiry be made: I have not much fear. I am a political man; I have made some political fights; I have won some of them, I think; and I have been obliged to do what some other men have done—give notes and endorse notes. Let one of my actions be connected with that deal of the Drummond County Railway, and I say again, I will go into private life in disgrace. Sir, I say, and I will state it on my oath, that no promise has been made to me, and no money has been given to me, thank God; I have not done anything improper. I know that my name has been connected with that transaction, because "La Patrie" newspaper has been bought by the Liberal party, and because Mr. Greenshields' name has been connected with that purchase. I will state frankly what took place; and, I say again, let an inquiry under oath take place, and if my statements are not proved, I will go into private life a disgraced man. But what has been the case, Sir? The Liberal party had no organ in Montreal. Mr. Beaugrand, the owner of "La Patrie," telegraphed on the same day to Mr. Laurier and to myself that he was dying. I went down to Montreal; the Premier could not go with me.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, spare us, spare us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I want to put myself right before this Chamber and before the country. My hon. friends have attacked me unfairly. Let my hon. friend who leads the Opposition get up in his place on the first day of next session, and ask for an inquiry, and let us settle our accounts; but until then I am not obliged to lie down under unfair and unjust accusations. Sir, I have been

hounded; I have not been treated like a political man; and what is my course? I parted from my friends on the other side of the House. I parted from them manfully; I did not betray anybody or anything. What passed between the friends of the party and myself has remained a secret. They speak of my endorsing notes as if I had never endorsed notes in the past. They speak of election expenditures as if during twenty-five years of association with the Conservative party I had never spent any money. My colleagues will bear testimony for me that I have never uttered a word of what took place when I belonged to that party. I have my failings, but I am not a traitor. I was going to state that the leader of this Government had begged me over and over again to arrange to have a Liberal organ in Montreal. My hon. friend, who leads his party with great vigour and energy, will admit that a party ought to have organs of its own. I arranged that Mr. Greenshields, who was my lawyer in many other cases, should act as the purchaser of "La Patrie," as the lawyer of the party. They speak of a cheque which Mr. Greenshields gave. There is no secret about it. Mr. Greenshields had a cheque in his hands, not of his own money, but of the money of the party, and he paid that cheque. Let an inquiry take place, and all this shall be proved. Every private act of ours is scrutinized; our private affairs are no longer private. We are treated as if we were thieves and knaves. We are not thieves or knaves. This Government is composed of honest men, who want to govern honestly, and we will govern honestly, in spite of all the conspiracies that have been formed against us. What has taken place in connection with this scheme is a conspiracy of the first rank. Sir, I charge my hon. friends with being the tools of Armstrong and a lot of schemers in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I demand that that statement be taken down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend allow me to explain?

Mr. FOSTER. I have made my demand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a parliamentary statement.

Mr. FOSTER. We will find out whether it is a parliamentary statement. The hon. gentleman has charged me and other members—but I will take my own personal case—with being the tools of Mr. Armstrong and his associates. I say he has no right in fact to make that statement; but I am not discussing that point just now. He has no right to say that of a member of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is right. Will he permit me to explain?

Mr. FOSTER. I have raised the point of order, and I want to know where we stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend permit me to say one word?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wishes to retract that statement. There was no equivocation, no "if's" or "and's" about it. He shook his fist in my face, and said, "I charge the hon. gentleman."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. We are perfectly cool on this side, however excited my hon. friends may be. He charged me personally with being the tool of Mr. Armstrong and his associates. I require your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that my hon. friends are the willing tools of Armstrong; I do not mean to say that at all. I know that my hon. friend is not; but I say that he is his tool all the same, in an indirect way.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I say that is not parliamentary language. I am here as an independent member of this House; I state on my word or honour as a man and a member that I have had no communication with Mr. Armstrong or with any of his party. I state, on the other hand, that no gentleman has a right to say of me as an independent member of Parliament that I am the tool of any man in my action in this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I accept the statement of my hon. friend altogether. What I meant to say, if my hon. friend would permit me, is that that man Armstrong has deceived and poisoned public opinion to such an extent that those who have opposed the scheme have been unwillingly his tools—nothing more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand, then, Mr. Chairman, that you either give your ruling on this, or that the hon. gentleman retracts that statement, made personally of myself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I rise to a point of order. During the sixteen or seventeen years I have never heard such a trifling objection taken before. An hon. gentleman defending his conduct, points to his opponents as the unwilling tools of a vile conspiracy.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a point of order before the Chair, which I understand the Minister of Marine and

Mr. FOSTER.

Fisheries in discussing, and hon. gentlemen ought not to interrupt him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am addressing myself to the point of order, and in doing so I wish to speak with every deference to the hon. gentleman, but he is assuming an arrogant tone in this House which I for one will not submit to. He has taken charge of the House and endeavours to put down every hon. member who rises to address it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the point of order?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am coming to the point of order. The expression which the hon. gentleman has used is apt, proper and parliamentary. He says the conduct of my hon. opponents opposite is that of the unwilling tools of a conspiracy. He did not accuse them of consciously being these tools, but he declared that they were the unconscious tools, but none the less the tools. Why, what better language could be used? My hon. friend has acquitted them of all moral guilt, but he says you are being made unwillingly or unconsciously the tools of a vile conspirator. My hon. friend has not scrupled to describe as a vile conspirator this individual who is at the head of the opposition to the Government scheme. Every one knows that this man has haunted the purlieus of Parliament in his attempt—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—to prejudice the Senate against the Government scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely I can make that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every one knows that this man Armstrong has haunted the corridors of Parliament. However, I do not propose to interfere in or anticipate what my hon. friend is going to say, but I say that, under the circumstances, for any hon. gentleman to warn his opponents that they are unconsciously the tools of that man is not parliamentary and proper, I for one am disposed to accept the responsibility of it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have raised no point of order against the hon. gentleman who has sat down, and who has only obscured, by the angry statement which he has made, what the hon. Minister of Public Works really did say. I asked that the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works be taken down. That statement was not, as my hon. friend himself will bear me out in saying, what the hon.

Minister of Marine has just told us it was. I understand the Minister of Public Works to state that he did not intend to convey the idea which his words expressed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I certainly did not.

Mr. FOSTER. But intended to say something else. Now, as between the Minister of Public Works and myself, we understand each other. If in the statement which he did make that I was really a tool, he did mean that without any unequivocation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not intend to mean that.

Mr. FOSTER. That satisfies me, but this gratuitous insertion of himself by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries simply obscures the issue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member is satisfied.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has taken it back manfully, and I am satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to another point of order. The parliamentary rule says :

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any one of the Royal family, nor the Governor General, nor shall he use offensive words against either the House or any member thereof.

I would ask whether it may not be regarded as offensive to say that any members of this House are tools, whether willing or unwilling.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that we were tools generally on this side of the House. He qualified that afterwards by saying that he believed we were unconscious tools, and he has assumed that this side of the House is entirely influenced by Mr. Armstrong. He does not better his position in the least by saying that we are unconscious tools, because he presumes we are influenced by Mr. Armstrong. I deny that, and it is equally offensive to say we are unconscious tools and have been so influenced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am of opinion that the expression used at first by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that some members of this House were tools, was certainly offensive, but I understand that afterwards the hon. gentleman withdrew that expression. He declared that he did not want to make any reflection upon the character of members of this House, and I think that the expression "unwilling tool" is not absolutely out of order, and besides the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has accepted the withdrawal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When that incident took place, I was just giving to the House the inner side of the scheme through which our policy has been opposed and obstructed. At the head of this scheme is Armstrong. Through the guarantee that he obtained from the dying Flynn Government, he expects to be able, if he can float any loan, to buy the South Shore Railway, to build a bridge at Longueuil, and go on with a prospective road from Sorel to Lévis. We were asked this session for a subsidy to that line, but we did not see fit to grant it, because this Government—and any other Government would do the same thing, I hope—has made up its mind not to touch any scheme with which such men as Armstrong are connected. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never put themselves in direct opposition to the idea of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. In the other House, I understand, the same stand has been taken. But our friends, the Senators, say—and it has been said in this House also—that some better and less expensive scheme might be propounded. Well, Sir, the map of the route is open to any member of this House, and it shows the position to be very clear. The Grand Trunk Railway, as I have said, comes as far as St. Hyacinthe, and anybody who will look at the map will see that the most direct route to St. Hyacinthe is by the Drummond County road. Our friends opposite speak a great deal of Mr. Greenshields—he is connected with the scheme, and so the scheme must be rejected. Let my hon. friends remember that Mr. Greenshields was not the promoter of this scheme originally; the scheme had been promoted and partially accomplished long before Mr. Greenshields went into it. The men who have promoted this scheme are business men, some of whom are living in the eastern townships and know the ground thoroughly well. They were able to get the financial support of the Eastern Townships Bank for this road, which is a paying road. These men made up their minds that some day the Grand Trunk Railway or the Government would feel justified in buying their road but, at any rate, they said to themselves, no doubt: If we do not sell our road, we can work it and make money out of it. But what are the other schemes, what are the other lines by which this Government, or any Government, might extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal? The South Shore scheme is before you. But it is a prospective scheme. The South Shore people, who have invested their money in this property, are friends of ours, nearly every one of them. But this Government has not to deal with friends or opponents, this Government has only to deal with business propositions. In what position are we to-day? Suppose we had made up our minds to make an arrangement to go by

the South Shore and its extension to Quebec. Let any one of our friends opposite rise in his place and tell us how much it would cost. It would have implied the immediate carrying out of the scheme of building the Longueuil bridge, or would have submitted us to the necessity of making arrangements with the Grand Trunk to use their bridge alone, an arrangement to which they would never have consented. The South Shore scheme is out of the question. The Drummond County and Grand Trunk Railway scheme is the best, the cheapest, and the only practicable one. But hon. gentlemen opposite have another scheme. They say: Why do you not build a bridge at Quebec and come up to Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway? Those of us who know the ground, know that that is a preposterous scheme, to say the least. In the first place, a bridge at Quebec could not be built with prayers alone; it would cost, and will cost eventually, a great deal of money. I do not want to discourage my friends from Quebec; the old city of Quebec is dear to me for more than one reason. But to pretend that to carry out the Government's policy of extending the Intercolonial from Lévis to Montreal by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a ridiculous proposition. Suppose the bridge at Quebec to be built—can you imagine the Canadian Pacific Railway would give us the use of their line for prayers alone? We should be obliged to make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and, speaking of that, and remembering that our friends of the other side say that we are spending a large amount of money for our scheme, how much has the North Shore Railway cost the province of Quebec? The De Boucherville Government spent \$7,000,000 to build it, and it was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the large sum of \$4,000,000. And, at the time, I opposed the sale because I thought the price given was not high enough. But after we had built the bridge at Quebec and had arranged with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of their line, we would then be obliged to arrange with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of their terminal facilities. Now, what have these terminal facilities cost the Canadian Pacific Railway? That company is spending \$2,000,000 in addition to what they have already spent in the past.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And should we then get equally good facilities with those we get by the Grand Trunk Railway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that is out of the question. Any one who lives in Montreal knows that what I say exactly represents the position. But our policy has been vilified, and why? Because—I say it again—because, in the press of Montreal, Armstrong has been in a posi-

Mr. TARTE.

tion to give out shares in his schemes. I say on my responsibility as a member of Parliament, and on my responsibility as a Minister, that Armstrong has distributed shares among the press of Montreal. I know some of the men who have got shares in their pockets. I know the bottom of the whole conspiracy, a conspiracy against myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every one has his enemies, sometimes, even in his own camp. I know what has taken place, and I challenge an investigation. I have acted as a man who means fight when he wants to fight, there is no doubt about that; but I have done nothing that needs to be covered up. I say that the Drummond County and Grand Trunk scheme is the only practicable scheme to extend the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, and that scheme we have adopted after careful consideration. Of course, there are political friends of ours interested in the scheme. Mr. J. N. Greenshields is one of our most active and most efficient political friends in Montreal. He has helped us to the best of his ability ever since I came to Montreal; he has acted like a friend; he has acted like a man, and I will not go back on him to-day. But Mr. Greenshields is not the only party interested in this scheme; and hon. gentlemen opposite, after they have uncovered this mare's nest, will find that Mr. Greenshields is not the only man to be considered. And they will find that, in the past, subsidies to the Drummond County road have gone in ways that they would not like to have made publicly known. We did not get a dollar from the deal, we do not expect a dollar from the deal. Let the investigation take place over years past, and we shall know more than is known to-day. But, Sir, our policy has not been looked upon favourably by the Upper Chamber. We bow to the decision of the Upper Chamber, we must do so, and we come before this Parliament with a new proposal—I say, deliberately, with a new proposal. I am not the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I speak for myself.

Mr. FOSTER. And for the Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And for the Government, for I am sure that we all understand each other on this point. This is what I mean to say: The proposal which was rejected by the Upper Chamber was one by which we arranged for ninety-nine years to get the use of the Drummond County Railway and of the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, what is our proposal to-day? To-day we ask Parliament to give us a sum to pay nine months rental, nothing more, and in that light I say it is a new proposal. We do not ask Parliament to bind the credit of Canada for ninety-nine years, we simply want to be authorized

to spend a certain amount of money during the term of nine months. I say it again, this is a new proposal, and we feel that we have a right to expect that Parliament will agree with us. Our main proposal has been rejected by the Upper Chamber after it had been accepted by this Chamber. We do not desire any permanent conflict between the two Houses, I am sure, and the best means to settle that difficulty is the one which we are now proposing. We propose to test the project. Suppose we lost money—we will not lose money—but suppose we do lose a certain amount of money, Canada will certainly not be ruined. It is a pretty small vote we ask for compared with our Budget. We ask Parliament to authorize us to spend a certain amount of money in making the test. If the test does not prove that we have made a good bargain, we will let it drop. We are not the men to come to Parliament and ask for this vote unless we feel sure that the scheme is a good one. We are sure that those who are opposing us to-day, will collapse, their conspiracy cannot last after public opinion has become enlightened. I am sure there are members of the Senate who are beginning already to see this question in a different light. When our policy has been tested I have no doubt whatever that both Chambers will be able to agree on a plan. I have not much more to say on this question. I will only add that though I have my failings, though I have made mistakes, I am sure that I have never committed any dishonest act. I am sure that on this occasion no promise was made to me, no money was given to me, no consideration was offered to me or to any member of this Government. I say that during the next session of Parliament, if our hon. friends opposite want an inquiry, they will be welcome to one.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a few words in reference to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. He started out with a good deal of warmth to defend himself against supposed accusations, though there were none made that I am aware of.

Mr. LISTER. See what the newspapers say.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that he was answering what took place in this House. Of course I have no doubt that he had those things in his mind, and probably was endeavouring to set public opinion at rest. The first contention that the hon. gentleman makes is that this side of the House is influenced by some rival scheme of Mr. Armstrong. I may tell him as one who opposed the Government's proposed contract, that I know nothing about Mr. Armstrong's schemes, or about himself, and they do not influence me in any degree. I have not considered any rival scheme. But I opposed this because I believe the deal was a bad one for the country; that we

were paying too much for what we were getting in return, that Parliament was not justified in committing itself to the expenditure and to the long lease that was proposed by the Government. I opposed it because I believed the deal with the Grand Trunk Railway was a bad one; that we were not getting full value for what we were giving, and that the country ought not to be bound for ninety-nine years to any lease of this character. I believed we were paying too much for the Drummond County Railway in view of what has been expended by the country on that railway, and the small amount of money that was expended by the owners of that charter. I opposed it because I believed that we could get a better service in bringing the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal by another line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where would you suggest?

Mr. SPROULE. I suggested the building of the bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, and using the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much do you suppose we would have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of it?

Mr. SPROULE. I reasoned in this way: We have already a bargain to give the Canadian Pacific Railway the use of the Intercolonial Railway for a good many miles, more mileage than is involved in this proposal. Now, we have agreed to give it to them on reasonable terms, and I assume the Government would have a right, in view of the assistance which we have given the Canadian Pacific Railway, to ask them for some concession for the use of their road between Quebec and Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman seriously imagine that we could get from the Canadian Pacific Railway a right to use 173 miles of their road for less than it would be worth, and does the hon. gentleman imagine then that we would be allowed the traffic which we could pick up on that road, under any arrangement that could be arrived at with the Canadian Pacific Railway? Or does he imagine that if we built the bridge across the river at Quebec we could do it for less than four or five millions? The hon. gentleman has not thought that question out, I am sure.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I have thought it out, and from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite I assume that this bridge has got to be built.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not by us.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) said distinctly that the Government are committed to this ex-

penditure to this extent, that as soon as a company was formed that was able to build that bridge, the Government was prepared to subsidize it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. But that is a very distinct proposition from the one that the hon. gentleman has put forward. He said a moment ago that we could build that bridge and then acquire rights on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now he makes a very different proposition, that we should build the bridge across the river ourselves as distinct from our giving a subsidy amounting to 15 per cent of the cost.

Mr. **SPROULE**. No, I do not take that ground. I took the ground that they intended to build the bridge, and I was going on to elaborate the means by which they intended to build it, and I assumed that that was the mode they had in their minds when the hon. member for Quebec West said the Government would give a million dollars towards building that bridge. Then I assumed that they had a scheme on hand as to the building of the bridge and that it would be only a matter of a short time. It must be built at some time or other. But there would be a large outlay in carrying out this proposed deal. That was what I had in view in regard to the building of that bridge. I notice that during the present session the Minister of Railways and Canals has asked to have tacked on to every charter, passed through the Railway Committee of the House a condition that other railway companies shall have the right to use the road on fair and equitable terms. I assume that that was the policy determined upon by the Government and that it applies to any railways that are built in the future and which we must subsidize on the same principle as we have subsidized roads in the past, and I say that it would be no great injustice to the Canadian Pacific Railway, if we asked the same consideration from them in regard to a road which we have already subsidized and which is running by virtue of that subsidy.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not pretend to suggest that the Railway Committee or a railway commission could exercise any such jurisdiction as compelling any railway to submit the use of their railway for less than the board awarded.

Mr. **SPROULE**. No, but I imagine that the use of that railway could be got on more favourable terms. I assume that there would be some compensation of course. I do not imagine that the Government would take that right without the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway and without giving them fair terms.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How much would you imagine that it would be proper to pay for 173 miles

Mr. **SPROULE**.

of the Canadian Pacific line? Do you think that you would be permitted to go upon its railway with the right to take up traffic along the line for anything like \$1,000 a mile?

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think the right to pick up traffic along the line is another question.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is a question with us.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Do not the railway companies have the right to pick up traffic?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, they have not.

Mr. **POUPORE**. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me to ask him a question. Does he not think that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be just as difficult to deal with as the Grand Trunk? My impression is that it would, and I am asking the hon. gentleman if the Government would not be obliged to pay fully as much money to the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the Grand Trunk?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. More.

Mr. **POUPORE**. It strikes me that you would find it more difficult to make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway than with the Grand Trunk.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It would cost us more.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I was going on to say that the right which we have of taking up traffic along the line of the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway is only a right that applies to a limited section of the country.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). It applies to all the local traffic there is.

Mr. **SPROULE**. These were my reasons for opposing the Bill and it was not because I thought there was any other rival scheme that was being engineered by Mr. Armstrong or any one else. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) said: "We are not thieves; we are honest men." We are not disputing that statement. I suppose this statement of one of the members of the Cabinet refers to the whole Government. He has given them a certificate of character, and I have no objection to it. He said: "We challenge inquiry." If there is nothing behind, that they are afraid to have come out, it would be perfectly natural that they should challenge inquiry. I think the hon. gentleman is quite within his rights in saying so because there are various rumours afloat through the country. I would like to ask him if there were not some grounds for the suspicion which is abroad. While I pay very little attention to newspaper rumours, I shall call his attention to a statement which is made the basis of an

article that I saw some time ago. It was brought here for the purpose of drawing the attention of hon. members to it. I refused to bring the matter up at that time, because I said that it was a newspaper article and if it was libellous the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has the right of redress by going to the courts. If it is only idle rumour there may be nothing in it, and yet there may be. But I read it only to show that there were grounds for the suspicions which I have referred to, although I do not pay any attention to newspaper rumour. The statement is in the "Pembroke Standard" of 5th May. It is going on to criticise the policy of the Liberal party, and it says :

As to the Drummond Counties Railway deal, the story is common property in Ottawa, that Mr. J. N. Greenshields, who practically owns and controls the road, has given "assistance" to the amount of \$50,000 to prominent Liberals to aid in the promotion of "Purity of election," in the province of Quebec, in both federal and provincial elections. Of this sum, \$30,000 is said to have been invested in the purchase of Mr. Beaugrand's paper, "La Patrie," for the sons of Hon. J. I. Tarte, who are not popularly supposed to be millionaires, but who were nevertheless able, thanks to the assistance of friends, to pay an enormously fancy price for a property which, largely through the illness of Mr. Beaugrand, had become so depreciated in value as to be considered worth very little. The payment was made the day after "La Patrie" was purchased, and it is said to have consisted of Mr. Greenshield's cheque on La Banque d'Hochelaga, Montreal, for \$10,000, and his note in favour of Mr. Tarte's sons for \$20,000, which was subsequently discounted in the same bank. A few days before the Champlain election, Mr. Greenshield's note for \$20,000, endorsed by a very prominent Liberal politician, was, it is said, discounted in the same bank, and it is a remarkable coincidence that Hochelaga Bank bills were never so plentiful in Champlain county as during the last election, a fact which was shown by the remarkable quantity of bills of that bank which merchants of Three Rivers received from their customers in Champlain county within a few days after the election, one merchant alone being known to have received over \$5,000. Although it has not been referred to, either in Parliament or by the press, the story has been current in Ottawa, and in Montreal and Three Rivers for some time, that the money which was spent by the Liberals in Champlain county, was obtained in connection with the Drummond County Railway deal; and it is understood that the matter will be brought up in the House at an early date.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any reasonable ground for that suspicion?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I have not time to read all the newspaper stories. My hon. friend is a responsible member of Parliament. He is an old and respected member of Parliament. It was his duty if he thought that there was anything in that story to ask for an inquiry and it is still his duty to do it. I say that there is not one word of truth in all these statements.

Mr. SPROULE. I merely read this in order to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) an opportunity of clearing himself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wants an inquiry now, let him put his seat in the balance of Parliament.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If an inquiry is granted, will my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) undertake to say that he will answer the questions put to him and not entrench himself behind the privilege of Parliament?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Any proper questions that will be put to me will be answered by me.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, any proper questions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Any question put to me by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) if it is indecent, I will not answer it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What do you mean by indecent? I would not put an indecent question to the Minister for fear I might shock his virtue.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I meant any improper question.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, I will put to him this question. If an inquiry is granted, will my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) shield himself behind any privilege as a member of Parliament, and refuse to answer questions as he did in other investigations?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not shield myself behind any privilege of Parliament, provided a member of this House brings a charge against me. I know my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain).

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, we know each other well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I know you very well. You are just as pure as any other member, and no more. We are old friends. I elected him for Parliament, and I know how he got there. Let my hon. friend from Montmorency bring a charge against me, and we will not be the worse friends for it. If I am guilty of any wrong, and my hon. friend can prove it, I will suffer the consequences.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If we did bring a charge and asked for an inquiry, I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) would do what he did in Montreal when he was charged with receiving part of \$10,000 from Whelan. He would shield himself behind some privileges, so as not to answer certain questions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an inquiry in Montreal when I

was in the Conservative party, and when the two commissioners were appointed by Mr. Mercier. I answered to any questions connected with the case before these commissioners. When the time came to give answers which would have exposed some of my political friends of the time, some of the friends of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain)—

Mr. CASGRAIN. I don't admit that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me answer my hon. friend. They had committed no crime; we had made elections together, and spent money together.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I don't speak of you.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You had better not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, if you are going on that ground, my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) knows enough of the past of the Conservative party to be sure that we never made elections with prayers. His own election has cost more than any other election. His own election has cost about \$12,000, and yet he speaks of purity.

Mr. SPROULE. After this explanation, I hope I will be allowed to finish my speech. I have always rather admired the moral courage and the pluck of the Minister (Mr. Tarte). I have not done this for the purpose of making a charge by insinuation or otherwise, but for the purpose of enabling him, if he thought well, to deny it; and I merely did it in answer to the statement he made, that there were suspicions and insinuations. My answer to that was that there appeared to be some grounds for suspicion, and therefore it is right for a member of Parliament, knowing what has taken place, to try and probe the thing as far as possible to the bottom. I say that, taking that article, what more reasonable than to come to this conclusion: The Minister of Public Works whose sons purchased that paper has himself power to purchase a railway; that railway is owned largely by one Greenshields; the party who was interested in the sale of the railway, out of gratitude for that probably good bargain, what is more natural to suppose than that he is disposed to be as generous as possible out of gratitude for benefits received, and that, by way of accommodation, or otherwise, he has invested so much money for the benefit of the sons of the man who is instrumental in assisting to accomplish the deal. What more reasonable than to believe that there might be something in it. It gives fair ground for suspicion, and when he has discounted his notes to the extent of \$50,000—to the extent of \$20,000 in one instance—these, I assume to be facts, as they are allegations of fact.

Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question, and I cannot ask it without his consent. Is it fair for him, with regard to a matter of which he knows nothing, to take a newspaper report and bring it into this House and spread it on the pages of "Hansard," when he himself says he knows nothing about it, and in the face of the fact that the Minister concerned says that there is no truth in it? If we adopt such a policy as that, every day we might make each other's lives very unhappy without any just cause. I am not complaining, but I ask the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) to consider for a moment if this is a fair thing to do?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was about to rise and make the same observation as has been made by the Minister of Finance. A report from a newspaper has been read by the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) and it has been denied entirely by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. It is only fair and just, and according to the rules of debate, that the hon. gentleman's statement should be accepted and nothing more said on this subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not refused to accept the Minister's statement at all, and you must have entirely misunderstood me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) but, at the same time, it is according to the rules of debate, which are well known to the hon. gentleman, that when a Minister or a member makes a statement in answer to a charge made by another member, that statement must be accepted, and there can be no further reference to the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly, but, at the same time, I have the right to apply myself to the argument of the Minister of Public Works. I brought this matter up for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of denying it, because I did not think it was right that he should lie under it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I deny it again. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) and the House understand me well. I stated, and I state again, on my responsibility as a Minister, that Mr. Greenshields, out of this \$20,000 that we paid cash, did not pay \$1 out of his own pocket. Is that a fair statement? Can I say anything clearer than that?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying it is not a clear statement, and I am not refusing to accept it, but I thought it was my duty to the hon. gentleman himself, who may not have seen it, to bring the statement to his notice. Now, as to the right of any member to read a newspaper statement in this House, I think I understand the rights of a

member, and I intend to avail myself of them. Every week during every session, newspaper articles have been read in this House, and the members concerned are given an opportunity of explaining or denying them. As regard this vote, I do not oppose it because of any suspicion that the Minister of Public Works is implicated in an improper deal. I do not oppose it upon the grounds that some parties are getting a large profit out of it. But I do oppose it on the ground that we are paying too much for what we are getting, and from the information we have in our possession with regard to what that railway cost. I oppose the deal because of the present condition of the road, because we are not getting sufficient for the money we are paying, and because of the long time we are bound by that lease. I oppose it on those grounds, and on those grounds alone. And, in opposing it on these grounds. I am doing so from motives as proper as could actuate any member of Parliament, and I am perfectly within my rights in opening it.

At One o'clock the Committee took recess for one hour.

At Two o'clock the Committee resumed.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great attention to the discussion of this most important subject and I am satisfied that the merits of the question have been pretty well threshed out by both sides of the House. Despite what I have heard, my opinion as already expressed remains unchanged. The proposition put broadly before the people of Canada by the Government represents their sole object in attempting this undertaking, as being to show a balance on the right side, or at least to make the two sides of the ledger balance, in carrying on the Intercolonial Railway, so that if there is not a balance in favour of the Intercolonial in future, there will be at least no adverse balance. In asking Parliament to accept that proposition, it seems to me that it is the first duty of the Government to show, by reasonable and almost conclusive evidence, that there is something in sight that would warrant a conclusion of that kind, more than what may be called vague speculation. In the first place, it is not intended that there will be any increased traffic. The only hope of bettering the financial condition of the Intercolonial Railway by the extension to Montreal is based upon an expectation of securing a greater division of the receipts which were shared in by the other roads. Now, I am sure that the people of Canada will not be blind to one thing that seems so plain that no one can escape it—that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in entering into this arrangement with the Government of Canada, feel sure of one of two things, either that the Intercolonial Railway is not likely to cut into their receipts to an alarming extent, or that the

sum paid by the Government for their piece of line is worth infinitely more to them than the portion of the receipts which will be diverted to the Intercolonial Railway from that part of their line. If either of these propositions be true, and I care not which you take, it seems clear that the bargain is a bad one for the Government. Now, the Minister of Public Works declared that there was no difference of opinion in the House as to the advisability of an extension of the line in Montreal. I do not so understand it. The difference between the views held, I think, generally on both sides of the House is this. There is no difference of opinion as to the advisability of having better facilities for the Intercolonial Railway; but that does not involve the proposition that a line should be built to Montreal by the Government of Canada or that you should pay a sum for running over any of the lines already built.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How would the hon. gentleman suggest that we should reach there?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman asks a very reasonable question. I am sure he himself would not argue that it is a good thing for Canada to own a single mile of railway more than it can possibly help, to be operated as a Government railway; otherwise we should extend the line to the city of Winnipeg. When the duty is cast upon the Government to operate a railway, then it becomes an admitted evil that must be tolerated rather than an advantage. Coming to the question how the traffic is to be reached at the city of Montreal, there are two alternatives. One is for the Government of Canada to avail itself of the competition existing either at the city of Quebec or at the city of Montreal. There can be no profit in hauling over that 170 odd miles, if the same competing lines are met with at the city of Quebec. Therefore, there is no object in going to Montreal. I do not propose, as has been suggested by some, that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be sought, rather than the Grand Trunk. It seems to me that the wise policy of the Government would be this: We cannot close our eyes to the fact that in the extension of commerce, and with capital seeking investment, it is only a question of a short time until there is a bridge at Quebec. Whether that will be contributed to largely by the Government of Canada, and how largely, is a question for future consideration. But there is a scheme in the air, which will probably mature, it may be in the near future, for a bridge at Quebec. Let us suppose that the Government of Canada contribute a reasonable sum towards that bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What would you consider a reasonable sum?

Mr. CLANCY. I think my hon. friend has asked a rather unreasonable question.

I would say that any sum, if it were at all less than the sum proposed here, would be reasonable, even though it might be very large.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. member will allow me, I do not know that I quite follow him when he says that if it were at all less than the sum proposed here. Does he mean that we should contribute a sum for the bridge which would be represented by the whole rental we propose to pay under these agreements, for the lines between Chaudière and Montreal, including the terminals?

**Mr. CLANCY**. What I want to make clear is this, that the sum to be contributed by the Government of Canada would be less than the whole charge on the treasury of Canada involved in the scheme proposed to Parliament a few days ago.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Then, the hon. gentleman would cross the river at Quebec by assuming obligations equal to those which we propose to assume under our agreement to carry us to Montreal?

**Mr. CLANCY**. No, it involves more. It involves all the good that can arise from meeting competing lines.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You would have no competing lines at all then. You would have the Canadian Pacific Railway.

**Mr. CLANCY**. You would have the Canadian Pacific Railway as well as the Grand Trunk at Quebec. The Intercolonial could ship by either of the two competing lines already in operation at the city of Quebec, and there is a third line in sight. There would be three competing lines between Quebec and Montreal; and I would ask the hon. gentleman whether, having these three competing lines from Quebec, two of which have been subsidized heavily, it would be wise to secure running powers over any one of them more than another. No one would pretend to say that it would be any advantage.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman think, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, that it would afford any facilities for the Intercolonial Railway to carry any freight which might be originated on its western line, when it already has the short line through to St. John? It does not follow that the Grand Trunk Railway Company afford any such facility under the circumstances more than it has in the past, seeing that this is its own line.

**Mr. CLANCY**. But the hon. gentleman has competition under his own scheme. The Canadian Pacific Railway goes to St. John, and he cannot hope to compete there. The very thing which the hon. gen-

**Mr. CLANCY**.

tleman points out as a weakness in the proposition I am laying down, is equally fatal to his own. It is certainly unwise for the Government to build or operate a line from the city of Quebec to Montreal with the object of making it a competing line. In the first place, it will have to compete with railway companies already subsidized from the Treasury of Canada, and in the second place, I would ask why not go to Toronto as a distributing point instead of Montreal. Would the hon. gentleman not have infinitely better prospects if the Intercolonial Railway ran all the way to Toronto than if it terminated at Montreal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman think it should go to Toronto.

**Mr. CLANCY**. No, I do not, and for precisely the same reason why I think it should not go to Montreal.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understand the hon. gentleman to say he would not favour the extension to Montreal or to Toronto, but he would favour the extension from Lévis to Quebec.

**Mr. CLANCY**. That is utterly unimportant at this moment, for the simple reason that if there is a bridge, traffic will find its way through the channels of the least resistance by high freights either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway from that point. You would have, under the proposition I have stated, all the competing lines from Quebec to Montreal and west that you would have from Montreal west, and therefore it is wholly illusory to say that you are limited to an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no such proposition made from this side of the House as that you should take one line or the other, but the broad proposition is that another line will soon be added to the two already in operation, all of which may be made use of. More than that, the great bulk of heavier freight is carried over the St. Lawrence River during navigation. Laying aside all sentiment, there is no justification for operating a line from Quebec to Montreal, but there is every justification for seeking every means to better the financial condition of the Intercolonial Railway by getting better facilities, for freight and passengers from some competing point, and that can be had as well at Quebec as Montreal. You have to make a choice of evils, and I am afraid the hon. gentleman is taking the worst. The Intercolonial Railway has not been able to make the two sides of the ledger balance. There has been an adverse balance from year to year, and the hon. gentleman's object is to overcome that if possible. That being his object, he

should have something clearly in sight before adopting what is an experimental scheme fraught with difficulty. No one will pretend to say that an arrangement extending over nine months, taking three-fourths of the sum proposed to be handed over to both of the railway companies—to the one for its ultimate purchase and to the other for running powers—does not involve very serious difficulties. Either the scheme has to be accepted by the country as a whole or rejected as a whole. Parliament will meet again before nine months, and the hon. gentleman could then come before the House and with some show plead that his scheme had not been given a fair chance, that nine months was not a reasonable time in which to try the experiment, and he would ask for another year. At the end of another year, the hon. gentleman will no doubt say that he requires another year's test. And let me suppose that at the end of the time, the hon. gentleman finds he made a mistake. What will that have cost us? There is first this \$100,000 for rolling stock, which we would not require but for this experiment. Then, at the end of the nine months, we will have paid \$157,000, and at the end of another year \$210,000, so that the experiment would cost us altogether about half a million dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would you be willing to credit any, even a trifling amount, on the other side of the term?

Mr. CLANCY. If it be a failure, there will be nothing to the credit of the other side. I am simply pointing out what is in sight and likely to occur. I am satisfied that the country does not look with favour on this scheme. The hon. gentleman may have better reasons, but I tell him that the people of the country are not satisfied that these reasons are sufficient. The scheme is regarded with extreme doubt by the country. I do not propose at this late stage of the session to pursue the subject further. But I repeat that the hon. gentleman has put before Parliament a scheme respecting the Intercolonial Railway without giving us the slightest ground for hope that the people will be benefited either by reduction of rates to the shipper, or by equalizing the balance between the two sides of the account of this Dominion railway. He has shown no reason why the Government should adopt this proposition, instead of making Quebec the terminus. There is no advantage in going through to Montreal which cannot be gained just as well at Quebec. In proposing this scheme, the hon. gentleman is like the gambler who, having lost a part of his money at the table, stakes the rest in the hope of recovering what he has lost.

Mr. POWELL. Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) any statement of the through tickets sold by the Intercolonial Railway to

Montreal and points west via the Grand Trunk from Lévis or via the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. Johns.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the information that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) desires.

Mr. POWELL. Has the hon. Minister any statement of the through freight that is billed from points on the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal or points west, either via Lévis by the Grand Trunk or via St. Johns by the Canadian Pacific Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave a statement that was furnished me by the chief engineer, but I have not it at hand now.

Mr. POWELL. That is your estimate; I want the actual figures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am not referring to the estimate that was made of the probabilities of the business. I refer now to the statement I made the other night as to the relative proportions of through and local business done by the Intercolonial Railway. I stated that four tons of freight carried by the Intercolonial Railway was purely local freight to every one ton of through freight.

Mr. POWELL. These figures, I presume, are reliable. There is no question about that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave them to the House as I got them.

Mr. POWELL. I will assume that they are absolutely correct. According to those figures one-fifth of the freight traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is through, and four-fifths is local traffic. Does the hon. gentleman remember what is the proportion in the passenger traffic?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not have any statement as to that traffic, but the proportion of through business is very much less in the passenger than in the freight department.

Mr. POWELL. Generally, we may say, the through traffic is very much less than the local or less, that will be sufficient. In view of these statements of the Minister of Railways I purpose directing a few criticisms as to the policy of projecting the line to Montreal—that is, on the lines of the present agreement. I purpose giving to the committee an analysis of the returns of the railway, both passenger and freight traffic. The hon. Minister estimated the other night, so far as the passenger traffic was concerned, that there would be a probable increase of 630,000 passengers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, if the hon. member (Mr. Powell) will allow me, there must have

been some misapprehension as to the number being 630,000. I gave the hon. member (Mr. Foster) who leads the Opposition, the memorandum I received from the chief engineer, and the hon. gentleman did not return it. Perhaps he has it at hand.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I have not. It was passed on to gentlemen who were taking part in the discussion and was not returned to me. But I may say that I made the subtraction carefully, and it was 630,000. That is a matter that can be easily verified by asking the superintendent to send a duplicate of that estimate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that very shortly after the statement was made that the estimate of increase was 630,000, the chief engineer told me that there was some misapprehension somewhere, as this was not in accordance with the figures he had made up, or, at any rate, in accordance with the statement he had intended to make. He said that he and Mr. Pottinger had furnished to a member of the Government in the Senate a copy of the statement, and, if my memory serves me well, the difference was only 300,000.

Mr. POWELL. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) made the subtraction, then the paper was passed to me and I made the subtraction, then it went to the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and he made the subtraction, and we all agreed in our figures. There may be some clerical error in the statement itself.

Mr. FOSTER. And it will be remembered that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) defended it afterwards in the debate.

Mr. POWELL. Moreover, on looking over the unrevised report of "Hansard," I find that the hon. Minister commits himself to that statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I read the statement, but the chief engineer said that there was some misapprehension as to the number.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it not appear in the unrevised?

Mr. POWELL. No, the statement does not, I think, appear in the unrevised "Hansard," but simply the figure \$517,000, the increase of tonnage of freight. I do not know that that figure appears in the hon. Minister's speech, but it appears in the speech of the ex-Minister of Finance who, as I have said, is correct in his figures. All this goes to show one thing, and that is that there has been no business method pursued in looking into this matter, and estimating what the amount of railway traffic is likely to be on the Intercolonial Railway as a result of this purchase. It is on a par with the Minister of Railways' action in

having reserved the inquiry to be made by his engineers into the state of the Drummond County Railway to a time posterior to the making of the bargain. So, he has made his calculations as to the traffic upon the railway after the bargain and where the reports have failed him he has drawn upon his imagination—I use the words in no offensive sense—in forecasting the result of traffic. I took the trouble to make an analysis of the figures given in the published report of the Department of Railways and Canals which bear upon this question of increased traffic. First, as regards the freight traffic. The Grand Trunk Ry., with a total mileage of 3,146.98 miles has a total freight traffic of 7,587,148 tons. The Canadian Pacific Railway, with a mileage of 6,211.5 has a freight traffic of 4,776,632 tons. The Intercolonial Railway with a mileage of 1,150.5 has a total traffic in tons of 1,379,618; the Grand Trunk Railway has 2,410 tons of freight per mile; the Canadian Pacific has 737 tons of freight per mile, and the Intercolonial has 1,199 tons of freight per mile. Now, my hon. friend must know that every ton of through freight that will pass over this line that he intends to rent, with the exception of our share of the freight which will come from Quebec, won either from the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, passes in some form or other over the Intercolonial Railway. My reason for making that statement is this: All freight originating at St. John must continue to pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway, the only freight that we can hope to get is that freight to the eastward of St. John which, if the Government gives better and cheaper facilities, will be diverted from the Canadian Pacific Railway and go to swell the revenues of the Intercolonial. Through traffic that originates on or passing over the Intercolonial to-day is billed as through traffic, and appears in the statement of tonnage over the Intercolonial Railway, billed as through traffic by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or billed as through traffic by way of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is not claimed, and no man can claim, that the purchase of this extension or the renting of this extension will create one ton of freight; it will not create a solitary pound of additional freight, but it simply enables the Intercolonial Railway to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway for existing freight and possibly to get a larger portion of through freight than it now does. Let us bear in mind, therefore, that, with the exception of that freight which comes from Quebec to Montreal and which is to-day allotted to the Grand Trunk Railway and to the Canadian Pacific Railway, all this additional freight in the nature of through freight is included in the 1,379,618 tons I have given as the freight tonnage of the Intercolonial Railway. Of this amount the Minister says, not more than one-fifth

Mr. BLAIR.

or 275,923 tons is through freight. The extension cannot have more through freight than this until the trade of the country increases. Now, the hon. gentleman has given to this House the statement that there is going to be 517,000 additional tons of freight to accrue to the traffic of the Intercolonial by reason of this extension. Let us analyse these figures. That statement that 517,000 tons of additional freight for the Intercolonial Railway will accrue as a result of this extension, means that this little bit of line through a wilderness is going to give to the Intercolonial Railway system as large a traffic as one-fourteenth of the total traffic of the Grand Trunk Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, with its immense traffic from the east, its transcontinental traffic that is shipped from Portland, its freight that goes to the United States, its freight that is a result of it having connection with these large centres, like Hamilton, St. Catharines, Sarnia, Windsor, Brockville, Belleville, Montreal, St. Johns, Toronto, London, Guelph, Oshawa, Peterborough, Sherbrooke, and a host of other places that I might mention—that this little bit of line will give to the Intercolonial Railway one-fourteenth of that traffic, is absolutely absurd. Now, take the Canadian Pacific Railway. We know what an enormous railway the Canadian Pacific Railway is, that it sweeps a continent, that it has branches in every direction which are immense feeders for railway traffic; and what about that? Why, this little bit of railway of 170 miles, it is claimed, will bring to the Intercolonial Railway system as much freight as is one-ninth of the total freight of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is it not absurd? Take also, the Intercolonial Railway, and I may say I was surprised in looking into the returns of the Intercolonial Railway. I find there has been—I do not think that it is owing to political reasons—but there is something strange about the statistics of the Intercolonial Railway. I heard the leader of this House declare that the deficit in view of the traffic was perfectly phenomenal. I must say, in looking into the matter fully for the first time, that I am inclined to agree with him in that matter. We find that the Intercolonial Railway is a well-patronized road, that its total tonnage per mile is 1,199 as against 737 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, still the one is a magnificently paying institution and the other always has a deficit. But this, by the way, the Minister claims that this extension will bring upwards of 36 per cent additional traffic to the Intercolonial Railway. In respect to passengers, the Canadian Pacific Railway has a passenger traffic per mile of 489, but the Intercolonial Railway has the magnificent passenger traffic of 1,279 per mile. What does the Minister of Railways think that already great patronage will be increased to? From this 170 miles of rail-

road alone the Minister of Railways claims that he will derive a traffic to the Intercolonial Railway that is nearly 35 per cent of the present passenger traffic of the whole Intercolonial Railway. Why, it is absurd. The Grand Trunk Railway carries over all its main lines and branches, 5,077,671 passengers, or 1,613 per mile. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries over all its system, main line and branches, 3,036,619, or 489 per mile; the Intercolonial Railway carries 1,471,866, or 1,279 per mile. Now, what about the railway that we have here? At present it carries 263 per mile. But what increase does the hon. gentleman profess to be able to get? I will concede him as local traffic—which is simply absurd—the same patronage as the Grand Trunk Railway has, with its suburban traffic advantages, with the magnificent country through which it runs, the oldest and most densely populated portion of Canada, with its through traffic to the United States and that to the maritime provinces, the traffic on that basis for the 130 miles, exclusive of the thirty-five miles of the Grand Trunk Railway between Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert—I say exclusive, for the two stand upon a different basis—would be 209,690 passengers. In respect to the thirty-five miles, the Intercolonial would only get a small fraction of the local patronage, while on the 130 it would I admit get the whole of it. Ninety miles of this little line has to-day 23,773; concede this 130 miles 209,690. Allow a traffic at the same rate as the Grand Trunk Railway over this thirty-five miles of road. This concession is absurdly large, because the Intercolonial Railway will not run a local train over the thirty-five miles, and the Grand Trunk Railway will practically monopolize all the local traffic. But let the Intercolonial Railway have the full rate over the Grand Trunk Railway and this thirty-five miles will have 56,455 which the House will notice gives 246,145 local passengers on the whole extension. Subtract that from the 630,000 the hon. gentleman gave us, and it leaves 383,855 of through passengers as the result of this extension. If he had the whole through passenger traffic to and from all points on the Intercolonial Railway he could only have as I will show at the very outside 147,186. The Minister of Railways admits that the through freight on the Intercolonial to-day is only one-fifth of the traffic, and that the through passenger traffic is a greatly less proportion of the total passenger traffic. Say the through passenger traffic is only one-tenth of the total traffic, the through passengers amount to 147,186. These figures are away above the true figures, yet they represent both the Intercolonial and Canadian Pacific Railway shares of the through passengers from points on the Intercolonial Railway. As a matter of fact I affirm, having the best of reasons for the affirmation,

that the through traffic between points on the Intercolonial Railway and Montreal, and points west does not amount to 50,000 passengers per annum by all routes taken together. Yet the Minister counts on no less than 364,000 through passengers. If the local traffic on this extension is reckoned on the basis of the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic, the Minister would have to find 510,000 through passengers, allowing the Intercolonial Railway the same number of local passengers on the thirty-five mile section as I have done in the case of the estimate on the basis of the passenger traffic of the Grand Trunk. So far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned I am not going into the discussion of every particular feature of the Bill, but if there is one thing more than another which strikes me either as being preposterous from a business standpoint or as being prompted by other considerations than those of business, it is the arrangement in regard to that portion of the road between St. Lambert and Ste. Rosalie. The distance is thirty-five miles between those points. According to the figures given by the Minister of Railways and Canals as to the cost of constructing a railway in that district, \$15,000 a mile would build and equip it. So that \$600,000 would build and equip a road from St. Lambert to Ste. Rosalie or to the eastern terminus of the Victoria Bridge. What is the Minister of Railways and Canals giving to the company and what is he getting for the outlay? You can build the road for \$600,000 and then own it completely. He is giving to the company an annuity of \$37,500, which capitalized at 3 per cent would amount to \$1,250,000. In addition to this, we are bound to what is an equivalent of an expenditure of five-sixths of the cost of the double tracking of the road. I say five-sixths, because we agree to pay 5 per cent on half the cost. The Minister may talk as he likes and disclaim if he pleases any intention to assist in building the second track, but this whole scheme rests upon and is conditioned upon the Government approving of the double tracking of that line of thirty-five miles. They are actually pledged for a grant already for double tracking the bridge. This will add at least what is equivalent to \$200,000 to the cost to the Government, making in all what is equivalent to \$1,450,000. To sum up: for a road that we could build, equip and own for \$600,000, we are paying \$1,450,000. Worse than that, we are paying that immense sum simply for the privilege of running trains over it. The Grand Trunk Railway Company would be getting for about one-tenth of the use of this thirty-five miles no less than \$850,000 more than it would cost this country to build a new road and own it, or in other words, we are donating the Grand Trunk Railway \$850,000 for the very small use we will have as a matter of fact of this thirty-five miles alone. This

Mr. POWELL.

fact illustrates the nature of the transaction which we are asked to adopt. Is it any wonder this side of the House is suspicious and complains.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is opinion and not fact.

Mr. POWELL. I take the statements of the Minister of Railways and Canals as facts. He has given us the cost per mile and the mileage of this section, and if there is anything wrong in the calculations, I have made, the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Railways, can certainly point it out very easily. I shall not further take up the time of this House; I shall not go into the discussion of the questions raised by the Minister of Public Works. I can sympathize with a man who feels irritated that charges should be insinuated and not openly made against him; but I will say to that hon. gentleman that he has got a fair field where there is no favour in which to establish his innocence in respect to several matters of political charges that have been made against him, and before he exercises the declamatory powers he exercised so vehemently on the floor of this House to-day and boasts so loudly of his innocence, it would be just as well to have the issues in the criminal prosecution for libel pending at Montreal brought down to trial, so as to establish his innocence. Until he shows himself sufficiently courageous to do that, I for one will not attach much weight to those protestations of virtue.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the resolution carries, I propose to ask the indulgence of the committee for a few moments. I am not going to traverse the ground that my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) who sits behind me has so well covered, and the fact that neither the Minister of Railways and Canals nor any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House has seen fit to reply to his arguments gives us reason to conclude that they cannot reply to them. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) has adopted a business basis; he has taken the traffic on the existing Canadian routes, he has reduced that down to the percentages; he has given us the very largest possible that can be claimed as an accretion of traffic upon the Intercolonial Railway, and he has reduced the matter down to figures on that basis which simply puts the calculation of the Minister of Railways and Canals in point of utter absurdity before this House. The Minister of Railways and Canals did say to us and it was the strongest argument that he had, and the statement that he read from he passed over to me, directly he had given it to this House, that there was an estimated increase of 630,000 passengers and 500,000 tons of freight. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) has dealt with that, and I do not think there is a business man who has or will read the Minister's remarks but will conclude that it is perfectly absurd that such a pro-

phetic statement should have been made and taken as the basis of voting the scheme that was voted through here a few days ago. I am not going to follow the Minister of Public Works in his peregrinations around his political and personal history during the last twenty-five years. The hon. gentleman has a little habit of placing himself ahead of his subject and obscuring the real issue by putting the personal issue in its place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never do that ; you do that.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) is content to let his history to be judged by his contemporaries and those who follow him, I am quite willing to allow it to go there for the present. I did not desire to mix the discussion of this question. However, I am bound, as he introduced the question, to go aside from the merits of what we are now discussing. I am bound to say when he assumes a position of virtuous indignation against and a great contempt for a certain person by the name of Armstrong, that it did not make any difference at all what his personal opinion of Mr. Armstrong was, what Mr. Armstrong had asked from him, or what he had refused to give to Mr. Armstrong, so far as the discussion of the proposition before the House is concerned. That is altogether aside from the question at issue. He dares not, and does not assert that there is any conspiracy in this House. He does not say that, of course. If there is not, then it is outside the issue so far as this question is concerned in this House. My hon. friend will not take the responsibility of pointing out a single member in this House who has opposed the scheme, and say to him that in respect to this, he has been conspiring from any motive which was referred to, to prevent the passage of the measure introduced by the Government a few days ago. I do not think my hon. friend will take the responsibility of making that charge. If he does not, all that he said in reference to the point was aside of the question, and whatever sympathy he will arouse by his allusions to anything connected with the impression he has endeavoured to create, he is entitled to, but it does not weigh as an argument in favour of this measure. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has distinctly stated that this proposition is quite different from that which was presented to us a few days ago. In some respects the present proposition is not, to my mind, so outrageous or untenable a one as the preceding proposition. But in another respect, it has an aspect which inclines me, for my part, to consider it less favourably than the permanent arrangement. If we were entering into a permanent arrangement, one for ninety-nine years, all the preliminary expenses that we would go to so far as the outlay for capital is concerned, would be spread over that period

of ninety-years, and we should not have to meet the argument that because you would have to undertake, say, \$200,000 of present expenses in order to put yourself in a position for the traffic you would have to consider that in no other light than as preliminary expenses if it were to be distributed over the whole term for which the operation was to be carried on. But does not my hon. friend see, and does not every one see, that it is very different to come to this House—in good faith I presume—to ask for simply an experiment of nine months or a year. I do not apprehend that the Minister of Public Works holds that the Government has decided to put this through perpetually year after year. The Minister of Railways did intimate that, but the Minister of Public Works took the only tenable ground, namely, that they proposed to try an experiment, and that if it did not eventuate in that year successfully, they would drop it. If they could show that it could be successfully run, then they would make it permanent and in that case the opposition would disappear. That is a reasonable thing for us to consider. When we are face to face with the arrangement for nine months and the initial expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to carry out that experiment, you have a very much more difficult question than you had before, when that initial capital expenditure was to be distributed over the whole period of the arrangement, say, for instance, ninety-nine years. You, therefore, have to give additional grounds for your belief, that this experiment will eventuate successfully, in order to induce business men to put the extraordinary initial expenditure into operation. The Minister of Railways frankly confessed that he would not have asked for the hundred thousand dollars, except that it were made necessary for the carrying on of this scheme. Now, we have come down to that point. It is a very grave question whether we ought to do it or not. We are now in July, and taking the most sanguine view of it, your railway will not be ready for use before November. Everybody knows what is contingent in this matter of building railroads, and its more likely by far that the road will not be completed for traffic before January, than it is that it will be ready in November. Very well : in January this House meets, if you are going to have any common-sense arrangement with reference to the sessions. We have met late this year, against, I believe, the feeling and convictions of the Government who started in with the idea that they would have early sessions, and as a consequence we are thrown into the turmoil and confusion of passing millions of dollars in reference to most important matters, at a time when no person is in a position to give candid and clear and efficient consideration to any question, and when most of the members have returned to their homes. I apprehend that

the Government do not intend to continue that, and that next year they propose to be ready for an early session. The probabilities are that you will not be able to put this experiment into execution until Parliament is able to meet next year. Is it wise for us to undertake the experimental business for nine months, with the fair probability that you will not get a rail to run on before the first of January, when, on the other hand, your Parliament can be called in January.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. February is more likely.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Well, the 1st of February if my hon. friend says so. Then, let Parliament when it has time, without hurry and without heat, take up the question as a permanency, and discuss it and settle it for good and all. If Parliament concludes then that it is to be undertaken, the initial expenditures will be scattered over the whole term, and Parliament will have decided upon it after a cool and calm discussion of all the probabilities in the case. I ask my hon. friend, and it is an important question: What will harm if this operation does not commence on the 1st of November and is left over until the 1st day of March, next year? The Intercolonial Railway has not entered Montreal since its existence, and it will not certainly make a revolution if it be allowed to remain on the same track, and with the same limitations for six or eight months longer. Will any hon. gentleman tell me: What will hurt if this is left over for six months? When you had your hard and fast arrangements for the ninety-nine years' lease, you had an argument why it should not be left over for nine months. You had your bargain concluded then, and you could argue that you might not be able to have the option and to make a bargain at the end of that time. Such an excuse is entirely gone. Your bargain is off. Again, I ask for a reasonable reason, as to what would be hurt if this arrangement were left even for the calm and cool discussion of another session, when people are ready to discuss it and are in a mood to discuss it. You might say, that you still would have a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway; but I tell you, that the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, its proportion of it for that time, could be borne better than to go into this enormous initial outlay. I have searched for a reason as to what interests would be injured, and I have failed to find one. What insuperable objection is there, that we cannot leave this thing over for six months until Parliament has a chance to thoroughly discuss and look into it. I wait for a reason, and I hope before this discussion closes, some Minister will give a reason which could be urged in that respect.

Then, going on to another branch of the question. I do not emphasize this consideration any too strongly when I say, that it is

**Mr. FOSTER.**

a tremendous consideration for a business man to imperil \$100,000 of capital for a nine months experiment, of the success of which he acknowledges that he has doubts. No business man conducting a business of his own would do that kind of thing. No business man would enter into that kind of arrangement on the airy basis of the supposed traffic that would accrue, and the supposed added profits that would come in.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND**. You do not suppose the rolling stock would be all lost, even if it were purchased?

**Mr. FOSTER**. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) heard the Minister of Railways say this morning, that if it were not for this experiment the \$100,000 worth of rolling stock would not be called for.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. Not this year, perhaps.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Would any business man carry out an experiment under such circumstances, and say: Go into the expense and build an extra factory and put in extra machinery, and it will not all be lost. Would any one say, that if we were not going to take that extra mileage from Lévis into Montreal, that in the present state of the country's finances, we would store up \$100,000 worth of rolling stock. You might store it up and in years to come it might be used on the Intercolonial Railway proper, but that is not a business arrangement, and no sane man would suggest it to Parliament. I want to put strongly two points: First, what injury would come to any interest if this matter were left over, and next session we took it up and thoroughly discussed it, and, perhaps, come to a conclusion for a permanency.

In the second place, is it not a very strong argument against a nine months' experiment that if at the end of the nine months, involved as it is in uncertainty, you find that the experiment has not come out well, you have, in addition to the nine months' experiment, to put \$100,000 into rolling stock in order to carry out the experiment? Now, let us see what the hon. gentleman is going to undertake as a financial venture for nine months. He is going to pay on the eastern or Grand Trunk section \$6,000 as a rental; on the Drummond Country section, \$64,000 as a rental—I am taking the year's rental, because I imagine that it will run for the year at least; on the Ste. Rosalie section, \$37,500; on the Grand Trunk bridge, \$40,000; on the terminals, \$62,500, and \$100,000 for rolling stock. There is no uncertainty as to the items; they are all to accrue and to be paid and they foot up to the tidy sum of \$268,800 for a year's experiment. That is the initial expenditure. Now, the Intercolonial Railway has been running between important points, with a long and well-established traffic, and it does not now meet the op-

erating and maintenance expenses by its rates.

Mr. FROST. Is not that the fault of the terminals?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend puts a pertinent question. Would it not be the reverse if you got Montreal as a terminal? There is the whole point of the question, and I will come to that in a little while. But, in the first place, it will cost just as much, will it not, to operate and maintain the new section as it does the old Intercolonial Railway, because the old Intercolonial Railway has an old and well-established road-bed, with rolling stock and in good condition all through.

Mr. FROST. When you get to Montreal, you have the increased distributing centre.

Mr. FOSTER. We will come to that later. The maintenance and operating expenses of the new section will certainly be no less than on the Intercolonial. I would be perfectly fair in saying that they would be more, because it has not so settled or so good a road-bed and there are incidental expenses of which the hon. gentleman has not deigned to tell us the probable amount. When he gives the rental of \$64,000 to the Drummond County Railway Company, is he going to put any improvements on the road in order to make it a good running road, or is the Drummond County Company to do that out of the \$64,000 rental? Under the old agreement, the \$64,000 was a rental, but outside of that the Government were to put on the road the expenses that were necessary to bring the whole line up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, or as near to the standard as the railway authorities thought necessary. There, then, is this plain statement, which no one will, I think, contravene, that you are going to pay as much if not more for the maintenance and operating expenses on the new section as you are paying on the Intercolonial. To-day the accounts do not balance on passenger and freight traffic, and they will not balance on the new line. The difference will be rather in the way of an increased deficit than of increased surplus. That is reasoning on the basis that you are going to get just as much, and no more traffic in proportion than you got on the Intercolonial Railway. Now you come to the main point, that is, whether you have any reasonable ground for thinking that you will get more traffic by going to Montreal. Would even that fill the bill? No, Sir. You have not only to get more traffic, but you have, in the first place, to get enough surplus traffic to pay these charges of \$210,000 for the rental for the year; over and above that, you have to get a sufficient traffic to pay you for your proportion of the outlay on the capital stock rendered necessary for the experiment; and when

you have got that much of extra traffic, you are just where you are to-day with reference to the old Intercolonial Railway, with a deficit on each mile of it, when you compare the receipts and expenditures. And, more than that, you have to meet the extraordinary expenditures for the new road, to bring it up to the standard, and the incidental expenses of any enlargement that may take place, for which you will pay 5 per cent interest on half the cost. Now, the whole question is: will you by getting into Montreal on any reasonable basis be able to get that surplus profit of \$210,000 and whatever sum is necessary beyond that to meet all these extraordinary expenses which I have mentioned? There is the whole point, and no man on the other side has attempted to meet it. When you get your road into Montreal, and get the advantage of the terminals and the connection there, you are without, as my hon. friend well said, the creation of one single ton of freight. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) laughs. Am I not right? Was my hon. friend not right? Tell me whether, when you have got your road into Montreal, you have added one single ton to the surplus product of wheat, one single bale to the surplus product of cotton, one single ton to the surplus product of butter or of cheese. You have not created one single ton of freight. What have you to look for? Diversion and transfer, that is all. You may, out of the freight that offers, divert a certain amount to the Intercolonial; but you have created none. What better chance have you to divert it? I do not want to go into that long argument again. I made the argument as plain as I could, and so did other gentlemen on this side, that when you meet with competing railways in the city of Montreal you have to compete on all through freight at a great disadvantage. At Montreal you meet the Canadian Pacific Railway, with its immense western system, originating freight on every mile of it, with its 76 miles of advantage of haulage, as regards Halifax, a shipping port, and 278 miles of advantage as regards St. John, another shipping port. I ask any business man, whether under these circumstances, you have added anything to your position of competition for the transfer of through freight. With that mileage against you, you will be reduced to one of two things—either to suffer in the competition if you keep your rates on a paying basis, or to take freight at less than the paying basis; and your profits disappear when you come down to the line of payment for level haulage, without any surplus. I am willing to submit that to any business body in this world, and I believe that I would be safe in their verdict. I admit that you get at Montreal the local freight that offers at Montreal for distribution points on the Intercolonial Railway. You are there where you can originate the

freight for yourself. Previously you had to have it originated by the Grand Trunk Railway to Lévis or by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec, but then you could go in and originate local freight in Montreal yourself. That is some advantage, but when you try to originate freight in Montreal bound for Halifax or St. John, either for themselves or as distributing centres, you are met with somebody else who is originating freight too. You are met with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, you are met with every competitor which you had before, and they enjoy a better advantage because you are meeting them where they have competing routes straight out from the point. When you were at Quebec you had an advantage in getting whatever it was in the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway to give a longer haul over its line to Lévis, and whatever it was in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway to bring down on the north shore and give a longer haul to. But when you go to Montreal you come to a point whence diverge these competing lines straight out from that point and when you try to originate freight in Montreal you find the Grand Trunk Railway offering to carry freight to Portland and thence to Halifax. Some one may say that it is not likely the Grand Trunk Railway will take freight from Montreal to Portland and thence by steamer to Halifax and distribute it from the wharfs of Halifax. But the hon. Minister of Railways used that argument, and, therefore, I am entitled to take it up. The Grand Trunk Railway can carry their freight down to Portland by the short line, put it upon vessels for Halifax, and distribute it from Halifax to the different points. You have to meet the competition of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with that competition to meet you are incurring an initial expenditure for this nine months' experiment of \$268,800.

To say that by going to Montreal you will get 500,000 tons more of freight and 630,000 more passengers, is to my mind, to state an absurdity which every business man sees at once. That is not all. This proposed nine months' arrangement will lead the Government into an expenditure of at least \$134,400 more. That is the minimum, but there is also a maximum which will amount to double that or \$268,800, and which is more likely to be reached. Why? This was a solvent road or was it not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was a solvent road.

Mr. FOSTER. Had it a property which was worth what my hon. friends have declared to be worth? If it was that kind of a road and had those prospects, could it not with those prospects have been allowed to build a paltry 42 miles without the Government coming down and giving it from

Mr. FOSTER.

\$3,200 to \$6,400 per mile. What imperative necessity was there that this Drummond County Railway should get ready money and get it quick? And so because the original arrangement could not get through and therefore it is disappointed in its annuity of \$64,000 a year, upon which it could finance, therefore, in the last days of the session, the treasury box is opened and a certain \$134,400, and a possible \$268,800, is to be poured into the coffers of that company inside of four or, at the outside, six months from this date. What imperative necessity was there for this if it were a solvent road and a most excellent property? If it were, it would pay and pay well, and yet, by hook or crook, whether Parliament wishes it or not, it must get an annuity of \$64,000 a year to commence at once, and if it cannot get that by the will of Parliament, then the treasury must be raided to an amount possibly of \$268,800 for the benefit of this solvent and prosperous road. For until the defeat of the Government project, there was no contemplation of giving this road a bonus. Now, however, the bonus will be assured. A nine months experiment may be to the advantage of the Drummond County road, because if at that time the experiment prove a failure the Drummond County road has not failed entirely. It will have got this large bonus from the Dominion treasury and have satisfied its urgent need for ready money which it seems unable to obtain without the help of either the permanent or the temporary arrangement now proposed. These are inevitable bills drawn on the treasury to-day and which have inevitably to be met. The only contingency is as to the margin of difference between \$134,400 and \$268,800, which depends on two things—the ability of the company to make their road cost more than \$15,100 per mile, and the good-will of the Minister of Railways who will pay that money if they can show him the road has cost that amount. There are the financial items, the outlays, the bills to be met—all for a nine months' doubtful experiment. Now, I plead for a better way. I plead for this Government to drop this costly experiment and to wait until the assembled wisdom of this House meets here next year. Why wait? I will tell you why. One very good reason is because you took care to see the House was scattered and confused before you brought your measure down for full discussion—because you wearied it out and sent it away and scattered it to the four corners of this country until you had but a declaimed residue, and then you went on with your proposals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are you quite sure it was we who wearied it and not yourself?

Mr. FOSTER. I leave that to the country to decide.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It is we who have been the sufferers.

**Mr. FOSTER.** No doubt my hon. friend the Postmaster General has suffered, I have seen him suffer. No doubt he had a very bad quarter of an hour last night. No doubt two of his colleagues beside him had just as bad a quarter of an hour, and no doubt if I had not been as generous as I was, there would have been a very bad Cabinet crisis, so that I have great sympathy with my hon. friend when, in plaintive tones he declares to this House that he has been suffering so much.

Now, so far as the teaching of wisdom is concerned, if my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) were in a receptive mood, he would be the gainer by every hour he listened to the Opposition in this House, no doubt of it. For the reasons I have given, I plead with the Government to take the better way and leave this experiment, this costly and doubtful experiment, over until Parliament, fresh, strong, ready to debate and ready to decide, meets next year and takes the whole matter up, and until the Minister of Railways gets a little information which, to-day, he does not appear to have. Why, Sir, the idea of the Minister of Railways bringing a proposition like this down and defending it before this House by declamation and prophecy, and actually obliged to confess to my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) who questioned him, that he had no idea as to the number of through tickets that were sold on the Intercolonial Railway. And yet the whole basis of his calculation must have been—or ought to have been—a comparison of through traffic on the various roads and an estimate of what proportion of through traffic he could add to that already carried by the Intercolonial Railway. I think, then, the Government would be wise in leaving this experiment until Parliament, the whole of Parliament, had an opportunity of discussing the question—the whole of Parliament, because every member of this House has a right to have these great public questions brought before the House in some fair and reasonable time when his public duties will allow him to take part in the discussion and to share in the conclusion and in the responsibility that goes with it. I do not say that we can make an impression on hon. gentlemen opposite. If they have determined to carry this measure through, they have the physical force to do it. It remains with them to take the responsibility, and it remains to the country to decide. But, depend upon it, the decision will be based, not upon prophecy and declamation, but the Government for its action in rushing to this hasty and ill-considered experiment will have to face the business sentiment and the business intelligence of the country which will demand sound reasons for the course that is taken.

Resolution to be reported.

### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 146) to authorize the building of a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.

(In the Committee.)

**Mr. FOSTER.** I am afraid the House is getting into a position where there may be a misunderstanding, and I think we had better have it cleared up. According to my understanding, the vote of \$100,000 for rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway was not carried. When that was brought up this morning, the Minister agreed that it should be allowed to stand until the other was carried. We have carried the other, but not the vote of \$100,000.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** We have a right to go back into Committee of Supply.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Yes, but I wish the matter to be understood.

The committee rose and reported progress.

### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway—To purchase rolling stock ..... \$100,000

**Mr. FOSTER.** Will my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) give us an explanation of what rolling stock he proposes to purchase, or did he give that before?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I gave that before, it will be found in "Hansard."

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would like to ask another question. Is it not possible for the hon. gentleman to carry out this experiment with the rolling stock he already has on hand, without incurring this expenditure of \$100,000? Could he not carry on this service for nine months until the House meets again, without spending this money?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Anything that can be done in the way of avoiding the expenditure of money for rolling stock will be done. I am not in a position to say that there is any spare rolling stock upon the Intercolonial Railway which could be used for this purpose. We are not equipped in any superabundant way, I can assure the hon. gentleman. But no unnecessary expense will be incurred.

**Mr. BELL (Pictou).** May I ask the hon. Minister if the rolling stock proposed to be purchased is the rolling stock of the Drummond County Railway, or any other?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have not had it in mind that

we should use this vote for the purpose of purchasing any of their rolling stock. I do not say that we will not do so, but that is not the present intention.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Minister tell us what rolling stock they have on the Intercolonial now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not, at the moment, give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. SPROULE. Upon what basis does the hon. gentleman ask for more, if he does not know what they have now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Upon the basis of the report of the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, which is to the effect that they require more rolling stock to run this road. I gave the committee, at a previous sitting, a statement of what this additional rolling stock is to consist of.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says he gave the information. Does he know what the rolling stock of the Drummond County Railway to-day consists of?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will send down and get the information, I thought it had been furnished.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. You will find all the discussion in the "Hansard"—about the additional stock.

Mr. FOSTER. There is this point yet to be cleared up. Under the old arrangement, the hon. gentleman bound himself to buy the Drummond Railway rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not at all bound to buy it.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the arrangement as proposed by the measure introduced in the House, the hon. gentleman bound himself to buy, at an agreed valuation, the Drummond County Railway rolling stock. Now, I understood from the hon. gentleman this morning, that the conditions were practically to remain the same. He is going to rent the Drummond County road. Does he feel himself bound, or is there anything in his contemplated arrangements which will make him buy the Drummond County Railway rolling stock under the rental conditions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand the stipulation which was contained in the original agreement to bind us to purchase the rolling stock of the Drummond County Railway. I understood that that clause simply amounted to a declaration that we would buy the property if we could get it at a price which we thought was fair.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I said.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not exactly what the hon. member said, and could not be so understood. It would be understood that we were bound to buy it on an agreed price, but it would not be understood by anybody who was reading that statement that we had an absolute right to determine the price, be it satisfactory or otherwise. It might be it would be determined in some other way, and that we were not to be necessarily a consenting party to the price which was to be named. However, that agreement is at an end and we are no longer under any obligation. It is open for us to make an arrangement with the Drummond County Railway to use their rolling stock if they are willing to let us use it on such terms, or to have nothing to do with the Drummond County equipment in any way. We are entirely free to act in the matter. We are under no agreement, expressed or implied, as matters now stand, to take any part of their stock.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Minister consider himself justified in using this appropriation to buy new rolling stock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would consider myself bound to exercise my very best judgment under the advice which I should receive from those who are competent to advise me in making any purchase Parliament might authorize me to make. I would feel bound to do what would be best in the public interest to do.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. Minister mean the committee to understand that the whole or a portion of this money may be invested in the rolling stock already on the Drummond County Railway? The hon. gentleman says that he is not bound to do so. But it would be well that the committee should have some information as to whether the hon. gentleman intends to invest any of this sum in the rolling stock that is now owned by the Drummond County Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman would be satisfied with my statement of what is in my mind now, without holding that I am committed by my present statement under all circumstances and at all hazards, no matter what might hereafter appear, I would say that I do not contemplate buying any part of the Drummond County Railway stock out of this fund under existing circumstances. That is my present statement.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is it not more likely that the Drummond County Railway would be willing to make any arrangements with the Government for the lease of their road which would not include the rolling stock?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They might require a rental for the use of it, unquestionably; I think it is possible. But I am speaking of a purchase.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). Does the Minister consider that portion of his agreement with the Drummond County Railway includes the lease of their rolling stock for the nine months' experiment?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is my present impression, although I have not exchanged a word with them on the subject. But I think it is reasonable to expect that they would be willing to let us have the use of their rolling stock for a reasonable consideration; and if they are, and we find any need of a part or a whole of it, I think it would be a good business to make an arrangement of that kind.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Would the Minister feel justified under this vote to purchase additional rolling stock instead of renting it? Would the Minister consider himself entitled to lease the rolling stock and use the money for that purpose?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think any portion of this vote could be used for the purpose of renting the stock. I think we would have to have ample authority under our general appropriation to pay for the use of any of the rolling stock on that road we might conclude to buy.

Mr. **SPROULE**. That is under the \$157,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I mean under our general appropriation for the use of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then it is apparent that in the event of no purchase being made of the Drummond County Railway rolling stock the sum of \$100,000 will not be absolutely required for other purposes, because if it were contemplated to purchase a portion or all of their rolling stock, then this \$100,000, or a portion of it, would be absorbed in that. If that be not the intention, and there is to be a mere rental paid for it, then the hon. gentleman does not seem to require the \$100,000 that is now asked for.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I might find it desirable to expend a portion of the \$100,000 for the purchase of the rolling stock. I have already said that the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway is not in excess of its needs; it is good, but it is not what you would call ample, it is not superabundant, and I think it might be concluded that it would be desirable to spend a portion of this amount in the purchase of new rolling stock to

a limited extent. But I do not think that I ought to be asked to commit myself definitely to any statement beyond that.

Resolution to be reported.

#### CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 146) to authorize a subsidy for a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. **LISTER**. Before this Bill is declared carried, I desire to say just a few words regarding it. I may say, in the first place, that I regret that my hon. friend the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has not been able to complete the very interesting address which he partially delivered to this committee the other day. The address was interesting for more than one reason. We have on the other side of the House at least three leaders, and one or two embryonic leaders.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) is going into controversies and party subject-matter, and it must be understood that we shall have to persist in our replies.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We must have something to say in reply.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We want to hear you again.

Mr. **LISTER**. Three or four men in Toronto, so rumour states, think of deposing the real leader of the party, but we have at least four leaders representing the Opposition to-day. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who has been leading the Opposition during the session, and who is now absent, with perfect frankness declared that the scheme now under consideration was one in the interest of this country and should receive the support of all political parties in this House. That was a frank and open statement which we can well understand. We have the acting leader of the Opposition (Mr. Foster) who sits here to-day opposing the manner in which the scheme is being carried out, while the leader from West York (Mr. Wallace) is opposing it entirely. While we know that the real leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) frankly approves of this scheme in all its details, we have hon. gentlemen, with infinitely less frankness, pretending that they are opposed to the project of the Government when, in fact, they are in favour of it for the most selfish reasons. While these hon. gentlemen want this project carried out; while they desire that the work shall be proceeded with and completed, they are posing before this House and the country as opposed to the whole scheme. They want the Bill sent to the Senate; they want the

Bill to become law, but at the same time they want to pose before the country as opposing the Bill when, in fact, they are in favour of it. The hon. gentlemen are trying to get on both horns of dilemma. They want the Government to construct this railway and they want the party advantage of going to the country and saying that this was not in the interest of Canada, that it was not a scheme that was as favourable to the country as the one they proposed and that, in fact, it was generally a bad scheme. The hon. member for West York opposed this Bill upon three grounds. First, he said that the Government should have disallowed the British Columbia charter altogether and thus prevented the construction of the road under the charter; in the second place, he argued that the road was not at all necessary; and in the third place he said that the agreement which the late Government proposed to make with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was an agreement much more in the interest of the country than the one now placed before the House for its consideration. It is wonderful, Mr. Chairman, how hon. gentlemen change their principles. While they were upon this side of the House they took up one set of principles, and as soon as they change their seats they immediately become possessed of another set of principles. The hon. member for West York says that the Government should have disallowed the British Columbia charter. Does not the hon. gentleman know that it has been a recognized principle of this House that where a local legislature legislates within the purview of its authority, this Government would be doing a violence to the constitution by disallowing that Act? British Columbia had a right to incorporate this railway; British Columbia had a right to make such grants as it thought proper in aid of the project and, having done so, and being a responsible Government, answerable to the people of British Columbia, it would have been doing violence to the constitution of this country if this Government had disallowed the Act. When hon. gentlemen were on this side of the House, when the hon. member for West York was supporting the then Government, what do we find? We find that the British Columbia Government gave a local railway company on Vancouver Island a grant of lands that, in fact, places the control of the coal lands upon Vancouver Island entirely in the hands of one vast corporation. Nobody else can acquire these lands, or work them, and yet the hon. gentleman who proposes in this House that this Government should have disallowed that legislation, was one of the men who supported the Government, who refused to disallow legislation giving the coal lands on Vancouver Island to a railway company. So far as he is concerned, it is not in his mouth to say that this Government should have disallowed the Act. The hon.

Mr. LISTER.

gentleman says further that the Crow's Nest Pass road is not necessary. The leader of the Opposition says that the road is necessary. The acting leader of the Opposition will not dare to say that it is not necessary, but the hon. member for West York has gone to the length of saying that the road under consideration is one which is not necessary in the interest of the country, and he has pointed out that railways from the south were being built into British Columbia and that the Canadian Pacific Railway with its water connections could find its way into the mining country, and that, in fact, there was no necessity of the road being built at all. What is the condition of affairs in that country to-day? We have, as a fact, a country of unexampled wealth; we have, as a fact, a country that produces nothing to sustain life—a mining country, pure and simple. We have a country that will attract from every quarter of the globe an enormous population seeking to get the wealth out of it. That means an enormous consumption of the products of Canada; it means a population that will open a market for the older provinces of Canada and for the North-west Territories; it means a market costing this country comparatively little, when we are travelling the world over for the purpose of finding new markets. I venture the assertion that within a few years it will be found that the mining country of British Columbia has a population of hundreds of thousands of people who will require to get from older Canada, not only what they consume, but their clothing and, in fact, everything that is necessary to life in that country. We have spent millions of money in constructing a great railway line through that country, and it is not fair to the people of Canada that this expenditure should not be made by which the people of the older provinces may have the trade which the development of the country will certainly bring forth. The man who opposes this scheme is a narrow-minded man. He is not equal to the occasion; he does not take in the great possibilities of the development of the riches of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) says that they can get their supplies from the south. That is not what we want. We want the people of the mining country to get their supplies from British Columbia and from older Canada, and they can only get that trade by getting these supplies in there through our own territory and not through the United States.

As a matter of fact, millions of dollars worth of property has gone into the British Columbia mining camps, and but a small tithe of that has been taken in from older Canada. It has been purchased in the markets of the United States and carried in by United States railways, to supply the Canadian residents of that country. I therefore say, that this scheme upon its face is one of absolute necessity, one that

will bear fruit to the benefit of our people, and the Government would have been blind to their duty to Canada, if they did not take vigorous and early steps to secure the construction of a railway which will connect the older provinces of Canada with that country of wonderful wealth. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) goes on to say, that the agreement made by the late Government was better in the interests of the country than that proposed by the present Government. Sir, I deny it. I say that the two schemes will not bear comparison; I say that the agreement made by the Conservative Government would be an onerous agreement, an agreement that would fall far short of giving to the people of Canada the advantage which the agreement of the present Government gives them. Under the new agreement made by this Government, the people of the North-west alone will undoubtedly save of from \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year in freight charges. Is not that a great advantage? Then, Sir, under the new agreement, the Government of this country save for the people of Canada for all time to come, 50,000 acres of the coal lands of that country, which must for ever prevent a monopoly in the coal business. And, Sir, this agreement enables the people of western Canada to supply the people of British Columbia with such products as they require and we produce.

The agreement made by the late Government was simply this: They gave the railway company \$5,000 a mile, and they lent the company \$20,000 a mile more; taking from the company a mortgage upon the roadway or the bonds as security for that loan. I have no doubt that the railway company would prefer the arrangement with the old Government, because we know from our experience in lending public money to railway companies, and to harbours and such like, that while we take a mortgage from a company that mortgage would never be paid. As a matter of fact, the agreement entered into by the late Government would mean an addition to the public debt of Canada of \$8,250,000. Sir, the country was amazed during the late elections at this proposition of the Conservative Government. They were amazed that the Government should borrow money upon the credit of the country, for the purpose of lending that money to a railway company, in consideration of a mortgage upon the roadbed. The proposition of the late Government involved an expenditure of \$8,250,000, and the acceptance of a mortgage, which I venture to say, under circumstances which may arise, no Government of this country would be strong enough to enforce, if default was made in the payment of the mortgage or interest. The agreement made by the late Government practically was, that they should give \$8,250,000 for the building of this road, and receive no con-

cessions in return. This Government get the road for \$3,600,000, and they have besides obtained concessions, that looking into the future, it is impossible now to put a value upon. I admit the necessity of the road; I admit that in the interest of older Canada we should have access to that mineral country, and admitting that, I declare that the present Government is entitled to every credit for placing before Parliament this scheme which must receive the fullest approbation of every man who takes a true interest in public affairs in this country.

Why need we be alarmed? The interest upon this \$3,600,000 will amount to over \$100,000 a year. I point to my hon. friend the Postmaster General; why, Sir, by this Government coming into power and that gentleman getting control of the Post Office Department, he saves more every year, by the economies he has made, than would pay the interest on the money which we have to borrow to pay this subvention. In addition to that, this Government has saved \$250,000 a year in connection with the fast Atlantic service as compared with the contract entered into by the late Government. There is no need for alarm. If this country is to be developed, if this country is to be peopled, if this nation is to become great, as we hope it will, then no Government can afford to stand still. It must be progressive it must be business-like, it must be abreast of the times, and if it is not the people will not submit to it. We cannot expect to develop this country by a policy of standstill. Wherever it is necessary to pierce the country by railways, wherever it is necessary to cheapen transportation, wherever it is necessary to afford complete communication between the various parts of this country, the Government must be alive to the fact and the country expects they will accomplish it. I believe, Sir, looking at this scheme from every point of view, that it will satisfy all reasonable men in Canada, and that it is a scheme that will do more than anything that has been done in recent years, to develop the wonderful, and I believe illimitable resources of that great province of British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has availed himself of this opportunity of putting upon record an answer, to some at least, of the objections which were raised on the other side of the House against this proposal of the Government. I myself believed that the position taken by some of these hon. gentlemen opposite was scarcely frank or candid, because I well know that there was no genuine opposition on their part to the measure. On the contrary, there was a general consensus of opinion that it was desirable that this Bill should pass and become law; and

I think it was a very transparent attempt upon the part of those gentlemen who did speak against the Bill, to win for themselves and possibly for their party a certain measure of commendation from those who, in the various constituencies might be hostile to the arrangement which we have made. Now speaking in all fairness, I think that those gentlemen would have appeared to some better advantage if they had allowed the Bill to pass as we submitted it, and had not made what I venture to regard as the futile attempt to appear to be resisting the measure in the public interest. I further think it required a good deal of intrepidity on the part of those gentlemen to oppose the measure, and to claim, by a comparison between the plan of the late Government and this plan, that the advantages were all in favour of the former and against the latter. The hon. member has made a comparison between some points of the two plans, and it does seem to me that if you put these two proposals side by side, there is not room for a difference of opinion as to the side to which the strong preference must incline. On the one hand, the late Government proposed to grant a subsidy of \$5,000 a mile and a loan of \$20,000 a mile upon the security of the property which was to be created by the loan itself—without condition, without stipulation, without seeking to secure from the corporation to which that loan was made any remission of any of the terms and conditions under which they were operating their railway system in Canada—without a single attempt to secure any concessions in the interest of trade, in the interest of the people of the western country, in the interest of those who have been complaining of the incubus which the operation of that great railway imposed upon the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. member does not want to impress the committee with the idea that the Government of Canada had not already the power to exact those conditions and might do so in case of exorbitant charges being made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government have not at present the power to do what has been secured in the terms set forth in this Bill. Perhaps we could exercise the arbitrary power, because there is no limitation, in a sense, on the power of Parliament; but we could not, without a distinct violation of a solemn compact, to be found embodied in an Act of Parliament—without being guilty of an act which I think this Parliament will never be guilty of, we could not secure the concessions which by this agreement have been obtained for the people of Canada. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman. There is a widespread feeling throughout western Canada, and I think shared in by the people of the eastern part of Canada, that the agreement which permits the Canadian Pacific

Railway Company to impose such schedule rates as it pleases, so long as it does not show sufficient excess of revenue to pay a dividend of 10 per cent on its stock, is a condition of things which has been much attacked and which is believed to be a very great burden upon the people of the western country, from which for a long time they have hoped to secure some relief. I think I am not overstating the case when I say that there is a strong feeling in the country that it was a mistake that that condition was agreed upon, and that there would be a feeling of great relief if we could secure a complete rescinding of that agreement. We have not been able to accomplish that in its entirety, but we have succeeded to some extent. We have succeeded in securing from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a rescinding of that agreement to such an extent that all traffic which may originate in any part of Canada for the western country, and all traffic which may originate in that country for any part of Canada or any portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, shall be subject to such rates as either the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or the Governor in Council, or a railway commission, should one be constituted, shall impose. That is a most important concession, one which I consider worth a very large amount of money, and one which I think the people of the western country will highly value; and if hon. gentlemen who object to this arrangement had been negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the subject, they would be satisfied that the Canadian Pacific Railway people at all events regarded it as a very important concession, that they valued it at a large amount of money, and that they only yielded when they found the Government determined that they should not get any financial assistance from the Government of Canada unless they consented to the terms which we demanded. Make a comparison of these two contracts, one beside the other, and can there be a doubt in any man's mind as to which contract is to be preferred? On the one hand, we were to grant the company \$20,000 a mile as a loan and \$5,000 a mile as a subsidy. That would have amounted to \$8,250,000, which sum we would have had to go into the markets of the world and borrow and hand over to the company. I was amazed to hear hon. gentlemen say that that transaction was not adding to the public debt, while if we rent a railway and agree to pay \$200,000 a year for it, we are adding to the public debt. In other words, it is not adding to the public debt to have to go into the money markets of the world, and float your bonds to the extent of \$8,250,000. It only shows how differently hon. gentlemen view a transaction when they view it from a different standpoint. And the hon. gentleman who aspires to be the leader of the Conservative party, perhaps in the near

Mr. BLAIR.

future, ventured to assert that the Conservative party were not responsible as a party for a proposal, which was brought down and submitted to Parliament by the Conservative Government, under which they proposed that \$8,250,000 should be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with which to build this road, without a condition or a stipulation, except that they would agree to return the money. They proposed to lend that money upon the property that was created by it, and without even making an attempt to secure any relief for the people of Canada from the burdens under which they have been labouring, and of which they have complained for many years. If these two arrangements are compared, I do not think any one can doubt on which side of the balance the weight lies; and I can submit a very simple test as to which of them is to be preferred. I would like you to take the opinion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves as to whether they would sooner take \$8,250,000 as a loan, agreeing to return the money, or the terms which we have offered to them and they have accepted. If any member of this committee were to be in conversation with the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company after this matter is all closed, when they would have no interest in making any inaccurate statement regarding it, they would tell you that they would infinitely prefer the proposal of the late Government to those which we have insisted upon, and which form the basis of the present arrangement.

Now, the complaint has been made in some quarters that this agreement is not sufficiently explicit. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) criticised one of the conditions because it did not, he argued, make it obligatory on the Canadian Pacific Railway to convey the 50,000 acres of coal lands to us. The hon. gentleman, however, very frankly admitted, after he had studied the clause, that he was in error in his first view, and that he was thoroughly satisfied that it covered the ground. It unquestionably does cover the ground, because it provides that no matter what company—not the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, but any other company—may receive the land subsidy from the British Columbia Government for the building of this road, out of that land subsidy there must go to the Government of Canada 50,000 acres of coal lands. There would be only one possible contingency which would prevent the land coming to the Government of Canada, and that would be the withdrawal by the British Columbia Parliament or Government of the land subsidy before it had been earned, or the refusal of the British Columbia Government to enter into a contract with the company which had engaged to build the road. In that case, the lands would continue to be the property of the

British Columbia Government, and would not pass into the hands of any company, but I do not apprehend that as a possible contingency. I therefore say with the utmost confidence, that this contract fully covers all the ground.

There are just one or two other matters I wish to refer to before sitting down, and I am sorry my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is not here at this moment. He took occasion yesterday, and not for the first time in this committee, to refer to a statement which he said I made in British Columbia during my visit there last winter, with regard to the action of the British Columbia Government in giving this large subsidy to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. My hon. friend's statement was repeated by one of the ex-Controllers, who followed him, namely, that I had denounced the Act of the British Columbia Government as being a most infamous transaction. Now, I do not wish to have the impression entertained that at any time or under any circumstances I expressed myself in such a way. I did not altogether forget the position which I have the honour to occupy, I did not forget that I was responsible for any statement I made as a Minister of the Crown, but I did take occasion once, or perhaps twice, to refer to what I thought was the unwise policy which the British Columbia Government had pursued in giving this very large grant to a railway company. I did not denounce their conduct as infamous, I made use of no strong language, and if the hon. gentleman had read the published reports of what I did say, he would find that on no occasion did I use any strong language on that subject. I only said that I thought the policy was unwise and that if I had the opportunity, in my character of Minister of Railways, to take a course which would protect the people against monopolies, I would feel it my duty to use my best efforts in that direction and to see that any aid given by the Government of Canada for the construction of that railway would be given upon conditions which would protect the people against the creation of any monopoly. There was no impropriety surely in that. I felt that that would be my duty, and I desire to say, with regard to the conditions which have been arranged between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, that while they do not go as far as I would like to see them go, while they do not embody all my views, they do, in my opinion, fully protect the people of British Columbia against the existence and creation of monopolies in coal and timber lands. Therefore, I think I may fairly claim to have redeemed to the full any assurance I gave to the people of British Columbia in that respect.

The hon. gentleman made another reference, and it is not the first time it has

been made in this House. He said that I had posed before the people of British Columbia as being entirely opposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway having the contract, and would insist upon its being built as a Government work. I need only say that at no time, when I addressed the people in British Columbia, did I express any such view or commit myself to any such policy. I always said that it was a matter which had not been considered by the Government, that there were these various possible ways by which the road could be constructed—either by the Government as a Government work, or through the medium of a company and the granting of bonuses in the usual way. I said that upon that subject I was not authorized to express any opinion on behalf of the Government, I was very careful to avoid expressing any opinion of my own. The hon. gentleman undertook to state with a good deal of confidence how I thought this road should be built and how I was then turned down by my colleagues on the question. He may have information as to my private and personal view, and he may think his information is accurate. I am not going to affirm or deny what my individual or personal view was on the question. I apprehend that Governments could not exist unless their members were willing, after consultation with their colleagues, to yield to an extent, so long as no question of principle was involved, to the judgment of the majority with whom they act; and whenever it becomes impossible for me to do so, I shall feel it my duty, of course, to withdraw from association with my colleagues. But I do not say that the ultimate conclusion which was arrived at by the Government, the policy which was finally determined upon was one which, if my views prevailed, would have been adopted. But I have no hesitation in taking my ground strongly upon this, that if the policy which the late Government propounded on this question is to be the other alternative, I would, and so would any prudent man, infinitely prefer the plan which the Government has now submitted to Parliament to that which was favoured by the late Administration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall just for a few moments take up the time of the committee. I am in a peculiarly favourable position to express my views very fully upon the matter which is now occupying the attention of the committee. I was not in the Cabinet when the first project was discussed or decided upon—the one which was submitted to the company and which the hon. gentleman has referred to as having been discussed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I venture the opinion that the function of a constitutional Opposition is not to formulate the policy of the country, but to watch what

Mr. BLAIR.

is going on in the interests of the people, and to throw the responsibility for what is finally decided upon the Government, who command the confidence of the country, as shown by their coming successfully through the great test of the general election. I am sufficiently a constitutionalist to bow to the will of the people and to submit to the verdict that has been rendered. The Government, as was its duty, has formulated its policy upon this question, and we are now in a position to discuss it. I entirely agree with what has been said—that no sacrifice too great can be made to open up to the older provinces of the Dominion that wonderfully rich country that will be developed by the building of this road. As a rule, I am very much opposed to the building and management of roads by the Government, not because the Government would not build as good a road as a private company, but because when a railway is under the control of the Government, it is almost inevitable that political pressure will be brought to bear upon the Government that will prevent the road being administered as a business company would administer it—simply to carry the traffic of the country and yield due return upon the capital invested. Sir, the Government cannot be too careful to surround the building of such a road with all the precautions necessary to prevent injurious monopolies. Especially under the peculiar circumstances of this road, is it necessary that all precautions in this way should be taken. If, as I understand, the Crow's Nest Pass, owing to topographical conditions, cannot be made available for other railroads, then the future of that country depends upon the Government making such arrangements as will prevent this pass falling into the hands of a monopoly. Other railways must be allowed to use it under reasonable conditions so that they also may do their share in developing the wealth of the country. The hon. Minister of Railways has stated that every precaution has been taken in that direction. I assume that these conditions are actually provided in the Bill, and that the bargain is surrounded by such precautions as are necessary to be taken. We know that complaints have been made in the past, some of them probably reasonable, others quite as probably exaggerated, against the rates which were imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the carriage of goods over their road. The Minister of Railways has said that it would be extremely difficult to interfere with the conditions under which the Canadian Pacific Railway was built and which were granted to the company at its inception. Those conditions were necessary in order to secure the building of the road which has done so much to make Canada what it is to-day. But it is important this new line shall be placed under the protect-

ing eye of the Government so that by no possibility can anything interfere with it or make it a monopoly. These conditions being established, as I have already said, I think there can be no possible reason why the building of this road should not be entrusted to the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company have shown how perfectly they can build a line, and no doubt they will build this important road in a manner that will be satisfactory to the public. I do not wish to go into the details of the arrangement. I have not attempted to compare the two arrangements, except in a very cursory manner. The chief point that struck me as being of importance was not so much to discuss the policy of the Government, but because I considered that that policy must be left to the Government who have, through their majority, control in this House, and who must bear the responsibility. But when the time comes and the results of their policy is submitted to public discussion, then will be the time to judge of the policy from the results of it, and then will be the time for us to take the position which we shall consider right and proper and show, if we can, that their policy was not as favourable to the development of Canada as the policy which we advocated for so many years when we were sitting on the right of the Speaker. I wish merely to submit to my colleagues who sit behind me and to this House, without committing myself to the policy of the Government, that I am favourable to the Bill as it stands, provided, as the hon. Minister of Railways has stated, it is surrounded with such checks as will prevent this important road from falling into the hands of a powerful monopoly, who, by the rates imposed for freight, &c., thus impede the development of the country upon which we depend so much for building up the future of Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Sir Adolphe Caron), and I presume that, in the absence of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), he now speaks as leader of the Opposition.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I speak for myself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then it is to be regretted that at this, one of the last stages of this important measure, the hon. member for York is not present to say how far this completed scheme meets with his approval. The absence of the hon. member for York on this particular occasion, and at this particular moment, seems significant. He has for many weeks deluged this House, as have many of those about him, with criticism against this measure, calculated to create the belief among the public that they were fighting a desperate battle on

behalf of the interest of the people. But when they are challenged, when the hon. member for York is challenged to say now whether that scheme as a policy, not all its details, is proper, he withdrew from this Chamber in the midst of this debate instead of remaining here and saying where he stood upon the measure which is now presented for final assent. In like manner we find the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) following in the footsteps of the hon. member for York in a somewhat similar way. It is gratifying to know at least that the hon. gentleman approves of the policy of the Government in regard to this important measure. It is a measure of far-reaching importance, its consequences will live long beyond the lives of any living people, and being so, it is gratifying to find that one so prominent in the counsels of the Opposition, approves of the great principle that is involved in the measure now before the committee. What are we in committee for? We are not in committee to deal with principles, but to deal with details; the committee is the place for every member to direct his attention towards the details. If there has ever been a measure before Parliament demanding the close attention and reasoning of every member of the House, it is the Bill now before the committee, and each member of this committee is bound to direct his attention to the details in order that there shall be thrown around the scheme all those safeguards the hon. gentleman alludes to. The hon. gentleman has had this measure and all its details before him for a month, and he, as one of the committee, has a duty to perform, and I call upon him now to say whether he finds anything in this measure that in his judgment should be removed, or anything absent from it that should be put into it before it becomes law. We are now at one of the last stages, but there is still an opportunity to consider objections, there is still an opportunity to consider any suggestions, there is yet a locus penitentiæ in regard to the whole measure. Instead of the member for Three Rivers shielding himself behind the plea that these are mere generalities, it is incumbent on him now to point out what defects, if any, there be, in his judgment, in this Bill before it passes. I ask him now: Is he satisfied with the details? Can he make any suggestion about it? I am sure the Government will receive him with a welcome, and give to them its best consideration if they are likely to promote the public welfare. I am anxious to know if there are any shortcomings in it. I am desirous in every respect of safeguarding the interests of the public; so I think it is due to the committee that we should have the advice of the member for Three Rivers in regard to the measure. If it has any weak points in it, if he has no suggestions to offer, if, as a lawyer, and as an old parliamentarian, he can point out nothing capable of improve-

ment, then I think we are safe in assuming that he swallows it in its entirety, policy, details and all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman hardly understood my speech. As to advising the hon. gentleman, I have been so unsuccessful in the past that I would not venture to give any advice to the hon. gentleman. It is very hard to convince the hon. gentleman that he is wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am open to conviction.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He may be, but it is very seldom that he shows it, consequently I would not attempt to advise the hon. gentleman. But I think the short statement I made was favourable to the Bill. Now the hon. gentleman cannot impose upon me in the way he has attempted. I think I am at perfect liberty to express my views upon any measure in the way I desire, and if I cannot satisfy the hon. gentleman, it is my misfortune. However, I generally follow my own views in such matters, I do not need to consult the hon. gentleman as to how I shall express those views on any matter coming before Parliament.

Mr. CLANCY. The Postmaster General seems anxious that every member of this committee should show where he stands in respect to this measure. Now, it is clear that there is no division of opinion in this House as to whether that road should be undertaken as a Government work or by a railway company. The proposed arrangement of the late Government was one on the lines that the hon. gentlemen have adopted, namely, that a railway company should undertake the construction of the road rather than the Government. But we come now to another important question, and that is as to whether this is a good bargain and as to whether the first offer made by the Conservative Government was better or worse than the one now proposed to be carried out. I have no hesitation in saying that the objections that have been raised against the first offer are visionary, they are in a mild sense, bubble blowing. The member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) casts discredit upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Minister of Railways did not hesitate to say much the same thing, that they cast a doubt upon the ability of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to repay the \$20,000 per mile that would be loaned, in addition to the \$5,000 per mile to be given as a subsidy. I would like to hear the Minister of Railways now say if he thinks there is the least doubt of the ability of that great corporation to pay back the \$20,000 a mile that was proposed to be loaned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion the Canadian  
Mr. MULOCK.

Pacific Railway would be able to respond to a demand of that kind. I did not say so, but I am quite ready to say so now. I think the loaning of eight millions and a quarter of public money upon an undertaking which was to be created out of that money and upon that loan, was a very unbusinesslike proposition, and that it was really asking the country to assume all the risks of the enterprise without being able to realize any profit out of it, should it succeed.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I think the correct figures were not eight and a quarter millions, but \$6,600,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you multiply 330 miles by 25,000, you will find about eight and a quarter millions.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Yes, if the hon. gentleman regards the loan and the subsidy as being distinct. I took both, on the ground that both would have to come out of the public treasury.

Mr. CLANCY. I hardly follow the point that the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to make there. He has stated to the committee that he believed the Canadian Pacific Railway would be able to respond. That being admitted he is not compelled to rely on the security involved in the scheme itself. It does seem to me that it is not a sound argument to put forward. The hon. gentleman has taken the security of a great corporation. He admits that it is perfectly good; he admits that they are able to respond. But why urge the point that you are taking that alone as security. There is absolutely nothing in the contention. If the money had been loaned to a corporation that had no standing in the country there might be something in the argument of my hon. friend. But he admits that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to respond.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) claim that it would be a more favourable arrangement if we were to give the Canadian Pacific Railway \$5,000 a mile and loan them \$20,000 a mile in addition to such subsidies and other privileges and concessions as they might have. If the hon. gentleman would put that strongly I have no doubt that we might consider it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is putting his own case. He has not told the committee that the loan of \$20,000 a mile was to be repaid at the rate of 3½ per cent. Neither has he informed the committee that it was possible for the Government to have borrowed that money at a less rate or at 3 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at 3 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. The statement has been made that it could be borrowed at 3 per

cent. The difference between 3 and 3½ per cent would reduce the grant of \$5,000 a mile to something in the neighbourhood of \$2,500 a mile. If that proposition be correct, then, leaving out the question for the time being the concession of the coal lands the hon. gentleman will admit that it would have been an infinitely better bargain to have made.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It would not have been, however, if we could not get our interest.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I think it is quite as true as the other calculation that the hon. gentleman has been making which he has brought down and has not vindicated. It is reasonable to conclude that the money could be borrowed at 3 per cent. There could be no doubt that it would have been a better bargain so far as that feature of it is concerned. Now, let us turn to the question of the monopoly of coal lands. I am informed that the quantity of coal lands is almost illimitable. I am further informed that where coal lands stand alone they are absolutely without any value, that is, if they are without facilities for bringing the products to market. My information is that, aside from convenient railway facilities they have no value in that country.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Suppose your information is incorrect?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think railway facilities would be necessary to make them valuable, but then there is so much of it that you could not make it all valuable. The value would be in a monopoly, if a monopoly existed.

Mr. **CLANCY**. If there is so much of it as the hon. gentleman states, is it a fair question to assume that there would be a monopoly? There are now some facilities for reaching those coal lands, partly by land and partly by water.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The people in that country were seriously afraid that there would be a monopoly.

Mr. **CLANCY**. If they were never alarmed before they will be when they read the hon. gentleman's speeches. They will come to the conclusion that they have been saved from a great monopoly, but the hon. gentleman has just said that there is so much coal land in that country that there is no possibility of a monopoly and, therefore, monopoly can only arise out of unfavourable railway facilities.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There would have been monopoly in dealing with one corporation.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I am informed that though one corporation will hold a large quantity they will not hold it all.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. All this land through that portion of the country and along the coal-bearing area passes to the corporation as a subsidy for the building of the road. That will include the coal lands as well as the others.

Mr. **CLANCY**. It would only be in a section. But the fact is that no great corporation are going to hold that property for mere pleasure; they must hold it for profit. There is nothing in this notion that these men might enter upon a monopoly because, if they ever expect to realize out of these coal lands they must depend on their development. If there is not a large development they will get no profit, and while men are ready to engage in monopolies there is nothing that I can see that would induce the notion of the possibility of a monopoly in these lands for the reason that it is against every business interest of the present holders.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is another thing.

Mr. **CLANCY**. But it is one of the natural conclusions to which you come. Now, as to freight rates: the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says that it would be a violation of contract to undertake to get rid of this incubus that is placed upon the people by the provision preventing the reduction of freight rates until the profits have exceeded the 10 per cent limit. There is a feeling in this country that the time has come beyond which this limitation cannot further be continued.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Would you justify the repealing of that clause without any consideration of compensation?

Mr. **CLANCY**. That is another matter. The matter of giving compensation is independent of my contention, because it does not involve the question as to whether we should absolutely repeal that provision and that without compensation to make a case. The time is coming when no hon. gentleman in this House can shield himself behind what he considers the legal obligation resting upon the Government not to get rid of what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals declared to be an incubus upon the people of Canada. I say the time is coming and this is not a matter for the hon. gentleman to put forth as one of the good features of the bargain, because he is bound to see that with this state of things, we should turn our attention to ridding the people of so dangerous a thing. There are two or three things that have been urged very strongly in favour of the proposition of the Government—first, the possibility of a coal monopoly; next, the relief you are giving to the people by way of freight rates; and next, the advantages of the bargain proposed, as compared with the one proposed by the late Government. These reasons for the adoption of the measure

fall to the ground upon a careful examination of them. The hon. gentleman urged these as the principal reasons, but I wish to say that, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall hold myself perfectly free. I do not know any good reason why I should assent to the proposition that the bargain which the hon. gentleman has made is a good one or that it is as good as the one that was prepared by the former Government. All the benefits that were urged in favour of it have disappeared one by one, and possibly there will not be under it as many advantages as there would be under the former proposition.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask the Minister in regard to certain propositions contained in this agreement. The value of the propositions depend upon the way in which they are carried out. As to the running powers that are to be granted to other railways: in arriving at the basis of the payment for these running powers, is the amount of bonus that the Government is granting to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of this road to be taken into the calculation, or is the total cost of the road to be the basis of calculation. That is to say, when another company comes to the Canadian Pacific Railway and says: we want to run over your road, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other company come before the Government or before the commission, and the question arises what proportion of the original cost is to be borne by the second company? Is it to be a proportion of the total cost, or only a proportion of the cost for construction actually paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway? To put it another way: Is the country at large, through other lines of railway, to get the benefit of the money we are now paying for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, if I were sitting as one member of a tribunal which had to determine the question which the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) asks, and I had to decide upon what amount of compensation ought to be awarded to the dominant company, I will call it, I would not have any difficulty in reaching a conclusion. I cannot pretend to suggest upon what principle other gentlemen on the commission or tribunal which would have to interpret these powers would act. I can only state what my own view would be. I would consider that it would be proper to take into account the actual cost to the railway company itself of the construction of their line, after having deducted the amount of the aid or bonus which they received from the Government. I think that would be a fair basis of calculation. I would not think, however, as respects this road it would be proper to deduct the \$11,000 per mile,

Mr. CLANCY.

because I do not consider that we are giving more than the ordinary subsidy of \$6,400 per mile in consideration of the building of the road. We are giving the balance in consideration of the other concessions which the company had a right to refuse, or to make to us just as they chose, and the pecuniary value of which we consider is very large.

Mr. OLIVER. This question is a very far-reaching one, and it not only concerns the matter of running powers granted to other roads, but it also comes into the question of the general readjustment of rates by a commission. I take the liberty of suggesting that it would be a good thing to have that question decided when we are voting this large sum of money to the road. I will admit the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), that only a part of this money is actually chargeable to construction, and that a part of it is properly to be credited to the concessions given by the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I take this position, that for whatever money we do pay which is properly chargeable to construction, the company is not entitled to the credit of that money in any dealings the Government may have with them, either in the matter of fixing rates or granting running powers to other roads. That is an important principle, and I take the liberty of saying that it is a principle which I consider should be decided here and now, and not left to a commission which may sit afterwards. This is the essence of the value of that branch of the concessions which have been given as to running powers and as to fixing the rates.

We have no right to cut down the proper earnings of the shareholders or bondholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we unquestionably have the right to secure to the Canadian people adequate returns for the money we are actually paying to that company. I claim that now is the time to affirm that principle, and I should very much like to have it affirmed here and now, if that be possible. It is decided either one way or the other at the present moment. It cannot be that this bargain has gone through and that question been left in abeyance. Either the question is decided against us now, or it is decided in our favour. There are two parties to every bargain, and whatever our understanding of the matter may be, if the company have an opposite understanding, their understanding is as good as ours when we come to the question of readjustment. Now is the time that we want to know whether we are getting value for the money we are paying both in respect to the running powers and to the rates.

I want to ask another question. Does the power to regulate rates include passenger as well as freight rates?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, it includes both.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I shall avail myself of this opportunity to bring a certain matter, in this public way, to the attention of the Minister. That matter has reference to passenger rates. It is a local concern to some extent, but I will venture to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes. The Kootenay country, in the process of its development is an employer of labour. The district of northern Alberta is a field for settlement. At the present time, of the number of people who have come to settle in northern Alberta a number are not too well endowed with this world's goods; and the present difficulty in securing a rapid and successful settlement of that country is that there is no profitable employment for labour there outside of the cultivation of the land. That is to say, there is no other means whereby a man can get employment and secure ready money for it. Now, if the Government will take this matter of passenger rates in hand to such an extent as to secure low rates for labourers between northern Alberta and Kootenay, it will have a double advantage. It will be an advantage to the Kootenay in getting cheap labour and it will be an advantage to the agricultural settlement of northern Alberta, in that the poorer class of people who are settled on that land will be able to reach the ready employment which they are now debarred from on account of the high rates of transportation. I call the attention of the Minister to that point for his consideration when there is any adjustment of passenger rates. It is an important question. The field for settlement in northern Alberta involves an area larger than the present settled area of the province of Manitoba, and the matter of securing profitable employment for the people who go in there is a most important question in connection with the settlement of that region. At the present time, the labour employed in the Kootenay country comes from the south of the line. The distance is short and the rate low. The labour goes back there, and we lose it. We might as well have the benefit of the result of that labour to assist in the settlement of our own country, but we cannot have it unless we get a reduction in passenger rates, which we could not obtain in any ordinary way.

Bill reported.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 4736) respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also therein mentioned.

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair).** Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the committee will consider it necessary that I should occupy a great deal of time in making a general statement on these resolutions. I rather gather that it has not been usual to do so on occasions of this kind in time past, and therefore I do not apprehend that it will be necessary now. The committee will probably have noted that in these resolutions there are certain departures from the usual form in which proposals of this kind have in the past been submitted. The gross amount of the subsidies which are asked for will not, I think, be found to compare unfavourably with the amounts applied for in previous sessions. On the whole, I think it will be found that the requests we are making to Parliament in this direction are exceedingly moderate, and less in amount than have been submitted to Parliament on many previous occasions. I notice, however, that a good deal of criticism in the Opposition newspaper press has been directed to the fact that we are asking for so much in the way of railway subsidies; and these criticisms have rather led me to look a little into this subject in order to see how our proposals would compare with those that have been made by our predecessors in this direction, and I think I am quite warranted in stating that these proposals are in amount rather under than over similar proposals hitherto put before Parliament. In the first place, it will be noticed that a very large proportion of the votes which we are asking for are votes which have been already submitted to and have received the sanction of Parliament, and are in the nature of revotes. Of the total amount we are asking for, not less than \$2,140,000 are in the nature of revotes, which would not leave much more than \$2,000,000 which may be said to be new. I do not propose, therefore, to remark particularly upon these items in detail, unless it shall be deemed necessary to do so later, or unless some hon. gentleman may desire information which I may be able to give in respect to the different proposals. The committee will have observed that we do not propose to continue the system which has prevailed somewhat generally, I think very much more generally than was wise, of guaranteeing interest—of holding these subsidies, or receiving subsidies which may have been granted by any provincial Government, and holding them as a fund, guaranteeing to pay the amounts out in instalments, either annually or semi-annually, as may be agreed upon, by way of interest. We have abandoned that system, because we think it is calculated to give an unauthorized character to the undertaking with respect to which the payments are made. I think it is a bad system to continue. Therefore we have

determined upon abandoning it entirely and confining ourselves to the giving simply of straight subsidies. We propose that the amount which will go to all companies shall be \$3,200 per mile, but we have also provided—not, as seems to be the impression in some quarters, that any railway which has cost a sum in excess of \$15,000 shall get the Government subsidy of \$6,400—but we propose that if a railway costs more than \$15,000 it shall get a percentage of the amount in excess of that figure. It shall receive a percentage of the excess over the \$15,000, until it becomes entitled to the full \$6,400, when its right to any further subsidies shall be at an end and the limit reached.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). \$3,200 a mile is to be given a road that cost \$15,000. I would like to know how the Minister arrives at the other result. On anything in excess of \$15,000 the Government is to pay 50 per cent of that excess. It would appear as though the understanding was that a road which cost \$15,000 should receive \$3,200. Why does not the same proportion exist when the cost exceeds \$15,000. Why is it that the Government pays in halves on any excess over \$15,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is pretty difficult, the hon. gentleman will acknowledge, to lay down any rule of application which will be either a mathematical or scientific or logical or perhaps even equitable in its application to all railways. That would be an utter impossibility. There was no attempt to apply any principle at all in time past as respects the subsidies to railways, and we are making an effort to lay down a principle which will be of universal application and which will, at all events, be clear so far as its application under the like conditions is concerned. I cannot say to the committee that the limit of \$15,000 is one which the highest wisdom would select or which all wisdom would agree upon as the limit that ought to be fixed up to which the subsidy of \$3,200 should apply, and beyond which the increase should apply, but we had to fix some limit and it struck us that \$15,000 would be as near an approach to what is fair and reasonable in its general application as we could select. The sum of \$15,000, we thought, very fairly approached the outside limit of the average cost of an ordinary road, and I am inclined to think that our judgment in that regard will be found to agree with that of nearly all hon. gentlemen opposite.

I think hon. gentlemen will admit that a railway enterprise in one part of Canada, which is deserving and likely to be expensive, is entitled to receive the same liberal consideration as a railway enterprise in any other part of Canada. Locality ought not to give any particular undertaking, any preference or advantage over another, providing there is merit in the undertaking. Political influence ought not to operate as the sole

Mr. BLAIR.

criterion. And when I say political influence, I do not mean it in a general sense, but in an individual sense. If I have influence with my colleagues or if any hon. member has strong influence with the Government, he should not be in the position of being able to go the Government to give a \$6,000 or possibly a \$10,000 subsidy for a railway he desires to have constructed in his county, and for which otherwise he would only receive a smaller subsidy. It is no reason why the Government should ask Parliament to give a \$6,400 or \$10,000 subsidy to a railway because an hon. member, who is pushing its claims has a strong pull. It is not on a principle of that kind that I think the railway bonuses of this country should be given. We ought to establish a principle which properly enforced, will work out, not the same measure of equity in all cases, but which will, in the main, be fairer to all concerned and enable the Government to meet all applications upon the same basis. What do I find has been the case in the past? Glancing over the amounts of bonuses given to railways, I find the greatest disparity existing between the amounts given to some and the amounts given to other roads, without there being any real tangible substantial reasons given why any such distinctions should exist. I find that \$3,200 subsidy has been the amount generally given, but I find also that railways, whose construction was not one whit more expensive than many of those which received the \$3,200 subsidy, and were not one whit more entitled to consideration, received larger subsidies—some \$5,000, some \$5,161, others \$6,000 and \$6,400, and some \$12,000. The amounts range all the way from \$3,200 up to \$12,000, and I defy any hon. gentleman to distinguish some of these different enterprises as regards their cost and value.

Now, there is one thing which I think the laying down of a fixed rule, of a plain, clear principle, will tend to accomplish. Hon. members know that there is not a railroad enterprise promoted in any quarter of Canada that is not considered in that particular quarter, as having as great if not greater merit than any railroad enterprise in any other part of the country. The fact, that people feel, honestly feel, that way and act upon that idea leads and naturally leads, to discontent, when they find that their valuable and important undertaking is to be put off with a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, while another no better, or more meritorious, gets a subsidy of \$8,000 or \$10,000 a mile. Is it not the part of wisdom that the Government should entrench itself, if possible, behind some principle where it can meet all these claims and say: We are dealing with your road upon the same principle as we apply to others, we may not have hit upon the very line of perfection in the figures we have made, but we give you exactly the same treatment that we mete out to other appli-

cants for railway subsidies. I feel, and the Government feels, that it is an immense advantage to have some safe ground of principle upon which you can stand, and we think we have discovered it and have embodied it in the propositions now under consideration by the committee. And we believe that in applying them there is no reasonable ground for assuming that Parliament will be asked to contribute any more aid to railways, on the whole, than it has given under this go-as-you-please method that has hitherto been acted upon. We believe that the great majority of railways that are likely to be built with the assistance of the Government will be built at a rate inside of \$15,000 a mile. And we say there will be no inducement for the railway company to spend more than \$15,000 per mile upon its road, if the road can be adequately completed for less, for the simple reason that no capitalist is going to spend \$1,000 for the sake of getting back \$500. We are only giving 50 per cent of the excess beyond \$15,000, and unless the undertaking is one that the construction of which requires a larger expenditure—absolutely requires it for its completion—it is not at all probable that this limit of \$15,000 will be exceeded. There will be no inducement, so far as I can see, to exceed this sum. And we have supplemented the proposal with another to which probably exceptions may be taken in some quarters as an unreasonable burden to impose upon the railways—the condition that any company getting the \$6,400 subsidy or anything in excess of \$3,200 shall be bound to carry Her Majesty's mails free for a long term of years. I trust that this proposal will commend itself to the approval of Parliament. I trust it will commend itself to our friends opposite. While Oppositions are ordinarily very critical of anything the Government does, there seems to be a remarkable degree of unanimity when it comes to railway subsidies, which, usually have aroused very little opposition, at all events, that is my impression upon the subject. I hope that the proposal in this form will commend itself to the judgment of Parliament, and I do not think that there is any good reason to anticipate that there will be more than a very limited number of railways which are included in the list now before the committee which will be likely to call for anything more than the minimum subsidy. There is one that, unquestionably, calls for it. That is the railway in the Rainy River country. There possibly may be others, but I am not, at the moment, aware that there will be. But I think that I can safely assure the committee that they will be exceedingly limited in number and are not likely to include any roads which are not meritorious and which ought not to receive the sum we are proposing to give them.

Now, the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) asked me a fair question which I must answer before I sit down, and that is how we propose to apply the percentage in excess of the \$15,000 per mile. That question has caused us a good deal of consideration and we think we have incorporated in this resolution all the precautions that can be devised or that are necessary in order to make sure that the spirit and intent of the resolution is being carried out. We provide, in the first place, that there shall be no subsidy beyond the \$3,200 per mile unless we are satisfied not only that there has been an expenditure in excess of the \$15,000 in the construction of the road, but that it has been an actual and not merely a fictitious expenditure, and not only an actual but a necessary expenditure. We require that the chief engineer of the Railway Department and the Governor in Council shall be satisfied that there has been an actual, proper and necessary expenditure beyond the \$15,000 per mile before the maximum subsidy, or any part of it, shall be applied to the road. We provide that the chief engineer shall make or shall cause to be made, a proper inspection and investigation as to the case. It may be the opinion of some hon. gentlemen that we are imposing a very large and onerous duty upon the department. Well, we would be imposing a very onerous duty upon the department if my conjecture with regard to the number of roads costing over \$15,000 were unfounded and a great many railways were likely to come within the maximum clause.

I have said that I think very few of them would be entitled to the maximum amount, and it is because I think so that I do not regard the duty which it is proposed to impose upon the department as very onerous. I think there is likely to be no difficulty or, at all events, none of an insurmountable character, arising in working out this provision in the clause. I think the chief engineer will be able to satisfy himself, not necessarily by a personal inspection of the road, but by an inspection of the road by some member of the staff of engineers who have to report under the past system, in order to entitle the company to be paid these subsidies. When such report is furnished, if it is found that a claim is being made upon an alleged expenditure by reason of an expenditure which from the general knowledge of the country, which the chief engineer or his staff would have, or the knowledge of the country which the department would have, appears to be excessive, then an inspection would require to be made, and then we would have to be supplied with reliable data to satisfy us that all these conditions as to the actual, and necessary, character of this outlay, are satisfied. Now, this report will pass through the hands of the Minister for the time being, and then would be laid before the Governor in Council, seems to me

to supply about all the protection which Parliament would consider necessary to secure the proper working out of this principle.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words, first, with regard to the principle of subsidizing railways. Evidently, the Minister of Railways is not as well informed with regard to the platform laid down by one wing of his party, the Patrons, as some of the Ontario members are, or he could not have adopted this platform without putting himself in direct violation to theirs, because the Patron platform opposes subsidies to all railways. Several prominent members of the Liberal party, when we went to the country last time, acknowledged in public that they endorsed the platform of the Patrons, and stated that they had been fighting for their platform for years. Now, one plank of that was no subsidies to railways. Notably, I think, the Postmaster General publicly declared several times that the platform of the Reform party and that of the Patrons were practically the same.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman has any statements of mine of that kind, I should be glad to have him produce them; if not, I should request him to qualify his observations.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not got them under my hand, but I am sure I read them, and that I can find them in the "Farmers' Sun."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman never read any utterances of mine to that effect. He may have read statements that I had said so, but I never uttered them. I will say that I sympathize with many of the planks of the Patron platform, including that with regard to railway subsidies, but in regard to which I expressly said that each application of that kind should be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. SPROULE. I never happened to notice that portion of his speech, but I certainly have noticed speeches made by himself and by other members of the party acknowledging that the platform of the Patrons was practically the same platform as that of the Liberals, and that they were all fighting for the same things. Now, I do not agree with the Patrons in that plank of their platform, because I am strongly of opinion now, as I always have been, that portions of the country where they have no railways are entitled to Dominion subsidies for that purpose. Next, the Minister of Railways said that it is of equal importance to build a railway in one part of the country as in another part, and that they should all be supported upon the principle that a railway in one part of the country was just as much entitled to a subsidy as it was in another. Now, I do not agree with that view. I hold that in sections of the country which

Mr. BLAIR.

are remote from a railway, where they have not a railway communication within reasonable distance, they are entitled to a larger grant than another section of the country in convenient access to a railway. Does the Minister of Railways believe that a section of the country where there is no railway within fifty miles is not more entitled to Government assistance than another section of the country where there is a railway within ten, or fifteen, or twenty miles, or does he believe that in both cases the same bonus should be given?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that is a consideration which it is very proper to take into account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How could that be expressed in a resolution?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it is of equal value and equal importance to build a railway in one part of the country as in another, and, therefore, the subsidy should be the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I failed to make myself clear. I had in my mind the different portions of Canada, the eastern and western portions; I did not have in mind any close divisions of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that he laid that down as a principle in contradistinction to the principle laid down by the late Government, of giving a larger subsidy to a railway in one locality than another.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It depended then upon the amount of pull that the applicants might have.

Mr. SPROULE. If it was based upon those grounds, then there would be no justification; but if it is based on the needs of a locality, I think the principle is sound. Take some portion of Ontario, for instance. Take the Rainy River district, where settlement is not thick enough so that municipal bonuses can be raised to aid in building railways, and they have no other resources except selling bonds. It is important in a case like that, that the Government should give a larger bonus than they would to build a railway say from here to Kingston, the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway, for instance. The region through which this railway passes is old-settled and wealthy, as compared with Rainy River district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The railway you instance is a revote.

Mr. SPROULE. No matter whether it is a revote or not, I am talking about the principle.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The principle in respect to that road is being conceded by Parliament, and the money has been voted.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The hon. gentleman fails to understand my argument. I am trying to show that the principle laid down by the Minister of Railways is not sound when he said that one railway needs aid as much as another.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think that I stated it in that broad way. I said that railways of equal merits, because they were in different localities, ought not to stand, necessarily, upon a different footing.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, and the correction makes it satisfactory, because I hold that in granting subsidies, regard should be had to the remoteness of a locality from railway facilities. Now, then, I may say a word in regard to the calculation as to how we shall ascertain whether a railway has cost more than \$15,000 or not. I do not know whether I understood the hon. gentleman correctly in his statement as to that. Does the amount of \$15,000 include the equipment?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, the building alone.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The Minister said, "We have our engineers at our command; we have the records of the embankments and cuttings and other proofs as to what the road has cost." Suppose a railway company that was building a road put before the Minister an account of actual expenditure for the building of that railway and that it was above \$15,000 or up to \$20,000 or \$25,000 a mile, would the Minister and his colleagues accept that as a correct statement of the cost of the railway?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I presume if an account of that kind was submitted, the chief engineer would look into it, and looking into it he could form a judgment as to whether or not the prices were excessive or reasonable, as to whether the quantities were excessive or reasonable, as to whether the work which had been done was necessary and proper, or unnecessary. On the whole, looking into the matter, he would form a judgment as to whether or not the statement was a reasonable one to be accepted. He would subject this statement to close inquiry, particularly if there were to be founded upon it a demand for an additional amount of subsidy.

**Mr. SPROULE**. I take it that that would involve a re-examination or re-engineering of the whole work because you would have to deal with quantities and other details.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The plans filed in the depart-

ment would disclose to us the quantities, the earth, the masonry, the rock and embankment cuttings, &c.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Am I correct in supposing that the Minister would have regard to the actual amount that is put into the railway or would the company give you an account of the bonds sold?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That would not affect the question of the cost of the road.

**Mr. SPROULE**. From municipal bonuses or from whatever source you got the money, you would have to show that the money went into the railway?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

**Mr. SPROULE**. I can understand that it would be possible to make out a larger cost than the actual cost of the railway. In regard to the amount of bonuses, I understand that the minimum amount of the railway resolutions will be \$3,863,928, and that the maximum amount, if you go to the limit of the resolutions, will be \$7,727,850. Under these circumstances, we can fairly assume that the country is committed to an expenditure of \$7,727,850.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Has the hon. member calculated how much that would actually come to per mile? That comes to nearly \$22,000 per mile.

**Mr. SPROULE**. The only source of information we have at our command as to the cost of railways is Poor's Manual of Railways. I remember going over it carefully a few years ago, and the information I derived from it was that the average cost of railways at that time in Canada was over \$21,000 a mile, while the average cost in the United States was over \$35,000 a mile. If we left out a few railways in Canada the average cost is increased to \$29,000 a mile.

**Mr. LISTER**. That would include the Grand Trunk Railway, which cost over \$80,000 a mile.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman remember whether it includes the St. Charles branch, which cost \$125,000 a mile?

**Mr. SPROULE**. I do not remember, because I did not go into an analysis of the railways, but the amount which I have stated was given as the average cost of railways in Canada, and if that was so at the time for which the statement was made we may reasonably assume that railways will cost nearly as much to-day. I will assume that it will cost more than \$15,000 a mile, and that will call for the subsidy above \$3,200 a mile. There is no

doubt that in many cases the cost would be \$20,000 or \$25,000 a mile. Then the Government would have to consider how far they were exercising that stringent economy about which they have talked so much in this House and in the country. In regard to the railways that are aided in the different localities I have nothing to say, because I have not analysed that branch of the subject with sufficient care to enable me to intelligently speak upon it. I will call attention to this fact, however, that there is a proposal to spend as much money in sections of the country where they have good railway facilities as in localities where they have no railway facilities. That should not be the case. I think that in certain localities such as in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, they do not deserve aid because they have railways all through those portions of the country. The country has made a large expenditure already in giving these portions of the country railway facilities and these bonuses are intended to provide railways for localities where there are no railroad lines within fifty or a hundred miles. It is proposed to give the Drummond County Railway a subsidy, although it is quite close to the Grand Trunk Railway. It is proposed to give that road the same amount as any other. Then, again, take the railway from Ottawa to Cornwall. It is proposed to give this railway a subsidy notwithstanding the fact that we have the Canada Atlantic and the Brockville and Ottawa Railways going over practically the same ground.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) have any objection to subsidizing these roads two or three years ago?

Mr. **SPROULE.** Yes, I opposed it then, and I oppose it now. I always held that where you have another road within a reasonable distance, you should not subsidize these roads.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Did the hon. gentleman object when the proposals were made then?

Mr. **SPROULE.** Yes, I did object. I have taken a consistent position in regard to this question. I held then, I hold now, that we should not put the country to an expenditure for railways in localities where they already have railway facilities. It is not justifiable to make an expenditure of this kind in localities where they have railway facilities, and to that extent I condemn these resolutions and because I find that there are a great many cases they propose to subsidize lines in localities already provided with railway facilities, but I will support them in so far as they propose facilities for districts now without them.

Mr. **SPROULE.**

### After Recess.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 147) to amend the Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the province of Quebec—(from the Senate)—(Sir Louis Davies.)

### POST OFFICE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. **FOSTER.** This is a very important section, and it makes so generic a change in the administration, that it requires a great deal of serious and careful thought. The change is of such a nature that it should be well considered by the House. Every one will admit, that it is impossible to give this close consideration to a measure which touches all parts of the Dominion and in which no constituency is uninterested, at this stage of the session. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) seems to have had no valid excuse for deferring this legislation until this late hour. Here we are within a day or two of the prorogation of Parliament as we believe; probably only twenty or thirty members are here, and the larger part of the constituencies are unrepresented. This consideration alone ought to deter the Postmaster General from attempting to press this legislation through the House, under the circumstances. There are some kinds of legislation which refer simply to localities, but this touches every constituency in the Dominion, and the representative of each constituency has a right to be heard in regard to it. If the Postmaster General does not think that he ought to defer to that argument, it becomes the duty of these few who remain to make their protest against such legislation, at such a period of the session, and to conserve as far as possible the rights of their fellow-members. There are two different clauses in the Bill which claim the attention of the House; one being a complete change in the system of awarding contracts, but that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) wishes to allow remain for the time being—the other refers to the reorganization of the Railway Mail Department. This part of the Bill gives the Postmaster General power to appoint a controller, such superintendents as may be necessary all over the Dominion, and it confers upon him

the very wide power also, to appoint such other employees as may from time to time be found necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the branch.

This latter clause gives the Minister, to all intents and purposes, power to constitute a new branch of the service. The Post Office Department is an immense one at the present time, with a large number of employees at Ottawa and many others scattered throughout all the constituencies of the Dominion. At a period when the finances of the country are not in the most flourishing state to say the least; when the demands upon them are such as were never before made during the same period by any Government, under ordinary circumstances, and in accordance with a general desire, theoretically expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, for economy in the administration of the different departments at least; it does not seem to be opportune to give to the Postmaster General power to establish a new branch of the service, and to engage such additional employees as he may think necessary. There is, therefore, the additional objection to this measure on the ground of economy. The Postmaster General has not matured his plans with reference to it, and when he was asked the other day incidentally, as to whom he might employ he had but a very indefinite idea.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I had not an indefinite idea.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not know how many he might have to appoint, nor whom he would appoint, but he reserved that for future consideration. Then, he proposes to place over all of these a controller. That officer, I think he gave the House to understand, was to be somebody of experience taken from the service. With an appointment of that kind, once the legislation was adopted, I would have no particular objection, because it would be fair to appoint such a man, with a fullness of knowledge in the actual work of the service. That would not be in its widest sense a political appointment, although my hon. friend would have a perfect right to choose from amongst those capable and qualified, one of his own political persuasion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not done so, though.

Mr. FOSTER. But there are one or two considerations with reference to the organization of this office in the hands of the Postmaster General. It takes all the railway mail clerks out of the category of those named under the civil service law and commissioners. Heretofore, the officers in that branch of the department, as in every other, had this guarantee of permanence, that they were to be examined and their merit proved by a non-partisan body, by the same body that had charge of this work in connection with the whole civil service, and

certain examinations passed and their work done fairly, they had a certain guarantee of permanence, which under the present arrangement they will no longer have. In section 123, the duties of the new Controller are set forth. He is

To have control over the superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees in such branch in the discharge of the duties from time to time assigned to them by the controller, and to deal with all breaches or neglect of duty, with power to suspend such persons for such breaches or neglect of duty or other sufficient cause, during the pleasure of the Postmaster General.

The power given to him is a large power. He has power absolute over all those employees for certain defined conduct, and then a clause is added, providing for that or other sufficient causes—and a sufficient cause would be, I suppose, which would commend itself to the Controller in his recommendation to the Minister, and which would be approved by the Minister; further, there is to be a certain examination of the railway mail clerks under the Controller, and the reports of these examinations are subject, of course, to the recommendations and decision of the Controller. This gives the Controller a very wide power indeed, and I think it introduces a possibility of a Minister making a great many disposals of persons who may not be grateful to him in a political sense. The very possibility of that being introduced, damages the service. At the present time there is a remote possibility of that kind, and only a remote one. The railway mail clerk, in the first instance, has to pass the civil service examination in order to qualify for eligibility, and, in the next place, he has to get the admission to the service, at which point the political part of our service comes in. Whatever party is in power takes these recommendations of its supporters, and the rule is, and, I suppose, always will be while we have party politics, that those recommendations will be for the adherents of that political party. While we have party government, we can scarcely object to that, so long as meritorious men receive these offices. Once a man has gained admission, however, to the service, and becomes a railway mail clerk, then he is as far as possible removed from political control, and from the difficulties involved in political control. If he attends to his work properly, he can hardly be dismissed by any Government which wishes to retain its reputation for fair dealing and for fair government in this country. Of late, of course, a new crime has been imported, that of political partisanship; and if the unfortunate individual has happened in an unguarded moment to make an expression which may be tortured into an indication that he has a leaning to a certain party, or, worse still, suppose some member of Parliament makes the assertion to a Minister that he is quite con-

vinced that such and such a person has been an offensive political partisan, then, without trial, without being asked to rebut the charge, on the ground of this new political offence, the unhappy railway mail clerk or other employee may be dismissed. These are contingencies which he has to meet; this is a gauntlet he has to run; and it is quite severe enough for the civil service, without importing into it a new organization under the partisan methods which have already been carried out by this Government, in perhaps the mildest phase which it has yet assumed; because, from the back benches, we find very strong and very influential supporters of the Government telling them, if not to their faces, certainly to their backs, that they have not gone half fast enough. We had the expression from two members of Parliament, not long ago, with reference to the canals, that they would not rest satisfied until the canals had been entirely cleaned out, that is, free from Conservative labourers. Their ground of attack was, that the Ministers were too good-natured, that they had some bowels of compassion which they allowed now and then to be stirred, and had retained some Conservative employees; but, said these stalwarts, that is not what ought to be, and we advertise the Ministers that we will not rest content until the last vestige, not of protection, but of Conservative officialdom, shall be wiped out from such works as the Lachine Canal and others they had in view. So that you are importing into the service, and a most important part of the service, a Controller having the power of life and death, with yearly examinations, and reporting upon those yearly examinations to the Minister, who, however strongly humanitarian and sympathetic, he may be if left to himself, is to a certain extent at the mercy of his followers, and these pressing with a strong and ardent desire to have the last vestige of Conservative officials cleaned out from the public service of the country. This Bill furnishes a strong temptation for the dismissal of any of these railway mail clerks who may come within the area of the dislike of any member of Parliament or defeated candidate or office seeker, who wishes and believes that any place vacant will be filled up by some one who is of the right faith, a supporter of the party in power. Now, before we enter upon a course of that kind, it is well that we should at least take that course in cold blood, with all the members present, so that we may have really the voice of this House and the voice of Parliament. I therefore protest against the passage of this Bill for three reasons. First, that it has been delayed until this is no Parliament in reality. In the second place, because it is legislation which affects every constituency, and consequently the members representing these constituencies ought to have an opportunity of looking into this

Mr. FOSTER.

at a time when they are attending to their public duties. And in the third place, because it opens up possibilities, which, to my mind, are better not opened at the present juncture. Later, when this thirst for Conservative blood, speaking officially, shall have been to a certain extent slaked, when the veins of these office seekers shall have been cooled, when the fever is a little gone out of them, and the more normal temperature obtained by years in office shall have brought about a calmer and juster appreciation of existing conditions, the Postmaster General might bring up such a measure as this. At such a period to open up such a door as this would not cause such quakings of fear and tremblings of heart as I am sure this measure does on this side of the Horse at least. And perhaps it would be just as well for the adherents and followers of the Ministers, if they are not sufficient in themselves to restrain this desire, that the door should be kept, to a certain extent, closed, because even the best of Grits, as well as the best of Tories, are liable to yield to temptation, and if they see an opening for the dismissal of their opponents and the replacing of them by their own friends, they are very likely to yield to the temptation. So much with reference to that part of the subject, dealing with it not so much in detail as on principle.

With reference to the fifth section, of course when we come to that, the objections I have to it I shall state, in so far as they influence me. These are the reasons why I commend to the Postmaster General, whether it is not better for him, at this advanced stage of the session, not to press his Bill, but allow us to go on with the absolutely necessary measures which, we supposed, must be got through with before we adjourn. We had before us this afternoon, the railway subsidies. We simply had a discussion upon the principle, and I think the House might now take up the discussion again on these subsidies, whilst so many of us are here as now remain, because when Monday and Tuesday come there will still be fewer present. Surely, it would be wise and reasonable for my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, to push on this important matter of the railway subsidies, in which millions of dollars are involved, and allow trifling and unnecessary legislation to stand over. For some reason, my hon. friend the Postmaster General has intervened with this measure, and we are asked, on the last evening we shall be present in anything like even a quarter full array in this House, to waste the time of the House in discussing this unnecessary and vexatious measure. We are now fagged out. We have been sitting continually from 11 o'clock in the morning through the night, and it will take us until Monday or Tuesday to get through what is really necessary legislation. How many of us will be here on these days? Now that a quasi arrange-

ment has been agreed upon that we shall get through the business, if possible, by Monday evening, every one knows that as many members as possible will go to their homes. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite had to prevail on members who support them to stay here until to-day. I know that we have had to use argument on this side. Why then should this Bill intervene now, when we have only this partial array present, and leave over important legislation till Monday when we will be still further depleted. I think I have good ground for appealing to the Postmaster General to be merciful if he is strong. I think I may appeal to him to temper his imperial strength with charitable and merciful feelings towards a hard worked House of Commons which, for the last ten days through daylight and darkness, has been sitting from 11 o'clock on the one day until the small hours of morning of the next. During these long hours and days we have remained in the House registering some very wicked propositions, doing the best we could to fight what is bad and help what is good, but none the less wearied because we have accomplished something in this direction. I think the whole House would be satisfied if my hon. friend would weigh well these representations and defer this legislation until next session, and allow the Minister of Railways to go on with what is really of great importance, and which ought not to have been delayed until these dying hours.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot congratulate the hon. Postmaster General on his persistency in bringing forward his Bill before the House at this stage of the session. I have no doubt, from the amount of energy that he has displayed in pressing it, that he must consider it a very important Bill, and it is because it is of such importance that I join with my hon. friend who has just spoken in requesting him not to press his Bill at the present moment. I have no object in opposing its passage except that I do not believe it is a measure which should receive the approval of Parliament. I have stated on more than one occasion the reason why. The measure is one fraught with danger to the department over which my hon. friend presides. I do not believe that we should pass any measure which will remove from the control of Parliament the appointments to a department and leave them within the absolute control of any Minister, however perfect that Minister may be.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman point out one clause of the Bill that proposes to do that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) to section 2:

When, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the lowest tender received after public advertisement—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not under discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) was not here when we began to discuss this Bill. Clause 1 has been adopted; clause 2 stands for the moment; clause 3 stands; clause 4 has been adopted, and we are now on clause 5—section 119 under clause 5.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I regret that I was not here when the Bill first came up for the consideration of the House this evening. I understood, from the information I received, that clause 2 was kept in abeyance, but was open to discussion still. If I am not in order in discussing it at the present moment, I am quite willing to wait until the Chairman decides that the proper time has come for me to offer my objections to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. Postmaster General had agreed that, on account of the absence of the hon. gentleman, we should proceed with clause 5.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, Sir, I will take clause 5. This clause is an innovation upon the law, and it is manifest that it involves an increased expenditure in the department. As I have been able to understand the policy of the hon. gentleman from those newspapers that are supposed to be the organs of the Liberal party, he sought to make reductions in the expenditure and expressed the opinion that, under the old regime, if I may so call it, the expenditure of the department was very much larger than it should be. Where is the indication that the hon. gentleman wants to remedy the evil which he has pointed out to Parliament and to the public? We are not yet told how the hon. gentleman wishes to distribute the salaries, but we can see that there are important positions that he is going to give to several of the new nominees, and the salaries must be considerably increased, thus increasing the expenditure of the department. He is creating a controller and superintendents. Up to this moment this work has been carried on by the inspectors, who not only inspected this branch, but inspected post offices generally. Now a number of new officers are to be employed, increasing to a very large extent the number of employees, who are already supposed to be, as the hon. gentleman has stated, too numerous already. Are the inspectors going to be entirely relieved of the duty of looking after the mail clerks and the mail service? From my experience in the department, I do not believe that there is any advantage in centralization; but it seems to be the policy of the present Postmaster General to centralize as much as possible. The hon. gentleman wishes to dispense with the advice of Parliament in establishing the new offices under this Bill. The Controller is to be the head of the branch. I would like to

know how many officials are going to be placed under his authority to work the branch, and, if these officers are under the Controller's authority, what is to become of the inspectors, who are to be relieved of this duty of looking after the mail clerks? The inspectors, from the nature of their position, are better able to look after the mail clerks than any official in the department. Their duty calls for them to travel throughout their several districts, and it seems to me natural to suppose that their experience gives them a knowledge of the department and of the needs of the service that can be used to a greater practical advantage than that of a controller with headquarters at Ottawa. But I see that the hon. gentleman wishes to complete that organization by placing under the authority of the Controller, superintendents and other officials, who will be doing the duty which, so far, has been perfectly done, in my judgment, by the inspector and by the organization that exists at present. It seems that superintendents are to be established "at points to be determined by the head of the department." Always "by the head of the department," "and such other employees as are, from time to time, necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the branch." This is manifestly increasing the expenditure, and I do not see how greater efficiency can be secured by the change which the hon. gentleman is anxious to introduce. It is further provided:

The Governor in Council may appoint to such branch an officer to be called the Controller of the Railway Mail Service of Canada, together with such superintendents of mail clerks, transfer agents—

I do not quite understand that "transfer agents" may be; they do not exist at the present time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, they do. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to explain? I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman not knowing, though he was at the head of the department for years. A transfer agent is an agent who remains at the railway stations and see that the mails are safely transferred from one train to the other. For example, in the city of Toronto, the hon. gentleman may not be aware of it, he had agents appointed under the Civil Service Act, and it was their duty to see that the through mails were properly transferred from one train to the other.

Mr. MILLS. They were called mail-carriers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, they are called mail-transfer agents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see any such officer named in the Post Office Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are such.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman need not be surprised that I did not know any of these transfer agents. I am surprised that he should be surprised that I never heard of them. The hon. gentleman has explained that the official who did that duty under the Act was never called a transfer agent. The hon. gentleman can run over the whole Post Office Act before he finds any officer designated by that name.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to section 29 of the Civil Service Act he will find provision there for a large number of officials, not merely of the postal service, but of other branches, messengers, sorters, packers, letter carriers, mail transfer agents, box collectors. Then on page 98 of the Civil Service List he will find Richard Dagg, under the head of the London division of the post office, mail transfer agent, date of appointment, 26th June, 1893. The hon. gentleman says he never heard of one, yet the hon. gentleman appointed a man named Kavanagh mail transfer agent at Brockville about two years ago.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I still state that in so far as the transfer agents are concerned, if they do exist, they certainly do not perform the duties which the hon. gentleman has stated, because when a train comes into a station the mail carrier, the man who has got the contract, is the man who must look after the transfer of mails from that train to another train, or to the post office. They are merely letter carriers, nothing else. Now, as to the transfer from one branch of the civil service to another, that is a point which has led to discussion on more than one occasion, and the reason is that in the administration of the department it has been the practice under several Postmasters General to make the promotions in the various classes. Promotions from one branch to another branch have always been opposed by the experts in the department and they have resisted them under very strong pressure. The Post Office Department is more technical than almost any other, and there are branches in that department the duties of which are absolutely separate from those of any other branch. Take, for instance, the money order branch, take the dead letter branch, it is impossible to take from one of those branches one man and transfer him to another where the work is quite different, without considerably interfering with the efficiency of the service. These promotions so far have been made within the various branches, and I express the opinion that it would be a great mistake to change what so far has been the rule in the department, and to make promotions from one branch to another, irrespective of the rule which has prevailed and which was always followed, so far as my experience goes,

namely, to make the promotions within the branches, and not to take a man in one branch and to give him promotion in another branch. That is one of the reasons why I think that the change now contemplated would not be at all an improvement. I still believe that in these expiring days of the session, in view of the importance of this measure, it would be a great mistake to insist upon its being passed at the present moment. I think that the hon. gentleman, if he held over this Act until the next session, with the experience which he is fast acquiring in the different branches of the department, he would be in a better position to lay before Parliament a measure more complete, and less antagonistic than this one seems to be to the rules which have been followed in the Post Office Department. I do not think it will be an improvement. I think it will cause a large addition to the expenditure of the department. I think the new office of controller which is being created by the hon. gentleman, will necessitate a duplication of the different officers who so far, under the inspectors, have been able to carry out the work efficiently, and to the satisfaction of the public and of the department. I do not recollect that the hon. gentleman has given any reason that can be appreciated as satisfactory for the change by the House of Commons at this time. I do not see that the changes contemplated can improve the efficiency of the service, and I see that they must increase considerably the expense, without giving any better service to the public, or giving more control to the department over the branch in which the hon. gentleman wishes to make the change. The inspectors, so far, have fulfilled their duty in a very satisfactory manner, and I do not believe that the work they are called upon to do has increased to such an extent that this additional expense should be laid upon the country for the purpose of creating those new offices.

Mr. SPROULE. I wanted to ask the Postmaster General if he could give any opinion regarding the number of superintendents that he would be likely to require to appoint?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No superintendent can be appointed without first obtaining a vote from Parliament. No superintendent appointed will be a new official, but he will be one of the existing staff who has acquired experience in the service. There will be no additional expense incurred by the appointment of a superintendent, because he will simply be a transferee from some other office in the mail service. So that no matter how many there are there cannot be any more offices than there are at present. I would tell the hon. gentleman how many there are engaged in this task. There is one in the city of Hal-

fax, another in the city of St. John, another in the city of Quebec, another in the city of Montreal, another in Ottawa, another in Toronto, another in London, one in Winnipeg and one in Vancouver. None of these are new appointments. They are simply men transferred from other branches of the railway mail service, men who will give good service or, at least, it is hoped they will. I have taken no part whatever in the choice of the staff. They have been chosen for me by those in the service who know their qualifications best. The Controller was recommended to me by the highest executive officer under the deputy. He is not of my political party. The superintendents have been chosen on the advice of the controller, and I think the chief superintendent. I have not done what has been suggested, made the appointments on political grounds. For example, the superintendent in the city of Ottawa is Mr. Charles Plumb, who has been a strong Conservative in the past, though I do not suppose he is now. I confirmed the recommendation for his appointment because he was recommended as the best available man for this office.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to get some more information about this matter. I would like to disabuse the hon. gentleman's mind of the impression that I am trying to make any political capital out of what he has done. What I want to know is what additional expense this will entail?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will not entail any additional expense; on the contrary, I expect that it will result in the substantial reduction in the expense. Not only that, but it will promote greater efficiency. I submit that the arrangement is absolutely necessary for the efficient working of the railway mail service, as well as for its strict economical administration. I would not wish to be bound to a statement to-night as to the extent to which this system will produce economy, but I think that, after it has been enforced a few months it will commend itself to every one who desires to see the best service given to the country and, at the same time, to have the treasury properly safeguarded. There will be no increase; on the contrary, it will result in a substantial reduction.

Mr. MILLS. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that the superintendents have already been appointed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, temporarily, by Order in Council, on approbation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has just mentioned that there are superintendents at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, London, Winnipeg and Vancouver. Now, does the hon. gentleman refer to the inspectors or has he made appointments of new officers, called

superintendents, for these different places? When I was in the department we had inspectors in these places. But the inspectors are still existing in these postal districts, and I would like to know if, besides these, the Postmaster General has appointed superintendents.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman appears to forget that the office of superintendent is not a new office at all. There are superintendents to-day, but I will not attempt to educate the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) in the intricacies of his own department. They have been too much for him in the past.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Mail clerk superintendents?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Yes, does the hon. gentleman deny that? I have simply this to say, that I have placed this service under the direction of a controller instead of the local inspectors. It is simply a transfer of the jurisdiction.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I think the arrangement is likely to make an improvement and, to that extent, it is commendable; but, on the other hand, we ought to be careful that we are not making a list of new offices which would entail additional expense to the country. The Minister has assured us that he is using the men now employed in the service, and that there is no additional expense. Of course, that would go a long way towards satisfying us that it was unobjectionable. But when you come to read it you see that "There shall be superintendents." He has mentioned nine places, in each of which there is to be a superintendent. That might imply that you would have new offices or it might only be nine offices that are already in existence. If that were so, it would not be objectionable, but if it meant a case of nine new offices, it would be open to objection. Then it says:

The scale of salaries of clerks and other employees in the offices of the superintendents shall be the same as for clerks in the city post offices.

That would seem to imply that there must be a number of clerks in the superintendents offices. If you have nine superintendents and nine new offices, which would require clerks, there is no question that it would involve the appointment of a large number of new men. If you take men from the railway mail service to fill these offices their places would be required to be filled by persons from the outside, but if it is only meant to apply to officers in the service to-day, and it is simply intended to change their names, it should not be so objectionable. The hon. gentleman says that he will only take the men in the service now. The Bill says, "transfer agents and other employees in the mail service branch," but it does not say that they shall be in that service.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Read section 127:

**Mr. SPROULE:**

Except in British Columbia, no person shall be eligible to be appointed such superintendent unless he has served at least ten years as a railway mail clerk.

That, of course, would necessitate his taking them from the railway mail clerks, but in that branch you would make vacancies which would have to be filled from the outside. It seems to me that, putting this work under a Controller is an improvement upon the present arrangement, from everything I can hear by talking with railway mail clerks and those informed upon it. If it does not mean the creation of a lot of new offices, then it would be unobjectionable on that account. As for the other portions of the Bill, they seem to be workable. It cannot be objectionable if it does not mean the creation of new offices and the appointment of a lot of new men.

**Mr. MILLS.** It may be that the present Postmaster General will declare that there shall be no new officers appointed, but succeeding Postmasters General may see fit to appoint quite a number of superintendents under this Act. I am rather inclined to agree with the last speaker (Mr. Sproule) that it is a good thing to have the post office mail service branch out of the hands of the post office inspector. From what information I could gather, I think it is a popular thing. I believe, however, that these districts for the superintendents should be defined by this Act.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That would never work.

**Mr. MILLS.** If that were done, it would not be at the discretion of a Postmaster General to have as many superintendents as he thought fit.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** You would have to vote the money.

**Mr. MILLS.** Why not put a provision in the Act that the Postmaster General shall not appoint more than are therein stated.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Parliament always has a check in voting the money.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** I wish to ask the Minister if the expression "head of the department" in this clause is supposed by him to be equivalent to "Postmaster General"?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Yes.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** The expression "Postmaster General" is specially used in different sections of the Post Office Act, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that for the sake of uniformity, and to prevent any difficulties that may arise here-

after. it would be better to retain the expression "Postmaster General."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Civil Service Act uses the expression "head of the department."

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is because it is desired to designate the head of any department, but in an Act relating especially to a particular department, the custom is to refer to the head of the department by a particular name, and to adopt that name throughout.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to make the change.

Mr. POWELL. I have failed to discover what section of the statute relates to the duties of superintendents and authorizes their appointment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the Post Office Act are what are called chief clerks, and these are discharging the duties under another name.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was right in telling the Postmaster General that the superintendents did not exist under the Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I supposed that the hon. gentleman knew what duties were being assigned to these.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do, and I say that the duties which the hon. gentleman is assigning to the superintendents are not the duties performed by a chief mail clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think they are.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sure they are not.

Mr. POWELL. If the duties of the superintendents are not laid down by the Act, and even if they were laid down by the Act, they would not apply apparently to this, which is a special department. Serious consequences might arise from this. I presume that the Postmaster General is familiar with some litigation that arose a few years ago in connection with a question somewhat of this kind; I refer to the dismissal of young Waterbury. Under 31 Vic., there was power to appoint post office inspectors. The department undertook to appoint and constitute a new official by the name of the chief post office inspector, and this chief post office inspector was a Mr. Dewe who came down to St. John, N.B., to hold an investigation into certain alleged misconduct on the part of young Waterbury. While the investigation was going on he happened to make some statement in the presence of a third party, and Waterbury sued the chief post office inspector for slander. The matter came before the court in the first instance by way of demurrer, and that case is reported in 3 Pugsley, N.B.

Reports. Our court unanimously held that inasmuch as there were no statutory duties laid down for the chief inspector, and no such officer, therefore Mr. Dewe had no protection and no justification; that communication was not privileged, and he was mulcted severely in costs. This matter afterwards came before the courts on motion for a new trial, when all the facts were given, and this motion for a new trial is reported in 19 N.B. Reports, elaborate judgments having been given by the different judges. Judge Weldon gave a dissenting judgment; the other two judgments being delivered by Mr. Justice Wetmore and Mr. Justice Fisher, the latter of whom was a celebrated jurist, especially in these matters that had a constitutional phase. I see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) casting a significant glance at me, as if this matter had gone up on appeal and a different judgment had been rendered. It did go up on appeal, and, in order to show the House that the judgment on appeal did not at all conflict with the judgment of the lower court, so far as that judgment may apply to the particular case now before the House, I will simply direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that, under the old law, the duties of the inspectors were specifically laid down, and those duties are copied, almost verbatim, into the present law relating to the postal service, that is, chapter 38 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Now, I will read one paragraph from the judgment of Judge Wetmore:

As this action was commenced 24th July, 1875, before the Post Office Act of 1875 came into operation, it must be discussed under 31 Victoria, chapter 10. Section 8 provides for the appointment of the Postmaster General. Section 10 specifies his powers in 18 subsections. Under none of them is reference made as to inquiry or investigations in respect to lost or missing letters, or such as the defendant was engaged in in the present case. By section 14, the Governor may from time to time appoint fit and proper persons to be and to be called "post office inspectors," and to be stationed at such places and exercise their power and perform their duties and functions within such limits respectively as he may from time to time appoint. Subsection 2 particularizes their duties under such instructions as may from time to time be given to them by the Postmaster General,—after specifying a number of other duties, to inquire into complaints of losses of valuable letters, and generally to do all and whatsoever they are from time to time lawfully instructed or required by the Postmaster General. Section 14 applies only to post office inspectors; these are to be appointed by the Governor at any time, and, when so appointed and the limits of their respective districts so fixed, they can legally act under instructions from the Postmaster General, or Deputy Postmaster General, whose appointment is authorized by section 15; but I apprehend there is no power to act until so appointed, and the person so appointed can only act within the limits fixed by the Governor. A report of a Committee of the Privy Council, in reference to the Inspectors' Branch of the Post

Office Department, approved by the Governor General in Council, dated 25th May, 1870, was in evidence, in which Mr. John Dewe (the defendant) was recommended to be appointed Chief Inspector (with station at Ottawa). Under this, it may be presumed, he was appointed, as he says in his evidence he assumed the duties of that office in October, 1870. What the duties of that office are, or under what Act the appointment was made, does not appear.

When the case came before the Supreme Court of Canada, that court held that the fact that Mr. Dewe was appointed and named Chief Post Office Inspector, did not alter the fact that he was a post office inspector, that the wording of the Act applied to him, and that his defence that it was a privileged communication, was a defence that could be supported in law. Mr. Justice Strong, at page 155, vol. vi., Supreme Court Reports, said :

I have no difficulty in determining that the defendant was a duly authorized officer of the Post Office Department, under section 14 of the Act 31 Vic., c. 10. By that Act it is enacted that:

"The Governor may, from time to time, appoint fit and proper persons to be and to be called "post office inspectors," and to be stationed at such places, and exercise their powers to perform their duties and functions within such limits respectively as he may, from time to time, appoint."

I find nothing in this provision to interfere with the power of the Governor General to appoint an inspector with authority to act anywhere within the Dominion, that is to say, with powers coextensive with the limits of the Dominion. There is nothing in the language of this clause making it obligatory to restrict the office to any particular portion of the Dominion; the language is permissive, not imperative. Therefore, in my opinion, the Order in Council of the 25th May, 1870, constituted a valid appointment of the defendant as Chief Inspector for the Dominion. By section 15 of the same Act provision is made for the appointment of a Deputy Postmaster General, who, it is enacted,

"Shall have the oversight and directions of the other officers, clerks, messengers, or servants, and of all persons employed in the postal service, and shall have, under the Postmaster General, the general management of the business of the Department, and his directions shall be obeyed in like manner as the directions of the Postmaster General would be, subject, however, to the control of the latter in all matters whatsoever."

The Postmaster General may say that this clause applies to this particular matter, and that, under subsection "a" of section 123, the necessary protection would be afforded to this officer. However, I will read on :

The defendant acted under express directions from the Deputy Postmaster General in what he did in reference to the investigation at St. John, which resulted in the dismissal of the plaintiff, for the reasons given in the words which are complained of by the plaintiff as defamatory.

And this may support the view which is doubtless entertained by the Postmaster General :

Again, the statute 31 Vic., c. 10, organizing the Post Office Department, is not a disabling but

**Mr. POWELL.**

rather, an enabling statute. It authorizes the Governor General to appoint officers, and may be considered as implying and undertaking by Parliament to provide salaries for officers appointed in accordance with its terms. But it contains nothing taking away from the Governor General the authority which the Crown can always exercise without parliamentary sanction, subject only to a sufficient provision for the payment of the salaries by Parliament, of appointing any officers it may deem necessary for the administrative service of the Dominion, and of defining in regulating to their duties.

The most important judgment was delivered by Chief Justice Ritchie, who takes a different view of the matter from that of Mr. Justice Strong. He says :

I think the law is very clear on that subject. It is for the judge to rule whether the occasion creates privilege. It is clear that defendant was de facto, and I think de jure, in the discharge of a public duty, and the words were spoken while in the discharge of that duty and in reference thereto, to subordinate officers having a corresponding duty; therefore, were privileged.

The result of all the litigation was, that Parliament considered the matter to be one of such gravity and uncertainty that at the very earliest opportunity afterwards it amended the Act; and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 12 of chapter 35, which amends the Act in this way :

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint one or more person or persons to be Chief Inspector or Chief Inspectors of the Post Office Department of Canada, with authority over all or over as many post office inspectors and assistant post office inspectors and their respective districts as the Governor in Council designates, and with such other duties connected with the post offices of Canada as are, from time to time, assigned to him or them by the Postmaster General; and with power in any part of Canada to inquire into and investigate complaints or suspected cases of misconduct or mismanagement, &c.

And the specific duties are enumerated. The Postmaster General will see that, although the result of this litigation was to protect Mr. Dewe from the action that was brought against him by Mr. Waterbury, yet the full investigation of the subject threw considerable doubt on this matter of the protection of the inspector, unless his duties are specifically defined, or unless the Postmaster General or the Governor in Council are authorized to define those duties with particularity; and Parliament was so impressed with this view that it immediately altered the law and authorized the Chief Inspector to be appointed and his duties to be defined. I, therefore, suggest that a clause should be added, defining the duties of this official, so that he will have the protection of the law and will not be rendered liable to suits such as that brought against Mr. Dewe. The Postmaster General, a few moments ago, made an argument, in which he claimed that those individuals who are appointed, are inspectors, irrespective of this

Act altogether. Now, from that construction I expressly dissent, and dissent most strongly. In the first place, I ask the hon. gentleman to look at his own Act. So far from these people being inspectors or superintendents by virtue of former Acts, the office did not exist at all and has no statutory status whatever. Let us see what section 120 says :

The Governor in Council may appoint to such branch an officer to be called "The Controller of the Railway Mail Service of Canada" together with such superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees as are deemed necessary ; and such controller, superintendents, railway mail clerks, transfer agents and other employees may be appointed from among persons now in the civil service.

It is thus entirely a new office and not an old office. Why, the very wording of the hon. gentleman's Bill destroys his contention.

And, in such event, such appointments shall not, within the meaning of "The Civil Service Superannuation Act" or any other Act, be regarded as new appointments, but shall be regarded as mere transfers from one branch of the civil service to another.

Language could not make it clearer. It is entirely a new branch of the service. The duties performed under the previous section are not the duties they were liable to perform under the previous state of affairs at all, but the hon. gentleman has constituted a new and extraordinary office. If these officers are to be protected, they must be protected by statute, and if there is going to be a satisfactory administration of this Act, their duties must be defined by statute or else the substitutory course taken of authorizing the Governor in Council to make regulations

Mr. MILLS. If the superintendent relieves, as I understand he does, the post office inspector of some of his work, and a superintendent is taken from the service, there must of necessity be some work left undone by the superintendent in his former capacity. Then there will be a vacancy which must be filled and will consequently entail an increase of the number of officers. If the inspector is relieved from a portion of his work and that portion is done by the superintendent, and the superintendent is taken from the service, somebody must fill the superintendent's place, and this is all at the discretion of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General may go outside of the service to get the superintendents. The word "may" in this section when it applies to the Postmaster General cannot, by any manner of means, be interpreted as meaning "shall," but he may go outside of the employees of the service to get some one to fill the position of superintendent. I cannot see how that coincides with what the Postmaster General tells us that there is to be no increase of officers. The officers must be in-

creased if this Act is carried out. Now, as regards the number of the superintendents, I suggest that the country be divided into districts. The Postmaster General says that, according to the constitution of the service, that cannot be well accomplished ! I cannot see, if Canada cannot be divided into districts, why the number of superintendents cannot be defined and regulated, so that there will not be too many. I look with suspicion on this measure, and I shall tell the committee why. It looks to me as if it created a sort of congestion of power into the hands of one man, and taking into consideration the fact that in section 3, which will come up for discussion later, the word "four" is struck out in the second line of section 61 of the Postal Act, and the word "eight" substituted, which is an increase of time, this congestion of power and increase of time looks to me as if this Bill were on the same line as laws we passed recently in the province of Nova Scotia. In that province there was passed recently a Railway Act called "the Railway Development Act" or some such name, which gave power to the executive of that province, not only to bonus a road, but also to incorporate it without going to Parliament at all. All the applicants for incorporation have to do is to go to the executive and convince them that a road between certain points is necessary, and they have the financial ability the executive have power to incorporate that road at once, and not only incorporate it but bonus it at the rate of \$3,200 per mile, without going to Parliament at all. This Bill looks very much like these Nova Scotia Acts. Then in Nova Scotia, at the very last session, they extended the duration of Parliament from four years to five years. Instead, therefore, of having an election every four years as formerly, they need only have a general election every five years. It is just as if instead of having a mail contract to last only five years, Parliament shall provide that it shall continue eight years. There was a great cry against the late Government for renewing contracts after the four years had expired, which is their limit of duration under the law. Now, however, when a contract is passed, it will last, by this amendment, not four years but eight years. It is on account of these things that I look with suspicion on this Bill and with that suspicion that amounts to certainty on clause 2 and 3.

In clause 5 there is an element which I am inclined to favour. I think myself that the railway mail service of Canada is of sufficient importance to have it stand separate and apart from the postal service of Canada, but I am inclined to criticise considerably the details of clause 5, and I am of opinion that it would be in the public interest if the Postmaster General would allow the Bill to stand until next session and not force it upon the House at this late stage. The department will suffer no in-

convenience. I understand that the superintendents are appointed all the same. They are there doing their work, notwithstanding the fact that an Act of Parliament has not been passed. Well, if they can go on for a week, surely they can for a few months, and we will then have ample opportunity of thoroughly looking into this matter. I am inclined to agree in the main features of section 5, but some of the details are very objectionable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot say that I concur with my hon. friend that the principle of section 5 is a good one, but as we are more particularly concerned with the details just at present, I would like to point out to the Postmaster General that the language in section 14 is not at all carefully chosen.

Mr. LISTER. We want this well explained.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to direct the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) to this point, and I am sure he would agree with me.

Mr. LISTER. I think very likely.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think if the hon. gentleman will take a copy of the Act and just follow—

Mr. LISTER. I have it here. I am just following you.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman has before him a copy of the Post Office Act as contained in the Revised Statutes, he will find that section 4 reads as follows:—

There shall be at the seat of government of Canada a Post Office Department for the superintendence and management under the direction of the Postmaster General, of the postal service of Canada.

I would suggest that it would be desirable to follow, as far as possible, the same language in creating this branch. The section I have already referred to does not say that there "shall be at the seat of Government of Canada a Post Office Department composed of the Postmaster General." But that is about the language that is used here:

The Governor in Council may establish a branch of the Post Office Department, to be called the Railway Mail Service Branch, to be composed of a controller, with headquarters at Ottawa, superintendents at points to be determined by the head of the department and such other employees as are, from time to time, necessary for the conduct of the business of the branch.

This is followed up by the next section in which it is provided that the Governor in Council may appoint to this branch a number of persons of whom the branch is to be composed. Now, I may say, and to this point I would ask specially the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), that in some of the measures that have been brought down during the

Mr. MILLS.

present session, and in some of the contracts, there does not seem to have been a great deal of care in drafting. For example, in one of the measures brought down it is provided:

The said steamers are \* \* \* except such letters as are not required by law to pass through the post office, the contractors shall not receive or permit to be received or convey on board of a mail ship other letters than those mentioned—

Making very little sense, if grammatically construed.

The said steamers are \* \* \* the terms "mails" to include all boxes, bags—

And so on, which is perfectly meaningless. And it continues in this way through a long series of subsections. And another clause of the same contract says:

The contractors shall and will \* \* \* at the same time they, the said contractors, will give to the Minister a guarantee—

And so on. I have been quoting from the contract for the fast Atlantic line. I did not direct attention to these matters at the time it was before us, because I thought probably a court would spell out what the contract meant. But if any one looks at the third section of the fast Atlantic contract, and also at the first section, and compares the main sections with the subsections, he will see that there is no meaning in them, if they are read according to the ordinary rules of grammatical construction. Something of the same haste or lack of care is manifest in the drafting of this Bill. I would suggest to the Postmaster General that it would be far better to follow the language of section 4 of the Post Office Act and use some such expression as this:

The Governor in Council may establish a branch of the Post Office Department, to be called "The Railway Mail Service Branch," and to be under the direction of a controller to be appointed by the Postmaster General.

I think that would be a much better form of expression and would make the statute much more intelligible. Now, with respect to the words "superintendents," which has been referred to by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), I do not see that term used in the Post Office Act. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mullock) can correct me in that or not. If the word "superintendent" is not used or defined in the Post Office Act, it seems to me quite clear that the office of the superintendent should be defined under subsection 119, or some subsequent subsection of the Act, and the duties of the office should be set forth. Otherwise, the difficulty may arise which my hon. friend from Westmoreland has pointed out. I understand the Postmaster General to state that officers have been appointed who, under the Post Office Act, or by some regulation of the Department are known as superintendents. If so, I have been unable to ascertain just

where the word is defined. But, in any case, as has been pointed out, this statute involves the creation of a new department or the creation of a new branch of the department—to all intents and purposes it is a new department—and it might very well be thought that the word “superintendent,” as defined or used under any regulation of the department, if it is so used, would not have necessarily, the same meaning as under this Act. Therefore, I think it desirable that the Postmaster General should consider this before passing the Act in its present form.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to tell us what the duties of the superintendent are, as there seems to be some misunderstanding in regard to that. I understood him to say that these officers were already appointed. But I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie) sitting to my left that while there is a man in London whom he regards as doing that duty, he has no office but simply goes on to the train and looks after the exchange of the mails. But he has no office and no one under him. But it is clear from the Postmaster General's explanation that this officer is to have a residence at some particular point and an office and is to have clerks under him, because the Bill speaks of “the scale of salaries of clerks and other employees in the offices of the superintendents.” Perhaps the hon. Minister could explain that.

**Mr. BEATTIE.** My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) seems to have misunderstood me. Mr. McWhinney, who fills the position of superintendent at London, as I understand it, has an office up stairs in the post office building, but he has no clerks. His duty is somewhat the same as that of a superintendent. He visits the trains and railway mail clerks going both east and west. He is a very efficient officer, I must say. I may add that the transfer mail agent is an officer known in London for years. He has an office in the railway station and takes charge of the mails as they arrive and transfers them to their proper trains. It seems to me that this is merely putting the railway mail clerks under a new head and giving the present officers the different name of superintendents. So far as London is concerned both those positions mentioned in the Bill exist already. I think it is merely putting the department of railway mail clerks under a different head and making a new comptroller.

**Mr. SPROULE.** If that is the case, and it is the same man, and he is now named a superintendent, will the Postmaster General give us some explanation as to what additional duties he is expected to perform, which will necessitate the employment of other hands?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I am only too glad to give any explanation. The

Controller has certain duties assigned to him, as the hon. gentleman sees by reference to the Bill, and the superintendents are his agents, to assist to carry out those duties. If he has a staff to assist him, of course, their duties are those that are assigned to the branch. The general Post Office Act says that the Postmaster General may, subject to the limitations of the Act, assign duties to various officers, and that Act places railway mail clerks under local inspectors. That has not worked well; it has been an expensive and a cumbersome system, wholly against the public interest. This is a transfer of the most important branch of the service and placing it under direct control of the head of the branch.

**Mr. SPROULE.** What new duties will the superintendent have added to those which he has already performed?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** There will be a great reduction in the work done in connection with the railway mail service by the system I am asking the House to assent to. At present, the country is divided up into small districts. For example, in the province of Ontario the mail clerks have been assigned to those districts, and you have groups of inspectors and their staffs, and a system of clerks attached to them, and red-tapeism that makes it expensive to carry on the service, and that sets up a cumbersome and awkward system of the civil service, and, worst of all, it has greatly impaired the efficiency of the railway mail service. There has been no stimulus to the railway mail clerks to excel and to acquire proficiency. Any inquiry required to be made was a most troublesome affair. If the hon. gentleman is familiar with the geography of the country, let me give him an illustration. There are at present railway mail districts and an inspector's district at Toronto; there is also another at Stratford, and another at Barrie. A train leaves Toronto with two railway mail clerks of the department in a postal car in charge of postal matter for Orangeville, where the train divides, and one portion of that mail matter, we will say, goes to Teeswater in the Stratford district, and another portion branches off and goes to Owen Sound in the Barrie district. At that point of separation the Stratford mail clerk proceeds with his mail matter to Teeswater and the other to Owen Sound. They return, and finally meet again at Orangeville and go down to Toronto. Now, of those two clerks, one, we will say, has been attached to the Stratford district, and another to the Barrie district. They have, therefore, an inspector to whom they report, the Stratford man to the Stratford inspector, the Barrie man to the Barrie inspector. Neither of them live in their inspectorates, and they start on their journey in the morning from the inspectorate at Toronto. Some difficulty occurs on that train, some letter

goes astray, or something else happens, and it is a subject of inquiry. Instead of that being inquired about directly by the Controller in Ottawa, he would be advised of it by his local superintendent. The procedure today involves the most roundabout system of red tape. The inspector in Toronto, for example, has heard about it. What is his course of action? He writes to that mail clerk belonging to the Stratford division, who may be sitting in his office at the time; he writes to the inspector of Stratford, asking him to report upon the incident in connection with this trip from Toronto to Orangeville; the latter writes to his mail clerk, whom he does not see, and he gets his answer, and there are three letters. Then that answer is sent to the Toronto inspector; then he has to have it confirmed by a similar roundabout procedure. He writes to the inspector at Barrie, who writes to his mail clerk, and he sends his answer back to the inspector in Barrie, and then that letter is sent to the inspector in Toronto, and there will be ten letters written, and ten or fifteen days will elapse before the supposed transaction has been dressed up. Meantime the public service has suffered. That is a sample of the system of red-tapeism that has been built up by having these little groups or departments of the postal service scattered through the province of Ontario. Instead of this service being built up for the benefit of the people, there has been no practical administration at the head of it, and a system of red-tapeism has grown up, and the public is suffering. There is unnecessary expense and inefficiency in the service, and delays. The mail clerks are not encouraged in efficiency, and there is no supervision over them to speak of. They were not rewarded by reason of their efficiency. There were when I took office 404 railway mail clerks in the service of this country, a considerable number of whom would be unnecessary had they had proper encouragement and been under a proper system, free as much as possible from red tape, under a system devised solely in the interest of the people. When I detach that work, if you will permit me to do so, from the inspector's office,—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman allow me? How would it be, for example, in Nova Scotia? As I understand, there is one inspector for that province and another for New Brunswick?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, now, do any of the mail clerks, for example, leaving Halifax in the morning, run beyond the jurisdiction of the inspector of Nova Scotia? Do any of them, for example, run as far as St. John?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not familiar with that particular district,

Mr. MULOCK.

but I will give the hon. gentleman an illustration. There are mail clerks who run from Lévis to Moncton, and there are mail clerks who now run from Moncton to Lévis. We have, temporarily, at least, abolished these inspectors' lines, the divisional lines, in so far as the railway mail service is concerned. The railway mail service is the same as that of the conductor, who continues his run to a reasonable distance, instead of having to break his journey because he has reached the end of his district. Of course, it is not to say that the abuse has existed to that extent, but it has existed to some extent. Now, to continue the line of explanation evoked by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). By this transfer of railway mail clerks from the local officers or inspectors to the Controller at Ottawa, the delays and the expenditure to which I alluded will be obviated, and the inspectors will then be at greater liberty to discharge the duty for which they were originally intended, for which their offices were created, namely, to regulate the work, such as inspection of post offices, watching the land service and the mail services, and to be on the move more or less, as in England, travelling from post office to post office, looking after their offices to see that they are kept well and in good order, to see that the postmasters understand their duties, and to avoid such things as obliged me to ask a vote of Parliament to prevent last year. I do not know that these frauds could have been discovered, but, as far as possible, there will be an active supervision over these postmasters and it will also enable them to feel that there is a reasonable supervision over them. It will leave the inspectors free to properly discharge the duties attached to their offices and it will also be a great saving of expense as time goes on. If this Bill is passed I do not intend to make the arbitrary use of it that has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen. I intend to use all these high offices as prizes for the worthy members of the mail service. As my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) has illustrated, for the information of the committee, perhaps, the hon. gentleman will be good enough to tell me to what political party Mr. McWhinney belongs, whose appointment I recommended to Council, for the time being?

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. McWhinney has been in the service for forty years and he is also a very good Conservative, I believe. I must say that he is a most efficient officer. He has held the position of inspector or superintendent, as you now call him, for a number of years. He visits all the trains coming and going and looks after the mail clerks. I think that before being taken into the post office he was a mail clerk on the train. He was then promoted to the inspector of mail clerks. As far as I understand it

you do not propose to make any new offices. These men are occupying these positions today as inspectors and you are promoting them by calling them superintendents.

Mr. MILLS. With the same duties as they had before.

Mr. BEATTIE. The same duties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are called superintendents in the United States. The system that I am suggesting here exists in the United States. There is one controller—I do not know his name or whether he is called a controller—and over the whole postal system of the United States there are these superintendents at railway centres where there are many trains. These superintendents must be always on the alert to see that the clerks engaged in the mail service are constantly at their duties.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister gave us a statement in regard to what the routine would be, describing what would happen on a trip between Toronto and Owen Sound in the case of a letter being lost. Two railway mail clerks go out to Orangeville where they separate, one going to Teeswater and the other to Owen Sound. Owen Sound is in the Barrie division and Orangeville in the Stratford division. He gave us a statement of what would happen in a case of a letter going astray. Would he explain what would be the routine under the same circumstances of a letter going astray on that route as to where it would be reported and how it would be traced.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We would send out what is called a tracer.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it first be reported to the Toronto office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We adopt a system of sending out a tracer. This is a sheet which is sent out, and when you get your clue you follow it up.

Mr. MILLS. That is done now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is done in a roundabout way. This tracer is sent out and each person whose hands it passes through makes his note upon it, and at last it comes back to the place from which it started.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be Toronto, I presume?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would come back again to the person who started the tracer.

Mr. SPROULE. How would you divide the country? There must be some divisions because I understand that no certain places where there are already superintendents which have been named by the Postmaster General. These are Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, London, Winnipeg and Vancouver. These are all important cities and they must be centres

of districts. Would a railway mail clerk report to the centre of the division or would he be obliged to report direct to the controller at Ottawa?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The matter would be worked out in the most expeditious way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is with a great deal of diffidence that I make a suggestion in regard to this matter because the Postmaster General understands the practical working of the department and I do not know very much about it. Would it not be possible to provide that the inspector at Toronto, for example, might communicate directly with any mail clerk who might have had a letter in charge? Why could you not in that simple manner do away with a piece of red tape? It seems practicable, but there may be reasons why the suggestion should not be adopted.

Mr. CLANCY. The Postmaster General has informed the committee that there will be a very substantial reduction in the cost of this branch of the service, which, I understand, he now proposes to separate from the other service and make it a special branch. So far as that special branch is concerned, he states in general terms, that there will be a considerable reduction. But the hon. gentleman has not stated where this reduction will arise. There will be the same number of inspectors to do the work as before and their work will be confined to the branch from which this is separated or what is called, I believe, in the words of the Postmaster General himself, the railway mail service branch. There will be no reductions so far as that is concerned. Then I understand that there will be no reduction in the number of mail clerks. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman believes that there are too many clerks in the service or that it will be possible without destroying the efficiency of the service to reduce their number. There can therefore be no reduction in that quarter, nor do I understand that the Postmaster General proposes to reduce the number of transfer agents. The hon. gentleman indicated that there were nine post office inspectors throughout the Dominion, but he did not state that there would be any reduction in their number. Therefore it is not to be expected that there will be a reduction of the number of employees in the service, and still less is it to be expected that there will be a reduction in the salaries. The new controller will be something like a deputy Minister, having his office in Ottawa, and so far as he is concerned there will be an increase in the inside service. As to the question of letters going astray; at the present time persons having complaints to make are brought directly in contact with the local superintendent who sends out his tracers. There are obvious reasons why this can be much better done

through the local inspector, than through the controller at Ottawa. Suppose a letter is lost in British Columbia, how much more readily can the evil be remedied if the local inspector is applied to in that province, and sends out his tracer, than that the complaint should be made to the controller at Ottawa, who will send out his tracers from here. The Postmaster General has not said there were too many mail clerks, but he thinks there is too much red tape, and he objects to a sort of irresponsibility which occurs when the mail clerks go beyond the division of the inspectors to whom they are responsible. I hardly think that is a very serious objection, but at all events it is not such as to necessitate the institution of all this new machinery. The hon. gentleman under this Bill makes the machinery more complicated, because he has divided the authority as to the search for letters lost in the land mail service, and the search for letters lost in the railway mail service. One searches in vain through the remarks of the Postmaster General to find a single substantial reason why this change should be made. The hon. gentleman has not stated, nor does anybody believe, that the present inspectors have been overworked, or that they require any relief in that direction. The Bill divides the responsibility between the land mail service and the railway mail service, and complicates the machinery. I should think that the experience of the heads of departments would lead them to centralize the responsibility as much as possible and to do that we should keep the service intact. Unless it can be shown that the railway mail clerks have been remiss in their duty generally, and unless the searching for lost letters has been a failure under the present system, no good reasons can be offered for this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. There are a few questions I would like to ask the Postmaster General, because I imagine my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has fully matured his information on this, having had so long a period to bring his measure before Parliament. It is objectionable in that the proposition in the 119th section looks towards centralizing the power in the hands of the Minister himself, which I am sure would be very disturbing to him, which would add greatly to his responsibilities, and which I do not think ought to be admitted as a general principle of legislation regarding the post office or any other department. I grant you from the start that the head of a department must have some power of control over the department to its uttermost point; otherwise the unity and consistency of the working of the whole department may suffer. But when the head of the department proposes in a Bill, in several points, to over-concentrate power in himself, and when general principles of great importance are shoved to one side in order to afford that concen-

Mr. CLANCY.

tration of power, I think that is very objectionable. The Chairman has stated that we are on clause 119. Very true; but I take it that all the sections of this Bill are members of one family, and that the blood relationship is found in them all. In section 2 we find the same principle of drawing inordinate control and power into the hands of the head of the department that we find in section 119.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think you ought not to discuss section 2 now. I suppose you would be able to make time on the other just as well.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I am in order in showing that what is a vicious principle in 119 is a vicious principle also in section 2, and we must take the Bill as a whole and object to it as a whole. In that section 2--

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must object to the hon. gentleman discussing section 2. He can do time on section 119 just as well.

• Mr. FOSTER. I must discuss it, and if my hon. friend feels that he cannot grasp the argument without my first giving an outline of it, I will give an outline of it, and show that the one section has a bearing on the other. What I object to in section 119 is the principle of putting an overconcentrated power into the hands of the head of the department. If I can show that in section 2 that some over-concentration of power is aimed at by my hon. friend, a repetition of the offence in the same Bill makes the Bill all the more objectionable, and renders my argument all the stronger. I hope my hon. friend will not object on the ground of irrelevancy. In section 2 we find the principle violated of giving all these contracts by tender. In that section the hon. gentleman proposes, under certain circumstances, to take away the right of tender, and to take the right of granting contracts to himself. Having received tenders, if the lowest tender is higher than the interest of the public services warrants him in paying, then he would have power to take the matter up and award the contract to any person to whom he might wish to award it, the only limitation being that he did not give as much to the contractor as the lowest tender amounted to. Now, I take it upon me to say that in ninety-nine out of a hundred mail routes throughout the Dominion of Canada, the matter would be settled by the first calling for tenders; the lowest tender would be a reasonable tender, and would be accepted. In fact, the rule is that the getting of a little ready money in their hands quarterly induces men to neglect their business in order to carry the mails for a mere pittance, in some cases hardly enough to pay the wear and tear of their horses and carriages. I believe that in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand the work is done at absurdly

low figures. But in order to provide for one case out of a thousand, my hon. friend takes a perilous step, and asks Parliament to do away with the principle of the lowest tender, and to put into the hands of the Postmaster General the power to award—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remark to the hon. gentleman that the discussion he is now making is concerning section 2, and we are on subsection 119 of section 5.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the Chairman is not unreasonable, but will allow me to make this argument strong, and then pile it up on my argument on section 119, to show that the argument is cumulative, and that has power with an audience, and I think has power with the Postmaster General.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It is really too bad for the hon. leader of the Opposition, in a matter of this kind, to take up the time of the House as he is doing. We have no objection to his taking all the latitude possible, but I certainly think, after we have two or three hours on this measure, it is an abuse of the privilege of a member to go on discussing all round it as the hon. gentleman is doing. Is it worth while dragging on this debate?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill has got to go through. I do not suppose that there are more than two or three days of the session left. And unless there is some strong argument against this section, I appeal to the hon. gentleman to let it pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I shall just pass from that first stage of my argument to the section under hand, to show that what is essentially a centralization of power and a dangerous one if section 2 is carried out and repeated again in section 5. That really puts the whole system of railway mail clerk work in the power of the head of the department, because the controller is to be the appointee of the Postmaster General and makes his report to him. Now, I do not think that that centralization of power is a good thing, and it is for that and many other reasons that I make my protest against this measure. I repeat again that at this extremely late hour of the session, we should drop this measure and go on with more important business, and if my hon. friend is reasonable he will give way to my appeal. If my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) were here, I would ask them to join me in this appeal. If we have any time at our disposal, let us rather take up the plebiscite. That is a matter which is dear to the Minister of Agriculture and of very great interest to the hon. member for Lambton. That hon. gentleman interpolated myself and some other gentle-

men on this side, the other day, with reference to it. Why should we go on with an unimportant piece of legislation such as the one before us when such an important and pledged-piece of legislation remain unfulfilled? Were they here I would appeal to them to join me in urging the Postmaster General to withdraw his Bill for the present and give up the hours we are now wasting to a discussion of the plebiscite measure. I think it is really too bad that that measure was not crystallized into form of law and placed before the people for their judgment, as was promised. That important legislation, however, is shoved off, and we are called upon to take up this Bill which is important, it is true, in some of its details, but which, at the same time, might very well wait for another session, when all the members are here.

Mr. MILLS. It would not be very satisfactory to pass this Bill in its present state, and I am sure the country is not pining for it. We have other legislation of vastly more importance to deal with. Some portions of this Bill I do not consider at all satisfactory, but quite the reverse, though, so far as section 5 is concerned, I repeat that in the main I approve of the railway mail service being made a separate department. This Bill was brought down for the first time when quite a number of members were present, and it was withdrawn on some objections to it being raised. Then it was brought on again, and again objected to, and again withdrawn; but now, in the dying hours of the session, the hon. Postmaster General brings it up again and persists in forcing it through. Under the circumstances, it is not decent for the Postmaster General to force this Bill upon the House as he is doing. There is not a shadow of excuse for his conduct, but we cannot but think that there is some sinister motive behind it and not a desire for the welfare of the country. I do not believe that there are three members on the other side who understand the Bill. We have had but very meagre information from the Postmaster General with reference to it. I looked over "Hansard" when it was first brought up, and could find very little information concerning it. I am sure that if this Bill should pass, and I were asked by my constituents to say what it means, I would not be in a position to do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would that necessarily be the fault of the Bill?

Mr. MILLS. Well, it may be a lack of intelligence on the part of the Speaker. But I do not believe you will get the constituency of Annapolis to believe that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But you may not have read it.

Mr. MILLS. I doubt very much if the Minister of Railways understands it. I

believe I could put to him some questions in regard to this Bill which he could not answer. And if he were to answer them as he has answered questions regarding other matters put to him by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) I should go away with less knowledge of the Bill than before the questions were asked.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Here we are in the last days of Parliament—in fact, we thought we should have been in our homes almost a week ago—and this Bill which has been kept back and which we thought would have been laid over is pressed forward. It is reported that a great many friends of the Government on the other side had very strong objections to this Bill, and had been pressing their objections upon the Government. But many of these gentlemen have gone away, and, though others may be left on the other side to object to the Bill, they also are leaving one by one. Parliament has dwindled until but few representatives of the people are here. It is almost an outrage upon Parliament to press through so important a Bill under these circumstances. Now, this Bill, as I understand it—and it is a difficult Bill to understand, in fact I doubt whether the Postmaster General himself understands it thoroughly—contains one very objectionable feature, that is, the altering of the contracts from four to eight years. We find that a great deal has been said against the late Government—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) that the section which he is discussing is not now before us. We are on subsection 119 of section 5.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Under this section 5 we are face to face with the creation of a new branch of the service, and the appointment of a controller and superintendents of the railway mail service. We already have a mail service throughout the country and its work is done efficiently without these officers. In fact, one of the strongest accusations that we had to face during the last campaign was that we had too many officials under the Government. Yet the Postmaster General proposes to create a staff of new officers—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I understand he will transfer some officers now in the service to this branch but others will have to be appointed to fill their places. I cannot believe that this is going to effect economy. And the fact that this Bill gives the power into the hands of the Postmaster General to extend the contracts from four to eight years, is, in my opinion, very objectionable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I would Mr. MILLS.

call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) is wandering from the clause.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I was just going to wind up my remarks but as the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) says I am wandering from the question, I say that it would not be wandering from the subject before us to say that the Bill refers to the extension of contracts from four to eight years. I was going to say that if there was one thing for which the late Government was called to account, it was for renewing contracts under certain circumstances. But here we are giving into the hands of the Postmaster General full power to renew—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. gentleman—

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)—those contracts, and under these circumstances—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I exceedingly regret that the hon. gentleman is not ready to confine himself to—

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I have finished my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to say a word by way of appeal to our hon. friends opposite. This Bill has been before the House nearly 20 days. It is a Bill not involving any principle advocated by either party, but it is merely a departmental Bill affecting the working of one of the large departments, and calculated, according to the opinion of the Government, to effect economy in the public service. The Government proposed the Bill after grave consideration. There is no desire to avoid the amplest and fullest and freest discussion, but we beg hon. gentlemen opposite, if they desire to facilitate legislation at all, in the discussion to confine themselves to the Bill itself and to the clause immediately under discussion. I see plainly that it may take us a long time, it may take us many days; but hon. gentlemen know that governments cannot bring down Bills after full consideration and allow them to be talked out by a few hours or a few day's discussion. Though I have no desire to limit the discussion, I would ask my hon. friends whether it is desirable at this late period, to waste time, and whether it is not desirable to come down to a fair and business-like discussion of the section, and if there are objections, we are ready to meet them and discuss them in a reasonable business-like way. Prolonging debates will not lead to good and will not be allowed to defeat the Bill. I suppose that if we sit here Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, the Government will find it necessary to carry the measure. If we meet again on Monday morning and talk on it all Monday, Tuesday and Wed-

nesday, going over the same thing, there still must be an end of it some time. I could understand if there was any principle at stake, and hon. gentlemen might say: We are prepared to sacrifice time, and stay here and fight it. But here is a departmental Bill, affecting the administration of one of the departments, which, in the opinion of the Head of that department, and in which opinion the Government coincide, will, when carried into effect, largely operate to reduce the public expenditure. Under these circumstances, I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side if it is proper that this prolonged and useless discussion should be continued. Nobody pretends that it is pertinent to the Bill, nobody pretends that anything has been said which could not have been said in two minutes respecting the particular section before the committee. Therefore, it is a palpable and plain wasting of time for a palpable object, and I appeal to the hon. members whether it is reasonable or fair.

Mr. POWELL. I am astonished at the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I can assure him that I have only one object, and that is to perfect this Bill. I appreciate the necessity for such a Bill, but there is a still greater necessity in having it properly drawn. The pruning knife should be applied with a wholesome degree of freedom in respect to this Bill; and I, in the exercise of my functions as one delegated by the people to the onerous duty of a member of Parliament, wished to make some suggestions that occurred to me as having particular force, and I am sorry to see that the Postmaster General paid no attention to them. Now, is it not desirable to have uniformity in our legislation? The Postmaster General, in adopting this procedure in reference to mail clerks, does not run it on lines parallel to ordinary postal administration in this country. In section 12 the Inspector has power to inquire into any complaints concerning the miscarriage or loss of letters. We find this gentleman who is appointed under the name of controller, has power to exercise control over superintendents, transfer agents and mail clerks and to deal with all neglect of duty. There must be a neglect of duty before this party can start an investigation at all. You have first got to charge a party with neglect of duty before you can have an investigation. Under the law, as it stood, the Postmaster General did not need to bring any such accusation against a member of the civil service, but he went with a roving commissioner to see if there was anything wrong. And when the wrong originated and how it could be remedied. I submit to the Postmaster General the great desirability of incorporating that provision in the new Bill. Then there is another question, one of statutory construction. I believe the Postmaster General either was or is a lawyer, but he

may not be acquainted with the canons of construction, and in that case I would appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if, in view of the long series of judgments from the illustrations of Baron Park, to the equally illustrious Cockburn, it would not be well to incorporate the old provision in this Bill. Now, I submit this question in order to test whether the Postmaster General is bona fide in his desire to have this Bill perfected. Section 120, after enumerating the different officers, says that they may be appointed from among persons now in the civil service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has probably forgotten that we are on subsection 119.

Mr. POWELL. I am directing my remarks entirely to section 110 as to the appointment of the parties, and connecting it with the subsequent provisions of the Bill to show who the officials therein named are. If it is a canon of legal construction that, on the creation of a new right, a procedure is laid down with respect to that right, then that procedure must be followed to the exclusion of every other procedure of common law, or otherwise. Now, if this Act, in the creation of new officials, makes it a qualification that they may be drawn from a certain class of people, then I submit whether it is not very desirable, in the public interest, in such a grave matter as this, that is going to work out retrenchment, reform and economy in the service, in this question of overshadowing importance it is necessary to inquire more thoroughly into this provision than the time at our disposal will permit. I don't commit myself to the correctness of the legal suggestion I make. In fact, I would lean to the opinion of the penetrating and comprehensive genius who has charge of the Bill. I could find out how to get the significance of my presentation into that hon. gentleman's cranial cavity. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not he considers that this is simply permissive or whether by the canons of construction it is imperative. If it is imperative, I denounce it as wretched in principle. Why? Because it is not all officers of the Post Office Department that are members of the civil service. The ordinary postmasters and the ordinary clerks are not and you are limiting this to the aristocracy in the Post Office Department. You propose to draw all your higher officials from these aristocrats while the ordinary plebian has no status whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no democrats in the party since the leader left.

Mr. POWELL. It may be that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has changed his opinions with his change from democracy to aristocracy. After receiving knighthood his sympathies may be entirely with the aristocracy of this country. I as one who have no aspirations

towards knighthood, who as one of the people, born of the people and who expects to die as one of the people—I, as a champion of the masses against the classes, now that our knight friend has forsaken the ranks and abandoned his democratic principles, stand up and demand that the ordinary member of this service should be admitted to the dignities and emoluments of this office, provided he is endowed with sufficient brains.

No person shall be eligible to be appointed Controller of the Railway Mail Service unless he has been for at least fifteen years employed in the Canada Post Office.

This is not very happy language. I do not know what the Canada post office is. The Canada Postal Department I know; the Postmaster General I know;—but who art thou?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If you turn up the Post Office Act you will find the definition there.

Mr. POWELL. I have turned it up, and I find that the Post Master General is not responsible for this linguistic atrocity, but it is referable to some predecessor of his, who has embodied this barbaric language in the statutes of the country, and a great shame it is. That recalls the statute passed by the Arkansas legislature, which expressly declared that you should pronounce the word Arkansaw. It is true, as the Postmaster General says, that this language is found in the old Postal Service Act. If that is true it makes no difference. If a barbarity were committed, I do not see why it should be perpetuated. Let the Postmaster General, if he has an earnest, yearning desire to perfect this Bill, eliminate such barbarities. Let it be clothed in the purity of English language and English idiom. I object. As a constitutional principle, the Postmaster General is peculiarly sensitive on this point. In the reign of one of the Edwards it was determined that no longer should an unknown tongue be used in the statutes of this realm, but language drawn from the well of pure English undefiled. I appeal to the Postmaster General not to neglect these great constitutional principles in a matter of such overwhelming paramount importance as the Bill now before the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman give us the statutes of Edward that he refers to?

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman will go and look through the parliamentary rolls, or black letter books, he will find the necessary information. They are very hard to understand; they are written in what is known as bastard Latin, which it would give the classical Postmaster General great pleasure to translate.

Mr. FOSTER. The chancellor will translate them.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, the chancellor of the greatest university in Canada, a master of linguistic science before whom Grimm and Condolle pale, a greater than Whitney of Yale, or Max Muller, a linguistic authority of great repute, Sir, in this country, whose achievements in Archaism and philological reasearch reflect glory on the country that has given him birth? I submit that these two features of the Bill are great blurs upon it, in my judgment, and I ask the Postmaster General, in the breadth of his knowledge and exquisiteness of his taste, to review the Bill, to perfect it, to give us something worthy of his reputation and the gigantic scheme he has in hand, and the tremendous objects he has in view.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this clause be adopted?—Carried.

Mr. DUPONT—

Mr. FOSTER. We have not finished this discussion yet, and you should not, Mr. Chairman, say carried when an hon. gentleman is on his feet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman was not on his feet.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has a right to discuss this question and we have never been in the habit of rushing these Bills.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The question was put and carried.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) was right, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dupont) will have an opportunity of discussing the Bill upon the next clause.

On section 12,

No person shall be eligible to be appointed Controller of the Railway Mail Service unless he has been for at least fifteen years employed in the Canada Post Office.

Mr. POWELL. I think that period is entirely too long. If the Postmaster General really has any desire to see this Bill go through, I would suggest to him on the eve of this Sabbath day that we should all be ruled by a calm and heavenly frame of mind. I would suggest that he should exercise more of Christian charity than to keep a man out in the cold for fifteen years. I would suggest that the term be reduced to five years.

Mr. FOSTER. It is necessary when you want a controller that you should have a man well fitted for the position. What range of choice are you going to have so far as this limits you. How many of the mail clerks have been employed for more than fifteen years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not limited to the railway mail service.

Mr. FOSTER. It goes out side of the railway mail service ?

Mr. MILLS. The interpretation is given in chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "An Act respecting the Postal Service." It reads : "The expression employed in the Canada post office applies to any person employed in any business of the post office of Canada."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is unfortunate that this Bill should take up so much of the time of the House, but the Opposition are not responsible for the delay. I understood that the Postmaster General had withdrawn this measure, but at all events it is quite certain that he brought it before the House on three occasions when there were very few members present. This is a very important measure, and I regret extremely that the Chairman declared clause 119 carried, while the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) had risen to speak, but as I am always prepared to abide by the ruling of the Chair, I shall do so on this occasion. It is not in the public interest that a Bill of this importance should be rushed through the House in the dying hours of the session. This clause says :

No person shall be eligible to be appointed Controller of the Railway Mail Service unless he has been for fifteen years employed in the Canada Post Office.

I wish to ask the Postmaster General, does that mean that he must be fifteen years employed in the railway mail service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It means any man holding an appointment in the post office service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand that, but does the Postmaster General intend to confer these omnipotent powers on a controller who has not been in the mail service branch. If the hon. gentleman selects an officer outside of the mail service, he will be making a great mistake, because that is a special branch, and if it is to be improved at all, a specialist in the knowledge that appertains to that branch must preside over it. Does the Postmaster General think that he can improve the mail service by taking a man who does not belong to that branch ? I believe that he cannot. The hon. gentleman was good enough to go into details, and he told us that the controller would have the duty of sending tracers to hunt up lost letters. Well, that is not necessary at all, because the duty is to-day performed as perfectly as it can be under the supervision of the present inspector. The intention is apparently to centralize this work at the headquarters in Ottawa. Now, if any trouble occurs in the province of British Columbia, a person there cannot apply directly to the resident inspector, but he will have to write to the controller at Ottawa and get the controller to send a tracer from Ottawa

to British Columbia, with all the delay and expense that involves. The system provided by this Bill is unworkable and cannot last, even if the Bill passes. It will create extra expense, and it will not give to the public as efficient a service as prevails at the present time. Take, for instance, a man who has been employed for fifteen years in the Money Order Branch of the department; would he be a proper man to place in charge of that branch of the service ? I say he would not, and that is why I am anxious to get information upon that point. I want to know whether the fifteen years of service would be limited to the railway mail clerk service, or whether the Postmaster General could select from any officers in the department outside of that branch the man who would be entrusted with the controllership of the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will answer the hon. gentleman if he will allow me. The present controller was not in the mail service. He had been in the Toronto post office. He was selected and recommended to me by chief inspector Sweatnam as having the best experience and being the fittest man in the service; because more than a mere knowledge of the mail service is required for the charge of a large organization. He is not a mail clerk, and never was a mail clerk. So that I do not contemplate limiting the choice to mail clerks, although I am free to admit that a railway mail clerk ought to have special qualifications for the office, and one would naturally look to the mail clerks for a controller.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then, how does the hon. gentleman explain what he told us a few moments ago, that his main object in proposing this measure was to create a healthy emulation among the railway mail clerks. How does he create the emulation by taking a man outside of that branch, and putting him over the heads of all the railway mail clerks ? That is one of the reasons why I was so anxious to get the information from the hon. gentleman. He stated that he wished to give promotion to the deserving members of the railway mail service, and to create this emulation among them, which he believed would largely promote the efficiency of the service; and he starts to create that emulation by taking an officer outside of that branch, a man from the Toronto Post Office, and placing him over the heads of men who have been ten or fifteen years in that service. Another thing strikes me as very peculiar in this most peculiar of all Bills that I have ever seen introduced into this Parliament. The hon. gentleman has been insisting upon our passing this measure; but what does he say ? He speaks of the controller whom he has appointed from the Toronto Post Office. How could he appoint him until the Bill was passed ? What

is Parliament reduced to to-day? Are we sitting here for three months simply to be told by the political head of a department that in his wisdom he has decided to do so and so, and has called us together simply to inform us that it was his sweet will to do what he has done? If the hon. gentleman has been able by some process of which I am ignorant to appoint his controller and superintendents, as he said he had done, why pass the Bill? Why not save time, and go on appointing controllers and superintendents without troubling Parliament? Why not follow the rule, which is new to us and new to any Parliament where constitutional government exists, and new to any man who has been following the precedents of this Parliament? If the hon. gentleman has been able to appoint a controller from the Toronto Post Office, and superintendents all over the Dominion, without a Bill, why should he keep us here in the last days of the session to pass a Bill which is incomplete, and which requires to be reconsidered before it can contribute to the efficiency of one of the most important branches of the service. The hon. gentleman has stated that he appointed the controller on the recommendation of his chief inspector. The chief inspector is an officer of great experience, an officer whose conduct has been everything that could be desired, and who has rendered great service to the department; but the chief inspector wishes to take a controller from the post office in Toronto, and to make him the head of a service of which he is completely ignorant, as the Postmaster General admits. I know not who that controller is; but the fact is admitted by the hon. Postmaster General that he is a man who knows nothing at all about the railway mail service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I admitted nothing of the kind.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, I thought, stated that the controller had never been connected with the railway mail service, and, no matter how large and important may be the post office of which he has been an official, he is not a gentleman who should be selected for the office of controller. These are points which I submit are of some importance and which must be discussed, however disagreeable it may be in the last hours of the session to discuss a measure which should not have been brought up at this late period, but which should have been brought forward at the beginning of the session when it could have been carefully examined and when its details could have been compared with the existing law, in order to see how the changes contemplated would affect the efficiency of the service. I venture to express the opinion that no one but a railway mail clerk should be placed at the head of that branch. It is a specialty

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

in itself, it is different from any other branch of the service, and it is impossible for me to understand that one who is not familiar with that branch is fit to take control of the whole service. I also venture to express the opinion that instead of simplifying the service and making it more efficient, the present measure will complicate it and very much impair its efficiency; and I point out the reason. If you centralize everything at headquarters in Ottawa, if complaints must be sent from every part of the Dominion to Ottawa, and if the men who are to report to the controller have to be sent from headquarters to examine into these complaints, it will complicate the service and impair its efficiency.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The inspectors at present do all this work. How much experience had they in the Post Office Department when they were appointed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They were trained to that special service, and a good many of them had been railway mail clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should like to know whether Mr. Hawkins was ever a railway mail clerk.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think he was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And Mr. Merrick, at Kingston, appointed two or three years ago? He was never a mail clerk, nor was Mr. Bolduc, of Quebec.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, he was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inspector in Toronto, Mr. Barwick, was not a mail clerk? Mr. Barwick, whom the hon. gentleman appointed a few years ago as inspector, was practising law in Toronto. Mr. Bain, of Montreal, was a member of this House, and was appointed inspector a couple of years ago. Was he ever a railway mail clerk?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not able, from memory, to give the whole history of every inspector in the Dominion, but from the very fact of their being inspectors they acquired experience, which the new man, the controller, whom the hon. gentleman asks power to appoint, could have had no chance of picking up.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You made your inspectors before they were in the service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But the hon. gentleman is trying to improve the law. He wants to improve the service, and yet he is going to appoint a man as controller who knows nothing about the service. He tells us that he is going to select a man as head of the service who has never been connected with it and can know nothing about it. The inspectors, however, from the fact that they have been in charge of the service, must have gained experience and knowledge, and I tell the hon. gentleman that if I were going to appoint a man specially to superin-

tend the mail service. I would certainly select one who has been in the service from the beginning. I have pointed out these objections, and would ask the hon. gentleman to hold his Bill over until next session.

Mr. CLANCY. We have learned to-night for the first time that the Postmaster General has appointed a controller and has all his staff in operation without any authority from Parliament. That simply means that he matures his plans and appoints his officers, and then comes down at the last hours of the session and asks the authority to do what he has already done. I asked the hon. gentleman to show us what reductions took place, and he disdained to answer that very plain question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did answer it.

Mr. CLANCY. How many reductions ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The system has been tried for nearly six months, and we have been able to allow vacancies to occur without filling them up. There will be at least thirty-four mail clerks less under this system, whose salaries will aggregate \$20,400, but I cannot contemplate dismissing them at once. I want to deal with them as gently as the hon. gentleman desired, and I propose just to allow vacancies to occur without filling them until the service gets down to its proper level. We are working with nineteen less now than under the old system.

Mr. CLANCY. How many transfer agents will there be in the future, and how many has he reduced ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have only reduced the number of transfer agents by one at present. I found a transfer agent at Brockville, by the name of Kavanagh, whom I dismissed for reasons the hon. gentleman can easily ascertain. He had a contract for performing some service, and this man was appointed transfer agent while a contractor. I am not able to say anything with regard to the transfer agents further than this, that I have opened negotiations with the railway companies to see whether at certain points we could utilize, to some extent, the station staff of the railway companies and divide the expense. That, however, is a thing that could be done quite as well, whether this passes or not.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman tells us that this system has been in force nearly six months and that he hopes to make a reduction amounting to something like \$20,000 by the reduction of mail clerks. I did not understand him to say that that has all taken place, but that that was what he hoped to do in the future.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What has taken place ?

Mr. CLANCY. What I mean is, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has said that he is going to deal gently with the mail clerks. I understand that he will not make sweeping changes, that he does not mean to cut off all the heads at once, but that he will remove them by a slower and less painful process. I did not quite understand whether the hon. gentleman had saved \$20,000 in the six months in which the system has been in force, or whether he hopes to make this reduction with regard to the mail clerks alone. He does not propose to make reduction in reference to the transfer agents. Does he mean to make a reduction in the superintendents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The old officers known as the chief railway mail clerks, disappear as such, and will be available either to be made superintendents or employed as mail clerks. I have stated that there will be no addition to the staff under these arrangements. I cannot make it any clearer than the Bill makes it.

Mr. CLANCY. Now we are getting this matter much more clearly before us. There is to be no reduction in the transfer agents, and practically none in the superintendents, so that the whole reduction is to be made in the mail clerks. All this makes it perfectly clear that there is no necessity for this Bill at present. The hon. gentleman has seen carrying out the new system, and the service has gone on without a single jar. Surely, there is no need for this Bill at present until a more perfect measure can be submitted to Parliament when there is a larger attendance. The hon. Minister of Marine, who is usually very fair, has addressed the Committee, intimating that time is being wasted. I can fairly say that on this side there has been a disposition, personally, I may say the strongest disposition, to facilitate the closing of the session. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) himself will admit that the Opposition has shown its willingness to curtail the discussion of Bills, even of the most vital importance, in order to hasten the close of the session. This Bill before us might easily be postponed. It is a contentious Bill and involves new questions—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am sorry to be obliged to tell the hon. gentleman that he is not speaking to the question.

Mr. CLANCY. I am speaking now of the importance of the controller. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will see that I am perfectly in order. The duties of the controller are very important. I am sure that there is the desire on this side to facilitate business as much as possible and reach the close of the session as soon as we can. Personally, my only desire is that this should be made a good Bill, and I say that the Postmaster General should have the assistance of the House—not of a part of the House, but of

the whole House—to make it as perfect a measure as possible.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Bill has certainly been treated as one of great importance. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Foster) characterized it, in the beginning of his speech, as a measure of immense importance, but subsequently he spoke of it as a trifling Bill, not worthy of our present attention.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is by way of comparison.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The leader of the Opposition can change his ground pretty quickly. However, I propose not to ask the Committee to dwell any longer upon the measure. I have no doubt that, after the thorough sifting the Bill has had, hon. gentlemen opposite will be better prepared to understand it when their attention is invited to it again on Monday. Under these circumstances, I shall ask that hon. members be relieved from further wrestling with the measure to-night.

I trust that after a day's rest they will come back sufficiently strong and vigorous as to be able again to devote themselves to this important measure, and bring again their energetic minds to bear upon it that has been so conspicuously displayed to-night. Some people, I won't say I am one, of course might think that the Opposition had not covered themselves with glory by such proceedings. They, of course, are judges of that; in the meantime, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRAYERS.

### THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

Mr. **GILLIES**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) what decision his department has come to with reference to the extension of the lobster season in the eastern part of Nova

Mr. **CLANCY**.

Scotia. I have received several letters from individuals interested in that industry, stating that dire distress might result if the season is not extended, because this season has been a most inclement one for the prosecution of the industry and generally unfavourable to the fishermen.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) has mentioned this matter. I have received communications from all parts of the coast stating that the season has been an unfortunate one, that storms have broken the lobster traps, and all that kind of thing. In conjunction with officers of the department I have given this matter a great deal of consideration. I would like to see my way clear in the general interest to extend the time. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and I are discussing these telegrams as received from hour to hour. I can only repeat what I stated on a previous occasion, that my own inclination is strongly against any extension of the time, though I know it will subject me to a storm of protest, if not abuse, from many parties. Still, I think that the general interest of the industry will be best served—

Mr. **GILLIES**. The hon. Minister must not forget that this has been an exceptional year.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I never saw a year that was not an exceptional year for some reason. We must put our foot down some time or other, and unless my opinion is altered by the telegrams received to-day, as to the effect of these storms, I have determined to take the responsibility of adhering to the law.

Mr. **MACDONALD** (P.E.I.) While I know that there is strong pressure being brought to bear upon the hon. Minister of Marine in regard to this matter, and while I know that the refusal to extend the season may affect many people concerned in this industry, still I think it is of much more importance for this country as a whole, that the Minister of Fisheries should carry out his present intentions with a strong hand, in order to prevent the industry being completely destroyed.

### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply.

Public Works—Chargeable to collection of Revenue..... \$171,700

Mr. **SPROULE**. I respectfully submit that we are going through these items in a way that was never before done, so far as my remembrance goes. It makes it utterly impossible to call attention to any of the items that we left over for further explanation on concurrence. The amounts only are mentioned and not the objects for which they are to be spent. We are going so fast

that it is utterly impossible to turn up the items and find out what these votes are for.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is quite within his rights. I assume that we have to read them over seriatim, only it takes up time. If the hon. gentleman puts his Votes and Proceedings before him he will be able to follow the items.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is utterly impossible to turn to the Votes and Proceedings at the rate we are going.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The resolutions are called in order and you will see each item in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wishes delay at the Table there will be delay while he turns up the items, but of course we want to go on as quickly as possible.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. If you take the Orders of the Day, in one hand, and the Votes and Proceedings in the other, you will have no difficulty.

Post Office—Outside service..... \$3,636,657

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before that item passes in concurrence, I would like to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) if he has yet brought down the return I have asked for. If it is not brought down I shall object to the passage of this item.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). What return is that?

Mr. **FOSTER**. The return I asked for a dozen times.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. About Mr. King?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I explained to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the last time he mentioned the matter that I could not comply with the order of the House at present, because the papers in question had been mislaid. I thought perhaps the Deputy Postmaster General might know where they were. He has been away six weeks at Washington. He has returned, but I do not understand that he has been able to lay his hands upon them.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I suggest that we allow this item to stand over, for the present, and go on with the others. It is an odd way that after a return is asked for, at the beginning of the session, it cannot be brought down up to the last day of the session. There are certain rights that an Opposition does have, and that an independent member of the House has, and I certainly propose to ask that those rights shall be maintained. The Postmaster General can put his hand

on that return and get his officers to make it. If he cannot he can wait a little for his estimate.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means by saying that I can put my hand on the return. I have stated the fact which is simply that the secretary informed me that he could not find the papers.

Mr. **WALLACE**. Parliament has ordered this return to be brought down, and Parliament is very much larger than the Postmaster General. The order of Parliament must be obeyed. If the Postmaster General had stated six weeks ago that he could not find these papers, and if that was the reason for not making this return and that his officers were making an effort to find the papers that would have been a proper thing for him to do, but he has made no such explanation. On the last day of the session he says that the papers cannot be found. That is no information for Parliament. The papers should have been brought down or the Postmaster General should have stated three months ago, after the order was made, that he had made diligent inquiry and that the papers could not be found. It is an extraordinary thing, when the Postmaster General has 300 clerks to look after these papers and keep them in order, that they cannot be found. The Postmaster General should have come to Parliament months ago with the statement that he has made to-day. Such a statement is of no use to this Parliament.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I will send for the deputy and see if he has been more successful.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Well, then this item may stand in the meantime. I would not be so strenuous upon this point if it had not been that, when I was trying to get this information, the Postmaster General blocked me on a puerile technicality thus showing his intention not to give the information. I have remembered that, and consequently it has made me less charitable to the hon. gentleman in regard to this case.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will accept the Postmaster General's unequivocal declaration that the papers cannot be found. If the papers are lost, with all due respect to the power of Parliament, he cannot bring them down.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think a question was put once before and my deputy gave me the substance of the papers, in answer to the question, so that the information is practically on record.

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I admit it is quite right, when orders of the House are given for returns, that the papers should be brought down, but this is not the first time that this thing has happened. I can draw

the attention of the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) to the fact that two years ago an order of this House was passed for a report of the investigation into the irregularities in the customs office at Winnipeg. The customs officer there was named Mr. Scott. I pressed for this return to be brought down. I urged it in the session before last, as well as last session, and it has never been laid on the Table of the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) are not quite relevant to this question.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I altogether deny that there was any such order agreed to when I was Controller of Customs.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is not going to set up the doctrine that because something has been done in the past which is bad, it will be done in the future.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The question is whether this item should be allowed to stand.

**Mr. MILLS.** I would like to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the returns I have asked for, time and time again, have not been brought down.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I think they have all been brought down.

**Mr. MILLS.** No. I have just received word from the proper officer saying that they are not there.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is too busy going over private correspondence to attend to the orders of the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** I think if the Deputy Clerk would read the head line, such, for instance, as mail subsidies and steamship subventions, and then go on, it would be better.

**Mr. SPEAKER.** The item stands.

Steam communication during the season of 1897, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows, and Iona, daily; between Port Mulgrave and St. Peters; between Grand Narrows, East Bay and Irish Cove..... \$7,000

**Mr. GILLIES.** I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies), in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) some facts with reference to this service, which is being performed upon the Bras d'Or Lake, in the Island of Cape Breton, between the railway terminus at Port Mulgrave and ports intermediate between that and Sydney. I wish to impress upon the Government the necessity of having a contract entered into with the Bras d'Or Lake Steamship Company, as to the proper performance of this service immediately.

**Mr. McMULLEN.**

Formerly a written contract existed between the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Bras d'Or Steam Navigation Company, for the performance of a service daily from Mulgrave to St. Peters; the steamer continuing from there to Irish Cove, thence across to the Grand Narrows, and back again through the canal to Mulgrave. That is really the important part of this service, because these people living there are deprived of all communication with the outside world, and the only means within their reach to have communication with the railway is through this subsidized company. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), who was in charge of that service in 1891, before the creation of the Department of Trade and Commerce, was about to reduce the subsidy to that company, because the service performed by them was so much less in consequence of the opening of the railway through Cape Breton, but, upon strong representations made to him by myself and other members on this side of the House that the service east of St. Peter's to Bras d'Or Lake would be diminished, and therefore the people would suffer great hardships, he agreed to continue the subsidy of \$7,000 to that company, in consideration of their performing the service in the Bras d'Or Lakes to which I now refer. Well, Sir, what is the fact? Although we are now entering the 1st of July, not a boat has gone down from St. Peter's through the Bras d'Or Lakes and no contract has been drawn up between the Government and the company.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies).** Was there any money voted last year up to the 1st of July?

**Mr. GILLIES.** Oh, yes; voted every year since 1883.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Was the contract a yearly contract?

**Mr. GILLIES.** Yes, entered into at the commencement of every season.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Have the boats been running this year?

**Mr. GILLIES.** Yes, but the boat I speak of runs from Mulgrave to St. Peter's only, and the boats from the other end is running in a perfunctory manner up to the Grand Narrows and Whycocomagh, and sometimes to St. Peter's. But the boat running from Mulgrave to St. Peter's which should continue down—perhaps the hon. gentleman is not familiar with the geography there?

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Oh, yes, I am quite familiar with the locality.

**Mr. GILLIES.** That boat should go down to Irish Cove and across to the Grand Nar-

rows, and then back to Irish Cove on to St. Peter's on the return trip, as formerly. The service was four times a week in the past. I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he said to me, it was certainly a reasonable request that the company should be compelled to do in the future as in the past. Really this company are doing as they please now, and my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) will understand the manner in which these corporations are apt to treat the public if they are not checked and brought to some sense of reason. What I wish to impress upon my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) is: that he should immediately compel that company to enter into a contract for the due and proper performance of the service from Mulgrave down to St. Peter's, through to Irish Cove, and through the Grand Narrows and back again to St. Peter's. They are getting their \$7,000 for that; and heaven knows it is a large subsidy, and they should perform the service. These people who are shut out from communication should not be treated by the company in the way they are now being treated.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** What is the name of the company?

**Mr. GILLIES.** The Bras d'Or Steam Navigation Company. It is now the 1st of July, and certainly the contract should be entered into.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce told me that he found it impossible to attend to these small matters because of the rush of business, and I can quite understand that; but now when the session is brought to a close, knowing as I do the desire of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (because he himself assured me of it) to have a proper service performed there, I would again ask the Minister of Marine, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to press this matter immediately on the attention of his confrères. It is a hardship as it exists now, and it is a hardship that should not be permitted.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I will take a special note of the complaint of the hon. member (Mr. Gillies) and take care that it is laid before my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he returns this afternoon.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Intercolonial Railway—To pay for land and damages, Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton divisions..... \$2,000

**Mr. GILLIES.** Is it intended that this sum shall cover all the railway land damages in Cape Breton district? I know that there are several claims before the Railway Department, and I would like to know whe-

ther this sum is intended to cover all these claims.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair).** My impression is that it will cover all that we have any knowledge of up to the present time.

**Mr. GILLIES.** I have in my hands several claims for damages in the Cape Breton district. I wrote several letters to the department in reference to them, but received no reply. An official was sent from the department last winter to investigate them. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has a return of all the claims for land damages resulting from the construction of the Government railway in the Cape Breton district, and if so, can I have a copy of these claims? I want to ascertain whether the claims on behalf of which I have made demand are in the department, as I cannot find out otherwise.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I would be very happy to give the hon. gentleman any information he requires. I have not it in my hand at the present moment. I think the sum put in here is the usual amount. The claims are coming in from year to year, and we are endeavouring to settle them as soon as they come in, and I think they have averaged about \$2,000. Whether the claims the hon. gentleman refers to are included I cannot say, but I shall be glad to allow the hon. gentleman, at any time, to have access to any information we have if he will call at the department; but there is no return in my possession.

**Mr. GILLIES.** There was a claim for damages at a place called Jamesville, near the Grand Narrows, which I wish to mention specially, as it has been hanging for some time. I wrote to the hon. gentleman's department four or five times, but, for some reason, I could not get a reply.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Did the hon. gentleman write to me?

**Mr. GILLIES.** I wrote once or twice to the Minister himself last winter. I was a little surprised at not receiving any reply. However, the department sent an officer down there to inspect the claim, and he visited the place. I happened to see him when he was there, and I directed him to go to the person whose land was damaged, and who would give him all the information he required. This was some time last January. I have not heard a word since, although my client has been frequently importuning me to get the matter settled in some way or other, or to get some decided answer. I would like to know, in this particular case, among several others, what decision the department has come to, and I will avail myself of the invitation now offered me by the Minister, to call at the depart-

ment and see the papers, if I shall be accorded that privilege.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Certainly, I shall be very glad. I would be sorry to have the hon. gentleman think that any letter he wrote to me I would not answer. I may say that when any such letters are received by me they are passed over, with instructions to reply to them, and I do not see them again. If there is any information for which the hon. gentleman has asked and which has not reached him, I shall take pleasure, if he will remind me of it, in seeing that he gets it.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to Income..... \$90,938 25

Mr. **FOSTER**. Before we pass this item, there is some information I would like to have. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is not here, but I imagine that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) could give the information I desire. We have some notice of a call for tenders for certain mining franchises in some districts, and I am not quite sure whether in the Yukon, but I fancy somewhere up that way. It was mentioned once in the House—that was the first information the House had of it—that an advertisement had been issued calling for tenders for the purchase of these franchises or privileges. The statement of the Minister of the Interior then was that no contract had been entered into. I believe he also stated the condition upon which tenders were asked, and if so, that will appear in "Hansard." I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the Government have gone further in this matter. It is a pretty grave question as the hon. Minister will see, to give up large tracts of that country to any company under tender in that way. I would like to know whether anything further has been done, or I would much rather get the information that nothing will be done until the House has had an opportunity of discussing the question of the conditions. This is a matter in which the people at large are vitally interested.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I am not aware that anything further has been done, nor is my colleague (Mr. Fielding), but I will send over to the Deputy Minister of the Interior and will inquire of him and later on I will let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) know.

To meet cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. (Payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act)..... \$7,500

Mr. **SPROULE**. I believe that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said,

Mr. **GILLIES**.

when this item was under discussion in Committee of Supply, that he would be able to give us some further information on concurrence as to these accounts and the progress that has been made by the arbitrators.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will turn up the Public Accounts of last year, he will find out quite a lengthy statement covering the matter, which, I think, he will find quite satisfactory, as it explains the whole situation and gives a number of documents. If the hon. gentleman finds that this does not cover what he wants and will call my attention to it later, I will be glad to supplement it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. But the Finance Minister will see that the public accounts only bring the case down to 30th June, 1896. Work has been going on since then of which we have no information.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There has been nothing material since.

Mr. **SPROULE**. They are not making much headway.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are the salaries still going on?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. These cases do not move very rapidly. I have some information with regard to it, but it is virtually a repetition of what appears in the Public Accounts.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is in the Public Accounts we can see, but we would like some information as to what has been done since.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. One of the matters of importance that is standing over is an appeal, and substantially no progress has been made. This is a very slow matter, as my hon. friend must have learned in the years during which it has been in progress.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What position does the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) take of the matter? I know the position he took two or three years ago, and I wonder whether the reversible patent applies to the Minister of Justice on these questions as well as on others. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will be able to tell me that the Minister of Justice is standing strongly for the Dominion contentions.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. These gentlemen of the legal profession do not seem to have any difficulty in standing strongly for their clients for the time being. At present the Dominion of Canada is the client of the Minister of Justice, and he is standing for the interest of the Dominion with all the loyalty that members

of the legal profession show for their clients.

Mr. FOSTER. Tempered, I suppose, in some slight degree, by the fees he receives.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In order to avoid any such suggestion as that made by the leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Justice has thought proper to continue the lawyers recently employed in the case, Mr. Christopher Robinson, Mr. Ritchie, and Mr. Coste, leaving them in absolute control of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very wise, because they were in it from the first.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that apply to the commission of interprovincial accounts only or does it apply to other questions between the provinces and the Dominion?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What other question?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that there was a question of Queen's Counsel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has nothing to do with this question.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but I understood the Solicitor General to speak of all questions that have arisen between the provinces and the Dominion. Has the same policy been pursued in connection with this question of Queen's Counsel?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This matter of the appointment of Queen's Counsel is now on the verge of solution as between the provinces and the Dominion. There is a tentative proposal that both sides shall accept the suggestion of the Supreme Court in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I was wondering if the lawyers in the case on one side would turn around like the Minister of Justice and argue the other way. But the Minister of Finance I understood, proposed to give us some information with regard to the interprovincial accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have a memorandum, but it does not contain very much in addition to what is already known. The memorandum which I have obtained in answer to my hon. friend's question, is that practically all matters in dispute between the Dominion and the provinces have been settled, with the exception of the following:—

I. The Common School Fund.—In regard to this, Ontario and Quebec have appealed from the awards made by the arbitrators, and the appeals are standing for argument before the Supreme Court of Canada.

II. The Robinson Treaties.—In regard to those, the decision of the arbitrators, in their award of the 13th February, 1895, that Ontario should be liable for payments made by the Dominion to the Indians, was set aside by a payment of the Judi-

cial Committee of the Privy Council, and, as a consequence of this latter payment, the matter has again been submitted to the arbitrators to determine whether Ontario and Quebec are not jointly liable for the payments.

III. Payments after Confederation.—The arbitrators have before them claims made by the Dominion against the old provinces of Canada for liabilities incurred and work done before confederation, but not paid for till after confederation. These claims amount to about \$60,000.

IV. Treaty No. 3.—There is also a claim before the arbitrators against Ontario for expenditures made by the Dominion in connection with Indian Treaty No. 3.

Practically, however, the matter has not made very much progress since the date of the public accounts.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope that in this matter the Solicitor General will give not only his passive support but his active support in maintaining the Dominion view on all these questions, especially in view of the fact that the Government is now largely made up of ex-provincial premiers who declared when they were at the head of their respective provincial governments that they proposed to vindicate the rights of their provinces and get as much of this money in dispute as they could. Now, I trust they will take the federal view, and not only in a passive way, as the Solicitor General stated, but in a most active way, vindicate the Dominion's rights on these questions.

#### Defence of Esquimalt, B.C.—

Dominion contribution towards expenditure for works and buildings.....	\$24,000
Pay and allowance of a detachment of Royal Marine Artillery or Royal Engineers.....	42,500
	\$76,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that item the amount is correct, but the division of the item is incorrect. I propose to change the division—of course without changing the total, which we cannot change. I move that the item read \$29,000 and \$47,500, and that would not affect the total.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we able to do that? We are not dividing, in a sense, the total amount, but we have the item given to us in two parts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At first I had, myself, some doubt, but after looking closely into it, I see it is not a division that ought to be objected to, because it is for the same purpose, simply two items of the same purpose, for the defence of Esquimalt—that is the purpose. I am informed it is the practice of the House that where we do not change the amount of the item, the division can be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another little peculiarity in this. Stripped of all its explanatory part, the vote could run, "defence of Esquimalt, \$76,500."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The first part of the item would read \$29,000, and the second \$47,500, the total being the same, \$76,500.

To pay E. St. O. Chapleau in full of all claims in connection with his patented poll-book, in use since 1891..... \$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had the pleasure of a return from the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I must apologize.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to have that wonderful book so that I might make some edifying remarks upon this vote. Now I have been balked in my desire in that direction. You may absolve me, but how shall we absolve the Minister of Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall cry peccavi.

Mr. FOSTER. In addition to peccavi, will the hon. gentleman bring this down this afternoon?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will bring it down.

To provide for the payments to collectors of customs for services in connection with the issuing of fishing licenses to United States vessels during 1896..... \$479 32

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry to occupy the time of the House, but this is the only opportunity I shall have of asking certain explanations from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). It appears that he has seen fit to reduce the price of licenses for pound-net fishing, in Essex, to \$25. My constituents, as well as those of other members along the Lake Erie coast have urged that the same reduction should be extended to those localities. I have conversed with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on that subject, and I wish to give him this opportunity of stating publicly why he has been unable to extend the reduction, which he has made in Essex, to other localities along the shore of Lake Erie. I am compelled to do this, in justice to my constituents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that this matter hardly comes up on the item before us, but I will have no objection of giving the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) an answer. He is not exactly correct in saying that this reduction has been made in the county of Essex, if by that he means to imply that it embraces the whole county. There was a small locality where I was informed there had been great difficulty in recovering the fees from the fishermen. My adviser, Mr. Prince, brought to me the information that last year they were not recovered at all, and the consequence was that I had to dismiss

Mr. FOSTER.

the officer there. He pleaded that he had done all he could but the fishermen were so poverty-stricken in the locality that they could not pay. I could not accept that as payment, or as an explanation, although it was, to some extent, an excuse. I had an investigation made by Commissioner Prince into the matter and he recommended to me that, under the peculiar circumstances of these few men, we should make a reduction in the amount of the fees. The moment we made it, as I had anticipated, the same thing was demanded all along the line, but I have declined because the circumstances in this case were of a special character.

Mr. CASEY. To what locality did it apply?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It covered a small locality between Pelee Island and the mouth of the Detroit River.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a matter—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not on the subject of fisheries generally. I will be happy to answer any question the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) desires to put, but I beg him not to go into the whole question of fisheries.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am not going to make any lengthened remarks at present. I had intended doing so, but I have not been able to carry out my intention, because I had not the necessary information I was expecting. I propose to ask the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the subject of the industry of fishing more particularly in regard to the introduction of artificial fish culture by the establishment of hatcheries and incubators in the maritime provinces, more particularly in Lunenburg, which is a fish centre. I hope that the Minister, or his commissioner, will give this his careful attention, during the recess, so that he may give us valuable information upon it when Parliament meets again.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman refer to any particular species of fish?

Mr. KAULBACH. I refer to lobsters and codfish. The introduction of artificial fish culture would be obviously in the interest of these fisheries, and I think it would be the best investment that the Government could apply money to. It gives a big return, and adds greatly to the commerce and trade of the country. I did intend to go into the matter very carefully, but I have not had an opportunity of doing so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will promise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) to consider this matter very carefully. So far I have not been able to bring my own views into unison with

those of Commissioner Prince upon this particular matter.

To provide for the expenses and salaries of commissioners appointed to investigate charges against Government officials, including witness fees..... \$2,000

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask a question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Has that any connection with the trouble between the Noble Brothers, of Collingwood and Killarney and the department, or is there any information as to how that case stands?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Judge Johnson was appointed some years ago to investigate that matter. He made an investigation in reference to the complaint in the time of my predecessor in the department. He reopened the case, and when I came into the department I found it hanging. The case had been reopened at the instance of the Nobles, and then they would not go on. There has been a great deal of correspondence between the lawyers of the Nobles and myself. They wanted to put the department in the position of defendants, requesting that the department should admit certain things and then go on and excuse themselves for seizing the Nobles' nets. We do not admit that we should take that position. We claim that the department was right in the course it pursued, and if they desire to give any explanation we say we will reopen the case and hear their witnesses. In the middle of this correspondence the decision came from the Supreme Court of Canada raising the whole question as to whether we ever had any jurisdiction in these waters at all. The Noble Brothers would then say to us: Well, we don't care now whether you are going on or not; if that decision holds we will sue you in law for damages for your illegal seizures, and if it does not hold we will be in no worse position than we are at present. I ordered the investigation at once to be closed, and there is \$100 due to Judge Johnston. I have sent the account to the Department of Justice for taxation, but it is not embraced in the \$200, and will be paid out of the general vote.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Fire protection, electric lighting, &c..... \$75,000

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is not true that the Government has a contract at the present time with the Ottawa Gas Lighting Company, which has still some three years to run, and which is current of course at the present time; whether that contract was not entered into after certain conditions agreed to on both sides, one of which was that the price of gas should be very largely reduced, and that the company should be compelled to supply a maximum quantity. In order to fulfil these conditions and to supply the quantity of gas that

was required, it is represented to me that the company went to some \$50,000 of extra expense to put themselves in a position to compass that cheapness and that supply. I am also informed that the price of gas not only has been reduced from \$4 to \$1.50, which is a very great reduction, but with the improvement in new burners you get a 40-candle light, and consume only about half the gas compared with former consumption. If these things be true, it modifies to a large extent the proposition which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) put before the House; and I myself had forgotten the circumstances at the time, and did not allude to it when the item was being discussed. If you are going to take the alternative of being in a position like that—and we must carry out contracts as fairly as we possibly can—you have got to go to the expense of wiring a large portion of the buildings, and you have to go to the expense of having a technical and efficient staff in order to carry this out, neither of which expenditures are needed if you light by gas; because of course the company looks after that. I bring this matter up because it is additional information which probably the House did not possess at the time, and I think it would modify the action of the Minister of Public Works. I do not make it a plea that because you are using gas now, therefore you should not make the change. But I do make this plea: that when the Government revises a former decision, and by conditions made on both sides, large expenditures are entered into, and a contract based upon them, it becomes a matter of great moment whether or not the Government is justified in destroying the investment to that extent, of the company with which it made the contract. Certainly the very best reasons should be given before that is done, and even then, it would be a question whether or not a consideration should be given to the contractor who entered into the contract in good faith. If my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) will view the circumstances in that light, and if he were to make a proposal to that company in certain directions he may find that he can make a much more advantageous arrangement in connection with the conditions as they exist, than by undertaking this very large expenditure of \$75,000 for installing an electric light plant. I am sorry that the information was not at hand and the question discussed when the Minister had his estimate before the committee; but that does not render the information any the less pertinent. I want to ask my hon. friend to take that into his consideration; and I am sure he will see the force of it. If I might express an opinion, it would be that, under all the circumstances, it would be well to go a little slowly in the interim between now and January; and the hon. gentleman can obtain full information, and have his plans

perfected by the time the House meets again.

The **MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS**. I may say that my intention is to go slowly. As I explained to the House, it is proposed to supply these buildings with a suitable fire system, and to change the mixed system of gas and electric light which we have at present. Since the discussion took place here, I may say, that I have met Mr. Coates, the president of the Gas Company, who said that he would be glad to meet me later on.

Mr. **MACLEAN**. I hope the Minister of Public Works will consider this matter carefully, and go in for the state having its own system of electric lighting. In Toronto we have had some experience of gas, electric light and power companies, which are all monopolies entrenched there, and the citizens cannot get their rights from them. We have heard a good deal about the vested rights of these companies. While they are entitled to consideration, the public are also entitled to consideration. The whole tendency of the day is to wipe out these monopolies, and to have such things municipalized, or managed by the state or the city. I trust that the Minister will not have too many negotiations with the monopolies which are entrenched here, but will go in for a state system of lighting. If there must be a combination, let him form a combination with the city of Ottawa, and let the state and the city together provide themselves with the cheapest light supply they can get.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

## Second Sitting.

MONDAY, 28th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House resumed consideration of resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Post Office—Outside service..... \$3,636,657

Mr. **FOSTER**. When this item was under consideration this morning I objected to it on the ground that certain returns ordered by the House had not been brought down. To that objection the Minister stated that he had given orders to have the papers assembled, and that they had been mislaid. He has kindly sent to me a letter from his deputy, in which the deputy says that his impression is that the papers in the Marsh

Mr. **FOSTER**.

Hill case were given out in the ordinary way to a clerk to be copied before the deputy went to Washington, but that they cannot now be found; that he is having a search made for them, and that the probability is that they have got mixed with other papers. On that ground I cannot see that I have a right to block the passage of the Minister's estimate; but I take occasion to say that these papers are more important in the sense in which I am asking for them than probably the majority of the members know, and if they are not found, the matter will, of course, be spoken of later. It will be a case in which papers involving very important issues have in some way or other disappeared from view. They are not papers which have not been spoken about, because for more than a year now I have been trying to get at the information which I suppose is contained in them. I sincerely hope that the Postmaster General will not intermit any diligence to have these papers found or to answer the order of the House.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The papers in question, so far as I remember, are very limited in number. They consist, I presume, of the appointment of Mr. King as postmaster at Marsh Hill, and his resignation. I think, speaking from memory, that his resignation was sent by telegram, and if it is to that the hon. gentleman attaches any importance, the probability is that a record of that can be obtained in the telegraph office through which it was sent; so that I do not think that ultimately there can be any prejudice in regard to the matter.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I hope my hon. friend does not suppose that I should hunt the telegraph office.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No, but I just wished to intimate to the hon. gentleman that even if the papers have been mislaid, secondary evidence can be obtained of their contents, in all probability.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Then, I shall hope to get that.

Resolution agreed to.

Kentville public building.....	\$ 5,000
Liverpool public building.....	5,000
Halifax drill hall (revote).....	12,000

Mr. **McMULLEN**. I was not in the House when the votes for the construction of post offices were under consideration. I am anxious to be entirely in accord with the Government, but at the same time I cannot lose sight of the fact that when in Opposition I advocated most strongly the principle laid down in 1890, with which principle I consider the item before us is at variance. I have frequently condemned hon. gentlemen opposite for not carrying out when in power that principle which they themselves had accepted, but their failure in this respect does not justify the present Government in pursuing a similar

course. For fifteen years in Parliament, I have been advocating certain principles, and these principles I am anxiously looking to see carried now that we on this side have it in our power to do so. I desire to see every principle we advocated when on the other side carried out by us on this side. In this matter of public buildings, there was a clear understanding reached in 1890 that they should only be erected in places which contributed the largest revenue to the treasury and then only when the revenue of the country warranted their erection. We have nothing to show that the places mentioned in this vote are entitled to public buildings or that there is anything exceptional in their case which would justify a departure from the principle we have laid down and so persistently and strongly advocated, and therefore, if only for the sake of consistency which is proverbially a jewel, I feel impelled to move :

That the resolution be amended by striking out the appropriations of \$5,000 each for Kentville and Liverpool public buildings.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend from Wellington is perfectly within his rights in moving to strike out this vote. Some years ago the question of the policy which should control the Government in this matter was debated at great length, and a general principle adopted, which principle, we contended, was not adhered to by the late Government. It was stated the other day, and I had hoped my hon. friend would accept that statement, that this Government did not dissent from the principle laid down and were prepared to carry out the spirit of the resolution adopted. The hon. gentleman is of the opinion that the vote for this public building in Liverpool conflicts with the spirit of the resolution I have referred to. There may be some question about that. Liverpool is the shire town of the county of Queen's, it has no public buildings. It is a seaport town of some importance, and although the receipts there are not as large as in some of the other towns my hon. friend may be able to cite, that is not the only criterion by which we can judge the importance of a place and its title to a public building. Apart from that, the vote was assented to by the committee, and I was in hopes that the promise which the Government willingly made of its intention to proceed along the lines adopted some years ago would have satisfied my hon. friend. It is not the intention of the Government, as we have stated already, to erect a large building there but one of a reasonable moderate character. And considering that the county of Queen's has stood almost alone in the province of Nova Scotia for many years back, as regards expenditure on public buildings, and considering that the expenditure is to be very moderate and that this is an important

shire town, which has some little claim to consideration, I think my hon. friend might very well let the vote go, upon the assurance given by the Government that the policy and principle of the resolution adopted some years ago will be carried out by them. In carrying out that policy, we did strike out the vote proposed for a building at St. Martin, which clearly did not come within the spirit of the resolution. The vote for Kentville I should imagine would come within that spirit. It is the leading town in the great Annapolis valley, and I could not imagine that any one would object to it. I myself saw the small, cribbed, cabined, and confined place which is now used there as a post office, and I thought it was hardly creditable to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not say anything about it ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, not even at the public meeting held there before the election. At the same time, I thought that the conditions in Kentville were such as would justify a small appropriation. I trust my hon. friend will accept the assurance given that the spirit of the resolution will in future be carried out, and that we shall not even shave on the lines of that resolution, as he may think we are doing in the matter of Liverpool.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if the Government are prepared to make any distinct statement as to the limit beyond which they will not go in the erection of these buildings ?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It is quite impossible at present, but I may give my hon. friend the assurance that the intention of the Government from the first was to put up a very moderate and economical building. There is no intention to build a large edifice which would overshadow every other building in the town.

Mr. SPROULE. I congratulate my hon. friend from North Wellington on his courage and good intentions in moving this amendment. All of us who sat in the last Parliament know how frequently and forcibly the hon. gentleman opposed this practice of building post offices in small places.

Now, he is carrying out that principle when he is supporting the Government. There is no doubt that it requires some moral courage to do that, because in doing it he is opposing his own friends. But I for one congratulate him on the course he has taken, and I am sure the country will do so as well, because it is an acknowledgment to the country that he is treating both sides alike, and that he was honest when advocating economy when in Opposition,

and is willing to advocate it now as he was then. I can support this motion all the more freely because I myself have never advocated the building of post offices in small places. I take the post office returns, and I find that in that village—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Do you call Liverpool a village?

**Mr. SPROULE.** We would call it a village in our part of the country. I find that the gross postal revenues of that place last year was \$2,085. Now, compare that with a village in my own locality which I know very well, in which there is only about a thousand people, and a gross postal revenue of \$1,705.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding).** The population of Liverpool is about 2,500.

**Mr. SPROULE.** But in these matters it should be judged by its postal revenue, which is only \$2,085, and this cannot justify the expenditure necessary for the construction of a post office building. If it did justify it, I could pick out places by the dozen in the province of Ontario which have not asked for a post office building, but which would be equally entitled to it. I say that I support this resolution all the more freely because I never advocated the principle of putting up post offices in small places when my friends were in power. I have always said that there may be exceptional instances in which a Government is justified in putting up a post office in a small place, that is where they may be unable to get a suitable building to rent at a moderate figure. But where a building can be got for anything like a reasonable rent, a building that will serve the convenience of the public, the Government is not justified in undertaking a heavy outlay to construct another building. The rent paid for the building is comparatively a trifling item as against the expense involved in the construction of a Government building. Not only must the country suffer the loss of interest on the sum invested, but there must be a caretaker and all the paraphernalia of expense, which would be enough to pay the rent of a suitable building three or four times over. If we can save money for the country and at the same time meet the public convenience, why should we spend money in putting up new buildings? In our part of the country we have never urged the Government to put up new buildings in small places. When we were on this item I mentioned that in our county we had a population of about 75,000, and that it contained several towns that have an equal or greater claim to a public building than Liverpool. For instances, we have Owen Sound, the county town, with about 9,000 inhabitants; Durham, with about 3,000; Meaford, with between 2,000 and 3,000, and

**Mr. SPROULE.**

Thornbury with close upon 2,000, besides two or three villages, every one of which is nearly as large as Liverpool. Yet in the whole county there is not a building for post office or custom-house purposes, and there is not a proposition in these whole Estimates to build one in the county. And our county in this respect is an example of what may be found in almost every portion of the province of Ontario. The Government say: Let this pass, and we will see to it that in future the principle will be adopted in regard to these matters recommended a few years ago by this House. But we had better adopt that principle now. They may feel that they do not want to offend their friends. Their friends should not be offended at the striking off of an item that should never have appeared in the Estimates.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** I hope the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will stand to his guns and that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) will support him. I am prepared to back him up to the fullest extent of my ability. I do admire independence in this House; I do admire men standing by their principles even in the face of their party. We have seen too many independent movements go to pieces in this House. We have seen the Patron movement go to pieces; are we to see the independent movement party in favour of economy now deserted? I hope not. I hope the hon. member for North Wellington will continue to advocate the same principles in power that he advocated in Opposition, and that the other gentlemen I have named will take the same position and assist him in the work he is doing, and I am sure that in doing so they will be upheld by the country.

**Mr. CASEY.** We have heard a good deal about consistency and independence, but it strikes me that the speeches of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) would have been much more in place, would have shown much more consideration for the public purse, if they had been made when their friends were in power and we were objecting to expenditures which we sometimes thought extravagant. Apart from that very obvious reflection, which must have occurred to the hon. gentlemen themselves I am sure, I want to say one or two words on the question at issue. I believe that when the House of Commons unanimously adopted the resolution already more than once alluded to, to the effect that public buildings should be distributed without regard to the political complexion of the constituency, the House did the right thing. But the glaring fact remains that for a number of years that have passed since that time, that resolution was not carried out by the party that was in power.

These buildings have not been distributed without regard to the colour of the constituency in which they were located. I believe that it devolves upon us as a duty to carry out the will of the House expressed in that resolution by, as far as possible, equalizing the distribution of the public buildings within the limits expressed in that resolution itself. It is a very great question whether it is the best economy in one case or another to have a public building rather than a rented one. My own opinion is that, in a great many places, a public building—it does not necessarily involve a caretaker and so on, as my hon. friend from East Grey said it did—may be a more economical arrangement and more favourable to the public interest. It is always easier to make a building convenient for the public when it has been built with a special view to accommodate the public. It is not always easy to rent a building that affords this convenience. And I believe there is just as apt to be jobbery in the way of renting a building from political friends as in putting up a public building when it is required. With all these considerations in view, with the broad fact before us that half the country has been defaulted of its necessary public buildings, notwithstanding the resolution of this House, by these gentlemen who have lately left office, I am not at all prepared to take the stand that we should be extremely critical in regard to the matter of the construction of public buildings by the present Government. If I did, in one or two cases, question their judgment in regard to this matter, I should hesitate a long time before I declared want of confidence in the Government or did anything to weaken their position by supporting a motion of this kind. I should give them the benefit of any doubt there may be in my mind as to the wisdom of the decision, and should, as I intend to do if this motion should come to a division, vote against any motion which implies want of confidence in their honesty of intention, or in the soundness of their judgment.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I just wish to say that I do not support the motion which has been made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on account of any approbation that I may receive from my hon. friends on the other side of the House, as has been promised by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I think every member of this House ought to have sufficient independence to vote for the same principles when he is supporting a Government as he did when he was in Opposition; and if my course does not meet with the approbation of the Government, I cannot help it. I sat on the other side of the House for fourteen sessions in Opposition, and every time these votes came up for post offices in all parts of the Dominion, it was the unanimous opinion of the Liberal party, led on by its leaders, and by the men who occupy prominent posi-

tions on the Government benches, that this policy should not be endorsed or supported by the people's representatives in this House. I for one am not prepared to swallow the principles or my words which I uttered in Opposition to the Government of the day at that time, in spending public money in this way; and although I am a warm supporter of the present Government, still I am not prepared to go the length of saying that I shall support everything they do, even though they do things which are contrary to the well-understood principles and practices of the Liberal party. That is the position that I take in regard to this matter. I say that there is no justification whatever, there can be no justification, for the expenditure of public money in erecting these post offices in small villages or towns, even though they may be shire towns, as mentioned in these Estimates. I say that in the province of Ontario there is not a riding where we cannot pick out three, or four, or five, sometimes ten or a dozen, towns which are just as important and far more important than the towns which are mentioned in this resolution. Therefore, I am bound to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Wellington.

Mr. SCRIVER. With regard to this question I have merely to say that I sympathize very strongly with the views that have been expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) who has just taken his seat. If there was one subject upon which I felt strongly in the old days when our friends on the Opposition benches were bringing forward almost, every session, votes for public buildings in many instances in very small places, it was this very subject, and both by act and by word I have strongly opposed the granting of sums for erecting public buildings in comparatively small places. I remember particularly the case of a public building at a place called Laprairie, in the that part of the country where I live, a small village, the post office revenue of which was only four or five hundred dollars. I felt it was an abuse which could in no way be defended; and I remember raising my voice against the appropriation. Well, now because our opponents did wrong in the past in these matters, I consider is no reason why we should follow their example; indeed I think we are bound to take a better course, not only in regard to this matter, but in regard to a great many others. The vote in this particular case is for erecting a public building in what we would call in the province of Quebec, a village, or a small town, and where it has not been shown by any words uttered by the Finance Minister or by those who have followed him in support of this course, that a public building is needed. I believe with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the erection of a public building will be followed by other outlays; in almost every instance, at all events, the services of

a caretaker will be required, and thus an expense lasting for all time will be entailed upon the revenue; whereas it is very rarely the case that a suitable building cannot be rented at a very much less cost to the Government. I feel that I cannot stultify myself as I would be doing if I were to vote in support of an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I regret that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) did not include in his amendment several other places where I think the argument is just as strong or stronger.

Mr. SPROULE. We can only deal with one item at a time.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, Kentville is included in the same item. Now, with regard to Kentville the facts brought out when we were discussing the matter the other day were these: For the post office and custom-house \$215 a year have been paid in rental for suitable accommodation for these two services, and a rough estimate was made of the interest on the cost of construction, of repairs, and of maintenance, which, for the first few years, I presume, would not be very much. Then there is the cost of a caretaker, the cost of heating, lighting and cleaning, and other services which are necessary in every public building, and which my hon. friend said might not be necessary. But you will particularly remember that of all the hundreds of public buildings in the country there was only one. I think, that at Orillia, where the Government dispensed with the services of a caretaker; and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was unkind enough to say that that was done for political reasons, and was a political job. Well, I do not know whether that is the case or not, but we can assume that a caretaker will be appointed here, and that, as in all other places, his salary will be paid by the Dominion Government. An estimate has been made that these services will cost \$1,500. Now, in order to save \$215 of rental, the Government wants to incur an expenditure at Kentville amounting, according to a rough estimate, it is true, but one that is likely to be as well within the mark as over the mark, to an annual expenditure of about \$1,300, which will be incurred for all time in order to give a post office and a custom-house to one of those places. I need not go over any of the arguments that have been adduced here when these items were up before, but this House should consider the statements made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I think it is a complete answer to the argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that in the county of Grey, with its 75,000 inhabitants, with one town of 9,000 people, and with other towns of two or three thousand inhabitants each, they have not to-day a single public building within its borders.

Mr. SCRIVER.

Yet in this county and in this town it is proposed to give a public building though the revenue will not justify it. The argument used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was that they were entitled to a portion of the public expenditure of this Dominion. Sir, I do not believe a more corrupting argument could be used before this House or before the people of this country, than the proposition that each locality is entitled to an expenditure of public money without regard to the requirements of that county. If a harbour requires to be opened for the safety of the public or for the promotion of commerce, there is an argument there for the expenditure of public money. If rivers require to be dredged so as to promote navigation and promote the safety of lives of people who have to travel up and down them, there is an argument for the expenditure of public money. But in this case the argument, I consider, is one which is entirely untenable. Then, Sir, we come to the next point. As has been stated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) and the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver), they have been preaching this doctrine while they were in Opposition. A gentleman who preached one doctrine when he was in Opposition and preached another doctrine when he is in power, is the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) who, this afternoon, to the surprise, and, I may say, to the disgust of every one who has heard his utterances in this House for the last eighteen years, not only denouncing the very thing he is prepared to support to-day, but denouncing the whole principle of expenditures in this direction, supported this proposition. For the last six or seven years it has been conceded that, although the Conservative Government had gone too far in the direction of putting up these public buildings, in 1890 they stopped short. At that time there was a declaration by resolution for a new policy. The Government of that day supported it; they permitted the motion to pass and bound themselves to be guided by it, and I am told that since that policy was laid down it has been very fairly adhered to. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has stated that there may have been one or two departures from that rule during the last half dozen years, but no more, so that the rule that was laid down in 1890, that the revenues and the importance of the place must be sufficient to justify the erection of these buildings, has practically been the policy of the Government of Canada for the last half dozen years. To-day this proposal entirely reversed that policy. We have not only Liverpool and Kentville, but there are other and more flagrant instances in the Estimates in our hands. I would like to ask whether the St. Martin's post office has been struck out? I think it is quite right to strike it out, and that the same argument would apply to

these other places where that argument has not been given. A reason has not been given to this House that will justify these expenditures, but the Government say: "Perhaps a mistake has been made; but if you let these items go through we will see that no objectionable items of this kind will come up again." I think the Government could more gracefully back down than that if they have adopted a wrong course. If these items are passed it will be regarded as a precedent for the renewal of a policy that has been abandoned. They have stretched that policy to a point that has not before been reached, though I must concede that in the past I could point to one place, at any rate, where a public building was erected, that could not be justified to-day. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will do its duty, and will sustain the pledge which was unanimously given in 1890 and which has been adhered to since, by voting for the motion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

House divided :

**YEAS :**

Messieurs

Bain,	Kloepfer,
Bergeron,	Maclean,
Broder,	McMullen,
Cargill,	McCrin,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Oliver,
Christie,	Powell,
Clancy,	Scriver,
Dupont,	Somerville,
Earle,	Sproule, and
Foster,	Wallace.—20.

**NAYS :**

Messieurs

Beausoleil,	Joly de Lotbinière
Belcourt,	(Sir Henri),
Blair,	Kaulbach,
Bostock,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Lemieux,
Britton,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Casey,	Mackie,
Costigan,	McClure,
Davis,	McIsaac,
Ethier,	Maxwell,
Fielding,	Migneault,
Fiset,	Monet,
Fisher,	Mulock,
Fitzpatrick,	Paterson,
Flint,	Perry,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Proulx,
Guay,	Rutherford,
Guité,	Tarte, and
Harwood,	Yeo.—40.
Jameson,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fraser). If I had not been I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. TOLMIE. If I had not been paired with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). If I had not been paired, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) If I had not been paired I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. KAULBACH. Had I not been paired I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McCLEARY. If I had not been paired I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GUILLET. Had I not been paired I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). If I had not been paired I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GILLIES. I am paired with the hon. member for Inverness, or otherwise I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. QUINN. If I had not been paired with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MOORE. I would have voted for the motion if I had not been paired.

Mr. BRODER. I am paired, but I do not know with whom. I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BAZINET. I am paired with the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas). If I had voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I am paired with the hon. member for Brant, or otherwise I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. LISTER. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order to say how an hon. gentleman would vote.

Mr. MACLEAN. When did it get out of order ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member (Mr. Kloepfer) is paired with the member for Brant who has voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Kloepfer) must vote unless he has a pair.

Mr. WALLACE. But he is paired with the hon. member for Brant, and the hon. member for Brant has voted.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not for the Speaker to have anything to say in such a matter, it is for the hon. member himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was paired a few days ago with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) by the Conservative whip. I saw the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) in the House and as I thought he voted, I voted also.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member (Mr. Broder) wish to vote now, under the circumstances?

M. BRODER. I vote for the motion.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I vote in the same way for the motion.

Mr. GILLIES. There seems to be a doubt as to the statement I made. In order to make myself sufficiently clear, I wish to say that if I had voted, I would have voted against the motion of Mr. McMullen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has not voted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was paired with the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), or otherwise I would have voted against the motion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. RUSSELL. And if I had not been paired with my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden), I would also have voted against the motion of the hon. member (Mr. McMullen).

Rivière du Lièvre—Little Rapids Lock and dam ..... \$4,500

Mr. FOSTER. Before these items are carried, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter which I brought up before with reference to the dismissal of Mr. McCallum who was lockmaster and foreman on the Le Lièvre works. We had some discussion across the floor with reference to that matter, and the Minister of Public Works gave a version of the reasons why Mr. McCallum was dismissed. These reasons went upon "Hansard," and Mr. McCallum of course read them. Mr. McCallum takes occasion to question the correctness of those statements made by the Minister—not of course because they were made by the Minister—but that the Minister's information was not correct, and consequently the statements were not as the facts actually were. The chief points of difference are these. In the first place, Mr. McCallum denies that he did anything else than loyally and fairly carry out the instruction that he received from the department. The instructions at first were given to him explicitly, to have recourse to Mr. Duncan McCallum. He had recourse to Mr. Duncan McCallum and to no one else. Then when the instructions were changed, he was told that it was not Duncan but Angus, and after that he was to have recourse to Angus McCallum for supplies, recommendations, and the like. From that time forward he had recourse to

Mr. SPEAKER.

Angus and not to Duncan McCallum. Mr. Angus McMillan, however, took the full interest in it, as he said himself, because Mr. Duncan McMillan did not care very much to be bothered with it, as there was nothing in it for himself. He, however, was employed, even before that time, whilst the patron of the works was Mr. Duncan McMillan. His time was constantly, or almost constantly, employed in carting the stone necessary for the work. This shows that even under Mr. Duncan McMillan, Mr. Angus McMillan, who, I believe, is a good Liberal, was not left out in the cold. The Minister declared that he had dismissed Mr. McCallum because Mr. Bourassa, the member for the county, had asked for his dismissal, and the Minister was of opinion that Mr. Bourassa had gone to the place, had held an investigation, and had found that the facts were in accord with the statement of the Minister, and that Mr. McCallum was untrue to his party. Now, Mr. McCallum denies point-blank that Mr. Bourassa ever made an investigation, or ever visited the works to make an investigation. Consequently, he is in the position of having been dismissed after simply doing his duty, without any investigation, and on testimony which he challenges and declares to be incorrect. Mr. McCallum's friends have asked the Minister, under these circumstances of misinformation, to give Mr. McCallum an investigation into the charges which were made against him by the member for the county, and in the remarks of the Minister whose opinion, I suppose, was drawn from that source, so that he may clear himself of those charges and those assumptions, which he declares to be false. He has sent in, I believe, a largely-signed petition, but not so largely signed as it would have been if he had had more time. What he asks for is simply an investigation. Acting for Mr. McCallum in the sense in which any person outside wishes a member to represent his case here, I mention these matters in order to ask the Minister to grant fair-play to Mr. McCallum and to have an officer investigate the charges. After that, it will be open to the Minister to employ Mr. McCallum or not; but I humbly submit that it is not open to the Minister to dismiss a man under aspersions which would impinge upon his character, and which he denies. It is the right of any man, though he does not enjoy the sweets or emoluments of office, to at least have his character left just as good as it was.

Mr. BOURASSA. The first time this matter was brought before the House I was not present. I have a very short explanation to make. For several months I resisted the pressure of some friends who asked for Mr. McCallum's dismissal from the employment of the Government because I did not care to have him dismissed on political grounds. But during the winter some repairs were made on the Little Rapids lock, and for the sake of economy the department appointed

Mr. McCallum, who was the lockmaster, to be the superintendent of works, and he was instructed to take advice from a certain resident of the township, Mr. Duncan McMillan, with regard to the employment of men. At the end of January he received direct instructions from the department not to apply to Mr. Duncan McMillan, but to Mr. Angus McMillan, with reference to the employment of men and the supply of materials. Instead of doing that, he employed all the same men for the full month of February, without giving any notice to Mr. Angus McMillan. Some of the men who wanted to get work applied to Mr. Angus McMillan, but Mr. Angus McMillan answered that he had no information on the matter, and it was seven weeks afterwards that I thought it my duty to the department to inform the Minister that an officer of his department, who had been instructed to take steps at the end of the month of January, had not done so. Having protected Mr. McCallum against dismissal on political grounds, I thought that he should be dismissed for having, during seven weeks, acted very badly in not acknowledging the duty he owed to the department, and in having disobeyed the orders of the department. It was only by special circumstances that I learned that he had not given notice to Mr. Angus McMillan. After the matter was brought to the notice of the department, he was dismissed on that ground, and on that ground only.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to pursue this further than to say that Mr. McCallum absolutely denies that.

Mr. BOURASSA. I may say that I have the written proofs of all this. I have not them here, but I will bring them to the hon. gentleman at any time he wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister anything to say?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I do not know that I have anything to say about it. I have not made many dismissals and I have been justified in making all I have made. In this case a member of Parliament stated to me what he has just now stated to the House, that is, that he had written evidence that one of our officers was disobeying us. I will never dismiss a man because he is a Conservative, but, at the same time, I will dismiss any of my employees who will not obey me, and I think my hon. friend would do the same. I have not done more than that. On the written statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that Mr. McCallum had disobeyed the written order to apply for information to Mr. Angus McMillan, I dismissed him, and I am sure the hon. gentleman informed me rightly.

#### Customs—

Additional amount required to meet salaries and expenses of inspectors of ports and officers on preventive service.....	\$6,250
Amount required for the purposes of defraying expenses of special preventive service.....	5,000
Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service.....	5,000
To pay John Reid for services.....	200

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to protest against all these items, but especially against the one providing an amount of \$5,000 to be paid the Department of Justice for secret preventive service. My opinion is strengthened by further consideration of this item that it should be struck out. It is an innovation in the customs service which is not justified. As I have already said, it will open the door to practices we are not accustomed to and which will be injurious to the well-being of the country and the Customs Department in particular. It is a well-known fact that enormous powers are given to the Customs Department, because that is the great collecting department of the Government and the revenue requires to be protected. But this is an extension of that power, and the hon. Controller told us he was not going to expend this money but would hand it over to the Department of Justice. That makes the case still worse, because the Department of Justice does not know the customs laws, practice and rulings, and is not familiar with the machinery of the Customs Department for making investigations and of detecting wrongdoing and the requirements for the prevention of fraud against the customs. These are entirely unknown to the Department of Justice, and yet it is proposed to hand that money over to it. I presume it will be manipulated by the Dominion Police. Would the hon. Controller inform the House whether it is to be under the control and management of the Dominion Police?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The Department of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, the Dominion Police are under the Department of Justice. The hon. Controller might tell us whether the intention is that the Dominion Police shall have the conduct and management of this matter. The Department of Justice has no officers of its own to conduct it. It has the control of penitentiaries and Dominion Police, and the only machinery it can utilize is the Dominion Police, and they are not the parties who should be entrusted with this important work. This will establish a system of surveillance over the importers, manufacturers and merchants, and authorize the expenditure of money to pay men to go into the offices of these people and become familiar with their business, or it may be used to bribe the servants and employees of these men. That appears to be almost

the only way in which this money could be utilized beyond what can be properly done to-day under the customs law and the practices of the department. So I think this item ought to be struck out and the Government should take more time to consider the matter before they put such an item in the Estimates. They tell us that smuggling is on the increase. I think it can be safely said that, previous to the introduction of this new tariff, of which I will not speak further, smuggling was not on the increase but, on the contrary, owing to the efforts of the Customs Department, seconded by those in the communities along the St. Lawrence who desired to see law and order maintained—and particularly the Roman Catholic priesthood in the province of Quebec who strove most strenuously to prevent smuggling and who deserve great credit for their efforts, which efforts, I am glad to acknowledge—smuggling was decreasing. Where smuggling of whisky is carried on it demoralizes the whole community. Now it is proposed to take \$5,000 of the people's money for a secret service fund. I think that is objectionable. The necessity for a secret service to be used in any such way as it is here proposed, has passed away. I would therefore ask the Government to reconsider this question, and, pending the reconsideration, to strike out this item.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** The information that comes to the Government leads us to the belief that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is mistaken when he says that smuggling is on the increase.

**Mr. WALLACE.** I said that it had been on the increase up to the time the new tariff was introduced.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** That is just the point I was coming to. The idea that smuggling is on the increase since the introduction of the new tariff is not in accordance with the information we have. What the hon. gentleman says of the efforts put forth by the clergy in the province of Quebec is undoubtedly correct, and it is exceedingly gratifying to have my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) bear testimony to it. Notwithstanding that they have done the best they could to assist the strenuous efforts of the Government, the information in the department has been that the smuggling evil, previous to the new tariff even, was growing greater. The ordinary machinery of the department is not enough to grapple with this evil. The experiment is to be made—and it is only an experiment—to deal with the matter in another way. This is practically a detective vote, a police vote, not necessarily for the Dominion police, but for any officer who may be employed by the Department of Justice. In dealing with this matter we find it necessary to depart from the ordinary methods of Government. If we

**Mr. WALLACE.**

were to take a large sum for this purpose, no doubt it would be objectionable, or even if we were to take a small sum without providing for a proper audit, it would be open to objection. That aspect of the case has been very carefully considered. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave the assurance—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was present at the time—that the record of expenditures would be submitted to the Auditor General, and, if desired, to the leader of the Opposition. As the amount is not a very large one and the evil to be overcome is admitted to be very great, we feel that the House will support us in trying this experiment.

**Mr. MACLEAN.** Is there a similar vote in Washington?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** This Government does not look to Washington—

**Mr. MACLEAN.** But I am asking whether there is such a vote.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I am not aware; I cannot answer my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean).

**Mr. MACLEAN.** I was only going to say to the Minister of Finance that I do not know but that this is a good vote. I am a protectionist and—it may be an unwise admission for me to make—if you have a protective tariff and there are wrongs done under it, you must find means of putting down these wrongs and enforcing the law. I believe that at Washington they have such a vote as this, and I have never heard it complained of. In connection with this matter and in connection with specific duties, which hon. gentlemen have often talked against, that matter was brought before the House at Washington the other day, and it was shown that the only way that they could get a revenue in and protect native industries was by maintaining specific duties; and the free traders there were the men who attacked the ad valorem duties on the ground that they did not protect the revenues.

**The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson).** In answer to the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), I may say that he is entirely mistaken when he says that smuggling was on the decrease prior to the introduction of the new tariff; at least, if he is correct, all the information in the department on that subject must be wrong. The hon. gentleman has given testimony, and, I think, just testimony, to the efforts of the clergy in the province of Quebec to abate this evil. I may say that the strongest representations we get on the subject are from these gentlemen, and their report is that, instead of smuggling being on the decrease before the present tariff, it was

a continually growing evil. There are no people more anxious, I believe, to have vigorous steps taken to put down this smuggling than the clergy of the province of Quebec, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman bears testimony to the help they have afforded in that direction. My testimony from my experience with the department has been to the same effect. As to this being a fund that may be used to oppress people and so on, there is nothing in that at all. This is a fund to be put into the hands of the Department of Justice to be expended in such a way as will command the confidence of the House. This is not for the purpose of harassing importers, but to give additional strength to the Government to put down this great and growing evil.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not rise to criticise the vote, but, so far as it brings up the question of smuggling, I have a word to say. Smuggling of late years has assumed enormous proportions, and I am confident that hon. gentlemen opposite will find, as the late Government found, that it is no easy task to put it down. I am sure, however, that the whole House will wish the Government success, and members on both sides, I believe, would be willing to afford the Government every reasonable facility in dealing with this evil. But I wish to call the attention of the Government to one point, to a weak point in our administration, according to my view. The division of the proceeds of seizures are so made that they are themselves an inducement to smuggling. Therefore, it will not do merely to get a vote of Parliament such as this or ask further assistance in rewarding informers; you must begin nearer home. There is no use in leaving the law in such a way that it offers inducements to smuggling and then seek to counteract that by legislation and the expenditure of money. I have in the past looked into this case very carefully, because the department of which I was the head, the Inland Revenue Department, in co-operation with the Customs Department, had officers to enforce both the inland revenue and the customs laws. With the assistance of my officers I prepared a calculation which showed this condition of things, and one which exists to-day, and I ask the Government to take it into consideration. I found that a smuggler may go to the United States and buy a cargo of these strong wines or alcohols, and bring it in with the view of landing it at a Canadian port, or smuggling it in in some way. If he finds that he cannot escape one of our revenue cutters, and that he is exposed to the danger of seizure and confiscation, by some one stepping in and making a seizure, the whole cargo and the vessel may be seized and confiscated, and he still gets out with a profit.

If he escapes he makes an enormous profit, but if he is seized, under the present law, he makes some profit. Now, does not the House see that if I am right in that statement, there is an enormous inducement to the smuggler. If he is successful he makes an enormous profit; and if he fails in smuggling, he does not lose anything, but he actually makes a small profit. That is the point to get at. I strongly advise the Government to give this question their most earnest consideration.

Mr. QUINN. I must oppose this vote for two reasons. In the first place, I oppose it on the ground of its being called a secret service vote; and secondly, because I think it indicates a desire to move further in the wrong direction which has already been pursued by our customs authorities. It is an acknowledgment, too, that the moiety system to which reference has been made by the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan), has been a failure. The moiety system has been the greatest curse which I think has ever been seen in this country, and has caused the perpetration of numerous frauds, and has brought into activity the worst characters that could have been found in the country. Yet by this vote the moiety system is not abandoned. If there was any hope that it would be abandoned, that would probably be a reason to make a trial of the secret service system. But we tack on to the moiety system a thing which I look upon with greater dread, and which I think will turn out to be a greater evil, than the moiety system, and that is the secret service system. Now, the Minister of Finance said that it is not in the true sense a secret service vote, that it is really a police vote. If it is a police vote why not put it in the form of a police vote? This House and the people of this country do not oppose giving to the Government all the powers necessary for the purpose of managing the police and detecting crime, either crime against the customs and excise laws, or the criminal laws. But the people of this country do object to giving any Minister the expenditure of a large sum of money without his being obliged to account for it to any one. That is what the people object to. Here is a sum of \$5,000 going into the hands of the Minister of Justice to be used by him as he thinks fit. After it passes this House he is not bound to account to this House to show how he has used it, even for customs purposes. He is supposed to use it for customs purposes, but as far as the people are concerned, the moment this vote is concurred in, all control over it is lost, and the Minister is not bound to account to anybody. It is secret service money, and its very nature precludes the possibility of accounting for it. On this ground I must object to it. I think the Government would have done much better if, instead of asking for it as secret service money, they were to provide

for the speedy trial of cases in which goods have been seized, and to pay for a commission, or a board of arbitrators, or a board of judges, or to devise some scheme, no matter what it is, that will secure the speedy trial of persons who are accused of infractions of the customs laws. Another mode might be the establishment of a police force having special powers to look after this smuggling in the Gulf, as I understand that is where it is intended to expend the money. Now, why not come out frankly and say: We want this money for police purposes, and ask for a vote of \$5,000 or \$10,000? There would be no objection to that. But to take a sum of \$5,000 as a secret service money to be expended by the Minister with no obligations on his part to account for it to anybody, is revolting to the ideas of the people of this country, and I think the vote ought not to be concurred in.

To pay expenses of commission appointed to inquire into the Algoma election..... \$547 30

Mr. SPROULE. Before this item is concurred in, I want to say a word with regard to the commission to inquire into the Algoma election. I looked over the report of that commission, and I cannot see why the information reported by the commissioner could not have been acquired just as easily from the Secretary of State here, as by appointing Mr. Crerar to go and make that report. He made one trip to Sault Ste. Marie and asked a few questions of the returning officer, then he made a trip to Dunnville and asked a few questions of Dr. Montague; and upon the strength of that and with the information that he got from the department here, he made his report. He bases his report upon the correspondence that passed between the returning officer and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery here. It was the plainest thing imaginable. There was no information contained in it beyond what might have been got from the department here. I do not see, therefore, any need for that commission whatever, and this sum of \$547.30 appears to me to be a very big sum for a very little service, paid to a needy party lawyer.

Lachine Canal—

Roofing and painting sheds at Jacques Cartier Basin..... \$1,500  
Complete electric station at Montreal.... 2,700

Mr. QUINN. Before this item is concurred in, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that he was to have brought down some papers giving information in connection with dismissals from the Lachine Canal. I have not seen any of these papers yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his place. I would like to ask the hon.

Mr. QUINN.

gentleman (Mr. Quinn) whether the return asked for was promised to be brought down on concurrence?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that case we will have to reserve that item until a later stage in the day.

Mr. QUINN. If you please.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Unless the hon. gentleman intends to move against the item, I hope he will allow it to pass and I will undertake to see that he has an opportunity to discuss it with the Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not know what promise the Minister has made.

Baie des Chaleurs Railway—Operating and maintaining..... \$18,500

Mr. FOSTER. The House will remember that in discussing the Baie de Chaleurs Railway arrangement the other evening I asked, whether or not, before the Government had undertaken to operate that road, the Minister of Railways and Canals had laid sufficient information before the Council that the Council might base its action on a report from the Minister which would give them grounds for supposing that they could operate the road without involving the country in expense. I think the committee will remember that I ventured the assertion that the Minister of Railways and Canals had probably laid no such detailed information before the Government. I asked that the Order in Council be brought down. I shall just read an interesting and instructive portion of this Order in Council that the committee may know the utter absence of any information there was before the Council when they determined upon taking over the running of the road for which they had not the least parliamentary authority and for which they had no appropriation. The Order in Council reads:

On a report, dated 17th November, 1896, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, stating that the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company have made application for a revote of the subsidies granted to the Great Eastern Railway Company towards the construction of a railway from Sorel to Chaudière Junction, and also for a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile for the extension of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway from Paspébiac to the Gaspé Basin, and have prayed that the amounts of the several bonuses given by the Dominion Government and the municipalities and provincial government may be taken and held by the Government of Canada as a fund out of which to guarantee and pay interest on the company's issue of bonds, as authorized by their charter, and in accordance with the scheme outlined in the company's proposals.

That is one share of their proposal.

The Minister observes that, in promoting their application, the company have pointed out that the Baie des Chaleurs Railway is at present in the hands of sequestrators, under proceedings pending in the courts of the province of Quebec,

and is not, therefore, in running operation, greatly to the injury of the section of the country through which the road passes, and it is represented by the president, directors and other persons who have been heard by the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council in support of the application of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company, that the operating of the said railway during the winter would be of immense benefit to the locality through which it runs, and would be a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, and they add that arrangements are practicable and could be made, if approved by Your Excellency in Council, between the courts having the sequestration proceedings before them and the Department of Railways and Canals.

The Minister adds that, in proposing that the Government should take over and operate the Baie des Chaleurs Railway for the coming winter, it was strongly represented to the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council that the road was in good, safe working condition, and was provided with sufficient rolling stock in good serviceable condition, and could be operated for the winter season by the Department of Railways and Canals as a branch or feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, not only without loss to the Government, but so as to produce a balance over working expenses.

That was the assertion of this celebrated individual by the name of Armstrong against whom my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) delivered such a fiery philippic and declared that he would not touch him with a ten foot pole. It was the assertion of this gentleman that this would be a valuable feeder and that if they would just take it over and operate it for six months in the winter it would not be a loss but it would actually bring in a valuable revenue. The Minister of Railways and Canals had no other information of any sort to back up the proposition. With the statistics of that road before him, with the expenses and receipts as sworn to by the company after it had been run for two years, he simply accepts the assertion of the promoters, leaps into an illegal and unauthorized operation of a railway and then comes to Parliament and meekly says: "We went into it as an experiment; we have lost \$12,000; we ask this Parliament for money to recoup us our expenses." I simply thought it would be well to read this Order in Council to show upon what information a business Government undertakes an unbusinesslike arrangement.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the most unbusinesslike proposition ever submitted by any Government in the history of this country. What are the arguments advanced in its favour? It has been strongly represented by the parties interested, they say. We have our own engineers whom we could send out at a day's notice to look over the railway. We could have ascertained how much traffic was handled. We could have got all this information but we did not take the trouble to get it. It has been strongly represented to us by the parties who are likely to profit by the transaction. To think that the Minister of

Railways and Canals with all the officers at his disposal—engineers, accountants and others, who are in the pay of the Government, did not take the trouble to look into this and ascertain whether or not it was possible to operate the road without loss, seems almost incredible. If this is regarded as a business transaction that ought to satisfy the Council it should not be looked upon as a business transaction that will satisfy this House.

#### Welland Canal—

To pay William Higgins, from time he became unable to work, 20th October, 1896, until the date of superannuation, 1st February, 1897, at \$38.....	\$139 33
To pay G. Edwards, from time he became unable to work, 20th October, 1896, until date of superannuation, 15th December, 1896, at \$45.....	79 16

Mr. McCLEARY. While we were discussing this question a few days ago, in reference to the Welland Canal, I called the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to some of the dismissals there and he questioned the statement I made as to the number that had been dismissed. He said that about 45 men had been dismissed. I stated that in addition there were 50 or 60 others, and he questioned the accuracy of my statement. In addition to the 45 men dismissed along the line of the Welland Canal formerly referred to, in the counties of Lincoln and Welland there were 69 others, which would make 114 dismissals. And in addition on the feeder branch the men dismissed, would number 15 or 20 more, so that out of 160 or 170 men employed on the Welland Canal upwards of 125 or 130 have been dismissed. I just call the attention of the Minister to this because he has given his friends carte-blanche there and they have been carrying out his instructions to perfection.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister nothing to say at all, when, after having made a statement to this House that no more than forty-five had been dismissed, in refutation of a statement made by a member of this House that many more had been dismissed, and now when the hon. member comes directly from the scene of action and reiterates this statement that more than he asserted have been dismissed, and the Minister simply says: I think your information is not quite correct. The Minister is in either one position or the other. Either he is not administering his own department, but it is being done by a committee, so far as dismissals and appointments in their places are concerned; or else, he is not giving to this House the information which the House ought to have, that is, authentic information when a Minister speaks as to the facts under consideration. I could easily see that the Minister might not be within a few of the number, but there is a wide divergence

between the statement as to forty-five, and twice or three times that number, that it does lead to the conclusion that some committee somewhere is arranging the dismissals or reappointments without the knowledge of the Minister.

Amount required to pay the British American Bank Note Company for printing and engraving Dominion notes..... \$33,656 15

Mr. FOSTER. The House will remember that on Friday there was a little conversation on this item with reference to the Jubilee stamps, and the Postmaster General made certain statements with reference to the British American Bank Note Company. These statements, of course, went upon the "Hansard," and I have had a communication from Mr. Burland with reference to what the Minister said. I do not want to put the House to the trouble of listening to the whole of the letter, but I may mention that Mr. Burland says that the statements made by the Postmaster General were, in Mr. Burland's opinion, not in accordance with the facts. He says:

When it became known that a Jubilee stamp was about to be issued, I waited upon the Minister, and, after discussion, he promised to give us the work. Our artists then prepared a design, which was submitted to the Minister. Upon examination, he admitted his ignorance of such matters, and referred the matter to Mr. Dobell by letter, which I conveyed in person along with the design. Mr. Dobell examined it carefully, approved of it, initialled it and wrote to Mr. Mulock to that effect. This letter I myself delivered to the Postmaster. He then delayed a decision, and from week to week for several weeks put the matter off, pleading that he was very busy and that he wished to take the opinion of a clerk in another department, whom he claimed was an artist. This clerk had himself made a design which was entirely unsuitable, and the Postmaster never at any time said the one submitted by us and approved by Mr. Dobell was not suitable. The design now actually in use is only slightly altered from ours, and not improved thereby.

All these delays were made, as it now appears, to allow our contract to expire.

Then Mr. Burland denies the statement made by the Postmaster General as to the inequality or unevenness of the work, and the inferior quality of gumming. Mr. Burland says that his work for thirty-five years answers for itself, and he is quite willing to let it go against the statement of the Minister. This is the substance of the assertions made by the president of the old company, and I think it only fair to have his statement go to the House, along with the statement made by the Minister on Friday, as his statement rather reflects upon Mr. Burland's work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite adhere to what I said before, and with regard to the reference to Mr. Dobell, it is hardly worth while referring to it. It happened in this way: I was submitting my

Mr. FOSTER.

sketches to various persons, amongst others to Mr. Dobell, and I think I had given them all to Mr. Dobell to look them over. Mr. Burland was running after me perpetually—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Burland denies that he ran after you.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He pursued me until he got possession of these sketches. I think Mr. Dobell made a selection out of the number, but they were in a crude state, wholly unfinished. I have nothing to withdraw of my statements whatever, and if Mr. Burland thinks I made any promise to him, and if he chooses to bring an action against the Crown, he shall have every opportunity to do so. If he has any promise from me he can have a remedy through an action for breach of contract. He called upon me after the work was given to the other company, and in the presence of my secretary we went over the whole matter, and in the course of that interview he stated that he recognized the fact that he had not received any promise, that he had no claim whatever, and that he only wished to publish this work himself. I myself would have preferred if I could have given it to him. I was anxious to have given it to him; my feelings were that way.

Public Buildings—Quebec..... \$58,908 15

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost of the Berthierville public building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not spend a dollar more than I am asking for, \$5,000.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there are some items here that should not pass, especially the vote of \$7,500 for Montmagny post office. I therefore move that it be struck out, seconded by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

Amendment negatived, on division.

To meet expenses in connection with the visit of Hon. Mr. Laurier to England at the celebration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the leader of the Government tell us generally what is the proposed method of expenditure of this amount. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to give the details at all.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is of course aware that under the circumstances it would not be for the credit and honour of Canada that the Premier should be stinted in his expenditure. He will almost of necessity have to visit a great many places and people, travelling a great deal, and, as he himself and Lady Laurier, with his secretary and ordinary attendants, will form the party, he cannot by any possibility—

Mr. FOSTER. Does this include the body-guard ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I cannot say that the military gentlemen will form part of his retinue. They are provided for from a different source. I am not in a position, of course, to give the hon. gentleman the details, but I think he can be certain that Sir Wilfrid Laurier will maintain the honour of Canada in a suitable manner, without extravagance, but without undue parsimony. That is all the information I can give. I think both sides of the House will feel that he should acquit himself on all occasions in a manner befitting the Dominion, and the very great distinction with which he has been received by all parties in England and elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no disposition at all to quarrel with even a generous amount for travelling expenses for the representative of Canada in Great Britain during the Jubilee celebrations. In fact, I would not be very careful to limit it exactly to the Jubilee week, or the time set apart for the celebrations. I am sure that gentlemen on this side as well as on that side can see in the Premier not simply the representative of a party, but the representative of the whole country on an occasion like this. It was not my disposition, in calling attention to this, to quarrel particularly with the amount. Of course, I know that Mr. Laurier—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg pardon—Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his immediate attendants are the guests of the Empire for the official period of the celebration; but I am quite aware also that outside of that there are large expenditures which any gentleman representing Canada as he does must be called upon to make; and I am not at all anxious to be carping or critical over the amount. While the people of this country are economical, the people of this country are also of sufficient good sense and sufficiently proud in their proper representation in Great Britain, to be willing that their representative should be treated in no niggardly way. I hope the hon. gentleman may have a most excellent good time. I am sure that Canada will be well represented, and I do not grudge hon. gentlemen opposite whatever pride and whatever satisfaction they may get out of their leader's position and tour as the representative of Canada during the Jubilee celebration.

Intercolonial Railway—Extension to Montreal—To pay rental to Grand Trunk Railway Company and Drummond County Railway Company for railway from Chaudière to Montreal, to be operated as part of the Intercolonial Railway, nine months..... \$157,500

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point with reference to this vote that I would like to have some information about. The House will remember that this item did not come down in the preceding Estimates, although the conditions were settled and the arrangement was virtually concluded when the House met, and the contract was signed on the 15th day of May. The House will remember also that this proposition started in this House in the form of a Bill, and that it passed this House and went to the other component part of the legislature. There it was thrown out, and, if my memory serves me rightly, it was thrown out on the morning of the 24th of June. But if I am not mistaken, the Governor General's Message, which brought down this item of \$157,000 as an item of the Estimates, thus seeking to carry out, in an indirect way, the intention of the Government which at first had been propounded in a Bill which failed to pass both Houses. What seems a little peculiar is that a Message should have been signed by the Governor General in advance of the decision of the Senate. To me it appears that at some period during the day of the 23rd June, before the Bill was negatived in the Senate, which happened on the morning of the 24th June, and consequently, before the decision of the Senate could have been possibly registered, the Governor General, with his own hand signed what was the alternative of the Government, provided their first proposition did not receive the assent of Parliament. I think an explanation is due the House, for the Government's sake, and probably for other reasons, and I hope my hon. friend will give us that explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that my hon. friend is in error in assuming that the item was in any way dependent upon the vote of the Senate. It was an item which would have been necessary anyway, and was omitted in the general Estimates, simply in error. It was a mere accident, and we brought it down as a supplementary Estimate irrespective of any vote in the Senate. It so happened that before we had the opportunity to bring it down as a supplementary Estimate, the decision of the Senate had been reached. The House was in committee all afternoon and night, or the item would have been laid on the Table at an earlier stage. It was not prepared in anticipation of any vote of the Senate, and would have been brought down even if the Senate had passed the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Government had been successful in putting through their scheme by way of a Bill, and this arrangement to pay \$64,000 and \$6,000 a year, and \$37,500 a year and \$40,000 a year and \$62,500 a year had been carried through, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he would have been obliged to come down to this House every year and include all these

items in his Estimates, or would he have considered it amply sufficient, as in other cases in the past and present, that when a statutory financial obligation is provided for a series of years, it is not necessary to bring down a vote each year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Statutory items are often submitted in the items for convenience. In this case, even if the Bill had passed, we would have required an appropriation for the nine months. That is the view taken by the hon. gentleman hitherto, and that was the view that we took, and the Estimate had been prepared and signed by His Excellency and ready to be submitted to Parliament before the vote was taken, and without respect to what the decision of the Senate might be.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not answered the question. Would he ask for that vote in the Estimate every year for ninety-nine years?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not an uncommon practice to insert in the Estimates the items which are provided by statute in order that the whole expenditure of the year might be known. My hon. friend took exception last year to the omission of an item of a statutory character. He thought it should have been in the Estimates, so that his own view then differs from his view to-day. The principle he laid down was that the Estimates should show the whole contemplated outlay for the year, and when I omitted to include the cost of the extra session of Parliament in the Estimates, my hon. friend took exception.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to have some more explanations from the Government with regard to this vote of \$157,500. Those explanations are entirely unsatisfactory. The Minister of Railways tells us that this is an experiment to be followed by another vote of \$100,000 for rolling stock, which is also an experiment, since it depends on this vote. Did anybody ever hear, in this or any other country, such a proposal as that made in these two resolutions? The Government had a scheme by which, at an expenditure of \$210,000 a year for ninety-nine years, they were going to extend the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec or Lévis to Montreal, but Parliament would not accept it. Now they propose to get around the decision of Parliament in another way. How do they propose to do that? By voting for nine months—the three months, I presume, it will take to construct the connecting links—\$157,500, and they will have to vote, I presume, a sum of money for the construction of that connecting link in addition, or give some further assistance, because that company could not go on with the construction of that link without some money to do it. Now, this proposal is to vote \$157,500 as an experiment, presumably to see whether the work will be profitable,

Mr. FOSTER.

but the hon. Minister told us there was no experiment about it. He gave us the figures of freight and passengers; 1,100 passengers per day will require to be carried, and 400,000 tons of freight in a year. There was no experiment about it. He had the figures down fine, he had a certainty. There never was a more glaring fraud in any proposal submitted to this House. Here is the Grand Trunk Railway, which is interested to the extent of \$5,000,000, because it is a moderate calculation to say that if the bargain which the Government desired to put through had been carried, the Grand Trunk Railway could have raised \$5,000,000 on the strength of it. Parliament, however, threw out the proposal, and then the Government come down with this proposal as an experiment to try for this year. Why, it would be the most successful experiment that ever was submitted to Parliament. The Grand Trunk Railway being interested to the extent of \$5,000,000 would send all their freight from Quebec to Montreal and Montreal to Quebec over this road within these nine months, in order to insure getting these \$5,000,000, which they would get practically for nothing, because they would have, in any case, to build the works themselves to accommodate their own traffic, which the Government propose to pay them for building. And the Government's rolling stock running over the road will be the smallest injury to the line and the slightest possible inconvenience to the Grand Trunk Railway. They will get this \$5,000,000 very largely for works which they contemplated building at any rate, and for which they would have had to raise funds from other sources. So, it would be to their interest, for these nine months, to make the experiment an abundantly successful one and, for that reason, to send their freight and passengers by the Government road for these nine months. They would receive two-thirds of \$157,000, or \$105,000 for these nine months, and other moneys besides. And when the Government came to Parliament next session, they would be able to say: You said this was not going to be a prosperous business, but we can show you that we have distanced the Grand Trunk, we have done twice as much business as they, and as it has been in the past, so it will be in the future. The proposition the Government made to have this experiment tried is so transparent that I wonder at the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) submitting it to the House. What did that road cost? I have a statement that I will read for what it is worth. It is said to have been made by a former officer of the road who knew what he was talking about, and who submitted these as official figures to parties to whom the road were creditors in an earlier stage of its existence. Grading, \$500 a mile; ballasting, \$250 a mile; ties, 2,640 at 18 cents each, \$375 a mile; iron, 56 pounds to the yard, say \$2,500 (this covered joints, bolts,

and spikes ; track-laying, \$150 ; five bridges, cost \$150,000, say \$1,500 a mile ; land damages, \$750 a mile ; probable cost of the road a mile, \$6,025. On the credit side were the following items :—Say \$50,000 received from the local government for bridges, representing for the whole mileage, \$500 per mile ; subsidy from the Quebec Government, \$4,000 ; subsidy from Dominion Government, \$3,200 ; making a total of receipts of \$7,700 per mile, which, as against an expenditure of \$6,025 would leave \$1,675 as clear profit for those who carried out the work of construction. Now the Government propose to give them at least \$2,000,000. I gave an estimate the other day, based upon careful calculation, that what the Government was giving would be worth \$2,200,000. So, besides this \$1,675 per mile, which was divided among a number of fortunate individuals. I presume they are to have over \$2,000,000 divided amongst them ; and we are told that Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Farwell, of Eastern Townships Bank, and a number of others—particularly a number of others—are to have this very large sum divided amongst them. It is even said that members of this House—and perhaps not those on one side alone—are also to have a share in the distribution of this money, or were going to have a share in it if Parliament had been generous enough to vote the money.

Mr. TALBOT. Do you know the names of any ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am told that another House is going to ascertain their names and other particulars, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) who has put his question has any further knowledge he can give it to the House. I have no doubt he has some information that would be very valuable to them, though he has not much that is of value to this House. Now, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has taken, apparently, a very deep interest in this scheme. There is no doubt that whether he has any financial interests in it himself the investigation will disclose that he is in very close touch and in closest financial relations with Mr. Greenshields and those other gentlemen who are interested most deeply in this scheme. That cheques have gone from one to the other, have gone from the promoters of this scheme to the payment of indebtedness of the Minister of Public Works is something that, I think, he himself has admitted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No, I do not admit that ; and it is not true.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement that I made was that cheques have gone from these parties for the payment of the indebtedness of "La Patrie"—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will go further and state that I have financial interests with Mr. Greenshields and will have the manliness to ask for a committee of inquiry, I pledge myself that this Government will immediately consent to it in this House. I cannot say more than that. Sir, I ask that hon. gentleman, if there is any manhood in him, to bring out his accusation against me now, and from my seat in Parliament I will ask for an inquiry to take place immediately. If he is a man, let him do that.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that anybody is very much frightened by this little fireworks display on the part of the Minister of Public Works. He says that if I have the manhood and courage to do so, he will meet me. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I have ever lacked the courage of my convictions ; and I can say this—that I have never run away from a prosecution—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nor I either.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Public Works started a criminal prosecution in the province of Quebec, and when the day was fixed for the trial, he was many hundreds of miles away from the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What the hon. gentleman says is quite inaccurate.

Mr. WALLACE. What I say I know to be true.

Mr. SPEAKER. When a hon. member gives a denial on a matter which is within his own personal knowledge, of course, every hon. member must accept that statement.

Mr. WALLACE. That is just what I wanted. I was stating a fact that was within my own personal knowledge.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he was referring to a statement contradicted just now by the Minister of Public Works. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to withdraw that reference, then he will place himself in order ; otherwise he would be out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that in connection with the inaccuracy of the distance that intervened between the hon. gentleman and the prosecutor ? If so, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) knew that he, the member for West York, was inaccurate. That is not a denial by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know what the denial was. I made a statement that the hon. gentleman started a criminal prosecution against an individual in the province of Quebec. Has he denied that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And ran away, which is not true.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says he did not run away. Is that the statement that I have to withdraw? The next statement I made, and which I shall not withdraw, is that when the case came on for trial the hon. gentleman was not in the province of Quebec. I made that statement knowing it to be true. And I make another statement, and that is that a criminal prosecution was started by the hon. gentleman—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I ask my hon. friend to keep in order.

Mr. WALLACE—a long time ago, and it has not come to trial yet, and I am told that the reason that it has not come to trial is because—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself to the item that is under discussion. This matter is entirely irrelevant. It may be very interesting and proper to discuss on a proper occasion, but that is not just now.

Mr. FOSTER. The item under discussion is the Minister of Public Works, and it was raised by himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman understands that he is trifling with the House in saying that.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know when a discussion of this question could come on more properly than in connection with a vote for the Intercolonial Railway extension to Montreal. That was the matter that I was discussing.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the matter that I was discussing when the hon. gentleman tried to draw a herring across the trail.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, without my drawing his attention to it, that questions relating to a certain criminal trial in Montreal have no connection with this Intercolonial Railway vote, and the time of the House will be saved if the hon. gentleman will confine himself to questions that have to do with this vote.

Mr. WALLACE. If you will take the trouble, and I am sure you will, you can recall to your memory the fact that when I was addressing myself strictly to the item under discussion, I was interrupted by the Minister of Public Works who dragged in these irrelevant matters, or what you call irrelevant matters. He referred to my manhood, and challenged me to bring in some other matter. I think that that is quite within your recollection, Mr. Speaker; and consequently if there is any irrelevancy, it

Mr. WALLACE.

was not due in any degree to any statement that I made to this House. The whole matter was brought up by the Minister of Public Works himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am prepared to assume that the hon. gentleman considered that it was irrelevant when he introduced it; but I do not think it was, and therefore he will oblige me by keeping the debate within the limits of relevancy.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is quite relevant to say that this matter is being now investigated by the other Chamber of this Parliament, and I am quite sure there will be a thorough investigation of this case; and according to the evidence that we have before us—but perhaps I should not prejudge the case—but at any rate there are sufficient facts before us to justify us in saying that it looks very much like another Baie des Chaleurs scandal, if not a great deal worse. We know, and it has become public property outside of this House, that men have been dividing up the shares of this company, they have been distributing them. Suppose one share is worth \$100, the cash value of it would be easily worth \$500, because there are two million dollars profit less \$400,000, making easily \$1,600,000 profit on this transaction. This is money that the Government proposes to hand over recklessly and extravagantly for the construction of this portion of the road, a total of three million dollars between what this company would get and what the Grand Trunk Railway will receive. So that this experiment that these gentlemen propose to make with \$157,000 of the people's money and another \$100,000 that appears immediately before it, and explains the evils of this experiment, I say is a wilful waste of the money of the people of Canada, and it will simply keep alive this further scheme for an expenditure of \$210,000 a year for 99 years, for giving the Government's guarantee to it, is equal to a cash payment of \$7,000,000 at the present time. I am entirely opposed to this scheme, and I do not believe that the people of Canada will consent to it. Why, just look at it. Lines of railway where there is no business to be done. There is a Grand Trunk Railway line from Montreal to Quebec, there is a Canadian Pacific Railway line from Montreal to Quebec, and there is a South Shore scheme, and here is a fourth line. But without the South Shore scheme, this would make three lines of railway running from Montreal to Quebec to do business that can easily be done by one line of railway. That proposal looks to me perfectly absurd. These two rival companies were perhaps justified each one in trying to get to the city of Quebec and connecting with the Intercolonial Railway that they might continue their road there. But that a third line should be proposed, and then this fourth line is absurd. With these three lines of

railway reaching from one of these points to the other one along the south side of water communication, is totally unnecessary and a waste of the money of the people of Canada. There is a great big job behind it, whether the Government are aware of the extent of that jobbery is a matter that investigation will prove. But I do not accuse the Government of being parties to it as a Government; I do not accuse the Government as a body in being parties to any corrupt transaction, but investigation will prove whether there are any members of Parliament or of the Government connected with this job, or implicated in the transaction. I think the Senate did wisely in throwing out the Bill, and I think the Government would do wisely in refraining from pressing forward this vote for \$157,000.

#### MILITARY EQUIPMENTS.

Mr. GUAY asked :

In re Lewis Military Equipment—Will a test be made by the authorities with a view of ascertaining the best equipment to be adopted for the use of the Canadian militia? When and where will the test be made? Will the Lewis and Oliver be considered in the test, and are there any other equipments to be considered? Who will be the judges in this matter? What are the conditions under which the test will be made? Has the question of the equipment been placed wholly in the hands of the General Officer Commanding the Militia?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Four sets of the Oliver, Merriam, and Lewis equipments are now being tested and will in due course be reported upon by the permanent corps at Halifax, London and Toronto. These are the only equipments under trial in this country. The reports will be considered by the general officer commanding in conjunction with the Minister of Militia and Defence. The conditions under which the tests are being made are their general suitability. The question of the equipment has not been placed wholly in the hands of the officer commanding the militia.

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

#### After Recess.

Intercolonial Railway—Extension to Montreal ..... \$157,500

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words upon this item that is now engaging the attention of the House. I understood the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) before six o'clock to say in answer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that this item had been assented to by the Governor General in pursuance of an arrangement that was entered into for the lease of

the Drummound County Railway, and also with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to enable the Intercolonial Railway to get into Montreal. Was I correct in that understanding?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I did say was that the Message of His Excellency was obtained before the vote had taken place in the Senate, and that it had no reference to that vote.

Mr. SPROULE. For the purpose of paying for the balance of the financial year the moneys incurred under that lease?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the purpose of paying the rental for the period covered by these Estimates—for the fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. Under that lease?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, originally under that lease.

Mr. SPROULE. In my judgment, it cannot be constitutionally done, because if the Governor General's assent is got to any item in the Supply Bill the money must be appropriated for the purpose for which it is obtained, and not used for any other purpose. I think that there is nothing clearer and nothing plainer in the constitution than what is written in reference to that. I have here Dr. Bourinot's work which, to my mind, expresses it very clearly. In the first place, it lays down that :

All the checks and guards that the wisdom of English parliamentarians has imposed in the course of centuries upon public expenditures, now exist in their full force in the Parliament of the Dominion. The cardinal principle which underlies all parliamentary rules and constitutional provisions with respect to money grants and taxes, is this : Whenever burthens are imposed on the people, to give every opportunity for free and frequent discussion, so that Parliament may not, by sudden and hasty votes, incur any expenses, or be induced to approve of measures which may entail heavy and lasting burthens upon the country. Hence it is wisely ordered that the Crown must first come down with a recommendation, whenever the Government finds it necessary to incur a public expenditure, and that there should be full consideration of the matter in committee and in the House, so that no member may be forced to come to a hasty decision, but that every one may have abundant opportunities afforded him of stating his reasons for supporting or opposing the proposed grant.

In the old legislatures of Canada, previous to 1840, all applications for pecuniary assistance were addressed directly to the House of Assembly, and every Governor, especially Lord Sydenham, has given his testimony as to the injurious effects of the system. The Union Act of 1840 placed the initiation of money votes in the Crown, and this wise practice was always strictly followed, up to 1867, when the new constitution came into force. By the 54th section of the British North America Act, 1867,—which is copied from the clause in the Act of 1840—it is expressly declared :

Then, the clause of the British North America Act which gives that clause, says :

"It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, Address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a Message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, Address or Bill is proposed."

The effect of this clause is that it is not only compulsory that the Governor General's assent to a vote, that is to the amount, shall be obtained, but he shall also approve of the purpose for which the money is to be expended. If it were a fact that the Governor General's assent was got to this item in pursuance of an agreement that was entered into subject to the approval of Parliament for the renting of a railway for ninety-nine years it will not be held that it would not be appropriating money for another purpose if you change that to the renting of a railway for the nine months which is the case here. The Minister of Finance does not contend that this lease in the event of its being carried out will extend over nine months, but the original lease was for ninety-nine years, and when the Governor General assented to this item he only assented to it for carrying out the previous lease for ninety-nine years and for that purpose alone. It is diverting the money from its original purpose to say that you will use it to pay the rental of the railway for nine months instead of ninety-nine years. On the other hand, it seems to me that this was to pay for the balance of the financial year during which this lease would run in the event of its being assented to by Parliament. The lease will commence on the 1st of November, but the financial year ends on the 30th June, so that there would be only eight months of the financial year to run instead of nine. Whatever view the Minister of Finance takes of it, he cannot constitutionally use this money for this purpose, or the Governor General was deceived when he was asked his assent to the expenditure to carry out the lease for ninety-nine years if the Government take it to carry out a lease that was entered into for only nine months. The Governor General was either misled or else the hon. gentlemen are using the money for a purpose other than that for which it was intended when they asked the assent of the Governor General. I think we are being asked to assent to something that we should not assent to. Why? Because in assenting to an expenditure of \$157,000, we are assenting to an expenditure of \$157,000 for an experiment. I think I might appropriately say that the only three principles of government adopted by the present Administrations are the following:—Government by commission, because they have appointed commissions for every conceivable purpose imaginable; government by plebiscite; and government by experiment. They are appointing commissions to get information upon which they base their judgment as to the need of

Mr. SPROULE.

legislation; they have promised to take a plebiscite to get information from the people as to what they want done, and lastly, they are now introducing a novel principle, that of experimenting. I think this experiment is going to cost us too much. It means not only an expenditure of \$157,000 to pay for the lease of this Drummound County Railway and to obtain privileges from the Grand Trunk Railway for nine months, but it means an expenditure of \$100,000 more for rolling stock, and of \$300,000 to assist the enlargement of Victoria Bridge. I take it that if we had not contemplated this scheme the Government would not have consented to assist to the extent they have, the enlargement of Victoria Bridge, for the use of the Grand Trunk Railway, because, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company required, for their own purposes, on account of increased traffic, the enlargement of that bridge, I do not think Parliament would be justified in granting them any such assistance as that which is now proposed. I say that we have been drawn into that by virtue of this agreement which has been thrown out by the Upper Chamber. We shall be committed to an expenditure if this goes through, of \$557,000 for the purposes of an experiment which is only to last for nine months. I do not think the people will appreciate that kind of government. We do not think the proposition is sound. We have always held that the proper course for a government to pursue is to lay their plans before Parliament, after they have been maturely considered, with such information as they have in regard to them and much explanations as will satisfy Parliament that they are in the interest of the country and that if they meet with the approval of Parliament, the Government should take the responsibility of carrying them out. In this case they submitted a plan and Parliament did not assent to it. Instead of dropping it, an effort is made in another way to force through the same scheme. I do not think this is right. It is an innovation that Parliament should not assent to. For these reasons, I oppose this vote, and I oppose it as strongly as I know how. I believe it to be unsound, I have not advanced any other reasons for that belief, although I think there are many. I think Parliament should refuse to assent to it. We should not, for the purpose of an experiment, or any other purpose, ask Parliament to vote that sum of money to carry out that portion of the agreement.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am in favour of the state ownership of railways, and I would like to see the Intercolonial brought to Montreal and not only brought to Montreal, but brought to Parry Sound. While I hold this view, and while I would like to have seen the Government introduce legislation to that effect, I cannot approve of the proposition before the House. It is not a well-matured

proposition, it is not one in the public interest. While I cannot approve of the proposition on its merits, still less do I approve of it when I have regard to the railway policy of this Government. I would have expected that when the Liberal party came in power they would have seen the mistakes of the Conservative party in relation to railways if there were any mistakes, and avoided them, but their policy is one that will only aggravate the present railway situation and do nothing to improve it.

To my mind, the great problem before the people of this country is the railway or transportation problem. It exceeds all others in importance. The tariff question is nothing in comparison with the problem before the people to secure the cheapest and best possible transportation for the products of the country. That is what the whole country has at heart, and that is what Parliament ought to secure. But from what I can gather, this particular proposition, as well as the general proposition of the Government with regard to railways, is altogether at variance with that object. What has taken place up to the present in regard to railways? In the first place, the railways of this country have been built chiefly by railway promoters—by men who have got large bonuses from municipalities, large subsidies from the provinces, and large subsidies from the federal treasury; and what have these men done? They have given themselves stock; they have watered the stock of the railways they have controlled; they have issued bonds and given the bonds to themselves or sold them at a great discount; they have formed themselves into construction companies and cartage companies. In every way they have manipulated these railways in order to make large profits for themselves at the public expense; and, so far as I can see, the Government of this country up to the present time have aided them in doing so. Not only have these men done that, but when they exploited these roads and made all the money they could out of them, they abandoned them, and turned them over to the very railways they were to be the rivals of. The same thing is being done now. The more railways you build the less you solve the transportation problem. Instead of getting the largest amount of traffic moved at the smallest cost, all we do is to get the least traffic moved at the greatest cost. A railway manager to-day has this proposition put before him—not how to accommodate the people and give them cheap transportation, but how to make dividends on inflated capital, on bonds which were stolen, on a railroad that was built by a construction company and that had probably been robbed by the men who exploited it. The Liberal party who are in power to-day have not addressed themselves to the railway question. They have not sought to reduce railway freights or passenger fares.

They have not sought to do anything in the interest of the people. All we see to-day is an endeavour to do something in the interest of the railway promoter. The people of Canada have asked for reduced passenger rates. I have tried to bring that question before the House, and I have received very little encouragement. The people of this country have sought to have a stop put to the scandal that exists of railway passes. Almost all the members of this House and of the other House have railway passes in their pockets. The people of this country want to see an effort made to do away with that scandal, but this Government have done nothing in that direction. The people of this country want to see fewer lawyers on the railway committee of this House. The only persons whose interests are mainly consulted in that committee are the railway promoters, the men who exploit the railways and make money out of them. Surely it is time an end were put to this. Surely it is time that gentlemen with the opportunity which the Liberal party have to-day, coming fresh into office, should attempt to do something in the way of solving the transportation problem, and obtaining for the people cheaper rates. We would have expected that the very first measure of their railway policy would have been one looking to the establishment of a railway commission for this country. They say they will give us a railway commission; but we are only to get it after these monopolies have been strengthened, and put in a position to be still more injurious to the country. The railway men of this country have asked me and other members of this House to seek to induce this Parliament to protect them from accidents. We brought in a Bill for that purpose, had a special committee to inquire into the subject, and had a Bill reported, but it is thrown out. The leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) told me the other day that I would have to wait several months for legislation in this direction. Why should not this Parliament do something for the people who sustain these railways and for the men who work on them? But instead of that, all we see is an effort to continue the old scandals, and the old way of doing business, and to strengthen these monopolies and give them all they desire. Take the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a great railway, which was built by the Conservative party, and they claim it as one of their great achievements. I give them credit for that; but that Canadian Pacific Railway to-day ought to be regulated by Parliament. Parliament ought to be the master of it; Parliament should have control over the rates of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. But, instead of that, Parliament is asked by the Liberal Government to strengthen that monopoly, and to give it greater privileges, instead of limiting its

privileges and regulating it. Now, I hold that all this should come to an end—that this House should cease to legislate in the interest of these railway promoters. They come here in their private cars; you will see them down at the station; they are here every day. They are the men who get attention in Parliament; but the men who work on the railways get no attention. It was said the other day that the Conservative party are committed to all these projects for the extension of railways, and to this project in particular. As a Conservative, I must repudiate that, especially as a Conservative coming from Ontario. The Conservative party, now that they are in Opposition, are prepared to make a new departure. They are prepared to give their most earnest attention to this railway problem. They do desire to regulate these railway monopolies and to give the people some relief in passenger rates; they do desire to do something for the benefit of the men who work on the railways; and they would have expected that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), of all the members of the Cabinet, would have joined them in this policy. He was a railway reformer some time ago, and he was supposed to be the railway reformer of the Government. But all we see is an attempt on the part of the Government to strengthen these railway monopolies. Look at the position of their great organ, the "Globe" newspaper. Is it not a scandal to find a newspaper which denounced the Pacific Railway from its inception, to-day the most pronounced advocate of increasing the powers and privileges of that great monopoly? Is it not a fact, as one of the members from British Columbia showed the other day, that the president of this great newspaper was interested in this deal in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway? After the record of the newspaper, we would have expected that it and the men connected with it would have been to-day fighting the battle of the people and not the battle of the railway monopolies? So it is a matter of regret to me to see the Liberal party to-day, instead of making a new departure and doing something for the people who maintain these railways, strengthening these monopolies in every direction. They even propose to strengthen the monopoly in connection with the Rainy River Railway. That is a project for a railway from Lake Superior to Winnipeg or near Winnipeg, and it is the most desirable railway project in this country to-day. If the Government were earnestly desirous of solving this railway problem, they would not only extend the Intercolonial to Montreal, but they would secure control of the railway to Parry Sound, put a line of steamers on Lake Superior, and build the Rainy River Railroad to Winnipeg; and along with all this, they would have taken complete control of the Crow's Nest Pass

Mr. MACLEAN.

Railway. If they had done these things, the railway question would now be in process of solution. Instead of that, all they do is to temporize. They have not considered the matter carefully, or if they have considered it at all they have only considered it in the interest of railway monopolies. I to-day appeal to the Liberal party and to the Government to take their time. I say to them: Abandon this ill-digested proposal to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal; have it investigated as it is to be investigated in another Chamber; and let there be also an investigation into this British Columbia Southern Railway Company. Let us know who these men in British Columbia are, who are so largely interested in that deal. Let us know who the Ontario men are who are so largely interested in that British Columbia deal, and who have tried to force it through this House. I say to the Government: Take time, take another year; first establish your railway commission, as we should have a railway commission in this country, and let Parliament first of all remove the scandal that surrounds the pass business. These pass scandals in connection with railway matters stink in the nostrils of the people of Canada. Here we see the Government and Parliament voting millions to railway companies, paying the greatest attention to railway presidents and railway solicitors who come here in their private cars: why, you see them all over this House, and you hear them through the press. But when the railway employees come here and ask for anything, it is a certainty that they will not obtain it. When the people of the great North-west come here and ask relief from oppressive railway rates, they cannot get it. Sir, all these scandals are continued to-day and are aggravated by the Reform party now in power. The Reform party has made no attempt to remove these evils. I say that if the Government are wise, they will not only abandon this poor scheme of theirs to bring the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, but they will throw the Crow's Nest proposition over and that they will throw the Rainy River proposition over until they first of all establish their railway commission and purge this country of the scandals which in the past have been extant in connection with railways, and which I am sorry to say are now being perpetuated. If the present Government will not do that, we of the Conservative party are prepared to stake our reputation and our future on a new solution of the railway problem, and we will become friends of the people and friends of the railway employees. We will do something to remove the scandals, and we will do something to give to the people of this country what they are entitled to and sadly need: lower passenger and freight rates. If there is any section of the members of this House who ought stand up for

such a policy it is the farmers, and especially those who are posing here as Patrons. If the representatives of any section of the country should support this policy more than another, the representatives of the great prairie country to the west should take a foremost stand. I am sorry to find, Mr. Speaker, that a number of the western members who declared themselves as prepared to vindicate the rights of the people in regard to the railway problem, are not here to-day to continue the fight they commenced in the earlier part of the session. If these gentlemen were here to-night, and if they had joined in this fight against such a railway policy as we now have presented to us, I would do my best to assist them. I will content myself now by saying: I do regret that the Reform party has not put forward a progressive policy in regard to the railway problem. I do trust that they will take time and allow these railway proposals to go over for at least another year. Failing that, I undertake to say that the Conservatives who come from Ontario intend to make the transportation problem the great question before the people of Canada, and they will hold the Reform party up to the people for judgment in connection with this question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. member from East York (Mr. Maclean) has done me the favour of referring to me in the course of his remarks. He has taken upon himself to announce a new policy for the Conservative party. I do not know whether he is the new leader or not, but he certainly would make a most worthy one, and I say it with all sincerity. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) speaks in the name of the Conservative party, I am reminded of the fact that he is the first member on the other side of the House who has yet announced this great policy. I am not going to quarrel with him about his policy—on the contrary I largely sympathize with him in it—but when he tells us what friends of the people the Conservative party will be in formulating this policy and in liberating the people from the thralldom of railway tyranny, I am reminded of the peculiar fact, that for seventeen years the Conservatives were in power, and that during all that time they did all they could to fasten the shackles on the people of Canada. When did the Conservative party in the last seventeen years give any evidence of adopting the policy that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) now announces for them?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am one that did so for the last seven years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) credit for that. He is consistent in advocating the same course in Opposition as he did when his friends were in power. He

spoke then in his own name, but he did not speak in the name of the Conservative party, and I fancy that he speaks now for himself and for himself alone, so far as the Conservatives are concerned. I need not give the record of the Conservative party in connection with the railways. It is written upon the pages of our history: it is written upon the statutes of our country, and it is written on the minds of the people who have no faith in them, and who have put them where they are to-day. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has no hope from the Liberal party, but let me ask him: What has the Liberal party done so far? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is in favour of the rationalization of railways. It is a popular idea: it has its attractions, but there are practical difficulties in the way. Nevertheless, the action of this Administration so far as has been in that direction. Whatever may be the demerits or merits of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway scheme, there is one consideration in connection with it which is at all events novel, and which is in the line of the policy of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). That Crow's Nest Pass Railway agreement provides in the most unmistakable language, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall enjoy no monopoly of the carrying trade over these 330 miles of road between Lethbridge and the western terminus. On the contrary, the agreement that we have prepared provides that every railway company that desires it shall be entitled to running powers over that line, not upon terms that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may impose, but upon terms that the Governor in Council shall impose, until a railway commission is established. The very fact that the agreement alludes to a railway commission, implies that the Minister of Railways, and the Government in sympathy with him, contemplate in the near future inviting the attention of Parliament and the country, to just such a tribunal as my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) refers. And, not only in the western country has our policy been in that direction. In the east we are aiming at bringing the Intercolonial Railway to the great metropolis of Canada, the city of Montreal. We have sought to nationalize the railway system of that section of the country, by securing at least running powers over other lines, and enabling the Government railway to control rates between the head of ocean navigation and the seaboard. I would rather approve, if it were possible, of extending that policy in which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has seen the realization of his hope, so that from one end of this great continent to the other there shall be at least one great Dominion Government road, operating as a regulating power to prevent railways in private hands being unjust towards the people of this country. And, Sir, inasmuch as the Liberal party both in the east and in

the west have given evidence of the faith that is in them, it ill becomes the Conservative party as a whole—I except the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) for he has always been consistent—it ill becomes the Conservative party as a whole to pretend that they are the friends of the people now—proclaiming, Codling is your friend, not Short—when for seventeen long years in power, they failed to give any effect whatever to the policy that is new born in them; a policy which we are told they are to resort to in the future to try and delude the electorate to believe, that they are desirous of the people's welfare.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) In case it might be taken for granted that my silence meant the approval of this item for the lease of the Drummond Railway, I think it my duty, in justice to myself and the province from which I come, to say that I am entirely opposed to any such grant, particularly in view of the fact that for sixteen sessions in this Parliament I urged on the party I supported the construction of certain branch lines in the province of Prince Edward Island. After a number of years of insistence and great patience, I succeeded in getting them to approve of the policy I advocated and to commit themselves to the construction of certain lines of railway in that province which would entail an expenditure of about one million dollars on the Dominion. The Conservative party, when it went out of power, was committed to that expenditure, at the rate of about \$250,000 a year, until these branches were completed. Not only was the Conservative party committed to that expenditure, but my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and my hon. friends from Prince County (Mr. Yeo and Mr. Perry), expressed themselves strongly in support of the construction of certain branch lines in the island which would have entailed a larger expenditure than that which I and others with me advocated. I think, therefore, it shows on the part of the hon. gentleman who has a seat in the Cabinet as the representative of Prince Edward Island, a great lack of interest in that province, or a very small amount of influence on his part with his colleagues, that while the Government are committed to the expenditure of millions of dollars throughout the length and breadth of this country, the claims of Prince Edward Island should have been entirely overlooked. We find that in the various railway subsidies which the Government have brought forward, in not one of which Prince Edward Island has any interest, there is to be expended over the length and breadth of this Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, about \$11,000,000. That is the total which we will have paid in railway subsidies when the various lines to which

Mr. MULOCK.

they are granted are completed. The Government are committed to an expenditure of between three million and four million dollars on the Crow's Nest Pass. They are committed to an expenditure on the Drummond line lease for nine months of this year only, to \$157,500, and which may be repeated for ninety-nine years if the Government could have their own way, as intimated to us by the Minister of Railways. We are further committed to an expenditure for rolling stock in connection with this same line amounting to \$100,000. And the Government have asked Parliament for a vote of between \$18,000 and \$19,000 to pay for the expenses of running the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, which they had not the authority of law nor any other reason except their own political exigencies, for entering into. Besides this they had committed themselves to an annual expenditure of \$210,000 on the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, which city has already three roads connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, and were only prevented from incurring this extravagant outlay by the refusal of Parliament to consent to it. They are committed also to a very large expenditure on the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, in the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, amounting to some \$300,000. I find that the Government have undertaken to provide for the construction of 346 miles of railway in Nova Scotia, twenty-six and a half miles in New Brunswick, 123 miles in the province of Quebec, besides an additional expenditure of \$662,672; 181½ miles in Ontario, amounting altogether to 677 miles in these provinces, exclusive of 330 miles in British Columbia, making a total of over 1,000 miles of railway in these different provinces. And notwithstanding the fact that the little province of Prince Edward Island has to contribute to the construction of all these works, her claims to consideration are entirely overlooked. The plea was made by the Government in favour of the expenditure of public money for the construction of a public building in a certain county in Nova Scotia that it had not hitherto benefited by the expenditure of any portion of public money for such purposes. On that very ground, we could much more forcibly appeal for a fair share in the distribution of these moneys. We are called upon to pay taxes for the construction of lines of railway and all the other public works of Canada, and surely we ought to have these branch lines built in our province to connect with our present system, which, I beg to remind this House, the people of our province have built for themselves entirely at their own cost, for if that money had not been expended in the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway, we would be entitled to the interest on the amount it cost, which would go towards meeting the expenses of the pro-

vinces. I therefore contend, and always have contended, that we owe nothing to the people of Canada for the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and if we should get anything towards the construction of branch lines, that would be the first expenditure in the shape of railway construction for which we might be indebted to the people of Canada. Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to object, in the strongest way possible, to the expenditure of this vast amount of money in the other provinces while our province is overlooked. I intended to have said something on this matter before, but I waited from day to day in the hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine would have been able to induce his colleagues to have put an item in the Estimates which would at least have carried out as good an arrangement for the construction of those branch lines as their predecessors in office had committed themselves to. I regret, however, that the hon. gentleman seems to have been quite over-ruled by his colleagues and unable to induce them to place an amount in the Estimates for this purpose.

Intercolonial Railway—To purchase additional rolling stock..... \$100,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been considering this matter since it came before the Committee of Supply, and talked it over with the officials of my department, and I have decided to propose to the House a reduction of this sum. The estimate was originally made when it was contemplated that the agreement entered into, which was submitted to Parliament, would have been approved, but in view of the fact that it has not, and therefore is at an end, we have thought it necessary to ask for a reduction of this sum of \$100,000. With the consent of the House, I would move that the amount of \$100,000 be reduced to \$50,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has come to no clearer determination as to what rolling stock he will buy—whether he will buy from the Drummond County Road or get new stock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can state very confidently that to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that it is not our purpose to purchase any portion of the equipment of the Drummond County Railway.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

#### (In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, the sum of \$1,772,474.61 be granted out of the consolidated fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service, the sum of \$26,552,226.85 be granted out of the consolidated fund of Canada.

Resolutions reported.

#### SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1897 and 30th June, 1898, for purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The House again resolved itself into committee to consider certain resolutions (page 4736) respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also therein mentioned.

#### (In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go on to the different items, I would like to have a little information with reference to that expression that is used twice there as to what shall be the "cost" of the road. It comes in in reference to the limit fixed of \$15,000 per mile for which the \$3,200 shall be granted, the rule being, if it can be called a rule, that the cost over \$15,000 per mile shall have a proportion equivalent to 50 per cent of the extra cost paid—I think that is the interpretation given—the whole not to exceed \$6,400. Now much depends as to what you are going to lay down as the cost of the railway, as to what may actually enter into the cost, as to whether the sum may easily be brought up to over \$15,000 on the ordinary railway or not. I take it, for instance—and it would be well if the committee could have a thorough understanding on that point—I take it to be granted at once that rolling stock of any kind does not enter into the cost to be computed for the payment of subsidies. Am I right in this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, again, with reference to the surveys. There are, I suppose,

different kinds of surveys; there is what you may call the exploratory survey which takes a view of the country in different directions to find out which is the section through which you may make the location survey of the road, and sometimes those exploratory surveys are very expensive. Is it to be understood that these exploratory surveys, or that any of the surveys, and if so, what part of the surveys, will enter into the computation as to the cost of the road?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I cannot say that I have given the subject to which the hon. gentleman refers, very careful consideration, but I would think that it would be a matter, with perhaps other things that will occur, and which would require to be considered in the same connection, in regard to which it would be rather difficult to lay down any hard and fast rule at the moment. It occurs to my view now, speaking, as I said, without giving the subject very careful consideration, that the cost of the survey would be a very fair item to take into account in determining what the whole cost of the road was.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The cost of the exploratory surveys?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Well, I should imagine that the cost of exploratory surveys would be quite as important as the cost of the final survey would be. It would all necessarily enter into the cost of construction, and it would be a very important thing for the companies to have the surveys made in a thorough manner. I think perhaps it would be dearing somewhat unfairly with any enterprise if we were to refuse to consider the sum which was actually laid out in necessary surveys, as a part of the cost of construction.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend will see that opens a pretty wide question. A company undertake in the first place, just experimentally, the mere idea of putting a road between two points, and may go to a large amount of expenditure in general exploratory surveys before they can come to a conclusion as to whether it is possible to put the road through or not. Once they have made these exploratory surveys, then they commence the work of actual surveying to locate the road. Now, if the former are allowed, it may be easily seen that a very large expense may be heaped up which, distributed over the mileage, would go very far towards gathering a sum to enlarge the cost of the road. My hon. friend is aware, I think, that in a great many cases these exploratory surveys are paid for in stock, or may be paid for in stock of the road. Now, suppose that that takes place, or suppose, what often does take place, that the stock of the road is taken by the

**Mr. FOSTER.**

builder in part payment, that is, that he gets so much cash and then takes so much stock, the stock being simply of a nominal value. Is the stock either of these cases to be computed as a part of the cost, and if so, how would my hon. friend arrange rightly to apportion the value which he ought to allow as actual value of the stock so applied towards exploratory surveys or to building? Or does my hon. friend take the safer course of simply keeping down the cost to what is the actual cash put into the road? If my hon. friend confines himself to that, then, of course, he is upon more solid ground; but if he is going to allow stock as part payment to enter into computation of the cost, then he will have very great difficulties in determining as to what is to be attributed as the actual value of the stock of an incipient railway company.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I would think that when a claim is made for the maximum, or a sum in excess of the minimum, subsidy it would become the duty of the department to look critically into the question of the alleged cost, and require to be furnished a complete statement in detail of the items which have gone to constitute the total amount which it is alleged that the road has cost, and upon which a claim for the larger subsidy is made. I would think if it appeared that there had been a contract for the construction, one portion of which provided that the contractor should be paid in stock, a large amount of stock, or even a smaller amount of stock, or that he would be paid in stock at all, that moment, suspicion would naturally be aroused as to whether the claim that the company made, was one which would stand inspection or not. We are not, I think, at all likely to find much difficulty in getting at what ought to be the cost of the construction of any railway when a claim of this kind is made or a question of this kind is raised. It is not at all difficult for competent engineers to look the ground over, to examine the work which has been done, and to make an estimate of what it has cost actually or should have cost. When it is found that the figures which are presented by the company claiming the subsidy, are in excess of the figures contained in the estimate, I would feel that it was my duty to ask the officers of my department to look closely into the question and satisfy themselves as to whether in point of fact the cost had exceeded the estimate, and if so, why, and in what respect the excess had arisen. I think there would be no serious difficulty experienced in getting at what ought to be the true and actual amount of the cost.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I had hoped that the hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways and Canals would have said that in computing the cost nothing should be accepted as cost except the actual cash that went into

the road. What consideration from stock or otherwise the contractor may get does not represent that which goes into the road. That is considered something which might mature in a number of years or might not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you are right about that.

Mr. FOSTER. If you allow stock at all as part payment of the contractor I think great difficulty will be experienced in arriving at the cost. But there is another difficulty that will be met, and that is in reference to the cost of bridges. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals on Saturday talked of there being no rule before, and said that there was a rule now. In what way? Before the rule was that \$3,200 a mile should be given for each mile of road; to-day the rule is that \$3,200 should be given for each mile of road not exceeding in cost \$15,000 a mile, and if it exceeds \$15,000 a mile then a certain proportionate part shall be given. How is one any more a rule than the other? You say that the former was not always carried out. There were exceptions to it. It is very true that as each road came up it was decided according to the circumstances of the case, the cost of the road, and the like of that. Perhaps cases may be found into which considerations entered which some one might submit did not exactly have reference to the cost of the road. But what I mean is that you simply had a rule that was laid down in the Subsidy Act for that one year and no other. You have no more of a rule now. You are not passing an Act of Parliament which you yourselves shall have no power to repeal, declaring that from this time on there shall be this rule adopted and no other. You are bringing down this Subsidy Act for one single year, and for a single year you say that this shall be the Subsidy Act, but it is perfectly open to you for another year to bring down another Subsidy Act and to grant subsidies on whatever conditions you see fit to impose. The rule will be determined, just as it has been heretofore, by what you think of the circumstances each succeeding year. There was one rule that was strictly adhered to in the past, and it was that as far as bridges were concerned we should not give more than 15 per cent of the cost of a bridge of \$200,000 or over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That only applied to bridges exceeding in cost \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, to bridges costing \$100,000 or over. That rule was closely adhered to so far as I know. For bridges smaller than that no percentage was given. What will happen in this case, and it is an important fact that the committee should turn its attention to. Suppose you have 50 miles of road being built; under the old rule, we will say, you give \$3,200 for

each mile of road, that would amount, in round numbers, to \$160,000 in subsidy for the 50 miles of road. You may have one bridge costing \$100,000. Under the former law you would only grant 15 per cent of the cost, and upon that amount it would be \$15,000, so that if you paid \$160,000 for the road, and \$15,000 for the bridge under the former rule you would be giving \$175,000 for the 50 miles of road. Take the present case. You have 50 miles of road, which we suppose will not cost more than \$15,000 a mile, so that the subsidy for the road will be \$160,000. But there is a bridge which costs \$100,000. Instead of giving 15 per cent for that bridge you distribute \$100,000 over the 50 miles of road and you pay one-half of the cost to the whole road. Instead of paying \$15,000 you are paying \$50,000. Heretofore 15 per cent was given for a bridge if it came up to \$100,000. Suppose with 50 miles of road you have four streams crossing each of which would require \$25,000 for a bridge, you are paying on the four bridges \$50,000 and you distribute that over the whole of the 50 miles. You are giving \$50,000 where under the old system you would not pay a single cent for these bridges. This is a costly form of subsidy, leaving out of account the fact that no mile of road is going to cost more than \$15,000 so far as the road itself is concerned. You have recommended a plan by which you are going to pay for bridging, a large amount. This is a matter which the committee must think of before it goes into ecstasies over this new rule. Another point is this. Suppose that a road of 50 or 100 miles is being built, and is coming into a city as one is now into Ottawa. It must have terminal facilities, and it spends \$100,000 perhaps for one mile of road. You will be paying the subsidy over the whole road and be paying a half of the cost to be added to the \$15,000 so that you may find yourself paying for half the cost of very expensive terminal facilities. These are important points which we ought to have settled. We ought to know just where we are. By adopting this new rule we will be paying more than under the old one. We will be paying for all this extra work of bridging and providing terminals while heretofore the country has not been paying for bridges unless \$100,000 were exceeded, then only 15 per cent of the whole. We paid for no terminals, and we paid for no bridges under \$100,000. If there was a \$100,000 bridge we paid simply 15 per cent of the cost. We ought to have some very clear information as to these terminals and bridges. We ought to know just where we are being led before we vote this form of subsidy. I should much rather, and I think it will turn out better, to keep to the \$3,200. Make it hard and fast if you want to, and I will support every effort to do that, but if Parliament at any time saw that a particular

piece of road could not be built without a greater subsidy, Parliament would be free, as it will be free hereafter, to say whether or not that particular road, or part of a road, should be paid more than \$3,200. You may depend upon it, that this principle that we adopt here, unless you limit it on the matter of bridges and terminals, will lead to very large demands of money so that in connection with all these roads that run into large towns and cities, you will find that you are paying the full \$6,400 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that it is not at all difficult to suppose cases in which there would appear to be a probability of the subsidy to be earned under these resolutions exceeding the subsidy which, in many cases, would be paid at the minimum amount, under the old system. But I do not feel, even supposing there were some such cases, that we would be thereby justified in preferring the continuation of the old system to the new plan which is here submitted. In the first place, I do not think that the question of terminals will be one which need be regarded as having any application in the present case, because, we are not proposing to pay subsidies further than upon the construction of the railway. We are not proposing to include in the calculation, any sum which is expended in the acquiring, or in the construction of costly terminal facilities. I do conceive, that what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has said on the subject of bridges, has been very fairly said, and may be taken as likely to occur in some cases under this plan. I do not at all, however regard that as an unsafe condition. I think, on the contrary, it has elements of fairness in it which will commend themselves to the approval of the committee.

I think that the object which Parliament has had in view in giving subsidies from time to time, is to lend its assistance towards the construction of railways upon something like an equitable plan, dealing in something like an equitable spirit with the various undertakings which the Government has approved. And in doing so, I do not think that it is fair to say to a railway company which is building a line having to cross in its route some extensive rivers, that it ought to be denied a fair and reasonable contribution from the treasury for its undertaking, in proportion to that which is given to other roads which have not these costly bridges to construct. I take it, that the effect of the refusal to give aid to bridges which were costly (though they did not come up to the sum which called for the usual 15 per cent contribution) has led in very many cases to the undue prolongation of the railway in order to, in the first place, avoid the cost of constructing these bridges; and, in the second place, to get the subsidy which the added mileage brings. On the other hand, it seems to be that the public

Mr. FOSTER.

interest on all sides demands that a railway which is projected to connect certain points should not be any longer than is absolutely necessary, and that every inducement should be offered to connect the desired points in the most direct possible way. The effect of our saying to the people who put their capital in these enterprises: We are willing to take into consideration in estimating the cost, the whole outlay that you are obliged to make from one end of your line to the other, including not only the cost of the roadbed, but the cost of bridging all the rivers which you may have to pass; the effect of our saying that will be to establish a fair principle and one which we can well afford to adopt. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that, on the whole, a recourse to the old method is at all desirable. I could name to this committee quite a number of railways which have been favoured by Government and Parliament, to the extent of receiving very much more than the ordinary subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, which were not more costly in construction and had not one whit stronger claim to larger aid, than many railways—or perhaps the great bulk of the railways—that have been built in this country on the \$3,200 subsidy. The difficulty that we wish to obviate is a serious difficulty. It is a difficulty which I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) experienced when, as a member of the late Government, he had to consider applications for subsidies. He has felt constrained to yield to the demands which have been made on him in one quarter, for a large subsidy—\$5,000, \$6,000 or \$8,000—and he has felt compelled to refuse to give to other claimants whose roads were going to cost just as much money, and had as great merit in them, he has felt compelled to refuse these any larger subsidy than the \$3,200 per mile. Take, for instance, the case of the Rainy River Railway. From what we know of the general character of that country, all will concede that this road will be costly to build, and I think the feeling is that it is a road which will likely open up a class of country, the development of which we ought to encourage. Well, now, we could scarcely come to Parliament and ask for \$6,400 a mile for that road, and refuse it to roads in other parts of Canada. We could not refuse it to the latter without creating a very great deal of dissatisfaction and without creating the belief in the minds of the people who are interested in these other railways that Parliament is dealing in one manner with an undertaking because it happened to be located in one part of the country, and dealing in a different manner with a road because it is located in another part of the country. I believe that every part of Canada should be dealt with in the same equitable way, and upon the same rule. Therefore, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has said, I still feel that the principle embodied in the

resolution is one that has very much to commend it over the practice, or custom, which has hitherto obtained. I admit what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has said, that it would be quite possible for us to come back next year and say: We will depart from this rule and we will adopt another rule; but we could not do it without stating to Parliament that the policy which we adopt to-day is a policy we had reason to recede from, and that there are good reasons why the policy we advocated in the session of 1897 ought not to be a policy which we would continue to advocate in the session of 1898. But, for our policy now, it is to be assumed that unless we shall have good reason to see that it was not a judicious policy to continue, unless the working out of this method of subsidizing railways shall prove to be unwise and not in the public interest, we shall continue it in the future. So that, I am not at all convinced by what the hon. gentleman has said that we are not laying down a rule. We are, I think, clearly. We are putting this forward as a policy, and it is a policy which will govern all railways included in the present resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us see what we have arrived at. We are not having any more fixed rule than before, because my hon. friend has himself stated that if next year the Government see fit, they will change it; that is, each year will bring its own wisdom and the cases will be judged on their merits, just as they have been in the past. What I want to draw the attention of the committee to is this—they may be in favour of it, or they may not, but let us understand it. Hereafter, with respect to every considerable railroad—because I think every good railroad will run to \$15,000 a mile—you are paying one-half the cost of every bridge on it. Heretofore we have subsidized railways, but never bridges, unless to the amount of 15 per cent of the cost of bridges costing \$100,000 and over. After this, on railways costing \$15,000 or over, you will be paying just one-half the cost of bridges. If the road does not cost \$15,000 a mile on the average, then you will have one-half the cost of the bridge to be added to the average of the whole to bring it up to \$15,000 a mile or over, and you will pay one-half the cost over that. Do I understand that the terminals in the way of station houses, &c., are excluded?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, supposing you are subsidizing a railway which runs into a city, and which in order to get into the city has to build a mile or two miles of road, and has to pay a very heavy cost for the right of way into the city. Does the cost of this right of way form a part of the cost of the

road, and are you going to take this into consideration. If so, wherever you subsidize a railway that runs into a city, such as Toronto, Ottawa, or Hamilton, or any other fairly large city, where it costs a great deal of money to get into the centre of business, that railway is going to get into the centre of the city while this rule prevails, by which you will pay half that cost, because of course the cost will be very large, going far above \$15,000 a mile. If you exclude buildings, the question is, are you going also to exclude land damages for right of way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would necessarily have to include in the cost of railways the cost of land damages and right of way. That would properly form part of the cost of construction. But when the hon. gentleman conjures up a case of the subsidizing of a railway running into a large city, and feels that there is ground for alarm lest the cost will run up into large figures, I think he is rather allowing his fears to control his judgment. We are not likely, I think, to be subsidizing railways running into very large cities. My own view would be entirely against encouraging the construction of new lines into large cities. I think there are very few large cities in Canada, where the cost of entering the city would be high, into which there are not already sufficient railways constructed; and I think it would be a very proper thing for the Government to insist that any new roads coming from other directions and entering the city should enter over one of the existing lines. At all events, we would be very careful not to contract to give a subsidy to any railway which was likely, in entering a city, to roll up any very large expenditures, or which was likely to add very much to the amount of the subsidy. We would have to take all these matters into consideration. I do not think any of the roads here referred to are likely at all to present any such case for alarm as the hon. gentleman suggests. There is one road, the Kingston and Smith's Falls, and with respect to that I have a suggestion to make in amendment to the resolution, which will provide that we shall only subsidize it to a point distant from the city, so that it will have to make arrangements to enter the city by one of the existing railways. I do not know that any one of the railways here referred to would be likely to come within the case the hon. gentleman fears.

Mr. CASEY. While the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is thinking up another conundrum, I want to ask for some explanation from the Minister as to his reasons for not granting the request of a certain railway company to share in these subsidies. The Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway is a railway which takes its origin at Windsor, under charter to reach Buffalo, according to its present amended charter, by way

of Ridgetown and St. Thomas. The road has been completed as far as Ridgetown, which is just within the western boundary of my constituency, under the distinct understanding that it was at least to reach St. Thomas where it would obtain an eastern outlet. The part of this road already constructed serves a district of country which is not served by any other railway, and the municipalities in that district have given considerable bonuses to it in the hope of obtaining an eastern outlet for their produce. At the present time, even from the eastern end of that road, the competition it has created enables the people to get better rates eastward, by sending their freight first west to Windsor and then eastward over the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, than they had before, but still not as good rates as they could get if they could ship east by way of St. Thomas. The distance is between forty and forty-five miles. I was on an influential deputation who urged the claims of this road on the Minister last winter. The objection urged against this road was that for some distance it would closely parallel the Canada Southern, operated by the Michigan Central. I think, however, that the circumstances of this road take it out of the category of those to which that objection would be fatal, for although there is a parallelism, it is only to the extent of 25 miles according to the latest plan, as I informed the hon. Minister, though, according to the first plan, which was before the Minister when the deputation waited on him, it would have been some 35 or 40 miles.

Now, the feeling of my constituents is that this road should be subsidized as an outlet for the country served by that part of it, which I am speaking of as the loop running through Southern Essex and Kent, which is a district not served by any other railway. In the second place they know from experience that the Canada Southern does not supply an outlet for their own trade. The county of Elgin, at least my constituency of West Elgin, has never had any Dominion money spent in it for railway construction. That county bonused the Canada Central to the extent of \$250,000, and a part of it gave a further grant afterwards to what is now a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, formerly the Credit Valley Railway. These people, who have been paying for years to subsidies granted in other parts of Canada, feel very strongly that it is about their turn to have a railway in their own county, which would be of material benefit to the business men and farmers of that district.

It has been suggested that along this part of the road, which is parallel to the Canada Southern, running powers could be obtained from the latter. In reply I would beg to say that I see very little hope of our obtaining such running powers on any reasonable terms. The Canada Southern is an ex-

**Mr. CASEY.**

tremely busy railway, carrying fully as much freight per mile as any part of the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, if not more. It has an immense number of trains of its own running over the road, and I do not think it could accommodate any more. Then, it is practically a through road. Notwithstanding the bonuses it has received from the county, it has not laid itself out to encourage local traffic. The railway is practically a link in a through line over the Michigan Central and New York Central, and local traffic is not favoured by it to the extent it should be, and consequently our business men and farmers are suffering from want of accommodation.

In view of all these considerations which I have already urged strongly on the Minister of Railways, I would like, for the sake of my constituents, to have an explanation from him to-night of the reasons which have induced him to leave that road out of even the Supplementary Estimates. I do not propose to find fault with those lines which have secured subsidies, but there are certainly some which have no better claim on the Government.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman is quite correct in the statement he has made. In company with a number of gentlemen interested in this railway, he applied to me to recommend to Council a subsidy for this road. In the course of the interview, they presented a plan showing the location of the proposed road and showing the other lines that were in the locality, and according to the plan, the new line, for which they desired aid, would parallel for a considerable distance, between 30 and 40 miles, the line of the Canada Southern, and parallel it within about half a mile distance. Under the circumstances, I did not feel that I could encourage the applicants in the hope that their request could be favourably considered. I thought that it was our duty to assist them in every way in our power to acquire running rights over the Canada Southern, and I learned from them that they had not applied to the Canada Southern at all to ascertain whether running rights could be obtained over that road on any reasonable terms.

**Mr. CASEY.** It was considered hopeless.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** So the delegation stated in the course of the interview, and so the hon. member has stated to me since. But I think that until the attempt, at all events, is made, and it appears clearly that there are good substantial reasons why such a concession cannot be obtained upon reasonable grounds, we would not be justified in assuming that such an arrangement is not within the bounds of probability or possibility. I fully sympathize with the desire of the people

in that neighbourhood to have their own line of railway. I am well satisfied that the road which they have already constructed has been very useful. It has, I believe, encouraged business in that neighbourhood and it has given quite a stimulus to certain classes of products.

Mr. CASEY. Do you mean the Canada Southern?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I mean the Lake Erie and Detroit Road.

Mr. CASEY. It only comes four miles within my constituency so far.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not confine it to the hon. gentleman's constituency. It comes from the other side of the peninsula, starting at Walkerville. This line runs down in the form of a bow until it very nearly touches the lake shore, and then deflects until it comes within half a mile of the Canada Southern following that road for a great many miles. It runs through a very rich country, and has stimulated classes of production which would not otherwise have been stimulated, and I do feel that we ought to go slowly in the matter of subsidizing railways which will duplicate existing roads and closely parallel them. I am not, however, averse to looking very carefully into the whole subject in order to ascertain whether it is possible to effect arrangements with the Canada Southern Railway whereby running rights over it can be acquired by the Lake Erie and Detroit. If after every means have been exhausted, a reasonable arrangement cannot be made, I would be very sorry to say that I would, so far as I am individually concerned, refuse to consider the matter further. I would be very glad to give it the best consideration in my power, and I think that if there is a bona fide effort made on the part of those promoting the undertaking to secure running rights and they fail, then the Government will be in a very much better position than it is in to-day to ask the House to consent to a subsidy.

Mr. CASEY. Before we drop that question, I would like to say, with respect to running powers, that it does not seem likely that the Canada Southern or rather the Michigan Central, who control that company under lease, would be willing, of their own motion, to give running powers at any reasonable figure to a rival company. I believe that the price that the new company would have to pay for these running powers would be more than the interest on the cost of a road through that country. Unless compelled to give these running powers, they would put the figures as near as they could up to what it would cost another railway to build a new line. If the hon. Minister is willing to say that he

will exercise powers vested in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to compel a reasonable arrangement, and would take action in the direction of a subsidy in case any such arrangement could not be effected, it might put a different colour on the question, but still the railway company and I, as a representative of the people concerned, feel that would be a very different thing from having an independent line of road. A company using a part of another company's railway track either by sufferance, under rental or by decree of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is not able to act with the same independence as if it had a line of its own, or to offer the same accommodation to the public. I would strongly urge, notwithstanding the paralleling of a short distance, my original contention. As to the plans of the Minister no doubt a trial survey was made on these lines. But it has been agreed to by the railway company with myself and others in the district that they shall leave the neighbourhood of the Canada Southern Railway at Dutton and cut across the country to St. Thomas, opening up a new country that really needs railway accommodation as much as any other in that district. Then, although the parallelism may exist for this 25 miles—I think that is the distance—the parallel road is required as a necessary outlet for what I have called the Essex loop of the road, which has no other means of outlet. For all these reasons I must strongly urge on my hon. friend the Minister, to reconsider if possible, before next session, if he cannot do it this session, the decision he has come to on that point, and to secure for these people the outlet for which they have largely paid municipal bonuses. I will emphasize again what I feel that I have been justified in already emphasizing, that fact that my constituents have paid out of their taxes for railway advantages, and that they are in a different position from counties that have had large sums of Dominion subsidies spent upon them. We have paid for our own roads as well as for others, and we think we are in a strong position when we ask for further accommodation in the construction of railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words about the principle involved in these railway resolutions before we go into the discussion of the several resolutions separately. To my mind the proposal is a very dangerous one. It may lead to all kinds of difficulties. It puts into the hands of the Government a power which they may use to an alarming extent to corrupt the constituencies. I think there is no doubt whatever about that. Since the first year when the Government adopted that railway policy it was held by the Opposition of that time that it was done for the purpose of corrupting con-

stituencies, and that when the Government wished to exercise an undue influence over a constituency in which a railway passed, it had in its power to do so by reason of the system that had been adopted in the bonusing of railways. Now, if that be the case with regard to the old method under which it was laid down that a railway subsidy should be a certain amount per mile, \$3,200 or \$4,000 or whatever it might be, how much more must it be the case under the present arrangement by which the Government have it in their own hands to raise the subsidy from \$3,200 to \$6,400 a mile. There is no doubt whatever that it puts in the hands of the Governor in Council a power which they may exercise to an alarming extent to corrupt the constituencies of the country. We have heard complaints of this over and over again in this House when the gentlemen who now sit on the treasury benches were on this side of the House; it was thrown up to the Government in the House time after time and also to the individual member of the constituency that this was intended as a corrupting agency. So I am surprised that so many members on that side who formerly occupied places on this side of the House have not a word to say in regard to the matter to-day. I have never believed, when a specific amount was fixed as a railway subsidy that it could fairly be called a corruption agency. But when you leave to the Government to say whether a subsidy shall be \$3,200, or \$3,400, or \$4,000, or \$5,000, or \$6,400 a mile—I think they can be depended upon to manipulate the figures so as to make the cost come out right—nothing else can be expected but that it will be used as a corrupting agency among the constituencies of the country. Therefore I view this proposal with great alarm. I think there is danger in it and that in the future we shall find it used against the best interests of the country. This departs from a principle laid down by the old Government in this respect. Before asking Parliament to vote a sum of money for the railway, the old Government first made inquiry with regard to the company and required a statement to be made to them as to the abilities of the promoters to build it, the probable cost of the railway and how it was expected to raise the money. And the gift of the Government was to supplement a financial structure which had previously been erected by the company. But now the Government subsidy to a railway will be the nucleus around which the financial structure will be built, and it will rather be a gift of the Government put into the hands of parties for the purpose of raising the balance necessary to build a railway. The subsidy will be given regardless of whether the road is absolutely needed or not, and whether the parties who have the structure under control are able to build the railway or not. Therefore,

**Mr. SPROULE.**

I regard with great suspicion the principle the Government have introduced. It is a most dangerous one to put into the hands of most honest men, but if you put it into the hands of unscrupulous men, what injury will it be? And there is no doubt that politicians use these things at times to bring support to their own candidates. We have seen that in the last election; we have seen it particularly in the by-elections since then. With regard to the construction of public buildings, subsidies to harbours, bonuses to railways, one way or another, the Government have impressed the people with the idea that if their candidate is returned they have the power to give the people money to assist in these desired public works. How much more will this be the case when the Government have the power to increase the railway subsidy from \$3,200 to \$6,400 per mile. Again, there is another principle connected with it that should not be lost sight of. Heretofore when you asked Parliament to vote money you did it upon specific information, and that information was given to Parliament so as to justify the granting of that money. In this case you do not give specific information, you give a running scale and you put the power of determining that scale into the hands of men who are represented by the Governor in Council, and they again act according to their engineers, who manufacture a large or small report that will give a larger or smaller amount. Suppose there is a railway projected through my constituency, and my people are desirous of having it built. I urge the Government to build that railway, and I would like to get as much subsidy as possible to help it along. But I am not a supporter of the Government, and the Government say to me: Now, you are not very friendly to the Government, we have no great reason to support your railway. But information may be given in a roundabout way, for that is the way it generally is given, that if you were friendly to the Government you might be dealt with with much greater generosity, and you might be better treated than on the line of cold justice. They send their engineer on to ascertain what that railway costs. It is an easy matter for the engineer to make a report to the Government that will enable them to give \$3,200 a mile, or \$4,200 a mile, or \$5,200. We know this may be done by the reports that are made to the Government year after year; we require no better evidence of it than the reports that were put in with regard to the Drummond County Railway by the engineers that were sent down to report upon that railway. Every one of them, it can be seen upon the face of it, reported favourably to what the Government aimed at, they knew what the Government wanted, and they reported accordingly. How easy it is for the Government to get their own

employees to make a report that will justify them in giving a larger or smaller amount, and when it is in their power to give a larger or smaller amount, how subservient the representative must be, how subservient the constituency must be who require in the interest of their own locality to have that railway built. For that reason I regard this proposal with great suspicion. There is great danger behind it, there is power given to the Governor in Council that we should not give. Parliament is asked to vote money on very imperfect information. I say we are not justified in voting money, and leaving it in the hands of the Government to manipulate that sliding scale according to their will. Now, if it was an engine which was powerful for injury before, how much more so will it be now. There is not a member in this House who supported the Government in the last Parliament but who held that to be the case when the Government commenced to subsidize railways on this line. Hon. gentlemen in Opposition also held that the Government were doing it for the purpose of corrupting constituencies. I say if that was the case before, how much more is it the case now. Now, I have a few words to say with regard to the calculations which may be made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of a railway. I asked the Minister of Railways: What do you understand as cost? Will the right of way be regarded as cost? And I understood him to say, yes. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked him: Would the terminals be regarded as part of the cost? At first he said, yes, but afterwards he qualified it, and said that where the railway was going into a large city the terminal should not be included in the calculation. But he went on to say there was one railway here, the Cornwall and Ottawa Railway, in regard to which he would have to make an exception to the rule. Now, if that be the case, there is the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway which also comes into Ottawa, and he will have to make an exception there as well, if he applies that rule. But I want to direct attention to the expression "cost" used in this resolution, where it says: "the true, actual and proper cost of construction." Now, surely that cannot mean right of way, according to a fair interpretation of the English language. If he had said the cost of the railway, then it would include the cost of the railway, but the cost of construction is one thing and the cost of the right of way is another. Therefore, I say, according to this resolution, the right of way could not be regarded as a portion of the cost. Now, I think the other feature to which the hon. member for York drew attention, is a very important one, namely, that while heretofore the Government gave no assistance for building railway bridges until they reached the cost of \$100,000, and

then they gave 50 per cent, now by this proposal they practically assist the building of bridges to the extent of 50 per cent of the cost. Suppose a railway is 100 miles long, and that railway has cost \$15,000 per mile, and it has two bridges, each one costing \$50,000. Under the old principle neither of these bridges would get any assistance from the Government. But as these two bridges costing \$50,000 make \$100,000, therefore it will increase the cost of that railway exactly \$100,000. Now, the railway has already cost \$15,000 a mile besides these bridges, therefore it makes the whole cost \$16,000 per mile, and therefore the Government propose by this sliding scale to pay \$500 a mile for 100 miles of that railway, or in other words, pay \$50,000 on the cost of these two bridges, which only cost \$100,000. Now, that will apply to any line. There is scarcely a line named in these resolutions upon which there is not one or more bridges, and it would be the easiest thing in the world for the Government engineer to say that the railway cost \$15,000 per mile without the bridges, and therefore the cost of the bridges would be added to increase the cost upon which 50 per cent will be paid by the Government. Now, that is quite different from the old principle, it is an entirely new principle, and one that I think is unreasonable and would be greatly abused. For these reasons, I am opposed to this proposition of the Government. In the first place, I do not believe it is wise to put into the hands of the Governor in Council this great power which they propose to take in these resolutions. I think it is something that may be used to the detriment of the country, that will be used, I have no doubt whatever, to bring strength to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have two years in which to commence these railways and they have four years to finish them. The end of four years will be about the time when we shall go to the country again, and that will be just the time when they will have in their hands the power which they will use for the purpose of bringing grist to their own mill. Therefore, I say it is a bad principle, and it is a power that Parliament should not grant.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to say a few words upon this question. I have been long enough a member of this House to watch with interest and study with care the history of this system of subsidizing railways. It began, perhaps a score of years ago, and began as in a day of small things. So far as I can remember, the practice as first introduced, was confined to the subsidizing of branches of Government railways. From that it extended gradually to larger and independent lines, and as many of my fellow-members, who are here present, will recollect, the then Minister of Railways boldly presented a scheme of subsidizing railways on a very large scale,

and in many instances without any reasonable justification for granting these subsidies. That it has grown to be a system which presses heavily upon the resources of the country, every one will concede who will inquire what the amount which has been granted to railways from various sources, municipal, provincial and federal, is at the present time. Several hundred millions of dollars have been expended upon railways from these sources, and that which has been contributed by the Federal Government alone is so much, including that given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the interest represents a very large proportion of the annual charge upon the resources of the Dominion. I do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that the party to which I have the honour to belong to, and which I trust I shall belong to as long as I remain in public life, was the first to oppose this system of subsidizing railways.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCRIVER. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is quite right in stating that the system was characterized by us, while upon the Opposition side of the House, as essentially a corrupt one, and that the object in subsidizing many of these lines of railway was plainly and unmistakably a corrupt one. We can give many instances at all events we can give cases, of railways being subsidized, ostensibly for the purpose of opening up new and unsettled portions of the country, but really because it was hoped that the counties into which these lines would run would return a supporter of the Administration of the day. I have myself contended for that view of the case in more than one instance, not only on the floor of this House, but before my constituents, and I could not think of going before my constituents at this day and attempting to defend the introduction of this system by the Government which I support. I would not be consistent in doing it, and my constituents would have reason to accuse me of having forgotten my past professions and past views in regard to this matter. Another thing I desire to speak of now, and my friends and leaders of the Government I am sure will bear with me in what is intended to be friendly criticism. I trust that no members of this House will suppose, because I have felt it my duty to criticise the course of the Government on two matters in one day, that I am going across the floor of the House or that I have lost confidence in them in regard to the main line of their policy. But they are doing some things which I cannot as a Liberal and as a consistent Liberal, support them in. I think they are worthy of blame, as the predecessors of the Government of this country were worthy of blame, and of great blame, in that they have deferred the bringing down of these resolutions until the closing days of the ses-

Mr. SCRIVER.

sion. I know the members of the Liberal party made it a matter of great reproach to the old Government that they brought these resolutions down at the closing days of the session, so that there was no proper opportunity for discussing them and examining them. I am bound to say that in the majority of cases the Minister of Railways of that day showed his complete ignorance of the merits of many of the schemes which he asked the House to subsidize. As a proof of this, I may state that on one occasion the Minister of Railways proposed that a line of railway not extending a very great distance, some twelve or fifteen miles, should be subsidized at so much a mile, and he was ignorant of the fact until I called his attention to it, that this railway was an extension of a Canadian railway into the United States. He proposed to subsidize twelve or fifteen miles of railway in the United States. It remains to be seen whether our present Minister of Railways has any better knowledge of the railways which he proposes to ask the House to subsidize than one of his predecessors in the past had. I think, Mr. Chairman, I may say, that it would have been much better if these resolutions had been brought down at an earlier period of the session, and if the House had been given ample opportunity to examine into their merits, if they have any, and to discuss them thoroughly. I know it is said by those who defend those resolutions, that the majority of them are re-votes. That does not lead me to regard them with any more favour. It shows plainly that these projects which it is proposed to subsidize now, by way of re-votes, were unable to be completed with the conditions attached to the subsidies which were granted to them, and now the persons behind them come before us again 'in forma pauperis,' and ask us for a renewal of these subsidies. I have no great confidence in extending these subsidies to them. I am bound to say that the proposition to subsidize railways at this time is an unfortunate one on the part of the Government of the day. The financial condition of the country is not such as to warrant the imposition of a large amount of additional debt upon us. The taxation of the country is large now, and we are proposing by the various schemes that are commended to our support to increase the debt very largely, and so increase the burden of taxation on the taxpayers of this country. My own province, I may say, the province of Quebec, is in an especially unfortunate position to be called upon to add to the taxation which it now bears. I suppose the majority of the members of this House are not aware, as I am, of the actual condition of things in that province from an agricultural point of view. Owing to the excessive rainfall of the spring and the unfavourable atmospheric conditions since, the crops of that country are not

only belated, but they are in a very bad condition. I have no doubt in the world that the hay crop in that province, the most important crop that we raise, is no better than was the hay crop of Ontario two years ago, when it was an almost complete failure. Such a fact is really calamitous, apart from the consideration of other crops. Owing to the excessive rainfall, we have been unable to sow our grain in any reasonable time. Some of our sodden fields are unsown yet, and we are not able as we would like, to plant corn to take the place of the failing hay crop. I speak with great feeling when I speak of the condition of my own province, and of my unwillingness that the burdens that the people of that province have to bear should be added to. While I feel the force of party fealty, I felt that it should not be suffered to interfere with the duty that one feels he owes to his province, and to the country at large. While I hesitated to criticise as I felt it my duty to do, the general course of the Government of which I am a faithful follower I hope; still, I felt it to be my duty not to let these resolutions pass without expressing my candid opinion, that it was an unwise policy on the part of the Government of the day, at this period of our history, and in view of the condition of things prevailing in the province of Quebec and in the Dominion at large, to introduce a system which was, I sincerely believe, the cause of great corruption in days past and the cause of great injury to the country. I am afraid that if it is again introduced, and if it spreads, as I am sure it will, that injury will be perpetuated. Why, I am told that the subsidies which it is proposed to give to railways under the resolutions that are to be submitted to us, form a very small proportion of the demands made upon the Government, and I fear that this policy will result in an injury to the country, which it will take it many years to overcome.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, although I do not fully endorse the views expressed by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), as to the railway policy inaugurated by the Conservative Administration, still I may say that I subscribe, to some extent, to the opinions he has advanced on our general railway policy. There is no gainsaying that the line of policy pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite is but a poor copy of the policy pursued by their predecessors in office, with this difference that instead of improving that railway policy, they have made it worse by the resolutions now under consideration. The hon. gentlemen opposite should have been taught, by experience, that the railway policy which has been carried out from 1884 was in some respects, vicious. It is no doubt within the remembrance of this House that I have, upon several occasions raised my voice against

and found fault with the subsidies granted by my hon. friends, when they sat upon the Treasury benches, to some railway companies. If we are to judge from the resolutions now before us, the experience of the past has been an eye-opener for the hon. gentlemen opposite, as to the improvements to be introduced into the carrying out of that policy. They close their eyes to the light of experience, finding it a more congenial task, as remarked by an hon. gentleman this afternoon, to bonus railway enterprises of a very questionable character, financially speaking, only because those railways are built by their friends or are running through counties that return supporters of the Government of the day.

I do not think the day has yet come when this system of subsidizing railways should be brought to an end. I am of opinion, on the contrary, that it will be necessary to build new railway lines, in certain parts of the country; but, before bringing down resolutions for the subsidizing of railways, I think the House ought to be supplied with all the necessary information and data, and given ample opportunity to examine into the merits of these resolutions. This system of subsidizing railways entails an expenditure of several million dollars every year, and if we go on at that rate, at the end of another decade, we will have piled up a debt of at least one hundred million dollars. We go on, year after year, session after session, blindly voting between ten and fifteen million dollars for the bonusing of railway enterprises, without being given an opportunity of examining into the merits of these schemes, without being supplied with any data as to topography and conditions of the country through which these new railroads pass, or as to the revenues and possibilities of the country which they are expected to open up and develop. We are without any information or data on which to base our judgment as to the merits of the resolutions for which the Government ask our consideration and support.

I am very happy to have heard a friend of the Government sounding an alarm, this afternoon, and warning the Ministers that if they had the blind support of the file and rank of the party, they could not, at least, expect to have the unanimous support of the back benches, and that, further, if they meant to give strength to their followers by subsidizing railroads in the constituencies, the people of this country would have their eyes opened to the extravagance and folly of the Government in saddling the country with an expenditure of over a hundred million dollars in one single decade. Many of these railways are being subsidized merely to serve local interests, and not as a matter of public policy. What has become of several similar railways that were built in several portions of Canada with no other result, sometimes, but that of causing other railways to be closed to traffic, in the very

country where it was proposed to build new roads? Several of these railways which we are asked to subsidize will cease to be operated, after millions of dollars have been expended on them, not by the promoters of these lines but by the Dominion Government, conjointly with foreign capitalists who have put capital in those enterprises. History will repeat itself, and experience of the failure of such enterprises, in the past, shows what resulted for us from the disappointment experienced by foreign capitalists who had invested money in those bonused railways, on the strength of the subsidies granted by the Government. Owing to this system of bonusing railway enterprises, capitalists had been put under a false impression and fooled into believing in the value of these roads, either from a trade standpoint, or from that of the opening up and development of the resources of the country. Capitalists were deceived and their capital is lost to them, as they no longer expect to be paid any dividends on the advances they have made, from the fact that those railways, some of which are no longer in operation, were operated at a loss and could never possibly be made paying properties either from the standpoint of trade or of the development of the country. I say that such a state of affairs, were it to become general, would simply be a calamity for Canada. Sooner or later, when foreign capitalists are invited to invest their money in important public undertakings, which might benefit the general interests of the country, they will decline assisting us in the building of railways that might prove useful to Canada, on the very ground of the distrust created abroad through the lack of prudence and wisdom of our Government in subsidizing railways which can be productive of no good either from the standpoint of trade or of the development of the country.

For my part, I do not believe it our duty to subsidize railways which can be of no assistance either to trade or to the opening up of the country. We are called upon to consider and assist such undertakings as may prove useful in the public interest, but not in a premature way. In my opinion, the Government of the day would evince a lack of wisdom in copying, in a slavish way, the railway policy of the old Administration. The House should not be invited to take into consideration any railway schemes, without first having been given, from the very outset of the session, ample opportunity to scrutinize their merits, and not until the Government have brought down on the Table of the House such maps and reports as are likely to give us an insight into the topography of the country through which these railways pass, as also such data and general information as might enlighten the House on the resources and possibilities of the country which these roads are intended to develop. With such information at hand,

**Mr. DUPONT.**

the House would be enabled to form a mature and healthy opinion as to the merits of the schemes which it is proposed to subsidize. I hold that it would be mere folly on our part to assist railway schemes, the merits of which are, to say the least, questionable. What, I ask, would the ratepayers in our great rural municipalities say, should the councils impose taxes upon them, for the opening of roads here and there, indiscriminately, and irrespective of the public interests? Such a corporation, the members of which acted in that way, would not long enjoy public confidence. Our municipal corporations being elective, the ratepayers would vote out of office councillors who had thus squandered public money.

I want the Government, next session, when they bring down resolutions for the purpose of bonusing railways, especially in the closing days of the session, not to do so, without those resolutions being accompanied by such maps as may show the survey of the projected lines, and the tract of country through which they are to pass. A report should also be submitted to the House, giving the population of the country, and showing the difficulties to be overcome in the building of the proposed railway, with such reports of engineers as may enable the House to form an estimate of the character of the obstacles met with, and the consequent cost of the undertaking. Moreover, the House should be given all such data and details as may be procured on the resources of the country which these new railways are to go through and accommodate.

Mr. Chairman, we have no right here to mortgage in that way the future of our country. The future of the country is not ours. The future of the country is the inheritance of our posterity, and should we, through our recklessness, mortgage the credit of the Dominion to such an extent that the next generation will find themselves handicapped, when called upon to carry out works of public interest, I say this Parliament, in my opinion, will incur an enormous responsibility, in the eyes of history and posterity.

Within the next twenty-five years, transportation may again be revolutionized. Science has not yet revealed all its secrets and surely the Government do not pretend to say that we have reached the acme of perfection in the matter of transport. No, I say, and I may even venture to predict that within the next twenty-five years, through the evolution of the mode of transportation, railways will likely be of less use than they are to-day. On that ground, I submit that we should not lay ourselves open to the reproach, that we have recklessly involved the credit of Canada to the very last limit in undertakings perhaps doomed to failure, and the merits of which, from a trade or a colonization standpoint, are, at least, questionable for the moment. Nowa-

days, Governments aim at doing things on a large scale, and at outdoing each other by their extravagant policy. But experience shows that, while trying to dazzle the people, they have, in several instances, squandered public money, without serving any useful purpose.

I am happy to say that my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) has taken a patriotic stand, this afternoon, and set to many of his colleagues an example of independence which they would do well to follow. The hon. gentlemen opposite, who, under the lash of the whip, are always ready to bow to the will of their leaders, would do well to take to heart the lecture administered to them by my hon. friend, who, I may say, is one of the veterans of the Liberal party and an honourable and honest man. I invite my hon. friends on both sides of the House to accept the suggestions of the hon. member from Huntingdon, which appeals, to the better sense of both sides in this House. As I said, at the outset, the time is not yet at hand, when we may consider our railway policy as completely carried out, but, from experience, we know that there are many improvements to be introduced into our system of subsidizing railways. Still, while still adhering to our old policy of bonusing railways, we ought to be careful not to put into the hands of the Government powers which belong to the House. If you give the Government the power to increase the railway subsidies, as they now do in the resolutions before the House, then the Government will have in their hands the power of raising those subsidies to \$6,400 a mile. Who knows but that, through spurious reports prepared by two obsequious engineers, such as we have seen of late, the actual cost of those undertakings may not be over-estimated, so as to enable the Government or the Minister of Railways, for the time being, to raise to a higher figure the subsidy granted to a railway scheme, of no value either from the standpoint of trade or of colonization, but whereby speculators and political friends may be benefited, irrespective of public interests? Such schemers as I speak of, are to be found in the ranks of every political organization; they stick close to the steps of the Ministers, and attach themselves to their fortunes, with no other hope but that of public plunder. I have remarked that the better to reach their ends, they frequently interest in their schemes politicians of different political stripes, in order to escape unscathed, with the fruit of their plunder.

I am happy to join with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) in sounding an alarm and asking the Government not to allow themselves to be caught in the trap laid for them by those unscrupulous schemers who are merely aiming at controlling the undertakings which they want subsidized, irrespective of the results which

may follow. Let, therefore, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, let this honourable House, ponder over what I have said, as public interests of the highest moment are at stake, under the resolutions now under consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been in hopes that since the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) have listened to the speech made by their faithful follower from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), they would withdraw these resolutions altogether. However, I presume they intend to force them through. To my mind nothing could better justify the course of the late Government, than the similar course which is now being pursued by the present Government. I expect, Sir, before the debate closes, to hear many hon. gentlemen supporting the Government rise in their places and make the same speeches as they did in years past when they were in Opposition. What does my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) say to all this. Why, I remember when the subsidy for the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway was going through the House some sessions ago, my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) was loud in the denunciation of the Conservative Government granting that subsidy. It was characterized by these gentlemen as an election promise, and a bribe to the constituents, and yet these gentlemen opposite support it now. They grant 35 subsidies to different railways all over the country, involving an immense expenditure. Does the leader of the House know that some of those very railways, are those he denounced as bribes. He may claim that a great many of these are revotes, but nevertheless the late Government put a time limit, and if the companies did not earn the subsidy in a certain time they would not get it, but these gentlemen opposite come down now and give them two years or four years more to earn the money. The Liberals to-day pronounce that these enterprises are good, and that they are not bribes to the constituents. Where are the Patrons to-night to oppose this. Their platform declared that no more subsidies should be given to railways, and the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) publicly stated that the Patron policy was so much like the policy of the Liberal party, that the two might be blended into one. Where are the seven or eight Patrons supporting the Government; where are they to oppose this violation of their platform. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), who I understand is the leader of the Patron party; where is he to denounce this proposal of the Government, and where are his colleagues? Where are they to denounce this proposal of spending \$4,928,728, to subsidize railways at the extent of \$3,200 per mile, and if that subsidy is increased by 50 per cent, as I presume it will be, where are they to oppose the expen-

diture of \$6,439,392 which will be involved on that account. There is not a Patron in this House of Commons to protest against it. I am glad that my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), one of the staunchest supporters of the Liberal party, feels it his duty to rise in his place, and protest against such an enormous expenditure for railway subsidies. I am glad that he at least is here, to be consistent with his policy when in Opposition. As my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) remarked, these subsidies will have four more years to run, the general elections will then be coming on, and this Government will say to the companies: Put us in power and we will give you 50 per cent increase on the subsidies if the roads are built, and if the roads are not built we will extend the time in which you can do so. Is not this the reason why these large subsidies are now granted? Sir, I am not opposed to railway subsidies. I was opposed by a Patron in the last election, and I then announced to my constituents that in those counties which were not opened up by railway communication, I would feel it my duty to grant subsidies for their development. I do not feel disposed therefore to protest against these revotes, because I supported them when they were first proposed, nor do I feel that I can protest against some of the new subsidies. All of these revotes are for sums that were granted by the late Government, and I thought they were then, as I think they are now, worthy—

Mr. LISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought so then, but the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) denounced them as bribes to the constituencies.

Mr. LISTER. Can you find anything of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think I would need to look through many pages of "Hansard" to find that when the bonus to the Cobourg Railway was being discussed, the hon. gentleman denounced it as a bribe to my hon. friend who now sits in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite denounced the subsidy to the Ottawa and Cornwall Railway as one of the most gigantic frauds that had ever been perpetrated on this or any other country—it was a wholesale bribe. These two subsidies, I remember distinctly, were attacked by hon. gentlemen now supporting the Government, when they sat on this side of the House. But I am glad that, like the National Policy, and every other good thing which the late Government introduced and carried into effect, these hon. gentlemen now adopt and support every vote here, and say that they are good and worthy enterprises, and that the late Government did right in introducing them. But I rose more particularly to call on the Patron representatives, if there are any left in the House, to

Mr. TAYLOR.

join hands with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), and denounce this Government for having introduced resolutions at this late period of the session, asking this Parliament to commit the country to an expenditure of \$7,000,000 in these times of depression.

Mr. BOSTOCK. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, before these resolutions are passed, whether he has taken into consideration, the advisability of inserting a clause in these conditions that if at any time the Government should find it necessary, or consider it a matter of policy to buy or take over a portion or the whole of any of these railways, the amount of money we are now granting to them by way of subsidy should be taken into account. We have had an instance lately in which we have paid for a railway to which we had granted a subsidy, and it was claimed that no account should be taken of that subsidy. I think it is only right, therefore, that, in granting subsidies to railways, the Government should provide that if they take the railways over again or in any way deal with them, the moneys now proposed to be granted to them should be taken into consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a few words on those resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. Lambton will come next.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite admit that years ago I challenged the prudence of granting large railway subsidies, and when hon. gentlemen opposite were passing some of these votes, I found fault with them. I can well remember that some years ago, when Sir John Macdonald was passing similar resolutions, the fact was pointed out to him that the province of Ontario had completely altered its railway policy, in that it only granted subsidies to colonization railways, that is, those railways which opened up new sections of country; that it had ceased to grant any assistance whatever to railways which could, in any sense, be looked upon as rival lines to existing roads. I remember that the then leader of the Conservative party admitted that that was a good and correct policy, and declared that so far as his Government were concerned, the same policy would be followed, except in the case of lines which had already been subsidized and had properly earned their subsidies; because, in such cases, it would be right that the contracts entered into by the Government should be honestly implemented. Nobody could find fault with that position. In regard to these revotes, I must say that a number of them do not meet with my approval. They are for old, dead schemes, which were introduced years ago for political purposes. I believe, and I earnestly hope, that none of them will ever be built; I do not think the subsidies proposed by these resolutions will vitalize them, and

I hope not. For my part, I think that there should be some provision made that the additional assistance for the construction of the roads should be confined to each mile of the road. I quite agree with the remarks of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster). If you are going to allow a very heavy expenditure, which may be made in carrying a road into a town or a city, to be applied over the entire line, so that the company may draw 50 per cent on the cost over \$15,000 a mile, in addition to the \$3,200, we may find ourselves called upon for very excessive additions to these bonuses. Take, for instance, the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In entering the city of Montreal, I believe it cost that company something like \$2,000,000 or \$2,500,000 for two or three miles of road. It also cost them over \$1,500,000 to get an eastern entrance into the city of Toronto to the Union station. If these large amounts were spread over forty or fifty miles of road, the Government would be required under this clause to pay a certain percentage. So that I think this clause, if it is to be applied at all, should be applied to the roads mile for mile, and that the companies should not be permitted to apply large expenditures for terminal accommodation in cities or towns over the whole line. The hon. Minister of Railways says the Government will exercise a great deal of caution. I have no doubt they will endeavour to keep the expenditure down; but if a company is proposing a very large expenditure for terminal accommodations in reaching a city, this resolution will be a great inducement to them to do it at once, so as to secure all the advantages of this extra 50 per cent. It is also well known that fully three-fourths of the railways, when first built, are built with wooden trestles and wooden bridges. The existence of this clause will be a temptation to the railways in future to build iron bridges and solid embankments at once, because, if a road costs over \$15,000 a mile, its promoters will say that now is the time to complete the road by building solid embankments and iron bridges with stone abutments. I am afraid this provision is going to open the door to increased expenditure for railway construction. I do not think the Minister of Railways expects this, but I must frankly say, not pretending to interpret the clause like an experienced lawyer, but judging from my simple view of the whole matter, I think the resolution is likely to involve the country in excessive expenditure for the construction of railways. I think that we should go back to the principle I have just stated, and in no case subsidize a road unless to open up a new district through which there is running no rival line. We should cease subsidizing lines simply in order to promote competition. We have learnt in this country that competition in railways does not reduce rates. In order to bring about competition with the Grand

Trunk Railway we subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to-day we find that these two lines combine as regards freight rates, and we are just in the same position in that respect as if we had but one road. I have no doubt a similar state of things will follow the construction of these branch lines. Every one of them will be operated either by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the result will be that we will have really no competition. I think the Government would do well to revise these resolutions. I am very much afraid that, under them, the country will be called upon to pay a great deal more money than expected, and that they may be the means of revivifying schemes which, in the interests of the country, never could be resurrected.

Mr. SEMPLE. I noticed in the Votes and Proceedings of the 21st of June, that there are subsidies to eighteen lines of railways, which are re-votes, and of which the total mileage is 674 miles. I am very much afraid, from what I have heard, that in some of these cases there will be more to pay under these resolutions, than under those which were brought down by the late Government. We know that these railway companies are always promoted by the best legal talent and the best schemers in the country, and it will be very strange indeed if they will not come before the Government and plead very strongly that the cost of constructing these lines was much greater than it really was.

Speaking for the agricultural portion of the community. I have no doubt that their feeling is that the fewer subsidies granted the better and the less money spent the better. I have been informed that the subsidy has been fixed at \$3,200 in order that the roads may be equipped with steel rails, but I am also informed that the price of steel rails is nearly \$1,000 a mile lower at present than they have been, and if that be the case, the subsidies should be reduced instead of increased. One of the principle planks in the platforms of the Patrons was that railway subsidies should be abolished. There are hundreds of thousands of Patrons in this country, although it has been stated they have not a representative now on the floor of the House, which is correct. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) sound a note of warning to the Government. I desire to assist the Government as much as possible, I desire to see it economize as much as possible, and that is why I have risen to make these few remarks, and I hope the Government will give attention to the criticisms which have been passed and spend as little as possible in subsidies to railways.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not desire to reflect upon the policy of the Government in granting these railway subsidies because

they are following out the policy we took in the past and which I am not prepared to admit was wrong. I believe, however, that the first paragraph of these resolutions, providing that when a railway costs more than \$15,000, it will be entitled to double the subsidy, is a very dangerous provision indeed. We all know, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said, that these railway corporations are composed of most intelligent men, who will lose no opportunity of proving to the Minister of Railways that their several lines cost more than \$15,000 per mile. If it were not for this clause, which is a very dangerous one, I would be very much disposed to support the whole policy of the Government with regard to these subsidies. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to one line which is to be subsidized, the St. Lawrence and Adirondack. I see that it is to be subsidized for 13½ miles. If I remember rightly, this is one of the lines which was to have been subsidized by the late Government, but instead of 13½ miles the subsidy should be given for 16 miles. If the hon. Minister will make inquiries in his department, he will find that there are 3 miles of that railway at Valleyfield which were built by the company now operating it, and the hon. gentleman ought to grant the company a subsidy on the full mileage. I am not prepared to comment on the other subsidies, and I imagine they have all been examined into carefully, but there is one railway which is down for a subsidy, and with respect to which I desire to express my satisfaction to the Government for the aid it has given. I refer to the Montfort Colonization Company. If there is any railway which deserves a subsidy, it is this one. Amongst those hon. members who have spoken against subsidies, nearly all have said that in certain circumstances—when, for instance, the road was opening up a new country and is a colonization road—they are in favour of coming to its assistance. Well, the Montfort Colonization Company is one of these. It is opening up one of the best and richest portions of the province of Quebec, which has hitherto been left undeveloped, and I must say that I am personally very glad that the Government are granting it a subsidy.

I hope the Government will again seriously consider the first paragraph of these resolutions, for in taking the power to double the subsidy, the Government are undertaking a most dangerous experiment.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is the hon. gentleman quite confident that this vote for the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway is a revote?

Mr. BERGERON. I know that in the subsidies which were prepared in 1896, but did not come down because there was no money voted, there were 16 miles of road to be subsidized.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is the road not already contracted and in operation?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BRITTON. This part is a revote. The statute of 1892 gives two subsidies to that same road, the St. Lawrence and Adirondack, for 5.42 miles from Huntingdon to the international boundary, for 18 miles between Valleyfield and Huntingdon, and 2.40 miles starting from the end of the 18 miles and going to the international boundary. It would look as if this was entirely new.

Mr. BERGERON. The present road, which is called the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway, is to-day the property of the New York Central. When it ran from Valleyfield to Malone, it was subsidized by the Canadian Government on Canadian territory. What this is for is a line from Beauharnois to Caughnawaga, which is a new line entirely, called the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway. And the three miles I speak of are at Valleyfield, starting from the old line which they have left, and coming down to the present station at Valleyfield. This has been built by a new company.

Mr. SCRIVER. When the item is before the House, I shall have a word or two to say about it.

Mr. BERGERON. I have spoken about it because I understood from the Chairman that we were speaking of the whole resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. There is one railway mentioned in the list of subsidies to which I would like to draw the attention of the House and of the Government, not because the part of the country in which I live is so directly interested as some other parts, but because, although it is a long distance from the constituency which I represent, still that constituency and the whole North-west Territories are very considerably interested in the possibilities of that road. I speak of the Rainy River project. As a local railway we have no interest in it whatever, but as a possible relief from railway monopoly for the North-west Territories, we have the greatest interest in it. Now, there has been a great deal of argument in this country and in this House in regard to railway monopoly in the Territories in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass scheme. But it is the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system connecting Lake Superior with the prairies of Manitoba that is really the part that gives the Canadian Pacific Railway control of the traffic and trade of the North-west. It is that section of 425 miles which makes them masters of the situation. It is because over that distance they have no competitor, and because, owing to the great cost of construction through that country, they are

not likely ever to have a competitor unless with Government assistance. Now, just to show the position in which the North-west Territories find themselves in relation to this question, I may say that by its control of this piece of land, the railway company is enabled to charge 161 per cent higher rates than are charged by the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and Montreal. It is possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to levy that high, that extortionate rate, because they have a monopoly and are safe from competition there. There is another feature of the case that I may point out. Ontario communicates with Manitoba by means of lake navigation during the summer season. This is the cheapest route whereby grain can be brought out and merchandise taken in. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a line of steamboats on the lakes and other companies have lines of steamboats also. There is competition in traffic on the lakes, but when the steamboat lines reach Fort William they find that there is no competition from there to Winnipeg; and the Canadian Pacific Railway meets the competition of the vessel lines and steamers by charging an extra freight over that piece of road on goods or produce carried to Fort William by steamers other than their own. So they not only have a monopoly over that piece of road, but they use that monopoly to give them control of what ought to be the free, competing navigation of the lakes. It is because they are absolutely free of the possibility of another road competing with them there that they are enabled to hold their hand on the throat of Manitoba and the North-west and strangle the trade that should properly pass from the east to the west and from the west to eastern Canada. I put this strongly to impress upon the minds of the people of eastern Canada that this is not a matter that is only interesting to the west; it is not merely a question of getting the produce of the west out, but it is even more a question of getting the manufactures and commerce of the east to the west. If the east is to have an extension of its manufactures and commerce that extension must be in the west; and if the avenue of trade is choked by monopoly, the east suffers as well as the west. In this condition of affairs it is a matter of interest to the east as well as to the west to break that monopoly and to bring the cost of haul, especially over that 425 miles, down at least to the basis of the rate over the Intercolonial Railway, which would mean a rate of 7 cents per 100 pounds on grain from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay as against the present rate of 17 cents per 100 pounds. The rate on grain coming out, although high in proportion to that over the Intercolonial Railway, is not as high in proportion as that on merchandise and manufactures going in. Under these circumstances, I say that if this Gov-

ernment finds it necessary to come forward and aid the construction of a railroad into the Rainy River mining region, it seems to me that it is only reasonable that the Government and the House should take into consideration the possibility and desirability of extending that project so as to give a competing line between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay, so that the country both east and west may be relieved from the present monopoly. We are going to pay a certain amount to construct a railway to Rainy Lake, then by paying a small amount more we can have a through line that will not only develop the Rainy River mining region but will develop the whole North-west and Manitoba, and also develop the manufactures and commerce of eastern Canada. If that object can be attained, by even a considerable expenditure of money, it is desirable that it should be. As long as hon. gentlemen consider the Rainy River Railway project in the light of a local line, they are not considering it in the light in which it is, in my opinion, of most importance to this country, both east and west. Members of this House have heard of the project of the Manitoba Government to secure an independent line of railway from Winnipeg to Duluth over which grain would be carried at the rate at which, as I have already stated, grain is carried over the Intercolonial Railway. That is to say, the province of Manitoba is giving a bonus of say \$100,000 to secure the carriage of grain from Winnipeg to Duluth at a cost of about six or seven cents per hundred. They also expect to secure a reduction of rates on freight coming in by 25 per cent. Everybody must admit that it is more desirable that the trade of Manitoba should be done by way of Port Arthur or Fort William than by way of Duluth, because if trade is done by way of Duluth it is to the disadvantage of this eastern country. If the province of Manitoba is interested to the extent of \$100,000 a year in getting relief from the present monopoly (which is, I have no hesitation in saying, simply unbearable) surely it is reasonable to suppose that they will be just as willing to enter into an agreement with this Government to have their competing line built to Fort William, to have that terminus in Canadian territory and keep the trade on Canadian soil, as to expend their money to carry trade to Duluth. But if this Government will not do that, certainly they are bound to have relief in some way, and if they cannot get it to Thunder Bay they will get it to Duluth; and this Government any more than the late Government cannot prevent them. I say it is a national policy that should be taken into consideration by the House and by the Government, that by all necessary means they should endeavour to cheapen the freight between eastern and western Canada and to keep the trade of Canada within our own ter-

ritory even if it should cost a few dollars more than for the building of a merely local line for the development of a certain section of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I propose that that clause be amended. I think it is necessary that we should prevent the scattering over the entire line of the enormous cost of entering into a city. If this cost amounts to \$250,000 or \$150,000, then you can scatter that over the entire line, and the country is called upon to pay for it. I think if we are to pay anything in excess of the \$3,200 per mile, it should be confined to each mile, and if one mile cost \$100,000 we should only be asked to pay \$6,400. But under the reading of this clause, if one mile cost \$100,000 you can scatter that over the entire line and you have got to pay 50 per cent of that entire cost. Now I think the additional subsidy should be confined to mile per mile of the road, and I suggest that after the words "average cost" in the tenth line, these words be added, "each line constructed and subsidized."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been considering the subject since some hon. gentlemen have presented their views with regard to this phase of it, and I perceive there is some fear on the part of hon. gentlemen lest the subsidies might be greater than we anticipate. I had concluded before the hon. gentleman arose, to suggest that perhaps the committee would adopt the resolutions as they are now on the table, and I would prepare some amendments which I think would afford all the guarantees that they might desire in order to avoid the possibility of these sums aggregating as large amounts as they fear they might under the present reading of the clause. If the committee would pass the resolutions in their present form, on the submission of the Bill for its second reading, I would be prepared with some words in amendment to the existing clause which I think would cover the ground. The Government have no desire to ask Parliament to give them power to grant any general subsidies. We have had the opinion, and I must say that that opinion is still maintained, that there will be but few roads entitled to anything more than the minimum amount of subsidy. I do not think that there is any substantial danger in regard to the cost of right of way in getting into towns where lands would be very expensive, and where the amount of cost would run up to large figures, because the only town which is named in connection with any of these proposed railways is the city of Ottawa. In looking over these carefully I do not note the case of any other city except Ottawa in which the danger could possibly arise. It is therefore largely an unfounded fear. I would therefore suggest to my hon. friend to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. McMULLEN. With that understanding I withdraw my amendment.

The Ottawa and New York Railway Company, for 53 87-100th of their railway, from Cornwall to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The name has been changed by Act of Parliament, and received the assent of Parliament early in the session.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any portion of the road built?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing is done yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it been surveyed, and have estimates of the cost been put into the department, and the line laid down, or anything of that kind?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no estimates of the cost.

To the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company, for 101 miles of their railway, from Kingston to Ottawa, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 5. (Revote.)

Mr. BRITTON. In this case there is an agreement between that railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in reference to running powers over the Grand Trunk Railway from the city of Kingston to a station called Rideau on some point between Kingston and Rideau. Therefore I have the consent of the Minister of Railways to moving this amendment, to add after the word Kingston, in the second line, the following words: "Or a junction with the Grand Trunk Railway at Rideau or other point near Kingston."

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister state with reference to either of these roads what is about the average cost, and if there are any large or small streams where fairly expensive bridges will be required?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman information on that point.

Mr. FROST. There are no large streams between Kingston and Ottawa. The road runs through an almost level country, and they think the road can be constructed for something like \$10,000 or \$12,000 per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any rocks?

Mr. FROST. There are no rocks; it is through a nice country. Fourteen or sixteen municipalities have voted bonuses to the line, showing that the people desire the road.

Mr. BRITTON. In addition to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) has said I may state that there is a bridge which will be included in that part of the Grand Trunk

where we have that running power. There will also be a bridge across the Whitefish part of Delta Lake, near Morton. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asked about rocks. There is a single portion of it rocky country in the township of South Crosby which will be a comparatively difficult portion of the road to build. But what the hon. gentleman for North Leeds (Mr. Frost) has said that it is not difficult on the whole to build is correct, and it certainly will not exceed, I think, \$15,000 a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. About how far would be the average distance between this road and the Brockville and Ottawa road from here to Smith's Falls.

Mr. BRITTON. It runs at right angles to the Brockville and Ottawa and crosses it at Smith's Falls.

To the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from St. Félix de Valois to Ste. Emilie de l'Énergie, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (Revote.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire to move an amendment to this clause. The name of the company is not the Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company, but the St. Gabriel de Brandon and Ste. Emilie de l'Énergie Railway Company. I propose to substitute St. Gabriel de Brandon and Ste. Emilie de l'Énergie Railway Company for Joliette and St. Jean de Matha Railway Company; also, 15 for 20 in the first line; also, the word "St. Gabriel" for "St. Felix de Valois" in the second line, and insert after the word "l'Énergie" in the second line, "and five miles from a point on the main line to St. Jean de Matha, making in all twenty miles."

Amendment agreed to.

For a railway from Campbellton, on the Intercolonial Railway, towards Grand Falls, N.B., a distance of 20 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (Revote.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would move that the words "commencing at Campbellton" be inserted after the word "miles" in the second line.

Amendment agreed to.

To the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, from a point on the Grand Trunk Railway between King and Newmarket to Schomberg, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a revote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This subsidy is for a road from a point on the Grand Trunk Railway between King Station and Newmarket to Schomberg, a distance of about fifteen miles. Although it

runs through a fine country, it will be a very difficult road to build.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will it cost per mile?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It passes through a fine country, but it is hilly. The valley of the Holland River runs through there, and then there is a very high ridge running through the country for many miles which has to ascend and descend, and which will make it an expensive road to build. They hope to induce the Grand Trunk to take an interest in it and promote it. It reaches a fine country.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not proposed to build an electric railway through this country a year or two ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not heard of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Minister of Railways and Canals will tell us what the cost of this road will probably be. It makes a great difference in the view that the committee may take, whether we are to pay \$3,200 a mile or \$6,400 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand it can be built for \$15,000 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the road been surveyed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the Minister has really no information about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to commend this answer to the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) who made a remark this evening as to the lack of knowledge possessed by the Minister of Railways in a Conservative Government in reference to the roads which he proposed to subsidize. I have put four questions in reference to four roads, and in respect to none of them have I been able to get any information from the Minister.

Mr. SCRIVER. I acknowledge the corn.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a commentary on Parliamentary proceedings to have fifty men here who are supposed to scrutinize the expenditures and vote moneys, called upon in the last night of the session to put through a string of railway votes of which there are not two men in this House—I doubt if there is one, the Minister of Railways included—who knows the least thing about any one of them, except, may be, the one in which he is least interested.

Mr. SCRIVER. You and your colleagues set us the example

Mr. FOSTER. You and your colleagues, after all your professions are going it just so much better than we did because you are not satisfied to give \$3,200 a mile, but you want to make it \$6,400 a mile. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) says that this road ascends and descends and goes up and goes down, and neither of them know anything about the cost of the road, yet the Minister of Railways asks us to vote this money. He has not a line of a report, he does not know whether it runs north by south or east by west, or whether it is going to cost \$15,000 or \$20,000 per mile. There is not an item of information in the hon. gentleman's department with reference to this, and yet he asks us to swallow this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. This road goes through a heavy country and I am quite sure it will cost \$25,000 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. Just one question more: When it stops, does it stop anywhere?

Mr. SCRIVER. It probably stops altogether, it is not started yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Not except as an election road. But when it gets to Schomberg is that on another road?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a mild anticipation that if this subsidy of \$6,400 a mile is granted, I think the Postmaster General said the Grand Trunk Railway would father it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said that I thought the promoters hoped to be able to interest the Grand Trunk Railway some way in this scheme, but I have not said that officially.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is a promoter's road; get the money voted and shove it off on somebody else, and make something out of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was promoted by the late Administration and was included in the list of railways they proposed to subsidize.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was not the first proposal to the late Administration to make it an electric road?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When they applied for incorporation I think they proposed to run it as an electric road, but when they came before the Railway Committee they changed their programme and applied for a charter for an ordinary steam railway and as such it received the imprimatur of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and he gave an undertaking to give it a subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Postmaster General is astray. My recollection is it never got a subsidy; they applied for one.

Mr. FOSTER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The resolutions were not brought down to the House but the Minister of Railways thought so much of it that he gave a letter to a very prominent gentleman on the eve of an election, stating that it would have been openly given a subsidy, only, that because of the obstruction of the then Opposition the Conservative Government had not been able to proceed with their railway policy; but it was on the list all right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) seems to be very much surprised that I am not furnished with information, and that my office is not loaded down with surveys and returns with regard to all these railways; and yet, I have in my hand 100 railway undertakings which were either subsidized or pledged to be subsidized by the late Government, and with respect to which there is not on file any survey or thing whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. No information?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No information and never has been.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to think this is the first Minister of Railways who did not know anything about it.

To the Pembroke Southern Railway Company, for 20 miles of their railway, from Pembroke to Golden Lake, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a new road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. New.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister give us some information as to where it runs, the nature of the country through which it runs, and the estimated cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That railway will run across country.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. POUPORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FOSTER. Give the Minister a chance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give way to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore).

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister has the floor.

Mr. POUPORE. I just want to explain this to the committee briefly. I have sent a page for the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) whose project this is, and I am sure he will be able to explain it fully to the House. It is a line of railway from the prosperous town of Pembroke, to connect with the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway. It runs through a very important section of the country, and will develop the resources of that part of our Dominion. There is no doubt that this is a very important railway project, and some

very responsible men are connected with it. There is a company formed composed of wealthy capitalists who are putting their money in the scheme, and who intend to carry it through to completion, with the assistance of this subsidy. It is a very worthy project, and ought to receive the hearty assistance of this Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry to see the Minister of Railways deprived of a chance to give this explanation. I noticed him looking around as if he had lost something, but he no doubt made an unexpected find in the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore).

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the Minister quite sure, that this line runs across country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

To the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway, from the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway to Rainy Lake, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Please where does that start and where does it end. I would like to have information about this road?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Almost every member of the House is well versed in the section of the country through which this railway is proposed to go. It starts from the western terminus of the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway, and runs through the Rainy River district where rich iron and gold mines are now being developed, and which has some very fair agricultural country. This is about half the distance of the line that is proposed to be built. The matter has been before the country so long, both in the provincial House and also in this House, that I thought every one was familiar with the road. The company has been reorganized to some extent, and the persons now connected with it are amongst the wealthiest in the Dominion. The province of Ontario has subsidized the road for the full length of 160 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Where will it get to when the 160 miles are built?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will connect with navigation, either on Rainy Lake or Rainy River, I forget which. But it connects with the navigation which supplies that whole country, which is one of the finest sections in the province of Ontario, and which it is very desirable should be opened up.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not opposing this road. On the contrary, it is one of the meritorious ones which will open up a new country. This will be an expensive road to build, probably running up the subsidy to \$6,400 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVER. And the one preceding it, as well.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for 7 miles of their railway, commencing at a point at or near Caradoc Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending to the town of Strathroy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Committee ought to have some information with regard to this short line of road, because it seems to me that in this case the Government are adopting a new principle. I think I heard the Minister of Railways, a short time ago, state, not in so many words, but in fact, that where a section of country was well supplied with railway facilities, the Government ought to go slow in voting money for assistance to new enterprises. I happen to know something of this district, and in the short space of seven miles across country, to use the Minister's phrase, there are three main lines of railway. The town of Strathroy, which is a small town, is on the Sarnia branch of the Grand Trunk; a short distance from it is the main line of the Grand Trunk, the old Great Western; and near the main line of the Great Western is the main Ontario line of the Canadian Pacific; and the principle adopted by the Government, in aiding this seven miles of railway, is simply to give competition to the town of Strathroy. I would like to know whether it is the policy of the Government to aid railways whose only object is to oppose other railways which have already developed a section of country and have afforded it every possible railway facility, because that is what this line does.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose that every railroad in the settled parts of the Dominion has received a bonus in past years, and that is what is intended in this case. There is no doubt that the object of this road is to give that section of country, which is, perhaps, the garden of Canada, connection with the Canadian Pacific at the town of Strathroy, and to provide that thickly-settled part of the country, which originates a great deal of freight, with competition between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no doubt that that is the only object, excepting the local convenience for the thickly-settled part of the country through which it runs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The question of local convenience does not come in at all. In the small triangle through which this road will run, between Strathroy and the station of Caradoc, the people have only two or three miles to travel to a railway station, and then they have a choice of the three main lines I have mentioned. I am not opposing this, because I am very friendly indeed to that section, but I am pointing out to the Government that they are laying down a principle which it will be very hard to carry out with equal justice to every section of

the country, if they are willing to say that, if a town of 2,000 inhabitants has good railway facilities passing through it, and other good railway facilities for competitive purposes within five or six miles, it is the duty of the Government to vote the public money for the purpose of giving that town competition. In doing this I think, they are laying down a dangerous principle and bringing difficulties into their own path, as well as into the path of their successors.

Mr. FOSTER. Who will operate this road?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no doubt, from the information that has been given to me, that it is the intention of this company to build the road and allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to operate it. They expect to make that arrangement. If they do not, I doubt whether they will build it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a company formed to build it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before this resolution is carried, I think we ought to have some declaration of principle. The Minister of Railways ought to tell us whether the Government intend to go into the business of providing competitive facilities for towns and cities, because that is the only thing that will justify this subsidy for this seven miles of road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that we propose to make it a part of a regular system that we should give aid towards providing competitive roads; but when a case is made out for a small piece of railway such as this, I do not think it is any particular answer to the application to say: You are only providing a competitive road. I think it is right that, under certain circumstances, some competition should be secured by means of a small subsidy of \$3,200 a mile, when people are willing to put in their capital and construct a railway perhaps costing \$10,000 or \$12,000 more. I do not think it will be wise for a Government to lay down an arbitrary rule and say that under no circumstances will it give assistance to an undertaking of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not understand, then, on what principle the Minister has gone. He refused to aid the Detroit River and Lake Erie Road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a parallel line.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a parallel line through a large section of country for a time, but it opens up another large section of country, eventually becoming a through route, affording great facilities for that section of country. Besides, the argument of

Mr. MONTAGUE.

the Minister of Railways fails. He says there is no objection to voting a large sum of money to provide a competitive line for that section of country. The hon. gentleman was not in this House when it voted a large sum of money to provide a competitive route for that very country. This Parliament has also voted a very large sum of money for competitive roads to that country. The Canadian Pacific Railway was bonused from London to Windsor, and that line runs directly through this section, to which it is said we ought to have a competitive line.

To the East Richelieu Valley Railway Company, for 24 miles of their railway, from Iberville to St. Thomas, boundary of Missisquoi county, in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Mr. Tarte). That road will connect Iberville with the American frontier and traverse one of the most fertile districts of the province of Quebec, which has been deprived of railway accommodation for a long time. It is 24 miles long, and I am very much obliged to my hon. colleague for having subsidized this line through my county.

Mr. FOSTER. I congratulate the committee on the large amount of information given it. But if we do not get information, we have had the mutual bows and congratulations of one Minister to the other, for having looked after each other's interests.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Ministers in this Government always bow to each other.

To the Portage du Fort and Bristol Railway Company, for 15 miles of their railway, to a point at or near Shawville, in the county of Pontiac.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have an explanation of this from the Minister of Railways?

Mr. POUPORE. This is a very important branch which is to be a feeder to the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, which that railway badly needs. It is to connect Shawville, a thriving village in the county of Pontiac, with another flourishing village in Portage du Fort. It is going to develop a very important marble deposit there and other mineral resources. This grant was promised by the late Government, and the Minister of Railways and Canals was kind enough to include it in the present resolutions, because he felt that the country was entitled to this line, and I beg to thank him for having given it that much consideration.

For a railway from a point at or near Windsor Junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Upper Musquodoboit, for a distance of 40 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new road?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, this is a road to Upper Musquodoboit, a very

thriving district in Halifax county, starting at or near Windsor Junction on the Intercolonial Railway and running through a good farming country, and a section of country entirely without railway facilities.

Mr. FOSTER. Any large bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Upper Musquodoboit as important a town as Liverpool ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When I represented Halifax county in the legislature, I thought there was no more important place than Musquodoboit. Now that I represent Queen's county, I think there are few more important places than Liverpool.

Mr. FOSTER. Will not gratitude for past favours induce the hon. gentleman to bring down in next year's Estimates, a post office for Upper Musquodoboit ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is worthy of anything you can give it.

For a railway from Sunny Brae to Country Harbour and thence to Guysborough, in the province of Nova Scotia, a distance of 65 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to make a slight alteration. I move to strike out the words "and thence" which are in the first line and insert the words "from a point at or near Country Harbour crossroad."

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total length ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The road will be a few miles longer than 65. A survey has been made from Sunny Brae to Country Harbour. A subsidy was granted from the Intercolonial Railway to Sunny Brae by the late Government and also for five miles of the road now to be built. A company has offered to build this road to Country Harbour, which is a very important harbour on the southern shore of Nova Scotia, with a branch from Country Harbour crossroad to Guysborough.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

For a railway from Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, to Port Hood and Broad Cove, 53 miles, for 53 miles of their railway, in lieu of the subsidy granted by the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 4. (25 miles revote.)

Mr. GILLIES. Is there any proposition before the Government on the question of this line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. GILLIES. How far north does the Government intend to subsidize this system, because I believe it is intended to be a system from Hawkesbury as far as Broad Cove, a distance of 53 miles ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The promoters of that road have looked forward to the extension of the road to Margaree and Cheticamp, but we think that the subsidy of 53 miles to Broad Cove will give a chance to start the enterprise. The ultimate destination of these enterprises is usually a point beyond. The Government is under no obligation to give a subsidy for an extension, but if the company were to build to Broad Cove, I do not see any reason why they should not get an extension at a future time. But at present we do not wish to commit ourselves beyond the limits of the resolution.

Mr. GILLIES. There is no proposition before the Government to that effect ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I believe not.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems like inviting a proposition. I suppose if this goes on it will cost the full \$6,400, going through that section of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is a very expensive road to build. It follows the coast line from Strait of Canso and so on up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was not there a subsidy voted for a road to Orangedale to Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that is a different project.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wondered whether this would not be a competing road with that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It runs across an entirely different direction, Orangedale being a station on the Intercolonial Railway. They would connect I think at Broad Cove.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, at Mabou.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know very much about this particular road, but it occurred to me that the other road was looked into very carefully by the late Administration of the Dominion, and I think also by the Administration in the province in which the hon. Minister of Finance was the leader, and very probably the Minister of Finance is familiar with it for that reason. I believe that the route commended itself to the provincial Government and that contracts were entered into to build the road, though, for some reason, they did not go forward. It occurred to me that this might be a competing road with that, and, if so, it might require consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Up to a certain point the two roads would not be competitors, until they reached Mabou,

and from there they cover the same ground. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was right in saying that there was a contract made for a road from Orangedale to Broad Cove. Though the enterprise did not succeed, the people in the section desired to have the road built, though there is no proposition at the present time to commence it actively. Whether they will be able to revive it, I do not know, but at that time the company were not able to prosecute the work.

Mr. GILLIES. As this is the only vote that touches the part of the country from which I come, I would like to refer to another line of railway that was taken up by the late Government and for which a subsidy was voted, and which I am sorry to see does not appear in these resolutions. I refer to the road between Canso and Louisbourg via St. Peter's, on the southern side of Cape Breton. The Minister of Finance is fairly familiar with that part of the country, I believe, because I think he drove over it once or twice. He will bear me out that this is a most important section of the eastern part of the Dominion. From Canso to Louisbourg is a distance of 90 miles, and the proposed line runs through a territory which is known to be very rich in minerals. Now, in the year 1894, a subsidy was granted for the first section of that road from Hawkesbury to St. Peter's, a distance of 30 miles, or one-third of the whole line, and an undertaking furnished by the Government to furnish the balance of the subsidy as fast as required. A contract was entered into for the construction of the road, but, owing to some financial difficulties, the work could not be gone on with. I regret very much indeed that the policy of the late Government in regard to this matter has not been taken up by the present Administration in preparing these resolutions. I had the pleasure of waiting on the Minister of Railways recently with some gentlemen and asked him for a subsidy to be brought down for this road, but he said that it was too late in the session to deal with it then, though I observed the resolutions with regard to other railways were brought down subsequently—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But they had been decided upon before.

Mr. GILLIES. No doubt, they had been dealt with before these matters were brought to the attention of the Minister. Now, inasmuch as it is a most meritorious line, that will accommodate some 30,000 or 35,000 people who are without railway facilities at the present time, and who find it impossible to get out of that section of the country in winter, and inasmuch as it is a very rich country, in respect of minerals and has a large industry in the way

Mr. FIELDING.

of fish and other products, I would ask the hon. Minister to give this system his attention; and I do trust that next year when he is preparing his resolutions in relation to railways he will not forget this important line. I would like to have an answer from the Minister of Railways if he will deal with this matter next year as it is not in his power to do so this session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The application made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) together with some gentlemen who were interested in the road was too late to be considered this session. It is quite true that additional resolutions were brought down after he had submitted the matter to me, but those resolutions embodied decisions that had been reached before, and it had also been decided that we could not take up for consideration any further application for subsidy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a road of which I have some knowledge and in which I felt a very warm interest. When in the provincial government, I made a contract with a company to build a section of that line from the Strait of Canso to St. Peter's, in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Gillies') county, but unfortunately that enterprise also failed. The contractor, owing to causes concerning which I never had any information, did not prosecute the work. I have not had a communication with him for a long time. If the contractor had been in a position to make a proposition to the Government, I think there would have been a fair chance of success, but as the promoters made no representations, we were not in a position to consider the work until after the railway policy of the Government had been agreed upon.

Mr. GILLIES. During the last session when the hon. Finance Minister was in the House of Assembly, an Act of incorporation was passed for a new company, covering this territory, and representatives of that company waited upon the Government, but the Government had not included a subsidy to this line. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, as he is the only Minister from my province, what his policy would be with respect to this line next session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is our policy not to make promises for next session. But, so far as I am personally concerned, I think that the people of the country, knowing what I have done in the past, will be willing to trust me to do what is fair and reasonable.

For a railway from a point on the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, to the town of Liverpool, via the village of Caledonia, or to the village of Caledonia, via Liverpool, or for any part thereof, the whole distance not exceeding 62 miles; 35 miles. (Revote.)

**Mr. KAULBACH.** I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Railways, for the information of those residing in the counties of Lunenburg and Queen's, as to where this proposed railway is to connect with the Central Railway in the county of Lunenburg?

It is to be hoped it is not contemplated by the Minister of Railways to interfere in any way with the proposed belt line already projected and subsidized, and upon which construction has already commenced between Shelburne via Indian Gardens, and Caledonia, connecting with the Central Railway at New Germany? I desire to further comment on this resolution, but I await an answer from the hon. Minister to my question.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I think I will have to ask the Minister of Railways to permit me to be his proxy in this case. The line to which the hon. gentleman opposite refers is one of 75 miles from New Germany to Shelburne, which was taken up by a company called the Nova Scotia Southern Railway Company, promoted by Mr. R. G. Hervey, of Brockville. Unfortunately the enterprise has not succeeded. The present vote is taken in such a form that if the company under the management of Mr. Hervey is able to carry on its work the Government will be in a position to grant the subsidy in accordance with the original design, for a line from New Germany, extending through Caledonia, in Queen's county, and on to the town of Shelburne. We are in a position to deal with Mr. Hervey's company if he is able to go on. But it is only fair to say that there has been considerable dissatisfaction in that district of country owing to the failure of Mr. Hervey to prosecute his enterprise, and it was not thought expedient to tie up the vote to that particular scheme. The vote is taken in such a form that if Mr. Hervey's company is not able to carry out its scheme, then the subsidy may be applied in another way, starting from the same point and going to the town of Liverpool, or starting from a point on the Central Railway, nearer the shore, say Bridgewater, and going by way of Mill Village to Liverpool, and thence up the river to Caledonia, thus leaving us in the position that, if Mr. Hervey's company is not able to carry on its work, we shall be free to deal with any other company.

**Mr. KAULBACH.** If I understand this resolution rightly, and I think the hon. Minister of Finance will agree with me, the people of Liverpool are anxious for railway connection, and they certainly are entitled to accommodation of this sort, and I am with them in the project. Now what is feasible and most advantageous for Liverpool is to construct a road from the referred to Indian Gardens to Liverpool following the valley of the Liverpool River, a distance of

only about eighteen miles. The object of the people of Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg is to have the shortest possible line from Shelburne to connect with the Central Railway at New Germany, in the county of Lunenburg, with a view to extend the same direct from New Germany via New Ross to Halifax, having connection with Chester, Chester Basin and Hibbert's Cove. This contemplated road passes through a country excellently wooded, well adapted for farming purposes, also well watered by beautiful lakes and rivers abounding in fish and attractive to sportsmen and tourists, so that this road when constructed to Halifax will shorten the distance between Halifax and Boston via the Yarmouth boats to Boston in contrast with any other road by five hours, offering at the same time the most comfortable, attractive and as I have said the shortest medium of transit to Boston from Halifax. I certainly do not object to the resolution as submitted, providing it does not interfere with the belt line between Shelburne and New Germany via the Indian Gardens and Caledonia.

For a railway from Brookfield Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Eastville, 30 miles. (Revote.)

**Mr. ELLIS.** Where is this?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** This is a railway up the valley of the Stewiacke River in Nova Scotia. It is a revote of a scheme which has been undertaken by a company called the Midland Railway Company. This end of it they have not so far undertaken. Eastville is on the Stewiacke.

**Mr. FOSTER.** My hon. friend the Minister of Finance seems to have had no trouble in the outcome of wrestling with his colleagues. I think Nova Scotia has between a million and a million and a half dollars. There does not seem to be a crack left in Nova Scotia that will not be covered with railways after a while.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I wish it were so, but I can assure my hon. friend there is quite a number of cracks left yet.

To the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for a subsidy towards the rebuilding and enlargement of the Victoria Bridge at Montreal over the St. Lawrence River, 15 per centum upon the amount expended thereon, not exceeding \$300,000.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I want to ask the Minister of Railways if the Government has undertaken the policy of granting 15 per cent upon the renewal of any bridges already built?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The circumstances in this case are entirely exceptional. A very large amount of money has got to be spent on reconstruction, not so much for the renewal as for the enlargement and extension of that bridge. We are informed that about two millions of money will be required to extend

the capabilities of this bridge. In the first place it will be provided with another railway track; then there will be two tracks laid down for tramways, and there will be a highway for carriages and a foot-path for passengers. Take it altogether the bridge will be comparatively new. It goes without saying that the abutments will remain, although they will be extended, but the superstructure will be absolutely new.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before you pass away from these itemized subsidies I hope the committee will not think me unfair having been absent so long, if I shall say just a word on a subject which has been considered, and it will be a brief word, in justice to some parties who have been attacked in connection with it. I refer to the line which it was proposed to give a charter from the Kootenay country to the coast. In order to put the committee and the country in possession of the facts of the case, and in order, as it seems to me, to do justice to a certain number of people who have been very bitterly attacked by the press, both Opposition and Governmental, it will be necessary for me to say a few words in connection with the history of the question. From the Kootenay to the coast it was proposed by two separate lots of promoters to build a railway. The one proposed, as I understand, to build from Nelson to Vancouver; the other proposed to build a road not perhaps the whole distance, but part of the distance with a view to eventually covering the whole distance over that same route. When the Minister of Railways and Canals was at the coast and going over the ground he collected information which I have no doubt was valuable to the Government and to the House, because no man can go over that section of the country without his views being very much broadened and without collecting a great deal of information, which must be of use to him. These promoters, one set representing the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway Company and the other representing the rival enterprise, asked an audience with the Minister of Railways and Canals and that audience was granted. They were each presenting the views as to the excellence of each one of their schemes, and they presented these views for the purpose of securing the all-powerful influence of the Minister of Railways and Canals in connection with the request for a charter which each one of them proposed, to ask of Parliament. The Minister of Railways perceived that the rivalry between these two parties might injure the project, and he proposed, and it was a very wise proposal I think, that these two sets of promoters should combine their efforts for the purpose of securing a charter for this route across the Hope Mountains, giving the trade, as they thought it would, of the Kootenay country, to the coast cities, Vic-

Mr. BLAIR.

torial, Vancouver and New Westminster. The suggestion made by the Minister of Railways was regarded by these two sets of promoters as a wise suggestion, and they adopted it. The people who came from Victoria were represented chiefly by Dr. Milne, who is a resident of Victoria and a prominent citizen of the coast. In that combined form they came to Ottawa for the purpose of securing a charter. I am not going to refer to anything that took place here, because being absent, and only receiving the papers very occasionally I have no knowledge of the history of the matter whatever. But the charge has been made in the papers that these people were charter hawkers. I see some of the Conservative press, as well as the Liberal press, have called upon the Government to pass legislation which will suppress this charter hawking business as they term it, and saying that they were endeavouring to secure this charter for their own profit and gain. I know nothing whatever as to any deal which was proposed by gentlemen representing that syndicate here; I know nothing as to what deal was proposed or accepted, and afterwards rejected or anything else, but I do want to say this that the Vancouver people who at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways are no charter mongers in any sense of the term. They only combined with the Victoria people because they felt it would be giving a more certain success to their efforts to acquire a charter. I say further that they put up their own private money and there are many of the most honourable citizens of Vancouver among them, to pay for surveying the route. They are not men who want a single dollar out of the sale of the charter. They would refuse to accept a single dollar out of the sale of the charter, and they asked me in justice to them to make that statement upon the floor of this House should I come here before Parliament was prorogued, and I make it with great pleasure. I want to say this further in their behalf. Some of them are Liberals and some of them are Conservatives. I want to say that they were willing to accept no proposition, however advantageous to them privately, individually or collectively that did not give them a railway from the Kootenay to the coast. I do not know any one of these people who have joined for the purpose of securing a consideration and they have no deal as I am assured by themselves. They have put up their own money, and they are willing to put up more as far as they are able for the purpose of testing the feasibility of the route across the Hope Mountains to Vancouver. I think it is to be greatly regretted from the Canadian standpoint, from the standpoint of the coast cities of Canada, that some aid has not been given to construct this road from the Kootenay to the coast. Rossland and Sandon are towns showing great progress and great activity.

While they are Canadian towns, there is a large American element in them, and they are not so adverse to trading with Spokane and cities south of the boundary as are the people on the coast and other portions of British Columbia. What concerns the latter is the prosperity of the coast cities. What should concern this Parliament is the turning of the trade of what is bound to be the richest portion of the Dominion of Canada into the coast cities of Canada at the very earliest possible moment for hon. gentlemen on the Government benches will know that once trade gets into a channel to the south of the line it will be difficult for a road constructed then to bring it back to Canada. I do not care who builds the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway have given a splendid service now by their rail and water route. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway build it if you like; let another Canadian company build it if you like, but I think it should be the policy of the Government to assist in the construction of lines that will take the trade of the richest centres in one of the richest provinces in the Dominion into cities built on Canadian soil and whose people are Canadian citizens interested in Canada where Parliament votes this money for railway construction.

Resolutions reported.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 151) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Blair.)

#### THE POST OFFICE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now one o'clock, and I suppose we are not to be kept here any longer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Call Item No. 2.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask the leader of the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) if he is really going to impose any more on us. We came here at eleven this morning, and have done so for ten days, and we cannot be asked to do impossible things to satisfy one member of the Government who expresses dissent. I know that it is the feeling of the House that we should go home.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On Saturday the House went into committee on the Bill, and the present leader of the Opposition took a course which probably commended itself to him, but the object of which was apparent to everybody. Four hours were frittered away by gentlemen on the other side speaking against time, with their eyes on the clock, until it would reach twelve o'clock on Sunday morning. The question is whether the minority in the House are going to regulate the course of business or not, or whether in a pure departmental matter they will be allowed to prevent the pro-

per conduct of the affairs of the department. If the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had been directing themselves to a fair consideration of the measure, it would be another matter. But the most irrelevant discussions took place—anything to kill time, to reach twelve o'clock and prevent the work going on. He thought, I suppose, that by these methods the measure could be prevented from going through. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries announced then, and I think I can safely announce now, that it is not the intention of the Government to hand over the conduct of their affairs to a minority, and to allow unparliamentary methods to prevent the proper conduct of affairs. If the ex-Minister of Finance desires a fair discussion, if he thinks it is unreasonable to proceed at this hour of the night, and is prepared to discuss the measure honestly, and after reasonable discussion to let the view of the Government take effect, and the Bill to become crystallized into an Act, that is one thing; but if obstructive tactics are to be continued in regard to this measure, there is no course open to the Government but to proceed as it has a right to proceed. If it comes to a matter of endurance, I presume that the members on this side are quite able to endure as hon. gentlemen opposite, and they are resolved, whether to-night or another night, that this measure shall become law, for the Government are in a majority. The measure has been thoroughly discussed, its principles are well understood, and five minutes ought to complete it, unless the same old tactics are to be resorted to. Most important measures have been threshed out here at a later hour than this, and this is a measure of very considerable importance in a departmental way; and if no obstructive tactics are resorted to, the mere carrying of the decision of the Government need not take many minutes. If the Opposition, however, intend to obstruct the measure, and that obstruction lands them in the small hours of the morning, the responsibility is theirs. The ex-Minister of Finance need not plead that it is a late hour to proceed to obstructive tactics. But if he intends to persist in his obstructive tactics, we may as well have the matter out at one time as another. I think there is no justification whatever for the Bill standing over any longer. I therefore move that the House resolve itself into a Committee on

Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to enter into a wordy warfare with my hon. friend.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very sorry, but I think this discussion is out of order.

Mr FOSTER. I do not suppose the Speaker is going to put me down.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** The House may go into committee, and then the discussion may take place.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What I want to do before the House goes into committee is to make an appeal to my hon. friend who is the leader of the Government for the time being. I am not going to waste a single moment in any warfare with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I simply rely on the common sense of the House to say whether we should be kept here any longer at this period of the session and this hour of the morning, and I think I may appeal with confidence to my hon. friend that it is time now to adjourn and go home.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** My hon. friend does not propose, I suppose, to enter into a mere contest of endurance as to this measure, but wants to criticise it fairly.

**Mr. FOSTER.** There has been every charge of obstruction made against me to-night—

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Most flagrant obstruction.

**Mr. FOSTER—**without any reason or warrant.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I saw you organize the obstruction.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman proposes to be insolent. He may be so if he likes.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** Let us have an understanding about this. I am quite sure that if the hon. leader of the Opposition says that it is not the intention deliberately to obstruct this measure, but merely to criticise it—

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would do anything for my hon. friend to pave the way to an adjournment—anything except to say anything untrue. I will say that it was our opinion on this side of the House that this measure was at one time practically withdrawn; we believe it ought to have been withdrawn. I cannot say that there will not be a very extended discussion on the Bill if it comes up again. It is the right of the Opposition to discuss it. I do not think any one wishes deliberately to obstruct. But my present plea is for reason in the conduct of the House, which I know my hon. friend will admit. I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion to adjourn negatived, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

**Mr. FOSTER.** I decidedly do not wish to undertake a speech of eight or ten hours to-night; I am not in a position physically to do it. I consider that this is nothing

**Mr. FOSTER.**

but an attempt to bulldoze a weary and tired House, and I again make my most earnest protest against being forced into a position of that kind. No man would agree for a moment to the proposition, put in the way in which it was put by the Postmaster General, and I do not propose to agree to it, that I should bind myself to stop obstruction and pass this Bill. That is not the way any man gets a Bill through this House—not the way a man should address other members of the House. I still hope, and still implore my hon. friend who leads the House that he will not force this House into that position.

**The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.** All I would say to the hon. gentleman is this. He himself, I am sure, will admit that this is a Bill of considerable departmental importance, which my hon. friend informs me is really necessary to the proper working of his department, and to enable him to carry out the economies which both sides desire to see carried out. We do not in the least object to any amount of fair and reasonable criticism upon it; but surely the hon. gentleman can give us some idea of what length of criticism would be required. He can have all to-morrow to criticise it if he chooses; but there ought to be some kind of understanding. It is not fair to attempt to block the Bill altogether. It is perfectly fair to criticise it, but not to attempt to block it altogether. It is really a matter which my hon. friend assures the House on his responsibility as a Minister is extremely important to the well-working of his department. I will press my hon. friend to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman as the House has been in session since eleven o'clock, but still this Bill has been up two or three times and no progress made, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to give some assurance that no unreasonable amount of time will be taken up.

**Mr. FOSTER.** We cannot make any promise as to time, but we shall give the Bill what reasonable criticism we think is necessary. There is one part of the Bill which is specially objectionable, and that is the provision dealing with contracts. That we do not feel disposed to agree to, and propose to oppose as vigorously as we can. The other portion is not so objectionable.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman says that the other portion is not so objectionable. If I saw in that the glimmer of a spirit of compromise, I am prepared to meet the hon. gentleman on that ground. I shall read, if you will permit me, a report from a gentleman whose opinion will have some weight.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. gentleman can read that to-morrow.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I must have an understanding on the subject. Day

after day this Bill has been before the Committee and talked out. On Saturday night, hon. gentlemen opposite talked from eight to twelve with the clear object of reaching midnight, when the House would have to rise, without anything being accomplished. The hon. gentleman made a proposition that seemed very fair for the moment, but the very moment I made the suggestion—

Mr. FOSTER. The proposition is: Withdraw your clause with reference to contracts and leave that matter stand as it has been standing these many years, and we will give a fair reasonable criticism of the other portion and pass it in the ordinary course of legislation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by passing it in the ordinary course of legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to promise at the dictation of any man that we shall discuss a thing five or ten minutes, or an hour. What I say is, that we shall give it a reasonable discussion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have some reason for trying to arrive at a mutual understanding. The treatment I have received causes me to desire an explicit understanding; and to show that I am not proceeding without some justification, I shall read a document on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. If you are going to come to an understanding, drop the document and come to an understanding, and let us go home. It will be daylight while you are talking about it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman's impression as to the understanding is so vague that he does not know what I mean.

Mr. FOSTER. If I were on that side of the House and in the position of the Postmaster General, I should be quite willing to leave it to my leader.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My leader and myself quite understand each other, and so do the Government. The understanding we have arrived at is, that, inasmuch as the Opposition has chosen to challenge the power of this Government to conduct its affairs, by the methods manifestly adopted on Saturday night, we are not going to depend altogether on hon. gentlemen opposite for the legislation we propose to invite the House to pass. If the hon. gentleman undertakes now to come to an understanding, with regard to this particular clause to which he objects, it will not take five or six minutes to pass the remainder.

Mr. FOSTER. I object to passing it to-night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I propose to read, for the information of all who

desire to know it, the opinion of the Chief Superintendent and Inspector of my department, showing what this measure—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are we to understand that this document which the hon. gentleman wants to read, applies to the clause about which there is controversy?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not bear on that clause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I understood the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) to say was, that if the hon. gentleman would drop the contract clause, he would allow the Bill to pass with ordinary discussion. And I understood the Postmaster General to say: Yes, I will agree to that; but before that I will read the report of a certain officer to show why I proposed that clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not understand the leader of the Opposition to say he was willing to go on to-night and pass the Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What do you propose?

Mr. MULOCK. I propose to go on with the Bill, and, if the rest of the Bill which is said to be not so objectionable, receives the approval of the Committee, I will view very favourably the request of the ex-Minister of Finance about clause 2.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the report which the hon. gentleman proposes to read, bear on clause 2?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it bears on the other clauses of the Bill, which the leader of the Opposition says is not objectionable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not understand. As I understand it, the proposition of the ex-Minister of Finance was that if the Postmaster General would drop the objectionable clause and allow this Bill to go on in the ordinary course of legislation, and not force the House to sit through the small hours of the morning, he was willing to have it discussed in the usual way, but the hon. gentleman now proposes to go on, whether we will or not, by reading a report which is part of the discussion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the rest of the Bill is so unobjectionable, it will only take a few minutes to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might understand the full sense of the House. It wants to go home. It has been sitting here long enough. We have plenty of time tomorrow to go on with this Bill. I made a proposition as clear as possible, and everybody except the Postmaster General under-

stands it. I know that the hon. gentleman's leader understands it, and I leave it to him whether it is not a fair and reasonable proposition and whether we ought not to adjourn?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I would ask my hon. friend to accept the proposition of the leader of the Opposition in view of the fact that the House has undoubtedly done a great deal of work. As I understand it, the leader of the Opposition has promised that a reasonable discussion only will take place.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLY BILL.

Bill (No. 150) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, and for other purposes relating to the public service, was read the second and third times and passed.

### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Bill (No. 151) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Agreeable to an announcement that I made last evening, I propose to introduce an amendment to the first section of the Bill, which I think will be found to remove any doubts which may have arisen with regard to the exact meaning of the clause. This portion as amended will read as I now read it, so that hon. members will be good enough to follow me :

**Mr. FOSTER.**

The expression "cost" used in this resolution, means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge up to but not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized and not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway, nor the cost of terminals or right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town.

Amendment agreed to.

On resolution 7,

**Mr. FOSTER.** Before the Bill is reported, I would like to inquire from the Minister of Railways what is the amount, at the minimum rate of \$3,200 per mile, of the subsidies voted here, first, as to revotes; secondly, as to new subsidies.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am afraid that I cannot furnish the hon. gentleman the information at the moment.

**Mr. FOSTER.** If the hon. gentleman has not that information, if he will have that calculation made by his department and the information here before the third reading, I would have no objection to letting this go at the present time; but before the Bill is read the third time, I would like to have that information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I had it all here, but a portion of my papers have gone back to the department. I think I can have it by the third reading.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It will not cause any delay in that way, because the Minister can send over to his department and have the calculations all brought over.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I can tell the hon. gentleman the gross amount of the subsidies included in the revotes. It was \$2,148,128.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That is the amount of the revote subsidies at \$3,200 per mile?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes. If my memory serves me well,—but I will get the exact figures—the whole amount will be \$4,100,000.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Does that include the Grand Trunk Railway bridge?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That includes all.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I should like to have it accurately before the third reading.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, I will give it; I have not the statement that I thought I had.

Bill reported.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 146) to authorize a subsidy for a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.—(Mr. Blair.)

### POST OFFICE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Post Office Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I observe that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is not present. I have some weighty arguments which would have no force at all unless they are addressed directly to the Postmaster General. I think we must have him here. I have great hopes of persuading the hon. gentleman this morning.

On section 126,

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is entirely too bad that we have to run this Bill through like this without having any information as to what is to be done. No matter how good-naturedly we have tried for information we get none. We are putting this through practically in the dark. We do not know how many officers are to be employed or how the work is to be divided, where the officers are to be located, or anything about it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). If the committee has been behaving very well, I will try not to behave very badly—

Mr. FOSTER. I say if my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) will allow me, that the arrangement of last night is being carried out, and that subsections 2 and 3 are dropped, and the Bill is passed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If you will allow me, I would like to explain to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, how this matter stands. A day or so ago, after I had listened to the criticisms on clause 2, and having thought them over, I came to the conclusion that there was some force in them. I desired to meet the views of my hon. friends opposite and, for that purpose, I drafted an amendment which I thought would get over the difficulty. I may say that the present Act is wholly unworkable. It requires, in the first place, an advertisement of a mail contract for six weeks. Then, if it is found desirable to refuse all the offers on the ground that the fee is too high, we are not at liberty to offer another price to the tenderers all at once, but are obliged to take them in detail, offer it to the lowest and await his refusal, or allow a reasonable time for refusal and then repeat with the others until the whole list of tenderers is exhausted. If they refuse—if there is a ring, for instance—you are just where you were when you started, and have to go through the whole thing again. I had a case in point in the east, and public service suffered through the cause I have pointed out. There was another case in the west, but I have got through the difficulty in that

case, but no thanks to the law as it stands. I do not, in the least, desire to destroy the principle of tendering, nor do I desire to go outside of the tenderers if one of them is ready to perform the service at a reasonable price. I therefore propose an amendment by striking out of section 2 all the words after "competition or," and substituting the following:—

May name a sum as the outside price for said contract, and may submit the contract for competition amongst all who have tendered and any others, such submission to be made by registered letter sent to said tenderers and to others, and to state outside price and to name a day, not being less than 15 days from the day of posting such letters, within which tenders will be received.

That is, if the lowest tender is not satisfactory, I can say: Here is a sum that is reasonable, and I offer the thing in competition again amongst the tenderers, and with permission to invite outsiders. If the tenderers are in combination as sometimes happens, it is idle to offer it amongst them, because they will stay where they were; and if we cannot escape from the tenderers we have got to readvertise and there is six weeks lost again; that together with the preliminary loss of time makes the Act practically unworkable when it comes to large contracts. With very small contracts there is no difficulty, but with large contracts involving a \$30,000 plant the law is inoperative to-day. It is simply to get out of the difficulty of delay that I asked to have the statute amended. As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has acted courteously to me, so I shall to him, and if he does not think it is in the public interest to accept this amendment willingly and gracefully, I shall withdraw it for this session. I shall accept any reasonable proposition my friend offers.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new proposition which will involve discussion and we are not in a deliberative mood. The best thing we can do is to adhere to the proposition made last night.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, I will not press it. Will you allow me to cut down the six weeks advertisement to four weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has plenty of opportunity again for that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An hon. gentleman on the other side suggested that the fifteen years mentioned in the Bill, should be cut down to ten years, I am willing to accept that suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to strike out the word "now" in section 120, line 18.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well. Will the hon. gentleman now accept a suggestion from me.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to have section 121 read "may be made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Postmaster General." I wish to add the words "by the Governor in Council."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, that was the intention.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 130) to further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

#### SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND MINING COMPANY.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I would like to move a motion. It appears that a gentleman from Toronto who promoted a railway Bill which came before the Railway Committee and the House, gave the Clerk a cheque in payment of the fees. That cheque has been dishonoured, and several weeks have elapsed in which the maker of the cheque has had an opportunity to make it right. I think it is a very disgraceful thing for solicitors or others promoting Bills to be guilty of such conduct; and, with the permission of the House, I beg leave to move:

That all proceedings had in this House on Bill (No. 53) to revive and further amend the Acts respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company and to change the name of the company to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company, be declared null and void.

I do not know the parties at all, and cannot find any person who does. It is a great convenience to solicitors, members and others interested in legislation, to have cheques received and their word of honour taken in these transactions. I think it is disgraceful that any persons promoting a private Bill should fail to keep faith with the Clerk; and if only for a warning for the future, I think this motion should pass.

Mr. SPROULE. Was not this one of the Bills which were assented to?

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill has not left this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the promoter before the committee?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill was in the name of Mr. Lount as member; but he had no knowledge of the parties, I understand, or of the Bill itself.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. SPEAKER. The cheque is not, I understand, a cheque of the member who introduced the Bill, nor the cheque of any solicitor or agent before this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any communication been had with the parties?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed by the Clerk that there has been communication for several weeks. I can understand how, from the fact of a Bill being in the name of a member of the House, some misapprehension might arise as to his relation to it. The name given to me by the Clerk as the maker of the cheque is Mr. Cheeseworth.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that Mr. Lount had no responsibility for the Bill. He only took charge of it for a constituent.

Motion agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT—KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg to extend my congratulations to hon. gentlemen on the approaching termination of the labours they have so zealously performed on both sides.

Mr. FOSTER. How near?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps my hon. friend has friends who can tell him better than I. In the meantime, I think, awaiting events, the House might adjourn until three o'clock, and I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the motion for adjournment is carried, I should like to ask the Postmaster General whether he has completed his investigation into the manner in which the mail service is conducted in the Kootenay mining district, and whether he is perfectly satisfied that he has now got that service placed on such a basis that it ought to prove satisfactory to the people of that district.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I sent Chief Inspector Sweetnam to British Columbia to look into a large number of postal matters, including the service in question. I received a telegram from Mr. Sweetnam a day or two ago, stating that he is on his way back, and this will be one of the matters on which I am sure he will report to me on reaching Ottawa.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If there is one department of the Government which more than any other should be of great value to the Kootenay country, it is the department of the hon. gentleman. But I never saw a section of country in which the mail service was so badly handled, and in which people were so much inconvenienced as they are at the present time by the inefficiency of the postal arrangements there, and I sincerely trust that they may be improved.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The information which the hon. gentleman gives me is not new. I may say that persons engaged in government contracts and works out there are so deeply interested in other matters that even postmasters holding lucrative positions will neglect to attend to their duties, and I have had twice to send officers direct from headquarters to British Columbia to overhaul the officers who were more interested in speculations than discharging their duties. It was just such difficulties that made it necessary for me to send our chief officer out there, and it seemed impossible to stir up the officials of local affairs in that country. When Mr. Sweetnam arrives, I will be able to deal with the matter.

The contemplated extension of the service in British Columbia during the approaching year will cost a good deal of money, but it was quite impossible to form any opinion as to the amount, and therefore I was unable to put an item in the Estimates to cover the expenditure. The rates they charge are abnormally high, and in some cases quite beyond what one would be apparently warranted in paying. Therefore it will be necessary next session for me to ask a supplementary Estimate in order to pay for the service we intend to inaugurate in the near future.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at twelve (noon).

## Second Sitting.

TUESDAY, 29th June, 1897.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved third reading of Bill (No. 151) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned. He said: The hon. gentleman wished to have certain information which I hold in my hand. The amount of subsidies which are revoted wholly or in part, under the first resolution, \$2,148,128, and under the second resolution, \$16,000, making a total of \$2,164,128. The amount of subsidies which are new votes, under the first resolution, is \$1,825,560, and under the second resolution \$277,000, making a total of \$2,172,561—or in all the sum of \$4,336,000.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This is, of course, on the computation of \$3,200 per mile.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

### REPORTS.

Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department for the year 1896.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, for the year ended 30th June, 1896.—(Mr. Fisher.)

### PROROGATION.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Although not in a position to speak absolutely and authoritatively, we are in hopes that sufficient speed may be made in the other branch of the legislature to allow us to prorogue at 8 o'clock in the evening. If the House will kindly adjourn until 5 o'clock, we should then be in a position to state definitely.

The **SPEAKER** left the Chair.

At Six o'clock p.m.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I beg to inform the House that I have received a letter from His Excellency's secretary to the effect that His Excellency will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue this session of the Dominion Parliament on Tuesday, the 29th instant, at 8 o'clock p.m. Therefore, I will leave the Chair until 8 o'clock p.m.

### PERSONAL—LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I beg the indulgence of the House for one moment. I read in the Montreal "Gazette," of yesterday, the following:—

Of the 20 who supported Mr. McMullen's amendment to strike out the item of \$5,000 for Liverpool, N.S., P.O., five were Liberals, Messrs. Bain, Christie, Oliver, Scriver and Mr. McMullen himself, in spite of the fact that when he left Ottawa some days ago, presumably for the session, a standing pair was found for him in Mr. Henderson, who has gone home to remain. The fact that he was paired seemed to make no difference to Mr. McMullen, and he voted.

In justice to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I merely desire to say that I do not consider that by his voting yesterday on that motion he in any way violated his pledge as, had I been here, I would have voted just as he did. The statement that I had gone home for the session is also untrue, which is evidenced by the fact that I am in my place to-day.

The Speaker left the Chair, to resume the same at 8 p.m.

### PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate Chamber.

### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to confirm an Agreement made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.

An Act to incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate Les Cisterciens Reformés.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company of Canada, Limited.

An Act respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.

An Act to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company.

An Act respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.

An Act respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.

An Act further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies.

An Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Minden and Muskoka Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Kaslo and Lardou-Duncan Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting La Banque du Peuple.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Columbia River Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Richelleu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.

An Act respecting Forged or Unauthorized Indorsements of Bills.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.

An Act respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.

An Act to incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America, Limited.

Mr. HENDERSON.

An Act to incorporate the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.

An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

An Act further to amend the Patent Act.

An Act respecting the Voters' Lists of 1897.

An Act to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act to provide for the Registration of Cheese Factories and Creameries, and the branding of Dairy Products, and to prohibit Misrepresentation as to the dates of Manufacture of such Products.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.

An Act relating to the Canada Investment and Agency Company, Limited.

An Act further to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate La Mutuelle Générale Canadienne.

An Act respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting interest.

An Act to amend the Companies Act.

An Act respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

An Act to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.

An Act respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Trans-Canada Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the American Bank Note Company (Foreign).

An Act respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Judges thereof.

An Act respecting Trials by Jury in certain cases in the North-west Territories.

An Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.

An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs.

An Act further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act respecting Export Duties.

An Act further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.

An Act respecting the Yukon Mining and Transportation Company (Foreign).

An Act respecting Cold Storage on Steamships from Canada to the United Kingdom and in certain Cities in Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.

An Act to amend "An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the province of Quebec."

An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act to authorize the raising by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.

An Act to provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.

An Act further to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

An Act to authorize a subsidy for a Railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railways therein mentioned.

An Act further to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act further to amend the Civil Service Act.

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

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows :—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

"An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, and for other purposes relating to the public service."

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words :—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Second Session of the Eighth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech :—

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

In relieving you from further attendance in Parliament, I desire to thank you for the assiduity with which you have discharged the duties of a fatiguing session, and I congratulate you on the very important legislation which has been the outcome of your deliberations.

The revision of the tariff, which occupied a large part of the session, has been completed in a manner which, I trust, will prove effective in promoting the trade and commerce of the Dominion. It is gratifying to know that this measure has been recognized as one of Imperial importance, and that it has already had a marked effect in strengthening the bonds which unite Canada to the motherland.

The arrangements for establishing a fast steamship line of the highest class between Great Britain and Canada, with the co-operation and assistance of the Imperial and Canadian Governments, encourage me to hope that at no distant day we shall see the accomplishment of that very important project.

I am pleased to observe that you have made provision for extending substantial aid to various important railway enterprises, which are designed to develop the vast mineral wealth of Canada, and to improve the facilities for transportation and travel.

The Bill to provide an effective system of cold storage on land and sea will promote the interests of our agriculturists, by affording means for the transportation of perishable food products and placing them in the best condition in the great markets of the world.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I thank you for the liberal provision which you have made for the public services.

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons .*

The session now closing will be memorable not only on account of the important measures which have been passed, but also because it has been held during the year of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, in which the people of all parts of the Empire united in celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. The splendid demonstrations which have taken place throughout the Queen's Dominions testify at once the loyalty and affection of the people towards their Sovereign and the unity of the British Empire. I know that you rejoice with me that Canada has worthily performed her part in these great events.

In now taking leave of you, I desire to express my best wishes for your personal happiness and my earnest hope that the work of the session may prove useful in advancing the prosperity of the people whom you represent.

The Speaker of the Senate then said :

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons.*

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure that this Parliament be prorogued until Wednesday, the eleventh day of August next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the eleventh day of August next.

# INDEX.

## SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1897.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

### **Bain, Mr. T. W.,** *North Wentworth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep. (cold storage) conc., 1899 (i).

Order, Ques. of, Newspaper quotations (remarks) 2521 (i).

#### SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2286 (i).

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (N.S.) 4923 (ii).

### **Bazinet, Mr. C.,** *Joliette.*

Timothy Seed and Clover, Imposition of Duty (Ques.) 793 (i).

### **Beattie, Mr. T.,** *London.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5393 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 844 (i).

Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121) 1°, 3234 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3074, 3169; (Indian corn) 4444 (ii).

### **Beausoleil, Mr. C.,** *Berthier.*

#### SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (N.B.) 4943, 4946; (Que.) 5280 (ii).

### **Belcourt, Mr. N. A.,** *Ottawa.*

American Bank Note Co.'s (B. 68) 1°, 1373; on M. for 3°, 3285 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°, 914 (i).

National Museum, Erection at Ottawa (M. for Ret.) 2426 (i).

Ottawa Gas Co.'s (B. 102) 1°, 1983 (i).

Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°, 1171 (i).

### **Bell, Mr. J. W.,** *Addington.*

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3153 (ii).

### **Bell, Mr. A. C.,** *Pictou.*

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1887 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5190 (ii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 96) 1°, 1738 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5356 (ii).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2167 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks), 1825 (i).

Moore, W.B., Fuel Inspector I.C.R., Dismissal (Ques.) 2121 (i).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Names of Militia Officers, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5363 (ii).

#### SUPPLY :

*Miscellaneous* (Tariff inquiry) 5209 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers* (dredging) 2784; (N.S.) 2729 (ii).

*Railways—Capital: I.C.R.*, 3836; (rolling stock) 5388 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2930; (iron or steel, scrap) 3610; (coal, bituminous) 4197 (ii).

**Bennett, Mr. W. H., East Simcoe.**

- Address, on The, 409 (i).  
 Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 636 (i).  
 American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Belcourt) in M. for 3°, 3289, 3461 (ii).  
 Anderson, Geo., Appnmt. as Agent to Japan (Ques.) 3339 (ii).  
 Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1854 (i).  
 Challenger, Dredge, Work done at Midland (Ques.) 260 (i).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4583 (ii).  
 Export Duty on Logs, par in *Midland Free Press* (remarks) 4105 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 870 (i).  
 Jones, County Court Judge, Resignation and Gratuity (Ques.) 2882 (ii).  
 ——— (M. for Cor.) 3537 (ii).  
 Owen Sound and Collingwood Harbour, Expenditure (Ques.) 796 (i).  
 Penetanguishene Customs Collector, Vacancy (Ques.) 261 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4503 (ii).  
 ——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5103 (ii).  
 Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. McLennan, *Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 699 (i).  
 Returns (inquiry) 4122 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Capital* (Trent Valley) 4825, 5126 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Indian Dept., 1714. Inland Revenue, 1921. Post Office Dept., 1723 (i); (technical services) 5102 (ii).  
*Customs—Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5052. Post Office (mail service) 5077 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2812 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5221 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (western dept. block) 4893. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4903 (ii): (Ont.) 2579; (Ridesau Hall) 2593, 2622 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2758; (Ont.) 2974, 2778; (Rimouski pier) 4964 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1501 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3029, 3036, 3162; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3314 (ii).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.**

- Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1895 (i).  
 Beauharnois Canal, Collector A. D. Danis (Ques.) 925 (i).  
 ——— Collector of Tolls, Appnmt., &c. (M. for O. C.) 1663 (i).  
 ——— Dismissal of Lockmen (Ques.) 1743 (i).  
 ——— Postmaster and County Election (Ques.) 268 (i).  
 ——— Appnmt. (Ques.) 572 (i).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

- Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal of Alexis Doutre (M. for Cor., &c.) 836 (i).  
 Bibaud, Azarie, Emplymt. in House of Commons (Ques.) 3509 (ii).  
 Brodeur, S. A., Collector of Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 2419 (i).  
 Conservative Newspapers, Postal Delivery (Ques.) 918 (i).  
 Convicts Liberated, Sentences Commuted, &c. (M. for Ret.), 546 (i).  
 Danis, A. D., Contributions to Pension Fund (Ques.) 2421 (i).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2317 (i).  
 Excise Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ques.) 2422 (i).  
 Gill Nets and Seines, New Regulations, &c., Montreal District (remarks) 4372 (ii).  
 Mercier, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Commissioner (Ques.) 917 (i).  
 ——— Investigation at Post Office, Valleyfield (M. for Ret. \*) 2448 (i).  
 Montreal Inland Revenue, Cost of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 3057 (ii).  
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 4115 (ii).  
 Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4724 (ii).  
 Soulanges Canal, Appnmt. of Arbitrators (Ques.) 1540 (i).  
 Speaker, Dep., and Elections (Personal Explanation) 2218 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 5506 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.*: (N.W.T. Exhibition) 4860.  
*Canals—Capital*: Beauharnois, 5271; Trent Valley (construction) 5129. *Income*: Beauharnois (damages) 5131 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Indian Affairs (Sec.'s salary) 4828. Interior Dept. (salaries) 4838. Justice (salaries) 4834 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Que.) 2553 (i); (preventive service) 5004, 5045, 5051 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2500; (travelling, &c.) 2508 (i). Post Office (mail service) 5071. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5135 (ii).  
*Government of N. W. T.* (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 4036, 4053; (general expenses) 4067 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4846 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Port Mulgrave, &c., and Port Hood) 4999; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4996 (ii).  
*Militia* (Jubilee contingent) 4994; (Royal Military College) 4816 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Commissions of investigation) 5236; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4861; (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Cont.***

**SUPPLY—*Con.***

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4792; (payments to Commissioners) 4801 (ii).

*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4899; (western dept. block, fire) 4896 *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4901; (grounds, Ottawa, &c.) 4943; (Rideau Hall) 2596; (Alexandria Reformatory) 4949; (Rat Portage) 5285 (ii); (Ont.) 2588; (Que.) 2577 (i). Harbours and Rivers, (Ont. Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Que.) 4958; (Gatineau River) 4959; (Rimouski) 4953 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (clerical assistance) 4892 (ii).

Valleyfield Collector of Customs, Appnmt. (Ques.) 926 (i).

— Mail Service, Delay in Transit (Ques.) 1743 (i).

— Postmaster Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 2566 (i).

— Appnmt. of E. Dion (Ques.) 418 (i).

Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5226 (ii).

**Bethune, Mr. J. L., *Victoria, N.S.***

I. C. R., Iona Station Restaurant (Ques.) 1739 (i).

Iona Wharf, Victoria Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 489, 921, 1740, (i).

North Harbour, Aspey Bay, Harbour of Refuge (M. for Cor.\*) 2445 (ii).

North River, St. Anns, Building of Wharf (Ques.) 1740 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2720 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Sunbury and Queen's.***

Amqui Municipality, Reimbursement for Ry. Crossing (Ans.) 1541 (i).

Ault, Mr. E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 2879 (ii).

Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Control (Ans.) 261.

Beauharnois Canal, Collector A. D. Danis (Ans.) 925 (i).

— Dismissal of Lockmen (Ans.) 1743 (i).

Brodeur, S. A., Collector of Tolls (Ans.) 2419 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5286 (ii).

Canal Contracts, Deposits on Tenders (Ans.) 1026 (i).

C. P. R. Rates and Tolls, West of Toronto (Ans.) 4204 (ii).

— Abrogation of Article in Contract (Ans.) 97 (i).

— Transport of Grain from N. W. T. and Man., 1891 to 1897 (Ans.) 3509, 3670 (ii).

Chambly Canal, Expenditure on Culvert (Ans.) 1028 (i).

— Tenders for Stone (Ans.) 1028 (i).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry., Rivière des Prairies Bridge (Ans.) 567 (i).

Cornwall and Beauharnois Canals, Cost of Breaks in 1894-95 (Ans.) 2425 (i).

— and Soulanges Canals, Dimensions and Contractors (Ans.) 2411 (i).

— Dismissal of Employees (Ans.) 2564 (i).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.***

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C. P. R., Construction (Ans.) 568 (i).

— Plans deposited by C. P. R. (Ans.) 267 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. (B. 146) Com. on Res. (m.) 3870; in Com. on Res., 4512; in Com., on B., 5164, 5338, 5346 (ii).

Danis, A. D., Contributions to Pension Fund 2421 (i).

Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4013 (ii).

Dom. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*) on M. for 2°, 2778.

Drummond Co. Ry. and G. T. R., in Com. of Sup., 5080 (ii).

— See "I. C. R. Extension."

Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4708 (ii).

G. T. Ry. and Dom. Govt. and reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjourn Hse. (remarks) 577.

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (remarks) 1546 (i).

— Par. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 2657 (ii).

— Drummond Co. Ry. and G. T. R. (Rep. presented) 4202 (ii).

— Agreement (B. 142) Com. on Res. (M.) 4258; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340; in Com., 4344-4394; 1°, 4477; 2° m., 4612; 3° m., 4654 (ii).

— Bicycles as Baggage (remarks) 2743 (ii).

— McDonald, A. R., General Inspector, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1078 (i).

— Dismissals, McLean, James, Foreman Carpenter (Ans.) 212 (i).

— Pierre Begin, Section man (Ans.) 1638 (i).

— Eugène Blanchet, Section Foreman (Ans.) 1082, 1639 (i).

— Moore, W. B., Fuel Inspector (Ans.) 1541 2121 (i).

— Employees Dismissed at Antigonish (Ans.) 2565 (i).

— at Rimouski (Ans.) 2566 (i).

— Dismissals (Ret. presented), 4203 (ii).

— St. Charles' Stationmaster (Ans.) 1540 (i).

— Iona Station Restaurant (Ans.) 1739 (i).

— New Time Table (remarks) 3242 (ii).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Lount*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 2609 (i).

Lachine Canal, Michael Behan's Dismissal (Ans.) 2565 (i).

— Dame David's Dismissal (Ans.) 3338 (ii).

— Employees Dismissed (Ans.) 923, 2410 (i).

— Michael Enright's Dismissal (Ans.) 2564.

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2164; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 2602; in Com., 2603 (i).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. *Lount*) 3° m. (Amt.) 2610 (i).

McArthur, Wm., Fenelon Falls, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1639 (i).

N. S. Central Ry., Balance of Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 3868 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Otonabee*, Dredge, Dismissal of Engineer (Ans.) 259.
- Point Tupper (C.B.) Station Agent, Appmt. (Ans.) 788 (i).
- Pontiac County, Drowned Lands, Claims unsettled, &c. (Ans.) 3869 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5402 (ii).
- Quebec Oriental Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 919 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).
- Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 492 (i).
- Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 3°, 2454 (i).
- Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).
- Robertson, Mr. A. B., Dismissal (Ans.) 2879 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River Canals, Improvements (Ans.) 2423 (i).
- St. Peter's Canal, Daniel B. Stone's Dismissal (Ans.) 2414 (i).
- Soulanges Canal (Sections 4, 5, 6, 7) Tenders (Ans.) 341; Contracts (Ans.) 483 (i).
- Appmt. of Arbitrators (Ans.) 1540 (i).
- Section 12, Contract (Ans.) 489 (i).
- South Shore Ry. Co., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 671 (i).
- Stanley Bridge and P. E. I. Ry., Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 2882 (ii).
- Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
- Subsidies to Rys. (prop. Res.) 4736, 5117; in Com., 5362; (B. 151) 1°, 5529; in Com. on Res., 5479, 5511, 5535 (ii).
- Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com. on Res., 5519 (ii).
- Joliette and St. Jean de Matha, in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 5513 (ii).
- Sunny Brae, &c., in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).
- G.T.R., Victoria Bridge, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).
- Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).
- Pembroke Southern Ry., in Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).
- Campbellton, N.B., in Com. on Res., (Amt.) 5513 (ii).
- Ottawa and New York, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).
- Sunny Brae (N.S.) Ry., Govt. Aid, Construction (Ans.) 1542 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Canals—Capital*: Beauharnois, 5270; Cornwall (enlargement) 3862, 5115; Galops, 3862; Grenville, 3876, 3922; Lachine, 3875, 4823, 4892; (enlargement) 5113; North Channel, 3862; River Reaches, 3862; St. Pierre River, 5150; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3874, 5118; Soulanges (construction) 3861, (contractors' claims) 5124; Trent Valley, 3863, 4825, 5127. *Income*: (Beauharnois (damages) 5131, 5275; St. Peter's (repairs) 5274. (ii).
- Civil Government*: Railways and Canals, 1923 (i), (contingencies) 4830 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Collection of Revenues*: Canals (Williamsburg) retiring allowance to Mr. Hickey, 5266. Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5133 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5215 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Montmagny P. O.) 5282 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (Dartmouth branch) 5114; (extension to Montreal) 3746, 3800; (land damages) 5422; (rolling stock) 5269, 5288, 5338; *sonc.*, 5477. P. E. I. Ry., 3854 (ii). *Income*: I. C. R. (expenses of commissions) 5254; P. E. I. Ry. (compassionate allowance) 5276 (ii).
- Trent Valley Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Dismissal of Timber Inspector (Ans.) 260 (i).
- Rosedale Works, Dismissal of Foreman (Ans.) 259 (i).
- Victoria Bridge, Montreal, O. C. *re* Govt. Aid (Ans.) 489 (i).
- Welland Canal, Dismissals (Ans.) 2122 (i).
- Williamsburg Canal, W. J. Casselman's Dismissal (Ans.) 2415 (i).
- Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

**Boisvert, Mr. F., Nicolet.**

- Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°, 1666 (i).
- I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, Cor. with G.T.R., &c. (M. for copy\*) 2446 (i).
- Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 90) 1°, 1666 (i).
- Nicolet River Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 671 (i).
- South Shore Ry. Co., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 671 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L., Halifax.**

- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2342 (i).
- I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4355 (ii).
- O'Brien, Wm., Dismissal from Str. *Lansdowne* (Ques.) 4008 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5379, 5391 (ii).
- Stewart, J. S., Postmaster, Upper Musquodoboit Dismissal (Ques.) 1542 (i).
- Subsidies to Rys. (Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood) in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).
- Sunny Brae Ry., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1542 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Administration of Justice* (travelling expenses) 4842; (Supreme Court) 4986 (ii).
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2279 (i).
- Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3957 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5137; (I.C.R., commissions of investigation) 5261. Weights and Measures (salaried) 2534 (ii).
- Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2824 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988; (room accommodation) 4852 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Newfoundland) 4904 (ii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.—Con.**

**SUPPLY—Con.**

*Penitentiaries* (gratuities, retiring officials) 4967 (ii)

*Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers* (dredging) 2782; (Ont.) 4969; (P.E.I.) 4981 (ii).

*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2245 (ii).

*Railways—Capital: I.C.R.* (extension to Montreal) 3823 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2888; (skates, &c.) 4152 (ii).

**Bostock, Mr. H., Yule and Cariboo.**

B. C. Southern Ry. Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 518 (i).

Columbia River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539 (i).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666.

— Return of Fees (M.) 4651 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4553 (ii).

Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).

McNab, Fisher, Inspector, Instructions from Govt. (Ques.) 3058 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5504 (ii).

Telegraph Lines in B.C., Govt. and C.P.R. (Ques.) 2567 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3391 (ii).

**Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N., Labelle.**

Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2473.

**SUPPLY:**

*Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers* (Little Rapids Locks) conc., 5444 (ii).

**Britton, Mr. B. M., Kingston.**

Address, on The, 469 (i).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3552 (ii).

Business of the Hse, on M. to adjn. for Queen's Birthday, 2740 (ii).

Coasting Laws of Can. and U.S. (M. for Cor.) 3525 (ii).

Criminal Code (seduction and abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3542.

Doia. Portland Cement Co.'s incorp. (B. 79) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1070 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, in Com., on Res., 4386 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4255 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 950 (i).

Methodist Trust Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707 (i).

**Britton, Mr. B. M.—Con.**

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., on Res., 5508 (ii).

— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 4986.

*Canals—Capital: Cornwall*, 5116. *Income: Rideau* (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).

*Collection of Revenue: Canals* (Williamsburg, retiring allowance to Mr. *Hickey*) 5277. *Railways* (Baie des Chaleurs) 5149 (ii).

*Civil Government: Inland Revenue*. 1918; Interior, 1706 (i); Justice (salaries) 4836 (ii).

*Legislation: House of Commons* (sessional clerks) 4850 (ii).

*Militia* (Royal Military College) 4818 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (litigated matters) 3864; (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5214 (ii).

*Penitentiaries: Kingston* (Commissioners' Rep.) 4744, 4782 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Ont.) 2587; (Rat Portage) 5286; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4968; (Man.) 4971 (ii).

Supreme Court Ont. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).

U.S. and Can. Mail Regulations, withdrls. before Delivery (Ques.) 1635 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3255; (surgical instruments) 3478; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4178; (cotton fabrics) 4179; (cotton duck) 4186 (ii).

**Broder, Mr. A., Dundas.**

Address, on The, 393 (i).

Ault, Mr. E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 2879 (ii).

Butter Exports, Bonus, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 1802 (i).

Morrisburg Collector of Customs, Appmnt. (Ques.) 341, 489 (i).

— David Halliday's Appmnt. (M. for Ret.)\* 1775 (i).

Robertson, Mr. A. B., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 2879 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, W. J. Casselman's Dismissal (Ques.) 2415 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Collection of Revenues: Customs* (Ont.) 2554 (ii).

**Brodeur, Mr. L. P., Rouville.**

Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539 (i).

Montreal and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1899 (i).

See SPEAKER, MR. DEPUTY.

**Brown, Mr. J. P., Chateauguay.**

Ste. Philomène Postmaster, Dismissal and Complaints against (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S., West Middlesex.**

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 885 (i).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S.—Con.**

- Strathroy Customs Officer, Name, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).  
 ——— Inland Revenue Officer, Name, &c. (Ques.) 483 (i).  
 ——— Post Office, Tenders and Contracts (Ques.) 797 (i).

**Cameron, Mr. M. C., West Huron.**

- Cobourg Postmaster, &c., Charges against (Ques.) 1306 (i).  
 ——— Charges against (M. for copy\*) 2020 (i).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2201 (i).  
 Fisheries Protection Service, Officers on Govt. Steamers (Ques.) 3670 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 756 (i).  
 Post Office Inspectors, creation of New Offices (M. for Cor. \*) 1664 (i).  
 Mail Contracts cancelled since July, 1896 (M. for Ret. \*) 1664 (i).  
 Post Office Dept., Administration. Appnmt. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 493 (i).  
 Stratford Street Letter-box Service (Ques.) 2126.

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government*—Inland Revenue, 1916 (i).  
 Veterans of 1837-8, Pension Claims, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 3537 (ii).  
 Winnipeg Industrial School, Name of Principal, Date of Appnmt. (Ques.) 490 (i).  
 ——— Appnmt. of Supt. (M. for Cor. \*) 1664 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. (salt, &c.) 3715 (ii).

**Campbell, Mr. A., Kent.**

- Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1895 (i).  
 Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) on M. for 2°, 701 (i).  
 Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Donville) 2° m., 2777 (ii).

**Cargill, Mr. H., East Bruce.**

- Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5105.

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* : Post Office (technical services) 5105 (ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : Res. 17 (combine clause) 3346 ; (files and rasps) 4141 ; (Indian corn) 4443, 4457 (ii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers.**

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2nd proposal (remarks) 782 (i).  
 ——— Tenders (M. for copies) 2426 (i).  
 Bazinet, Mr., of Joliette, and Quebec Elections (Ques.) 1634 (i).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5199 (ii).  
 Caplin River Postmaster, reported Dismissal (Ques.) 1027 (i).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A.—Con.**

- Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 5351 (ii).  
 Dablon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1027 (i).  
 I. C. R., Dismissal of Employees at Rimouski (Ques.) 2566 (i).  
 Militia, Active, Non-commissioned Officers and Men (M. for Ret. \*) 2445 (i).  
 "Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjourn., 1550 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. P. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4501, 47-6, 5377, 5409 (ii).  
 ——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5083 (ii).  
 Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 5184 (ii).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Militia Contingent and par. in Quebec *Chronicle* (remarks) 3241 (ii).  
 ——— Bank Holiday (remarks) 4872 (ii).  
 St. Valerien de Rimouski, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 2566 (i).  
 Smith, John L., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* : Justice (salaries) 4835 ; Post Office (statutory increases) 5078, 5267 ; (technical services) 5100 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (sessional indemnity, &c.) 4844 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4998 (ii).  
*Militia* (monuments, battlefields of Canada) 4961 ; (Military College) 4813 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5214 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital* : Dredging (St. Lawrence River Channel) 2576. *Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 2578 ; (Que.) 2577 (ii) ; (west deptl. block, fire) 4884 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2204 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce), South Oxford.**

- Address, on the, 85, 99 (i).  
 Adjournment (remarks) 5540 (ii).  
 Anderson, Geo., Appnmt. as Agent to Japan (Ans.) 3339 (ii).  
 Artillery, Garrison Battery, No. 3, Disbandment (Ans.) 340 (i).  
 Aspdin, Thos. W., Claim for Scrip (Ans.) 1374.  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2nd proposal (remarks) 782 (i) ; Contract (remarks) 4216 (ii).  
 ——— on M. to adjn. House (remarks) 938 (i), 2775, 3742 (ii).  
 ——— par in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2742 (ii).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2758, 2775 (ii).  
 ——— (prop. Res.) 3976 ; agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4251 (ii).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5187 (ii).  
 Bounty to Fishermen, Increased (Ans.) 4471 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse., Queen's Birthday, adjnmt. (M.) 2740 (ii).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Con.**

- Business of the Hse. Morning Sittings (M.) 3582.  
 — on M. to adjn., 4203 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 5010, 5038, 5287 (ii).  
 Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton, B. 124 (Mr. *MacPherson*) on prop. introd., 3579 (ii).  
 Coal Oil Supply, St. John Barracks, Tenders (Ans.) 1078 (i).  
 Cold Storage, Com. on Res. (M.) 3842 (ii).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4539, 4601; 1<sup>o</sup>, 4725 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4128 (ii).  
 Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., in Com. of Sup., 5079 (ii).  
 — See "I. C. R. Extension."  
 Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 972 (i).  
 Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. withdr. of B., 4341 (ii).  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res (Mr. *Fielding*) 4709 (ii).  
 Fisheries Act (saw-dust in rivers) Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3728 (ii).  
 Forged or Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills (B. 123) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3580 (ii).  
 Ft. Anne, Annapolis Co., Caretaker (Ans.) 5010.  
 Fortification Walls, Quebec, Repairs (Ans.) 1302 (i).  
 Gananoque Drill Shed, Removal (Ans.) 1078 (i).  
 Gray, Lt.-Col., late Inspector of Stores, Retiring Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2881 (ii).  
 Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3571 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Extension to Montreal (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 4086; on M. for Com. on Res., 4259; in Com. on Res., 4387; *pro forma* stage of Rep. of Com., 4477; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4612 (ii).  
 Iron, Pig, Can. Manufacture and Bounty (Ans.) 97 (i).  
 Isaac's Harbour Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4107 (ii).  
 Kingston and London Barracks, Wood Contracts (Ans.) 2425 (i).  
 Loans, Govt., Temporary (Ans.) 949 (i).  
 Loan (Public Service) \$15,000,000 (prop. Res.) 4735 (ii).  
 Mail Service, Ottawa and Brockville West (remarks) 4106 (ii).  
 Man. School Fund, Com. on Res. (M.) 3842 (ii).  
 Militia Camps, Eastern Townships Battalions (Ans.) 3669 (ii).  
 — Corps, Morris (Man.) Organization (Ans.) 1307 (i).  
 Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 667 (i).  
 Military College, Kingston (Ans.) 4108 (ii).  
 — Administrative Changes (Ans.) 791 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Con.**

- Military College, Change in Administration (remarks) 3541 (ii).  
 — Professional Staff (Ans.) 4120 (ii).  
 — Sergeants, Services dispensed with (Ans.) 4122 (ii).  
 Military Equipments, Conditions of Test, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (ii).  
 Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3719 (ii).  
 N. S. Southern Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 4471 (ii).  
 Old Fort Erie, Change of Control (Ans.) 2415 (i).  
 Pacific Cable, Govtl. Action (remarks) 4109 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5531; in Com., 5532 (ii).  
 Pouliot, Mr., late M. P., Deceased (remarks) 5184 (ii).  
 Prorogation (intimation) 5542 (ii).  
 Pulp Wood, Export Duty (remarks) 2021 (i).  
 — on adjmt. (remarks) 2297 (i).  
 Quebec and Gaspé Basin, communications between (Ans.) 790 (i).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 846 (i).  
 Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday (remarks) 4499 (ii).  
 — Colonial Troops (Ans.) 923 (i).  
 — on M. to adjn. Hse, 948 (i).  
 — Militia contingent (Ans.) 973 (i).  
 — Militia Appnmts. (remarks) 1083 (i).  
 — Names of Militia Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1901 (i), 3236 (ii).  
 — Militia Contingent and Quebec *Chronicle* (remarks) 3240 (ii).  
 — Celebration of Day (M.) 4736 (ii).  
 Queen's Own Rifles, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 1739 (i).  
 Questions by Members not in Order (remarks) 3974 (ii).  
 Ry. Commission, Creation of (Ans.) 3976 (ii).  
 Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3560 (ii).  
 Rys. in P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 2051 (i).  
 Returns, on inquiry for (remarks) 2969, 4032 (ii).  
 Rice Factories, &c., in Can., Number, &c. (Ans.) 258 (i).  
 Saturday Sittings (Ans.) 4394 (ii).  
 — (M.) 4472, 5157 (ii).  
 Select Standing Coms., Name added (M.) 2051 (i).  
 Silver and Lead Smelting in B.C., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3146 (ii).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) 3<sup>o</sup> m., 5541.  
 St. Johns (P.Q.) Military School, Contracts for Drugs, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).  
 — Tenders for Coal and Wood (Ans.) 1029 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (travelling allowance to Judges in Man.) conc., 3732 (ii).  
*Charges of Management*, 1666 (i).  
*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3887, 3957 (ii).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

*Civil Government*: Auditor Gen.'s office, 1721, (contingencies) 2070; Finance Dept., 1721; Geological Survey, 1981; Gov. Gen.'s office, 1666; High Commissioner's office, 1982; Interior, 1679, 1689; Justice, 1666, (Penitentiaries branch) 1668 (i), (salaries) 4834 (ii); Militia and Defence, 1669, 1926 (i), (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office, 5264 (ii); Printing and Stationery, 1669 (i); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4830 (ii); Sec. of State, 1926, (contingencies) 2068; Trade and Commerce, 1931, (contingencies) 2087 (i).

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5006, 5028. Post Office (mail service) 5069 (ii).

*Dominion Police*, 2090 (i).

*Indians*: Man. and N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000.

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091; Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (B.C. and San Francisco) 2791; Can. and Nfld.) 4994; Halifax and Nfld.) 2790; (Mar. Provs.) 2791; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 2793; (Port Mulgrave and Port Hood) 4998 (ii).

*Militia* (gratuities, &c.) 4993; (Jubilee contingent) 2659, 4861, 4994; (Military College) 4478, 4802; (monuments, battlefields of Can.) 4861 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (commissions of investigation) 5234; (litigated matters) 3864; (Jubilee expenses) conc., 5456 (ii).

*Penitentiaries*, 2794; (gratuities to retired officers) 4987 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.B.) 4944; (Ont.) 2585; (Rideau Hall) 2642. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Fort Francis Locks) 4970. Miscellaneous (Monument to Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 2789 (ii).

*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2242 (i).

*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5289. P.E.I. Ry., 3860 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1232 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6.

Trade with the Empire, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4104 (ii).

Volunteers of 1866, Recognition of Services by Govt. (Ans.) 3056.

Walsh, C. J., Claims on Leeward Islands Govt. (remarks) 3676 (ii).

**Ways and Means—The Tariff:**

In Com., Res. 1 (Customs Acts Amts., definitions, &c.) 2842; (mutton, &c.) 3361, 3381; (cornmeal) 3422; (iron or steel, scrap) 3630; (Norway iron) 3718; (watch cases) 4168; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4171; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466; (coal) 4469 (ii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.**

Address, on The, 311 (i).

Atlantic Fast S.S. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4240 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1°, 780 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 14) 1°, 481; 2°, m. 1064 (i).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Con.**

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2136 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 729 (i).

Business of the Hse., precedence, on M. to take Wednesdays, &c., 1900 (i).

Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Power, on M. for Ret., 1050 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1832 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 688.

Order (Ques. of) Chairman's Ruling, in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).

Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 563 (i).

— Bills 2 and 3, rep. from Sel. Com. (M. to place on Order Paper) 3500; (remarks) 4500 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. Res. (remarks) 842 (i).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 2) 1°, 87; 2° m., 608; on ref. to Com., 615; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 620; Pets. *re* B. (M.) 1299; in Com., 3560 (ii).

— adoption of Rep. and suspension of Rule (M.) 4007 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 16) Bicycles as Baggage, 1°, 565; 2°, 1775 (i).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Ques. of Order) 960, 964 (i).

Special Com., reduction of Quorum (M.) 1227 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5486 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Dominion Lands—Capital* (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).

*Fisheries* (payments to collectors) conc., 5427 (ii).

*Immigration* (Agents' salaries) 2815 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5436 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1560 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C., Montmorency.**

Address, on The, 149 (i).

Blanchet, Eugène, Dismissal from I. C. R. (Ques.) 1082 (i).

— (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (ii).

Bridge at Quebec, reported Govt. Aid (Ques.) 341 (i).

Delisle, L. T., Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal (Ques.) 1307 (i).

Exchequer Court, Local Judge in Admiralty, Appnt. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Fisheries Case, Appeal from Supreme Court Judgment (Ques.) 1303 (i).

Fortification Walls, Quebec, Repairs (Ques.) 1303 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1827 (i).

I. C. R., Eugène Blanchet, Section Foreman, Dismissal (Ques.) 1639 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Con.***

- I. C. R., Pierre Begin, Sectionman, Dismissal (Ques.) 1638 (i).  
 ——— Castonguay Station-master, Dismissal (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (i).  
 ——— St. Charles' Station-master, Dismissal (Ques.) 1540 (i).  
 ——— Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 3765 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4254 (ii).  
 Irvin, John, Appnmt. as Lightship-keeper (Ques.) 1633 (i).  
 Laverge, M. P., late Dep. Postmaster, Quebec, Dismissal (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (i).  
 Mercier, Jos., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1633, 1835 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).  
 Quebec Bridge, Speech of Mayor of Quebec (Ques.) 1637 (i).  
 Quebec Land Slide, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 3719 (ii).  
 St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Contract, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).  
 St. Gervais and St. Charles Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3721 (ii).  
 Smith, F. X., Lighthouse-keeper, Gaspé, Dismissal (Ques.) 1305 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (travelling expenses) 4841 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: Lachine, 4893 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Justice (salaries) 4837 (ii); Public Works Dept., 1736 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 4864, 5035 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2494 (i). Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5133; (I.C.R., commissions of investigation) 5262 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (counsel fees, award of Judicial Com.) 4999 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2808, 2819 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Que. and Gaspé Basin) 4996 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5220 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4797; (payments to Commissioners) 4801 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4899; Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4867. *Income*: Buildings (generally) 2592; (N.B.) 5275; (N.S.) 4902; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5281. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4967; (Manitoulin Island) 4864. *Miscellaneous* (clerical assistance) 4892 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3765; (rolling stock) 5314 (ii).  
 Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4211; in Com., 4214 (ii).  
 Vezina, Geo., and Inland Rev. Dept. (Ques.) 2569.  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3251 (ii).  
 Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5232 (ii).

**Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.**

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4228 (ii).  
 Cheese and Creameries Registration B. 117 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 3722 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 13) 1°\*, 339; 2° m., 1060; in Com., 2474 (i).  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4707 (ii).  
 ——— on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3874 (ii).  
 Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3725 (ii).  
 Forged or Unauthorized Endorsement of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 860, 881 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (ii).  
 Lord's Day, Better Observance (B. 10) 1°\*, 258; 2° m., 674; in Com., 2460 (i).  
 National Museum, Erection at Ottawa, on M. for Ret., 2432 (i).  
 Personal Explanation, Speech at Tonawanda, 914 (i).  
 Presbyterian Church of Can., Temporalities Fund (B. 18) 1°\*, 707 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3044; (Indian corn) 4407 (ii).

**Champagne, Mr. N., Wright.****SUPPLY :**

- Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Que., Gatineau River) 4960 (ii).

**Chauvin, Mr. L. A., Terrebonne.**

- Address, on The. 374 (i).  
 Civil Servants, County of Gaspé, Commission *re* (Ques.) 1451 (i).

**Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.**

- Berthier Wharf, Dues collected (Ques.) 262 (i).  
 Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 707 (i).  
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 5183 (ii).  
 Fire in West Deptl. Block, Documents destroyed, &c. (Ques.) 919 (i).  
 I. C. R. New Time Table (remarks) 3241 (ii).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Quebec Bridge, 4205 (ii).  
 Quebec Oriental Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 918 (i).  
 Superior Court Judge, Rimouski District (Ques.) 4476 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government*: Justice (salaries) 4833 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5036 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2820 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Official Reporters' accommodation) 4851 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4864 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4917 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: (I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3756 (ii).

**Christie, Mr. T., Argenteuil.**

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
In Com. (Indian corn) 4423 (ii).

**Clancy, Mr. J., Bothwell.**

Address, on The, 331 (i).  
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on ref. to Com., 660 (i).  
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1859 (i).  
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5190 (ii).  
Business of the Hse., on M. (Mr. Laurier) to take in Mondays, 2968 (ii).  
Brantford Free Postal Delivery (M. for Ret.\*) 3537 (ii).  
Canal Contracts, Deposits on Tenders (Ques.) 1026 (i).  
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 5347, 5355 (ii).  
Export Duty on Logs, in Com. on Res., 4614 (ii).  
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).  
Galope Canal, Cardinal Section, Tenders (M. for copy\*) 3538 (ii).  
—— Iroquois Section, Tenders (M. for copy\*) 3538 (ii).  
Grenville Canal, Enlargement, Tenders for Contract (M. for copy\*) 2447 (i).  
Hagersville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones (M. for Ret.) 3530 (ii).  
Indian Office, Brantford, Appnmt. of David Hill (M. for Cor.\*) 3539 (ii).  
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. on Res., 4386 (ii).  
Linley, Henry, Fishery Inspector, Cedar Springs, Dismissal (Ques.) 4206 (ii).  
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 2473 (i).  
Mitchell, Dr. G., Dismissal (Ques.) 927 (i).  
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière) in Com., 4723 (ii).  
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) Members accused of conspiracy, 5305 (ii).  
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4728, 5398, 5413 (ii).  
St. Lawrence River, North Channel, Tenders M. for copy\*, 3538 (ii).  
Six Nations Indian Office, Dismissals (M. for Cor.\*), 3538 (ii).  
Soulanges Canal, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Tenders and Contracts (M. for copy\*) 2447 (i).  
—— Section 12, Tenders for Contract (M. for copies\*) 2447 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180 (i).  
*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3884 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Post Office (technical services) 5105.  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5019, 5044, 5054 (ii).

**Clancy, Mr. J.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2824 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Banff Park) 5001 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioner's Rep.) 4743 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2738 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (hog cholera, compensation) 2272 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5317, 5339 (ii).  
Tariff, The, on prop. Res (Mr. Fielding) 1574 (i).  
Tuscarora Indians, Dismissal of Physicians (M. for Cor.) 3529 (ii).  
—— Reserve, Appnmt. of Physician (M. for Cor.\*) 3538 (ii).  
Walpole Island Indians, Appnmt. of Physician (Ques.) 787 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3015, 3150, 3166, 3184, 3313; (mutton, &c.) 3395; (photographs, &c.) 3476; (shoe tacks) 3654; (barbed wire) 3660; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &c.) 3680, 4147; (rice) 4132; (Indian corn) 4432 (ii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F., West Toronto.**

Address, on The, 377 (i).  
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 639 (i).  
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4235 (ii).  
Dom. Exhibition, Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1633 (i).  
Gray, Lt.-Col., late Inspector of Stores, Retiring Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2881 (ii).  
Queen's Birthday Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 4499 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (mail service) 2790 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2739, 2779 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
In Com.: (Coal, bituminous) 4194; (Indian corn) 4444, 4455 (ii).

**Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland.**

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 357C (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Civil Government*: Interior, 1681 (i).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4987 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5213; (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4743 (ii).  
*Public Works Capital*: Buildings (west deptl. block, fire) 4836. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 4868. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4921; (Que.) 5281; (Rideau Hall) 4886. Harbours and Rivers (Gatineau River) 4902 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (Dartmouth branch) 5115 (ii).

**Corby, Mr. H., West Hastings.**

Weller Bay as an Outport, Value of Goods, Duty collected, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 1663 (i).

**Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.**

Address, on The, 452 (i).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) on M. for 2°, 2347, 2451 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue, 1922; Marine and Fisheries, 1732 (i).

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) conc., 5449 (ii).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K., South Essex.**

Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 5) 1°, 88; 2° m., 621, 667 (i).

Coasting Laws, Can. and U. S., on M. for Cor., 3529 (ii).

Dom. Building and Loan Association (B. 48) 1°, 1171 (i).

**Craig, Mr. T. D., East Durham.**

Address, on The, 248 (i).

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 635 (i); in Com., 3557 (ii).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1760 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oslter) in Com., 2341 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 2026 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 13 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 2°, 1063; in Com., 2474 (i).

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2311 (i).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2159 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 3572 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M. for Com. on Res., 4324 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) on M. for 2°, 685; in Com., 2465 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) Rep. of Speech in *Globe*, 3672.

Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2°, 1792 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 2117.

*Civil Government*: Customs Dept. (contingencies) 2076 (i).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2096; (extra clerks) 2104; (Official Debates) 2105 (i).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1359 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2482 (i).

**Craig, Mr. T. D.—Con.**

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2910, 2327, 3153, 3170; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3258; (wire nails) 3647; (barbed wire) 3666; (files and rasps) 3698, 4133.

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

**Davies, Hon. L. H. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Queen's, P.E.I.**

Alaskan Boundary, Quotation from Treaty *re* Mount St. Elias (Ans.) 3505 (ii).

Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 665 (i); in Com., 3547 (ii).

American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Belcourt) on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).

Appnmts. under present Govt., on M. for Ret. 1055 (i).

— by late Govt. and Recommendations of Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1656 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 944 (i).

— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3994 (ii).

Beamsville (Ont.) Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1455 (i).

Bear River (N.S.) Obstruction to Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).

Behring Sea Convention, Re-opening, London Press Cor. (remarks) 4474 (ii).

— Seal Regulations, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 2570, (i).

Berthier (P.Q.) Wharf, Dues collected (Ans.) 262.

Bibaud, Azaire, Emplmt. in House of Commons (Ans.) 3509 (ii).

Bird Rock Island Lighthouse, Casualty, Rescue of Woman (Ans.) 3508 (ii).

B.C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. McInnis) 544 (i).

Bunker Island, Marine Hospital, Mr. LeCaine's Dismissal (Ans.) 3505, 3866 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oslter) in Com., 2338 (i).

Cap Saumon Lighthouse, Construction, Amt. paid, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).

— Contract for Firewood (Ans.) 264 (i).

Cascumpec Buoy Service Contract and Tenders (Ans.) 1742 (i).

Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton B. 124 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) in Com., 5051 (ii).

Cattle Shipping Regulations (Ans.) 2217 (i).

Cedar Springs (Ont.) Fishery Inspector Linley, Dismissal (Ans.) 4206 (ii).

Civil Servants, County of Gaspé, Commission *re* (Ans.) 1451 (i).

Coal Boring in P.E.I., Vote in Estimates (Ans.) 796 (i).

Coasting Laws, Can. and U.S., on M. for Cor., 3526 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. L. H.—Con.**

- Criminal Code Amt. (seduction and abduction)  
B. 13 (Mr. Charlton) on M. to conc. in Amts.,  
3542 (ii).
- Criminal Code, 1892 (B. 138) 4203 (ii).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com.,  
5167 (ii).
- Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. (B. 125)  
prop. Res., 4086; 2 m., 4110; in Com. on Res.,  
4122; in Com. on B., 4123 (ii).
- Delisie, L. T., Light-keeper, Dismissal (Ans.)  
1307 (i).
- Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).
- Inverness Co., Dom. Officials, 1879 (Ans.)  
4477 (ii).
- Govt. Employees, Rep. of Commissioners  
(presented) 4364 (ii).
- Emigration Agents in U.S. Appnmts. (Ans.) 3507.
- Fiddle Reef (B.C.) Marine Lights (Ans.) 1376 (i).
- Fisheries Act (saw-dust in rivers) Amt. (B. 127)  
1<sup>o</sup>, 3581; in Com., 3724 (ii).
- Fisheries Case, Appeal from Supreme Court  
Judgment (Ans.) 1303 (i).
- Protection Service, Officers on Govt.  
Steamers (Ans.) 3676 (ii).
- Fishery Bulletins, Distribution on Gaspé Coast,  
Delay (Ans.) 4008.
- Guardians, North Victoria (Ans.) 1081,  
1452; (remarks) 1308 (i).
- Inspector McNab (B.C.) Instructions from  
Govt. (Ans.) 3058 (ii).
- Fishing License, in Bonaventure (Ans.) 671 (i).
- Fish Island (P.E.I.) Light-keeper, Dismissal  
(Ans.) 2424 (i).
- Fish Traps used by Americans in B.C. (Ans.)  
1377 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M.  
for 2<sup>o</sup>, 993 (i).
- on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 548 (i).
- Gaspé Lightship-keeper (Ans.) 2126 (i).
- Gill Nets and Seines, New Regulations, &c.,  
Montreal District (remarks) 4372 (ii).
- Gloucester Fishing Schooners and N. S. Fisher-  
men (remarks) 4371 (ii).
- Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Powers, on M. for  
Ret., 1048 (i).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, Charter of the *Diana*  
(Ans.) 1987 (i).
- Emplmt of *Diana* (remarks) 1811, 1829 (i).
- Milburn and Co.'s offer of Ship *Port Perie*  
(Ans.) 1988 (i).
- Exploratory Expedition (Ans.) 796 (i).
- *Diana*, Names, Residence, &c., of Crew  
(Ans.) 2884 (ii).
- "Indian Garden" Reserve (N.S.) Sale of Hay  
(Ans.) 3510 (ii).
- Iona Wharf, Victoria (N.S.) Repairs, &c. (Ans.)  
489, 921 (i).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, (G. T. R. and  
Drummond Co. Ry.) in Com. on Res., 4384 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. L. H.—Con.**

- Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Quinn) on M. for  
2<sup>o</sup>, 3562; in Com., 4253 (ii).
- Irvin, John, Appnmt. as Light-keeper (Ans.)  
1633 (i).
- Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr.  
*Richardson*) in Com., 2606 (i).
- Lavoie, Dr. Nap., Emplmt. by Govt. on Str.  
*La Canadienne* (Ans.) 1304, 1544 (i).
- Lighthouse-keepers, Limitation of Age (Ans.)  
266 (i).
- Lobster Fisheries, Extension of Close Season, on  
M. for Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
- (remarks) 5416 (ii).
- Cape Breton (remarks) 1551, 2053 (i).
- Mabou Harbour Buoy Service (Ans.) 4227 (ii).
- Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4206 (ii).
- Mackerel Fishery in N. S., Protection of Fisher-  
men, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3674 (ii).
- Mercier, Jos., Ste. Famille, Emplmt. by Govt.  
(Ans.) 1835 (i).
- Murray Harbour (P.E.I.) Buoy Service, Con-  
tract (Ans.) 1029 (i).
- Harbour-master, Appnmt. (Ans.) 2216 (i).
- Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosa-*  
*mond*) in Com., 2346 (i).
- Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 105)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2215 (i); in Com., 2742; Sen. Amts., 4109.
- Newfield*, Str., Appnmts. (Ans.) 2125 (i).
- Oak Point (N.B.) Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal  
(Ans.) 3669 (ii).
- O'Brien, Wm., Dismissal from Str. *Lansdowne*  
(Ans.) 4008 (ii).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of  
conspiracy, in Com. of Sup., 5303 (ii).
- Paris Exhibition, 1900, Can. Representation  
(Ans.) 3508 (ii).
- Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr.  
*Guay*) in Com., 3539 (ii).
- Pin-plats Barges, Registration (Ans.) 922 (i).
- Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce  
(Ans.) 3506 (ii).
- Poaching by Americans, Deep-Sea Fisheries  
(Ans.) 1375 (i).
- Point au Baril Lighthouse-keeper, Appnmt., &c.  
(Ans.) 266 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in  
Com., 4627, 5401 (ii).
- Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr.  
*Fitzpatrick*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4204; in Com., 4724 (ii).
- Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks)  
557 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order  
Paper, 3501 (ii).
- Ques. by Members not in Order (remarks) 3973 (ii).
- Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr.  
*Oliver*) 3513, 3521 (ii).
- Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1457 (i).
- Returns, on Inquiry for, 949, 2298, 2571 (i)  
2969 (ii).
- River Matane Fishing Leases (Ans.) 4207 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. L. H.—Con.**

Salmon (B. C.) Sold in British Market, Quality, &c., on M. for Cor., 1995 (i).

*San Pedro*, Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 1376 (i).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Ques. of Order) 959 (i).

Scrip for Half-breeds, Claims, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Sessional Indemnity (prop. Res.) 3671; in Com., 3729; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 3730 (ii).

Smith, F. X., Lighthouse-keeper, Gaspe, Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 113) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2796; in Com., 3721 (ii).

Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 178 (i).  
— on inquiry for Ret., 949 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 5368 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (travelling expenses) conc., 4641, 3732 (ii).

*Civil Government*: Indian Affairs (sec.'s. salary) 4828 (ii); Interior, 1683, 1678 (i), (salaries) 4837 (ii); Justice (salaries) 4836 (ii); Marine and Fisheries, 1730 (i), conc., 3731 (ii), (contingencies) 2087 (i), 4840 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 4630; Sec. of State (Printing Bureau) 4831 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (P.E.I.) 2560 (i); Post Office (mail service) 5066, (outside service) conc., 5418. Public Works, conc., 5417. Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5146 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2536 (i).

*Dominion Lands*: conc., 5423 (ii).

*Fisheries* (counsel fees, Judicial Com.) 4999; (payments to collectors) conc., 5427 (ii); (oyster culture) 2551 (i).

*Immigration* (general expenses) 4070, 4992 (ii).

*Indians* (Elkhorn school) 5000; Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities to retired officers) 5000 (ii);

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4948, 5059 (ii). Library (salaries, &c.) 2116 (i).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 2994; (salaries, &c.) 2993 (i).

*Marine* (Govt. steamers, repairs) 2290; (investigation into wrecks) 2290; (hospitals) 2297; (obstructions in navigable rivers) 2293; (repairs to wharfs) 2295; (rewards for saving life) 2290; (tidal service) 2291; (winter mail service) 2293 (i).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff Park) 5300; (commissions of investigation) 5280, conc., 5429; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5218; (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4861; (tariff inquiry) 5206 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5433. Harbours and Rivers (dredging, Mar. Provs.) 4889; (Ont.) 4968; (P.E.I.) 4975 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: P.E.I., 3847 (ii).

*Scientific Institutions* (hydrographic service) 2295; (meteorological service) 2295; (Toronto observatory) 2295 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Baddeck and Grand Narrows, &c.) conc., 5419 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. L. H.—Con.**

Supreme Court, (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4211 (ii).

Tignish (P.E.I.) Wharf, Dues Collected (Ans.) 3057 (ii).

Trials by Jury in certain Cases in N. W. T. (B. 137) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4203; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4724 (ii).

Victoria Co. (N.S.) Iona Wharf, Payment for Repairs (Ans.) 489, 921 (i).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2547 (i).

**Ways and Means—The Tariff:**

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2865; Res. 17 (combines clause) 3264, 3306; (mutton) 3358; (cornmeal) 3431; (books) 3473; (coal oil) 3496 (ii).

Wood Mountain Scouts, Claim for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1054 (i).

**Davin, Mr. N. F., West Assiniboia.**

Address, on The, 111 (ii).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 643 (i).

Aspdin, Thos. W., Claim for Scrip (Ques.) 1374.

Audit Act Amt. (B. 107) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2408 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1889 (i).

B. C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. McInnes) 522 (i).

Butter Exports, Bonus, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 1799 (i).

Can. Investment and Agency Co.'s B. (128) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3842 (ii).

C. P. R. Transport of Grain from N.W.T. and Man., 1891 to 1897 (Ques.) 3509, 3669 (ii).

Cartwright, Mr. F. L., Appmt. as Inspector Mounted Police (Ques.) 489 (i).

Clerks of Works, Govt., and Private Practice (Ques.) 1306 (i).

Coal Oil Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup. (prop. Res.) 2744 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Controllers Repeal B. 125 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3580.

Daunais, C. M., Indian Instructor, Appmt. (Ques.) 1450 (i).

Dismissals, Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).

— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2330, 2348 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Douglas) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2042 (i).

— (B. 61) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1229; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2037 (i).

— B. 116 (Mr. Sifton) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4118 (ii).

Estevan Land Office, Removal to Alameda (Ques.) 1638 (i).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup. (prop. Res.) 2054, 2131; neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178 (i).

Govt. of N. W. T., Subsidy and Powers (Ms. for Ret.) 1030, 1043 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Richardson) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1574 (i).

Davín, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

- Hartney, J. H., Dismissal as Postmaster (Ques.) 2885 (ii).  
 Hudson Bay Expedition (Ques.) 796 (i).  
 ——— Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1817, 1833 (i).  
 ——— Charter of *Diana* (Ques.) 1987 (i).  
 ——— Milburn & Co.'s offer of Ship *Port Peric* (Ques.) 1988 (i).  
 ——— *Diana*, Names, Residences, &c., of Crew (Ques.) 2884 (ii).  
 Illicit Still, Seizure from Geo. Vézina, Que. (Ques.) 1374 (i).  
 Indian Dept., unanswered Cor., (Ques.) 1984 (i).  
 Indian Disturbances in N. W. T. (remarks) 3059.  
 Indian Office, Regina, Removal to Winnipeg (Ques.) 1985 (i).  
 Indian Supplies, Man. and N. W. T., Schedule of Tenders (Ques.) 487, 1078, 1301 (i).  
 Libel, Law of, Amt. (B. 95) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1738 (i).  
 ——— Mr. McColl's Letter *re* Purchases (Ques.) 1306 (i).  
 Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2469 (i).  
 McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1911 (i).  
 McGirr, Wm., notification of Superannuation (Ques.) 1987 (i).  
 Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. (B. 62) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1231; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2037 (i).  
 ——— (1889) Amt. (B. 89) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1539 (i).  
 ——— Pension Act Amt. B., withdn., 1226 (i).  
 ——— Pension Act (1889) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. *Davis*, *Saskatchewan*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1228 (i).  
 Northfield (B.C.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1305 (i).  
 ——— (M. to adjn.) 1377 (i).  
 ——— Inspector Fletcher's Rep. (M. for copy\*) 2021 (i).  
 N. W. T. Act Amt., B. withdn., 2878 (ii).  
 ——— B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2797; in Com., 4111; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4116.  
 "Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1546.  
 Personal Explanation, par. in Man. *Free Press re* M. on Order Paper, 2886 (ii).  
 McManus, Mrs., Postmistress, Northfield (B.C.) (M. to adjn.,) 1377 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) Duty on Farm Implements, on Chairman's Ruling, 2126 (i).  
 ——— par. in *Witness re* Mr. Fairlie's Letter, 2656 (ii).  
 Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 559 (i).  
 ——— or M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3502 (ii).  
 Qu'Appelle Mail Service, Tenders and Contract (Ques.) 1079 (i).  
 Quarantine, Man. and N. W. T. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).  
 ——— Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B.C. (M. for Ret.) 797, 822 (i).

Davín, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

- Quebec Bridge Co. and Hon. Mr. Dobell (Ques.) 1989 (i), 3056 (ii).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee and N. W. Mounted Police (Ques.) 97 (i).  
 ——— Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 845 (i).  
 ——— par. in *Quebec Chronicle* (remarks) 3239 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1797 (i).  
 Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com. (Amt.) 619 (i).  
 Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3513 (ii).  
 Red Deer Valley Ry. and Com. Co.'s Amt. (B. 122) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3418; M. to place on Order Paper for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3578; in Com., 4051 (ii).  
 Returns (inquiry) 1900, 2571 (i), 2887, 2970, 3146 (ii).  
 St. Paul Industrial School, Furnishing Supplies (M. for Cor.\*) 1664 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Election (remarks) 950 (i).  
 ——— Member's Seat challenged (M. to adjn. Hse.) 970 (i).  
 Scrip for Half-breeds, on M. for Ret., 3536 (ii).  
 Seed Grain, Distribution in Man. and N.W.T., Amounts outstanding (Ques.) 1989, 2215 (i).  
 Stockholm Exhibition, Walton Jones' Appnmt. (Ques.) 1984 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (creameries in N.W.T.) 2179; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2585 (i).  
*Civil Government* : Indian Dept., 1715, (law clerk) 1667; Interior, 1674; Mounted Police, 1709; Privy Council (contingencies) 2056, 2066; Railways and Canals, 1934, 1967; Trade and Commerce, 1981 (contingencies) 2088 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Post Office (mail service) 2790 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2825, 4038 (ii).  
*Indians* : N.W.T. and Man. (supplies) 4033 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091, 2100 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4084 (ii).  
*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 4078 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.W.T.) 2589; (Ont.) 2581; (Rideau Hall) 2598. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2781; (Man.) 2780 (i).  
*Quarantine* (Cattle) 2268; (salaries and contingencies) 2245 (i).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res (Mr. *Fielding*) 1322 (i).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).  
 Territorial Exhibition, outstanding Debts (Ques.) 1374 (i).  
 Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2547 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
 In Com., Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2956, 3121; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3333, 3340; (wheat flour) 3455; (coal oil) 3478, 3496; (wire nails) 3650; (strip fencing) 3691; (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 3696; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4150; (agricultural implements) 4156; (Indian corn) 4451 (ii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Williams, P. J., Indian Instructor, Dismissal (Ques.) 1450 (i).  
Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip (prop. Res.) 1051, 2033 (i).

**Davis, Mr. T. O., Saskatchewan.**

- Bremner Furs Seizure, Compensation (M. for Ret.) 1744 (i).  
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oslor) in Com., 2924 (ii).  
Champain, Emmanuel, Claim against Govt. through Rebellion, 1885 (Quez.) 490 (i).  
Dismissals, Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4027 (ii).  
*Gazette and Star*, Free Postage from Montreal (Ques.) 3841 (ii).  
Govt. Horses at Prince Albert, Payments for Care, &c. (M. for Cor. \*) 3537 (ii).  
Grundy, Ernest, late Postmaster at Duck Lake (Quez.) 3870 (ii).  
Hudson Bay Ports, Customs Collectors (Ques.) 794, 1452 (i).  
Indian Disturbances in N. W. T. (remarks) 3144.  
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B. C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1385 (i).  
—— Robert, late Postmaster at Northfield (B. C.) Character (Ques.) 2879 (ii).  
Man. and North-western Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4766 (ii).  
Mounted Police Pension Act (1889) Amt. (B. 59) 1°, 1228; 2° m., 2036 (i).  
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 139) (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4722 (ii).  
Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5094 (ii).  
Prince Albert, Appnmt. of Sheriff (Ques.) 667 (i).  
Prince Albert Branch, C. P. R., par. in Prince Albert *Advocate* (remarks) 2657 (ii).  
Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 824 (i).  
Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3515 (ii).  
Regina, Long Lake, &c., Ry. Co., Govt. Subsidy (Ques.) 1637 (i).  
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 963 (i).  
—— Mail Service, Regularity of Delivery (Ques.) 1634 (i).  
Saskatoon and Battleford and Onion Lake Mail Service (Ques.) 1633 (i).  
Scrip for Half-breeds, Claims (M. for Ret.) 3530.  
Smuggling by American Whalers, Mackenzie River Basin (Ques.) 794 (i).  
SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2190 (i).  
*Immigration* (agent's salaries) 4044 (ii).  
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1511.  
Trans-Can. Ry. Co., change of Title (B. 22) 1°\*, 707 (i).

**Davis, Mr. T. O.—Con.**

- Ways and Means—The Tariff :*  
In Com. : (shoe tacks) 3655; (tea and coffee) 3718; (wire nails) 3649 (ii).

**Dobell, Hon. R. R., West Quebec.**

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3999 (ii).  
Quebec Bridge Co. and Dockmasters (Ans.) 3056 (ii).  
SUPPLY :  
*Indians*: Man. and N. W. T. (gratuities to retired officers) 5000 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4870 (ii).

**Domville, Mr. J., King's, N.B.**

- Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2135 (i).  
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent (M. to adjn. Hse.) 638 (i).  
—— Colonial Troops (Ques.) 922 (i).  
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (ii).  
Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 104) 1°\*, 2051; 2° m., 2166; on Order for 2°, 2348 (i).  
Scovil, Walter B., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2415 (i).  
SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2197 (i).  
*Civil Government*: Railways and Canals, 1956 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Weights and Measures (salaries, &c.) 2517 (ii).  
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°\*, 1226 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*  
In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3223 (ii).

**Douglas, Mr. J. M., East Assiniboia.**

- Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 60) 1°\*, 1229; 2° m., 2041 (i).  
Farm Implements, Coal Oil in Tanks Duty, (Ques.) 2216 (i).  
Man. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 24) 1°\*, 707 (i).  
SUPPLY :  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2601, 2613 (ii).  
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1463 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*  
In Com. : (mutton, &c.) 3369; (wheat flour) 3458; (coal oil) 3482; (shovels, &c) 3703; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (agricultural implements) 4153.

**Dugas, Mr. L. E., Montcalm.**

- Beauharnois Postmaster and County Election (Ques.) 268 (i).  
Illicit Stills, Seizure at Pont Rouge (Ques.) 1373.  
Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ques.) 1544, 1637 (i).  
Lavoie, Dr. Nap., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1544 (i).  
—— on Str. *La Canadienne* (Ques.) 1304 (i).

**Dugas, Mr. L. E.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

*Collection of Revenues: Excise (travelling, &c.)*  
2508 (ii).

Vezina, Geo., and Inland Revenue Laws (Ques.)  
1637 (ii).

**Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.**

Address, on The, 194 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and  
Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M.  
for Com. on Res., 4326 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on  
Res., 5497 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3079; Res.  
17 (combine clause) 3319 (ii).

**Dyment, Mr. A. E., Algoma.**

Atikokan Island Range Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1<sup>o</sup>,  
1171 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal,  
on M. for Cor., 1871 (i).

Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr.  
Fielding) on M. for Com., 4717 (ii).

St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 42) 1<sup>o</sup>,  
1072 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (construction)*  
5120 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.)* 4942.  
Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Fort Francis Locks)  
4970; (Manitoulin Island) 4965 (ii).

**Earle, Mr. T., Victoria, B. C.**

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com.  
on Res., 4575 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : (rice) 4132 (ii).

**Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John City, N. B.**

Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 708 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Winter Terminus  
(Ques.) 1374 (i).

—— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright)  
4218 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) on M.  
for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3677 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening, &c., Amts.  
Paid (Ques., 3867 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures*  
(salaries) 2542 (ii).

*Marine (hospitals)* 2296 (ii).

*Miscellaneous (investigating charges, N. W. T.)*  
5220; (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).

*Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont., Rat Por-  
tage)* 5286 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : (wheat and flour) 3453; (books) 3473;  
(coal oil) 3479; (marble, &c.) 3497; (coal, bituminous)  
4201 (ii).

**Erb, Mr. D. K., South Perth.***Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. (photographs, &c.) 3475; (books, &c.) 3706;  
(paintings, &c.) 3708 (ii).

**Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., Two Mountains.**

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech  
(seconded) 18 (i).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)**  
*Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*

American Bank Note Co. and Mr. Reid's relation  
thereto (Ans.) 2881 (i).

—— Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

—— Cost of Engraving, &c. (Ans.) 3056 (ii).

—— Printing Contracts (remarks) 1462 (i).

—— Plates required and Cost (Ans.) 3506 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract, on prop.  
Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4232 (ii).

Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 169 (i).

Baie des Chaleurs Ry., par. in *Halifax Chronicle*  
(remarks) 3420 (ii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel (prop. Res.) 4653; in  
Com., 5186; 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 5201; in Com., 5288.

British Goods and Custom's Tariff (remarks)  
1461 (i).

Budget, The, Financial Stmt., 1083, 1120 (i).

—— (remarks) 783 (i).

—— See "Ways and Means."

Civil Service Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt.  
(B. 136) Com. on Res. (M.) 3721, 4118; 1<sup>o</sup> of B.,  
119 (ii).

Coal Trade of N.S., reported Newspaper utterances  
(Ans.) 670 (i).

Customs Act Amt. and Consolid. (B. 143) 1<sup>o</sup>,  
4698 (ii).

—— See "Ways and Means."

Drummond Co. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 3824;  
conc., 5458 (ii).

Estimates, The (remarks) 270 (i).

—— Year ending 1898 (presented) 667 (i).

—— Suppl. (presented) 3742, 4008, 4612, 5009.

Export Duty on Logs, &c. (prop. Res.) 4613, 4653;  
Com. on Res. (M.) 4701; in Com., 4718; (B.  
145) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4719 (ii).

Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3872 (ii).

Farm Implements, Duty, Coal Oil in Tank Vessels  
(Ans.) 2216 (i).

G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of  
\$300,000, on M. to adjn. Hse., 587 (i).

Insurance Co.'s Abstract Statement (presented)  
492 (i).

Kingston Cotton Mills and Tariff changes (re-  
marks) 98 (i).

Loan (Public Service) \$15,000,000 (B. 148) prop.  
Res., 4736; in Com. on Res., 5160; 1<sup>o</sup>, 5163 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 667 (i), 2658, 3742,  
5009 (ii).

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on  
M. for Com. of Sup., 2221 (i).

"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.***

- Personal Explanation *re* prop. Tariff Changes (remarks) 175 (i).  
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4721 (ii).  
 Public Accounts, Annual Rep. (presented) 169 (i).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Arrears of Interest (Ans.) 4471 (ii).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee Celebration, Vote for Militia, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2658 (ii).  
 Reciprocal Rights, Belgium and Germany (remarks) 1462 (i).  
 St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements (Ans.) 1987.  
 Shannon, Jas., Postmaster, Kingston, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3058 (ii).  
 Shareholders and Chartered Banks, List (presented) 492 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys., Brookfield Station, I.C.R., in Com. on Res., 5526.  
 ——— Central and Liverpool, in Com. on Res., 5525 (ii).  
 ——— Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood, in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).  
 ——— Windsor Junction, in Com. on Res., 5520.  
 Superannuations, July, 1896, to April, 1897, Names, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Capital* : Trent Valley (construction) 5128. Lachine, conc., 5451 (ii).  
*Charges of Management* (printing bank notes) 5201 (ii).  
*Civil Government* : Civil Service Examiners (salaries) 4828 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Customs (preventive service) conc., 5447 (ii).  
*Government of N.W.T.* (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 3745 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (contingencies) 4843 (ii).  
*Militia* (B.C. fortifications) conc., 5426; Jubilee contingent) 2659 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 4083, conc., 5424; (investigating charges. N.W.T.) 5215; (tariff inquiry) 5205 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.B.) 4945; (N.S.) 4909. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4984.  
*Railways—Capital* : I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3824; (rolling stock) 5316; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5458 (ii).  
 Supply (Res. for Com.) 481 (i).  
 ——— (B. 111) Militia Contingent, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2662 (ii).  
 ——— (B. 150) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5478; 2<sup>nd</sup> in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5535 (ii).  
 Tariff Res., Date of Introduction and N.S. Elections (Ans.) 268 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry, Translation of Evidence (Ans.) 793 (i).  
 ——— Res., 1136 (i); Res. as adopted, 4614 (ii).  
 ——— Res. (remarks) 2476 (i).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).  
 ——— (M. for Com.) 2829 (ii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.***

- Tariff and Her Maj.'s Govt. *re* Res. 16 (Ans.) 2880 (ii).  
 ——— (M. for Com.) 2829 (ii).  
 Thibeault, Chas., Superannuation, Contributions and Amt. drawn from Fund (Ans.) 1306 (i).  
 Timothy Seed and Clover, Imposition of Duty (Ans.) 793 (i).  
 Trusts and Combines, Existence in Can. (Ans.) 1986.  
*Ways and Means* (Res. for Com.) 481 (i).  
 ——— The Budget (Financial Stmt.) 1683 (i).  
 ——— The Tariff :  
 In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2966, 3129, 3150, 3167, 3179; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3250; (item 1) 3352; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3381; (eggs) 3408; (condensed milk) 3409; (fresh salmon) 3418; (cornmeal) 3423; (wheat flour) 3454; (books, &c.) 3465, 3706; (advertising matter, &c.) 3474; (photographs, &c.) 3476; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (putty) 3478; (surgical instruments) 3478; (coal oil) 3482; (china ware) 3497; (iron or steel scrap) 3606; (iron or steel ingots) 3637; (iron or steel angles) 3639; (wire nails) 3640; (shoe tacks) 3652; (screws) &c.) 3656; (buckthorn, &c., strip fencing) 3683; 4147; (wire cable) 3693; (brass wire) 3694; (skates, &c.) 3697; (rasps and files) 3701, 4133; (stereotypes, &c.) 3703; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (paintings, &c.) 3708; (tanning bark) 3711; (salt, &c.) 3714; (Norway iron) 3718; (rice) 4130; (peaches, &c.) 4132; (India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4146; (India-rubber clothing, hose, &c.) 4147; (clothes wringers) 4167; (watch cases) 4167; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4169; (cotton fabrics) 4180; (shirts and shirt waists) 4181; (cotton duck) 4186; (woollen yarns) 4190; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (coal, bituminous slack) 4192; (sugar) 4395; (sugar, confectionery, &c.) 4398; (velvets, &c.) 4465; (coal) 4466 (ii).

**Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.**

- Anqui Municipality, Reimbursement for Ry-Crossing (Ques.) 1541 (i).  
 Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 5185.  
 River Matane Fishing Leases (Ques.) 4207 (ii).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Canals—Capital* : Grenville (dismissals) 3888 (ii).  
*Civil Government* : Post Office (increased salaries) 5112 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* : (commissions of investigation) 5252 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Harbours and Rivers (Que., Rimouski Pier) 4963 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), Brome.**

- American Bank Note Contract (remarks) 1560 (i).  
 Butter Trade with England, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 603 (i).  
 Cheese and Creameries Registration (B. 117) in Com., 3722 (ii).  
 Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 1072.  
 ——— List (presented) 178 (i).  
 Cold Storage Contract (presented) 4364 (ii).  
 ——— Transportation (B. 141) prop. Res. and in Com., 4130; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 4252 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.—Con.**

- Dairy Inspector (P. E. I.) Dismissal of Thos. J. Dillon (Ans.) 2424 (i).  
Dismissals from Public Service (B.C. Quarantine Station) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2405 (i).  
Estimates, The, Typographical Error (explanation) 708 (i).  
Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5542.  
Grosse Isle Wharf, Extension (Ans.) 919 (i).  
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3568 (ii).  
Patent Act Amt. (B. 120) 1°, 3234; in Com., 3722 (ii).  
Patents for Wire Fences, Number Granted (Ans.) 2882 (ii).  
P. E. I. Mail Service (remarks) 1560 (i).  
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5542 (ii).  
Quarantine, Gov. Gen's Warrants, in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).  
— Regulations, Victoria, B.C. (remarks) 1556.  
Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 178 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (archives) 2106; agricultural societies) 2109; (cold storage) 2274; (criminal statistics) 2108; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180, 2119; (creameries in N.W.T.) 2179; (experimental farms, printing, &c.) 2118, 2110 (i); (N. W. T. exhibition) 4960; (Stockholm exhibition) 4859 (ii); (*Patent Record*) 2107; (*Year Book*) 2108 (i); (Wm. Stoker's salary) 4859 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2083, 2088 (i); (salaries) 4832; (messenger's salary) 4986 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4844; (patent poll-book) conc., 5427 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2730 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 2263 (i); (cattle epidemic) 4991; (Gov. Gen's Warrants) 4860 (ii); (hog cholera, slaughter, compensation) 2270; (Man. Hospital) 2263; (salaries, &c.) 2203; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2262 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3387, 3405; (strip fencing) 3689; (Indian corn) 4438 (ii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) Quebec<sup>c</sup> County.**

- Address, on The, 167, 181 (i).  
Admiralty Jurisdiction and N. S. County Court Judges (Ans.) 262 (i).  
Civil Service Act, Min. of Justice's Opinion (Ans.) 2124 (i).  
Companies' Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°, 3971; in Com., 4258 (ii).  
Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue Repeal (B. 125) 1°, 3580 (ii).  
County Court Judges, Commissions without Legislation (Ans.) 2125 (i).  
Forged or Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723.

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Franchise Act Repeal (B. 7) 1°, 89; 2° m., 718 (i).  
— B. 126 (Voters' Lists) 1°, 3724 (ii).  
Gahan, Convict, Release from Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) 3340 (ii).  
Goodwin vs. The Queen, par in *Toronto Globe* (Ans.) 3841 (ii).  
Interest Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°, 3971; in Com., 4252 (ii).  
Kingston Penitentiary, Dismissal of Guards (Ans.) 3339 (ii).  
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2473 (i).  
Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Dismissal, &c (Ans.) 4735 (ii).  
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 3679 (ii).  
Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. (B. 140) in Com., 4724 (ii).  
Quebec Land Slide. Appnmt. of Commission (Ans.) 3719, 3720 (ii).  
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Bank Holiday (Ans.) 4372 (ii).  
Savings Banks, Prov. of Quebec (B. 147) 1°, 5009 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 4986; (travelling allowances to Judges in Man.) conc., 3732 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5006.  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Returning officers, &c.) 4990 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5425; (litigated matters, &c.) 3863 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*, 2794; (gratuities to retired officials) 4987; Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4758, 4780; (payments to commissioners) 4798 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4985 (ii).  
Superior Court Judge, Rimouski District (Ans.) 4477 (ii).  
Supreme Court of Ont. (B. 131) 1°, 3719; 2° m. 4207; in Com., 4214 (ii).  
Voters' List, 1897 (B. 126) 1°, 3581 (ii).  
Wiggins, John, Dismissal from B. C. Penitentiary (Ans.) 2418 (i).

**Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth, N.S.**

- Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2314 (i).  
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Colonial Troops (Ques.) 922 (i).  
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 969 (i).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
In Com.: (coal oil) 3483 (ii).  
Yukon Mining, Trading and Trans. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5232 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E., York, N.B.**

- Address, on The, 67 (i).  
 Allandale Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1079 (i).  
 American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*)  
 on Order for 3°, 3089; on M. for 3°, 3285 (ii).  
 ——— Contract (remarks) 1461, 1560 (i).  
 ——— Notice of Motion, 2572 (i).  
 ——— Cost of Engraving, &c. (Ques.) 3056 (ii).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2662 (ii).  
 ——— Plates required and Cost (Ques.) 3505 (ii).  
 Appmnts. by late Govt., Recommendations of  
 Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1653 (i).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res.  
 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4002, 4224 (ii).  
 Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Control (Ques.) 261.  
 Beauharnois Canal, Appmnt. of Collector of  
 Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2419 (i).  
 Bompas, Bischoff & Co., Solicitors for the Dom.,  
 Retirement (M. for Cor.\*) 546 (i).  
 Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res.,  
 5187 (ii).  
 British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1461.  
 Budget, The (reply) 1172 (i).  
 Business of the Hse., on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to  
 take Monday, 2967 (ii).  
 ——— (remarks) 5010, 5038, 5286, 5287 (ii).  
 Civil Servants, Commissioners to investigate  
 Charges (M. for Ret.\*) 546 (i).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of  
 Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).  
 Commissioners to investigate Partisan Offences  
 (remarks) 1462 (i).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 140 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com.  
 on Res., 4523, 4588; further stages suggested,  
 4725; in Com. on B., 5164, 5338, 5342 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr.  
*Davies*) in Com., 4125 (ii).  
 Daly, Hon. T. M., Rep. on Immigration (Ques.)  
 922 (i).  
 Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., on  
 conc., 707 (i).  
 Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., in Com., of  
 Sup., 5080; conc., 5488 (ii).  
 ——— See "I. C. R."  
 Estimates, The, (Ques.) 270; Suppl., 554, 972 (i).  
 Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3873 (ii).  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr.  
*Fielding*) 4613, 4704, 4713; in Com., 4718 (ii).  
 Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. withdr. of  
 B., 4342 (ii).  
 Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on  
 prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup.,  
 2141 (i).  
 Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on  
 M. for 1°, 93; on M. for 2°, 719; Amt., 724;  
 prop. withdr. of Amt., 784 (i).  
 Gaspé Lightship-keeper (Ques.) 2126 (i).  
 G.T.R. and Dom. Govt., Reported grant of  
 \$300,000 (M. to adjn.) 574 (i).  
 ——— (Ques.) 342, 489 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer  
*Diana* (remarks) 1821 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal B. 142 (Mr.  
*Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4612; on M. for 3°, 4694;  
 Amt. neg. on a div., 4697 (ii).  
 ——— Extension to Montreal (remarks) 4203 (ii).  
 ——— G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry., on M.  
 for Com. on Res., 4259, 4287; in Com., 4342,  
 4374 (ii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 3748, 4810, 5269, 5288,  
 5328, 5338 (ii).  
 Kingston Cotton Mills and Tariff Changes (re-  
 marks) 98 (i).  
 Loan (Public Service) \$15,000,000 B. 148 (Mr.  
*Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5161; 1<sup>st</sup> of B.,  
 5163 (ii).  
 Loans, Govt. Temporary (Ques.) 949 (i).  
 Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in  
 Com., 2466 (i).  
 Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appmnt. of G.  
 G. King (Ques.) 261, 268, 483 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Cor.\*) 1662 (i).  
 Maugerville, Upper, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.  
 (M. for Cor.\*) 1663 (i).  
 McCallum, Angus, Lock Supt. du Lievre, Dis-  
 missal (Ques.) 1835 (i).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).  
 McKnight, W., Postmaster at King's, Man.,  
 Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3740 (ii).  
 McManus, Mrs., Postmistress, Northfield (B.C.)  
 Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1380 (i).  
 Members, Absence of, before Prorogation (re-  
 marks) 5159 (ii).  
 Mining Development and Advisory Corporation,  
 &c., B. 82 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2°, 1937 (i).  
 Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on  
 M. for Com. of Sup., 2222 (i).  
 Oak Point (N.B.) Lighthouse-keeper, G. R.  
 Pickett's Dismissal (Ques.) 3669 (ii).  
 Order (Ques. of) Members accused of conspiracy,  
 in Com. of Sup., 5302 (ii).  
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir  
*Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4719 (ii).  
 Portage la Prairie, Govt. Building, Change of  
 Site (Ques.) 282 (i).  
 Postmasters, &c., King's and York (N.B.) Dis-  
 missals (M. for Ret.\*) 546 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in  
 Com., 4505, 4725, 5372, 5399, 5531, 5537; on M.  
 for Com., 5529 (ii).  
 ——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5098 (ii).  
 Printing Govt. Notes, Stamps, &c., Tenders and  
 Contracts (M. for copies\*) 546 (i).  
 Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse (remarks)  
 550 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order  
 Paper, 3502 (ii).  
 Questions by Members not in Order (remarks)  
 3972 (ii).  
 Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1459 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Returns (inquiries) 1990, 2298, 2572 (i), 2969, 4032, 4109, 4470 (ii).  
 Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 957 (i).  
 Sessional Indemnity (Sen. and House of Commons) in Com. on Res., 3729 (ii).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 5478; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 5529; in Com., 5536 (ii).  
 ——— Brookfield Station and Eastville, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).  
 ——— G. T. R., Victoria Bridge, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).  
 ——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).  
 ——— Ont. and Rainy River, in Com. on Res., 5517 (ii).  
 ——— Ottawa and New York, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).  
 ——— Pembroke Southern Ry., in Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).  
 ——— Portage du Fort, in Com. on Res., 5520.  
 ——— Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood, in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).  
 ——— Richelieu Valley, in Com. on Res., 5520.  
 ——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).  
 ——— Windsor Junction, in Com. on Res., 5520.  
 Superannuation Act (C. S.) Abolition B. 9 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 554 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (travelling expenses) conc., 3734, 4841 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2275 (i); (Stockholm exhibition) 4859 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: Cornwall (enlargement) 3861; Galops, 3862; Grenville (dismissals) 3892, 3947; Lachine, 4823, 5113; North Channel, 3862; River Reaches, 3862; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3874; St. Pierre River, 5150; Soulanges (construction) 3861. *Income*: Welland, conc., 5454.  
*Charges of Management* (printing bank notes) 5201, conc., 5455 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2083, 2089 (i); (salaries) 4832 (ii); Customs, 1730, (contingencies) 2072; Indian Dept., 1709, (law clerk) 1677; Inland Revenue, 1721, 1914; Interior, 1669, 1693, (contingencies) 2069 (i), 6265, (salaries) 4838 (ii); Militia, 1927 (i), (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office, 1721, (contingencies) 2063 (i), (statutory increases) 5077, 5265; (technical services) 5100 (ii); Printing and Stationery, 1669; Privy Council (contingencies) 2067 (i), (salaries) 4830 (ii); Public Works, 1735; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2068 (i). (Printing Bureau) 4831: Railways and Canals (newspaper subscriptions) 4830 (ii); Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2088 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*, 2506; Culling Timber, 2509 (i), (salaries) 4864 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2502. Railways (L.C.R., expenses of commission) 5258; (Baie de Chaleurs) 5133, conc., 5452. Customs (preventive service, travelling, &c.) 2507 (i), 4864, 5014, 5027. Post Office (mail service) 5059; (outside service) 5417, conc., 5431.

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Dominion Lands—Income*: conc., 5423 (ii).  
*Dominion Police*, 2090 (i).  
*Geological Survey*, 4072 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2800, 3743, 4038, 4053; (general expenses) 4072 (ii).  
*Indians*: B.C. (surveys, &c.) 4076; (inspectors) 4078 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2092; (extra clerks) 2103; (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional clerks) 4849; (sessional indemnity) 4843; (patent poll-book) conc., 5427 (ii). Library (salaries, &c.) 2106. Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090 (i).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.) 2294 (i).  
*Militia* (B.C. fortifications) conc., 5426; (Jubilee contingent) 2659; (Military College) 4802 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5424; (commissions of investigation) 5235; (investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5215; (gratuities, quarantine officers) 4860; (Jubilee expenses) conc., 5456; (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5213; (tariff inquiry) 5205 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioner's Rep.) 4740; (payments to commissioners) 4798 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Canals (Lachine) 4892. Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) conc., 4895, 5429; (west dept. block, fire) 4880, 4894. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4865. *Income*: Buildings (Que., Berthierville P.O.) conc., 5456; (Man., immigrant shed) 4949, (Portage Laprairie P.O.) 4950; (N.B.) 4941, 5278; (Ont., Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 4948 (ii), (Rideau Hall) 2601, 2629, 2639 (i), 4886 (ii), (telephone service) 2653 (i). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4973; (Ont.) 2738, 2773; (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; Collingwood Harbour) 2771; (Que., Gatineau River) 4959; (N.B.) 2733, 4956; (N.S.) 2719; (P.E.I.) 2731; (Que.) 4958; (Little Rapids Lock) conc., 5443. *Miscellaneous* (architects' salaries, &c.) 4891; (clerical assistance) 4891 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2256 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3748, 3810; (rolling stock) 5269, 5288, 5328, 5338; (Drummond Co. Ry.) 5080, conc., 5488. P.E.I. Ry., 3860 (ii).  
 Sussex (N.B.) Govt. Buildings, Appmt. of caretaker (Ques.) 262 (i).  
 Tariff Changes, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Fielding) 176 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry, Confidential Evidence (remarks) 793 (i).  
 ——— Res., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2476 (i).  
 ——— (remarks) 717 (i).  
 ——— (Reply to Budget Speech) 1172 (i).  
 Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Grant of \$300,000 (Ques.) 342 (i).  
 ——— O.C. re Govt. Aid (Ques.) 489 (i).  
 ——— (M. to adjn.) 574 (i).  
 ——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Blair) 5526.  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (arrangement as to discussion) 2033; Res. 1 (Customs Acts, Amts, definitions, &c.) 2842; Res. 12 (packages, &c., for liquids) 2843; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2902, 2945, 2970, 3078, 3091,

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.***Ways and Means—Con.*

3095, 3158 ; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3299 ; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352 ; (vermouth, &c.) 3357 ; (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3381 ; (eggs) 3408 ; (condensed milk) 3409 ; (Indian corn) 3409, 4451 ; (salmon, fresh) 3418 ; (cornmeal) 3421 ; (scrap iron) 3635 ; (iron and steel ingots) 3637 ; (iron forgings) 3639 ; (wire nails) 3640, 3645 ; (shoe tacks) 3652 ; (screws) 3656 ; (barbed wire) 3659 ; (brass wire) 3694 ; (skates, &c.) 3696 ; (Britannia metal) 3703 ; (rice) 4131 ; (pears and peaches) 4133 ; (India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4145 ; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3069, 4147 ; (agricultural implements) 4153 ; (clothes wringers) 4166 ; (watch cases) 4167 ; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4169 ; shirts and shirt waists) 4181 ; (coal, bituminous, slack) 4194 ; (sugar) 4395 ; (sugar candy) 4398 ; (coal) 4466.

**Fraser, Mr. D. C., Guysborough, N.S.**

Address, on The, 420 (i).

British Yukon Chartered Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2142 (i).

Halifax Loan Co.'s B., Suspension of Rule (M.) 1665 (i).

Maritime Milling Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1071 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : (mutton, &c.) 3371 ; (wheat flour) 3445 (ii).

**Fraser, Mr. J., East Lambton.**

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière) in Com., 4723 (ii).

Private Bills, Ref. to Com. (M.) 1227 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. (Sunny Brae and Guysborough) in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).

Supreme Court, (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4215 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : (coal oil) 3486 (ii).

**Frost, Mr. F. T., Leeds and Grenville.**

American Bank Note Co.'s (B. 68) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1875 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 893 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. (Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa) in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

*SUPPLY :*

*Collection of Revenues : Post Office (mail service) 5075 (ii).*

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2997 ; (iron or steel scrap) 3621 (ii).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W., Charlotte, N.B.**

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 648 (i).

Behan, Michael, Storeman on Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 2565 (i).

Campobello Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 2565 (i).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W.—Con.***SUPPLY :*

*Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2193 (i).*

*Collection of Revenues : Weights and Measures (salaries) 2542 (ii).*

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3215 ; (coal oil) 3495, 3496 ; (marble, &c.) 3498 (ii).

**Gauthier, Mr. J., L'Assomption.**

Chateauguay and Northern Ry., Rivière des Prairies Bridge (Ques.) 567 (i).

**Gibson, Mr. W., Lincoln and Niagara.**

Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 709 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1755 (i).

C.P.R. and Hull Electric Co.'s Agreement (B. 25) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707 (i).

Can. Power Co. of Hamilton (B. 66) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i)

Dom. Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Co. s (B. 106) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2297 (i).

G.T.R. of Can. (B. 26) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707 (i).

Hamilton and Niagara Falls Customs Collectors (Ques.) 1540 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4671 (ii).

Jubilee Postage Stamps (Ques.) 2654 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) 2359 (i).

Printing of Parl., 2nd Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 4364 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 8) 1<sup>o</sup>, 95 ; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 673 (i).

Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838 (i).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A., Richmond, N.S.**

Admiralty Jurisdiction and N. S. County Court Judges (Ques.) 262 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4221, 4227 (ii).

Bear Island Postmaster (Ques.) 672 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Osler) on Order for Com., 2163 (i).

Chisholm, W. C., Indian Agent, Dismissal (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Coal Trade of N. S., Newspaper utterances of Finance Minister (Ques.) 669 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 3831 (ii).

L'Ardoise Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 670.

Lobster Fisheries, Close Season, Extension (remarks) 5415 (ii).

Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4019 (ii).

Point Tupper Station Agent, Appmt. (Ques.) 788 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Daniel B. Stone's Dismissal (Ques.) 2414 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. (Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood) in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2288 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: St. Peter's (repairs) 5274 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Post Office, 1727 (i).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Baddeck, &c., Grand Narrows, &c.) conc., 5419; (Mar. Provs.) 2791 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2784; (N.S.) 2727 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3831; (land damages) conc., 5431 (ii).

**Gilmour, Mr. J., East Middlesex.**

- Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 3577 (ii).

**Guay, Mr. P. M., Lévis.**

- Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. (B. 67) 1°, 1373 (i).  
 — Refund of Fees (M.) 4734 (ii).  
 Military Equipments, Conditions of Tests, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (ii).

**Guite, Mr. J. F., Bonaventure.**

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5138 (ii).

**Haggart, Mr. J. G., South Lanark.**

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 942 (i).  
 Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1873 (i).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4608.  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., in Com. on Res., 4718 (ii).  
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 2926 (ii).  
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbiniere) in Com., 4700 (ii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M. for Com. on Res., 4319; in Com., 4345, 4378; on M. for 3°, 4655, (ii)  
 Man. Schools Ques. and Remedial Order (Ques.) 792 (i).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Rothwell's promotion, 1902 (i).  
 Returns (inquiry) 4109 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 4986.  
*Canals—Capital*: Beauharnois, 5273; Cornwall, 5115; Lachine, 4824; St. Lawrence ship channel, 4867; St. Pierre River, 5150; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5117; Soulanges (contractor's claims) 5125. *Income*: Rideau (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Interior, 1675, 1701; Justice, 1667 (i); Post Office (technical services) 5104 (ii); Public Works, 1735; Railways and Canals, 1928, 1973 (i).

**Haggart, Mr. J. G.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5004. Post Office (mail service) 5074. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5137. (P.E.I., compassionate allowance) 5276 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (counsel fees, Judicial Com.) 4999 (ii).  
*Government of N. W. T.* (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).  
*Indians*: N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4987 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Victoria and San Francisco) 2791 (ii).  
*Militia* (gratuities, &c.) 4993 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Banff Park) 5001; (commissions of investigations) 5225; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (St. Johns, P.Q., postmasters' defalcations) 5213 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (gratuities to retired officers) 4987.  
*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4934; (Ont., Rat Portage) 5285, (Rideau Hall) 4887; (west deptl. block, fire) 4883. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4971; (Ont.) 4966; (Collingwood Harbour) 2764, (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Que., Gatineau River) 4960; (P.E.I.) 4976. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 4974 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (Dartmouth branch) 5113 (ii).

**Haley, Mr. A., Hunts, N.S.**

- McIntyre's Lake and Sydney Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3741 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D., Halton.**

- Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. Taylor) on M. for 2°, 660 (i); in Com., 3555 (ii).  
 C.P.R. Rates and Tolls, West of Toronto (Ques.) 4204 (ii).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4599 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. Davies) in Com., 4127 (ii).  
 Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., prop. withdr. of B. (remarks) 4341 (ii).  
 Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 2°, 3571 (ii).  
 Liverpool Post Office, par. in Montreal *Gazette*, (Personal Explanation) 5542 (ii).  
 Parliament Grounds, Repairing Walks (Ques.) 5037 (ii).  
 Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5093 (ii).  
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 2 (Mr. Cassey) in Com., 3562 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2192 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Ont.) 2555. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2545 (i).  
*Indians*: N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4990; (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Newfoundland) 4995; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4998 (ii).

**Henderson, Mr. D.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4928 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 2650 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Fort Francis Locks) 4971 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle, tuberculosis epidemic) 4992 (ii).

Trusts and Combines, Existence in Can. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: Res. 14, 2844; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3180; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3568; (item 1) 3351; (mutton, &c.) 3369, 3393; (strip fencing) 3683; (Britannia metal, &c.) 3703; (books, &c.) 3707; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (duck belting) 3710; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (tanning bark) 3711; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (shirts and shirt waists) 4180; (socks, &c.) 4187; (coal, bituminous) 4201 (ii).

**Heyd, Mr. C. B., North Brant.**

Hagersville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (wire nails) 3650; (woollen yarns) 4187 (ii).

**Hughes, Mr. S., North Victoria.**

Address, on The, 352 (i).

Bateman, Indian Agent, Scugog Island, Dismissal (Ques.) 1081 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1891 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oster) in Com., 2338 (i).

Fenelon Falls Customs Officer (Ques.) 258 (i).

Fishery Guardians, North Victoria (Ques.) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1019 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1834 (i).

Hungerford, Wm., Engineer Dredge *Otonabee* Dismissal (Ques.) 259 (i).

— (M. for Cor. \*) 1774 (i).

Kelley, Miss, Windsor P. O. Employee (Ques.) 920 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1899 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 2463 (i).

McArthur, Wm., Fenelon Falls, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1639, 1774 (i).

Military College, Kingston, Administrative Changes (Ques.) 791 (i); (remarks) 3541 (ii).

Mount Albert and Holt Mail Contract (Ques.) 795 (i).

Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Davin) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2041 (i).

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. Rosamond) in Com., 2347 (i).

O'Leary, Hugh, Appmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1302.

**Hughes, Mr. S.—Con.**

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 841 (i).

— (Ques.) 973, 1083 (i).

— Militia Contingent, List of Officers (remarks) 1901 (i).

Sadowa Postmaster, Appmt., &c. (Ques.) 2123 (i).

Scugog Island Indians, Wm. Bateman's Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 3524 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Experimental Farms) 2111.

*Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2088; Indian Dept., 1711; Interior, 1674; Militia and Defence, 1669, 1927; Mounted Police, 1709; Post Office, 1721; Railways and Canals, 1948; Trade and Commerce, 1981 (i).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (extra clerks) 2104; (salaries) 2102. Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 2581 (ii).

Tariff, The, arrangement as to Discussion, 3032.

Trent Valley Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Dismissal of Timber Inspector (Ques.) 259 (i).

— Rosedale Works, Dismissal of Foreman (Ques.) 259 (i).

Veneers, Imports by Dom. Organ Co. (Ques.) 1545 (i).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2546 (ii).

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2449 (i).

**Hurley, Mr. J. M., East Hastings.**

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1068 (i).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B., East Elgin.**

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 652 (i).

Aylmer West, Postmaster, Appmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 794, 795 (i).

— Appmt., &c., (M. for Ret. \*) 1662 (i).

East and West Elgin Mail Contracts, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 837 (i).

Fishing Licenses Granted, Lake Erie (M. for Ret.) 837 (i).

— Payments in Advance (Ques.) 267 (i).

Hagersville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4347 (ii).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Stmt. \*) 837 (i).

Public Bills, on M. (Mr. Casey) to place on Order Paper, 3501 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. Casey) on ref. to Com., 618 (i).

St. Thomas' Collector of Customs, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation* : House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4854 (ii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. : (clothes wringers) 4166; (Indian corn) 4445 (ii).

**Ives, Hon. W. B., Sherbrooke.**

British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1462.  
Crepeau, J. H., Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 1057 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4604 (ii).

Danville and St. Camille Mail Service, Tenders, &c., (M. for Ret.\*) 3538 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M. for 2°, 4612 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4507 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. Casey) on ref. to Com., 616 (i).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2965 (ii).

**Jameson, Mr. R. W., Winnipeg.**

Dismissal from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2307 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements (Ques.) 1987.

## SUPPLY :

*Miscellaneous* (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4083 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Man., immigrant shed) 4950 (ii).

**Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G.,**  
(Controller of Inland Revenue) *Portneuf*.

Coal Oil, Imports from U.S. in Tank Cars (Ans.) 796 (i).

Excise Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ans.) 2422 (i).

Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T., Changes (Ans.) 1077 (i).

Illicit Still, Seizure from Geo. Vezina (Ans.) 1374 (i).

— Seizure at Pont Rouge (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ans.) 1544 (i).

— Act Amt. (B. 144) Excise Res., in Com., 4698; 1° of B., and in Com., 4699 (ii).

— Deptl. Reps. (presented) 86 (i).

— Deptl. Changes (Personal Explanation) 4366 (ii).

"McCarthy Act," Claim against in Provencher (Ans.) 2422 (i).

Montreal Inland Revenue, Cost of Collection, &c. (Ans.) 3057 (ii).

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 139) 1°, 4204; in Com., 4719 (ii).

Queen's Birthday Perpetual Holiday (B. 84) 1°, 1738 (i).

Returns, on inquiry for, 3243 (ii).

**Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—Con.**

Scovil, Walter B., *Pet. re* (Ans.) 2416 (i).

Spence, John (Inland Revenue) Superannuation (Ans.) 1079 (i).

Strathroy Inland Revenue Officer, Name, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue, 1912 (i); (contingencies) 4839 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Culling Timber, 2509 (i); (salaries) 4864 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2493; (salaries) 2492; (travelling, &c.) 2507. Weights and Measures, &c. (Gas inspection) 2551; (salaries) 2511 (i). Staples (inspection) 5059; (technical translation) 5058 (ii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. : (mutton, &c.) 3385; (cornmeal) 3425; (wheat flour) 3459 (ii).

Weights and Measures Inspector, Port Arthur, Appnmt. (Ans.) 793 (i).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg, N.S.**

Bounty to Fishermen, Increased (Ques.) 4471 (ii).

Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Davies) in Com., 3728 (ii).

Gloucester Fishing Schooners and N. S. Fishermen (remarks) 4371 (ii).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1827 (i).

Mackerel Fishery in N. S., Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 3673 (ii).

N. S. Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 4471 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. (Central Ry. and Liverpool) in Com. on Res., 5525 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (payments to collectors) conc., 5428 (ii).

*Militia* (Military College) 4812 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4919. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2783, 4890; (N.S.) 2725 (ii).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. : Res. 17 (combine clause) 3328; (Indian corn) 4456 (ii).

**Kendry, Mr. J., West Peterborough.**

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: Trent Valley (construction) 5129 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1515 (i).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3207; (files and rasps) 4145 (ii).

**Kloepfer, Mr. G., South Wellington.**

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1442 (i).

*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :

In Com. (wheat flour) 3449; (Indian corn) 4462; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466 (ii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.**

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°, 1373 (i).

Can. Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°, 2051 (i).

Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton, B. 124 (Mr. MacPherson) on M. for 1°, 3579 (ii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G.—Con.**

Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 32) 1<sup>o</sup>, 838 (i).

Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1<sup>o</sup>, 707 (i).

Private Bills Petitions, Extension of Time (M.) 838 (i).

— Suspension of Rule (M.) 1665 (i).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Wood, *Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5005. Post Office (mail service) 5063, 5075. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2544 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4846 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4935 (ii).

*Quarantine*: Miscellaneous (gratuities) 4860 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (Indian corn) 4452 (ii).

**Langelier, Mr. F., Centre Quebec.**

Artillery, Garrison Battery No. 3, Disbandment (Ques.) 340 (i).

I. C. R. New Time Table (remarks) 3242 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 80) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1631 (i).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1373 (i).

Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Disallowance of Quebec Act (Ques.) 670 (i).

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.**

Address, on The, 209 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oster) in Com., 2344 (i).

"Les Cisterciens Reformes" incorp. (B. 88) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1632 (i).

"McCarthy Act," Claims under in Provencher (Ques.) 2421 (i).

Man. School Ques., Papers not brought down (Ques.) 168 (i).

— ref. in Speech from Throne (Ques.) 342 (i).

— further Papers (M. for Ret.) 826 (i).

— Settlement (Ques.) 918, 1451 (i).

— proposal as to Settlement (Ques.) 1307 (i).

Militia Corps, Morris, Organization (Ques.) 1307.

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2346 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2798 (ii).

Public Buildings (Man.) unsettled Claim of Prov. (M. for Ret. \*) 546 (i).

Superannuation Act (C. S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (objection) 552 (i).

Terrebonne Revising Officer, Amt. Paid (Ques.) 491 (i).

**Laurier, Hon. W., (President of the Council) East Quebec.**

Address, on The, 59 (i).

— consdn. (M.) 6 (i).

— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1900 (i).

— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty (M.) 3243 (ii).

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Con.**

Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 708; (M.) 838.

— Ascension Day (M.) 2878 (ii).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 658 (i).

Appnmts. by late Govt., Recommendations of Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1650 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Tenders, on M. for copies, 2426 (i).

— Winter Terminus (Ans.) 1374 (i).

Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 1541 (i).

Bazinet, Mr., of Joliette, and Quebec Elections (Ans.) 1634 (i).

Belgian Consul, Montreal, and Tariff Res. (remarks) 1461 (i).

Binder Twine made at Kingston Penitentiary, cost, &c. (Ans.) 1635 (i).

Bridge at Quebec, reported Govt. Aid (Ans.) 342.

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Disallowance (Ans.) 340 (i).

— Expiration of Time for Disallowance 3235.

Business of the Hse., Notices of Motion (M.) 86 (i).

— See "Govt. Business."

Cartwright, Mr. F. L., Appnmt. as Inspector N. W. Mounted Police (Ans.) 489, 490 (i).

Chisholm, W. C., Indian Agent (N.S.) Dismissal (Ans.) 1375 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 778 (i).

Coal Imports from Great Britain, Rate of Duty under new Tariff (Ans.) 1634 (i).

Cobourg (Ont.) Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 1306 (i).

Copyright Act (1889) Govt. Action (Ans.) 1542 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1064; in Com., 2474 (i).

Daunais, C. M., Indian Instructor, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1450 (i).

Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 480 (i).

Dom. Exhibition, Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 1633 (i).

Estevan Land Office, Removal to Alameda (Ans.) 1638 (i).

Estimates, Suppl. (Ans.) 972 (i).

Exchequer Court, Local Judge in Admiralty, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1986 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 92 (i).

Govt. Business, precedence, Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 1899 (i).

— Thursdays (M.) 783 (i).

— Mondays (M.) 2967 (ii).

Govt. Commissioners and Politics (Ans.) 1544 (i).

Indian Agent Bateman, Scugog Island, Dismissal (Ans.) 1081 (i).

— Disturbance in N. W. T. (remarks) 3059 (ii).

— Supplies (Man.) Mr. *McCull's* Letter re Purchases (Ans.) 1306 (i).

— Man. and N. W. T., Schedule of Tenders (Ans.) 1079, 1301 (i).

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ans.) 1638, 2570 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (Ans.) 1305 ; (remarks) 1546 (i).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for 1°, 550 (i).  
 Jones, Judge, Resignation and Gratuity (Ans.) 2882 (ii).  
 Kingston Penitentiary, Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 1983 (i).  
 Library Committee, Joint (M.) 666 (i).  
 Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 694 ; in Com., 2561 (i).  
 McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1390 (i).  
 Man. Schools Ques., Papers not brought down (Ans.) 168 (i).  
 ——— ref. in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 342 (i).  
 ——— and Remedial Order (Ans.) 792 (i).  
 ——— further Papers, on M. for Ret., 828 (i).  
 ——— Mr. Fitzpatrick's Letter to Hon. Ed. Blake (Ans.) 836 (i).  
 ——— Settlement (Ans.) 918, 1451 (i).  
 ——— proposal as to Settlement (Ans.) 1307 (i).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 492, 1900 (i).  
 Mercier, Jos., St. Famille, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1633 (i).  
 Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. 59 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for 2°, 2036 (i).  
 ——— (1894) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 2038 (i).  
 ——— (1889) Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 1539 (i).  
 ——— Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1072 (i).  
 ——— Strength of Force (Ans.) 1990 (i).  
 National Museum, Erection at Ottawa, on M. for Ret., 2433 (i).  
 Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°, 4 ; *pro forma* (i).  
 O'Leary, Hugh, Appmnt. by Govt. as Commissioner (Ans.) 1303 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) 724 (i), 3031 (ii).  
 "Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.  
 Pacific-Yukon Route, Surveys (Ans.) 1375 (i).  
 Prince Albert, Appmnt. of Sheriff (Ans.) 667 (i).  
 Printing Committee, Joint (M.) 666 (i).  
 ——— addition of Name (M.) 2476 (i).  
 Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 555 (i).  
 Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 826 (i).  
 Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Langelier*) on M. for 2°, 1631 (i).  
 ——— and Hon. Mr. Dobell (Ans.) 1989 (i).  
 ——— Speech of Mayor of Quebec (Ans.) 1637 (i).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee and N. W. Mounted Police (Ans.) 97 (i).  
 Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan*, *Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 702 (i).  
 Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1458 (i).  
 Regina, Long Lake, &c., Ry., Govt. Subsidy (Ans.) 1637 (i).

**Laurier, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Returns, on inquiries for, 2572, 2969 (ii).  
 St. Lawrence River (Upper) Sale of Islands (Ans.) 1026 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn., 956, 965 (i).  
 ——— Mail Service, Regularity of Delivery (Ans.) 1634 (i).  
 Saskatoon, Battleford and Onion Lake Mail Service (Ans.) 1633 (i).  
 Scugog Island, Indian Agent Bateman, Dismissal (Ans.) 1081 (i).  
 Select Standing Coms. (M.) 6 (i).  
 ——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 480 (i).  
 ——— Lists (presented) 661 (i).  
 ——— addition of Names (M.) 2408 (i).  
 Smuggling into the Yukon country (Ans.) 1375.  
 Speaker, Dep., and Elections (remarks) 2219 (i).  
 Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Disallowance of Quebec Act (Ans.) 671 (i).  
 Superannuation Act (C.S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 552 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
     *Civil Government* : Customs (contingencies) 2077 ; Privy Council, 1978, (contingencies) 2068 (i).  
     *Legislation* : House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2098 (i).  
     *Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2639 (ii).  
 Tariff, The (remarks) 718 (i).  
 ——— arrangement as to Discussion, 3033 (ii).  
 Terrebonne Revising Officer, amt. Paid (Ans.) 491 (i).  
 Territorial Exhibition, Outstanding Debts. (Ans.) 1374 (i).  
 Thousand Islands, Purchase from Indian Dept. (Ans.) 1080 (i).  
 Treaty between Great Britain and Japan (Ans.) 1985 (i).  
 U. S. and Can. Mail Regulations, withdrs. before Delivery (Ans.) 1635.  
 Vezina, Geo., and Inland Rev. Dept. (Ans.) 1638, 2570 (i).  
 Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Grant of \$300,000 (Ans.) 342 (i).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff :  
     In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2983, 3079, 3098 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures, Metrical System (Ans.) 1027 (i).  
 Williams, P. J., Indian Instructor, Dismissal (Ans.) 1450 (i).  
 Wood Mountain Scouts, Allotment of Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2031.
- Lavergne, Mr. J., Drummond and Arthubaska.**  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4716 (ii).  
 Great Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°, 1538 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 4665 (ii).  
 Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 80) 1°, 1538 (i).

**Lavergne, Mr. J. —Con.**

## SUPPLY :

- *Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2612 (i).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. B.) 5279; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5282 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3767, 3795 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
In Com.: (wheat flour) 3445 (ii).

**Lemieux, Mr. R., Gaspé.**

- Address, on The, 282, 397 (ii).
- Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1541 (i).
- Bird Rock Island, Casualty at Lighthouse, Rescue of Woman (Ques.) 3508 (ii).
- Immigration Agents in U.S., Appnmts. (Ques.) 3507 (ii).
- Fishery Bulletins, Distribution on Gaspé Coast, Irregularity (Ques.) 4008 (ii).
- Grand River Wharf, Construction, non-Payment of Labourers (Ques.) 790 (i).
- Langevin Block, Contractor's Claims (Ques.) 791.
- Magdalen Islands Savings Bank (Ques.) 789 (i).
- Winter Mail Service (Ques.) 789, 1027 (i).
- Paris Exhibition (1900) Can. Representation (Ques.) 3508 (ii).
- Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com., of Sup., 5089 (ii).
- Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 840 (i).
- Monument commemorative (Ques.) 3508.
- Quebec and Gaspé Basin, Communication between (Ques.) 790 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5004, 5057. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5135 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4995 (ii).
- Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3769 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
In Com.: (woollen yarns) 4190 (ii).

**Lewis, Mr. W. J., Albert, N.B.**

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 4957 (ii).

**Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.**

- Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1763 (i).
- Bremner Furs Seizure, Compensation, on M. for Ret., 1746 (i).
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Osler) in Com., 2340 (i).
- C. P. R. Land Grants Patented and Exempted from Taxes (Ques.) 2883 (ii).
- Patents (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
- Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) objection to further stages, 4725; in Com., 5342 (ii).
- Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2°, 1069 (i).

**Lister, Mr. J. F. —Con.**

- Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2143 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 2926 (ii).
- McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
- Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. Rosamond) in Com., 2345 (i).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 2953 (ii).
- Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière) in Com., 4719 (ii).
- Petroleum, Refined, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Moore) 824 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 5391 (ii).
- Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5088 (ii).
- Public Buildings erected in Dom., &c. (M. for Ret.) 493 (i).
- Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 802 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2°, 1788 (i).
- Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) on M. for 2°, 696 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital*: Soulanges (contractor's claims) 5125 (ii).
- Civil Government*: Inland Revenue, 1922 (i).
- Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5052 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897; (N.B.) 4943; (N.S.) 4907 (ii); (Ont.) 2582, 4948. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Manitoulin Island) 4966 (ii).
- Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2252 (i)
- Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. Morrison) on Sen. Amts., 5229 (ii).

**Logan, Mr. H. J., Cumberland, N.S.**

- Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1773, 1836 (i).
- Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).

**Lount, Mr. W., Centre Toronto.**

- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Osler) in Com., 2341 (i).
- Can. General Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°, 950 (i).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) in Com. on Res., 4349 (ii).
- James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°, 1172 (i).
- Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 2468 (i).
- McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1393 (i).
- Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 56) 1°, 1172 (i).

**Lount, Mr. W.—Con.**

- National Life Ass. Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 74) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).  
 North American Life Ass. Co.'s (B. 54) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1795 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (change of Title) B. 53, 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172 (i).  
 Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4212 (ii).  
 Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 45) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1072.  
 Trade and Other Labels (B. 46) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1075 (i).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P. E. I.**

- Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5473 (ii).  
 Govt. of P. E. I., Claims against Federal Govt. (M. for Cor.\*) 1662 (i).  
 Hillsborough River Bridge, Construction (M. for Cor\*) 1664 (i).  
 Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1820 (i).  
 Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4740; (remarks) 5416 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Ccm., 5403 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues* : P. E. I. Railways (compassionate allowance) 5277 (ii).  
*Militia* (Jubilee contingent) 4861 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2782; (P. E. I.) 2732 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* : I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5473. P. E. I., 3856 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
 In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3185; (strip fencing) 3691; (Indian corn) 4399 (ii).

**Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.**

- Atlantic S.S. Service, Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4219 (ii).  
 Coal Oil (American) Imports (Ques.) 258 (i).  
 — Imports from U. S. in Tank Cars (Ques.) 796 (i).  
 Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2145 (i).  
 Iron, Pig. Can. Manufacture and Bounty (Ques.) 97 (i).  
 Kingston Penitentiary, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 1983 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) 2625 (i).  
 Rice Factories in Can., Number, &c. (Ques.) 258.

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Capital* : Grenville (dismissals) 3919 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1486 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
 In Com. : (coal oil) 3480; (salt, &c.) 3717 (ii).

**Macdonell, Mr. J. A., Selkirk.**

- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2925, 3002 (ii).

**Macdonald, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

- Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Macdonald Election) 1615 (i).  
 Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4017 (ii).  
 Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 17) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2448 (i).

**MacLaren, Mr. A. F., North Perth.**

- Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3564 (ii).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F., East York.**

- Address, on The, 287 (i).  
 Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 89, (i).  
 Belgian Consulate, Montreal, and Tariff Res. (remarks) 1460 (i).  
 B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Disallowance (Ques.) 340 (i).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5013 (ii).  
 C. P. R. and I. C. R., Abrogation of Article in Contract (Ques.) 96 (i).  
 Cattle Conference between Mr. Gourdeau and S.S. Co.'s, Rep. (M. for copy\*) 2446 (i).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Plans deposited by C. P. R. Co. (Ques.) 267 (i).  
 — Construction by C. P. R. (Ques.) 568 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4124 (ii).  
 Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5468 (ii).  
 G. T. R. Co. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjn., 597 (i).  
 New York *Sun's* Article on Queen Victoria (Ques.) 1990 (i).  
 Ry. Employees Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 615 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 3) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 87; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 621, 1058 (i).  
 — (B. 4) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 88; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1058 (i).  
 Soulanges Canal, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Tenders (Ques.) 341; Contracts (Ques.) 488 (i).  
 — Section 12, Contract (Ques.) 489 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* : Post Office (technical services) 5102 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Customs (preventive service) 5051; conc., 5448. Post Office (mail service) 5073; (outside service) conc., 5419 (ii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2095 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5426 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5436; (electric lighting, Ottawa) conc., 5431 (ii).  
*Railways—Capital* : I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5468 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, and Her Maj.'s Govt., Res. 16 (Ques.) 2880 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
 In Com. : (spirituous liquors, &c.) 357; (mutton, &c.) 3369, 3379; (rasps and files) 3702, 4144; (agricultural implements) 4166 (ii).

**MacPherson, Mr. T. H., Hamilton.**

Address, on The, 291 (i).

Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton (B. 124) 1°, 3579.

**McAlister, Mr. J., Restigouche, N.B.**

Fishery Officer, Restigouche River, Dismissal, &amp;c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1662 (i).

Fishing Licenses in Bonaventure (Ques.) 671 (i).

Oak Bay Mills P.O., closing (M. for Ret\*) 1663.

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) on M. for 2°, 2348 ; 2452 (i) ; 2776 ; on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).

Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Donville) on Order for 2°, 2348 ; on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 2571 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4932.  
Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2780 ; (N. B.) 4957 (ii).

**McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.**

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government*: Interior, 1678 (ii).*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2767 (ii).**McCleary, Mr. W., Welland.**

Address, on The, 402 (i).

Beamsville Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 484 (i).

—— (M. to adjn.) 1453 (i).

—— Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1749, 1878 (i).

Gauld, R. T. Postmaster, Bartonville, Dismissal (Ques.) 1983 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1392 (i).

Old Fort Erie, Change of Control (Ques.) 2415.

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3877 (ii).  
*Income*: Welland (conc.) 5454 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 2587 (i).  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 2263 ; (salaries and contingencies) 2255 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3323 (ii).

Welland Canal, Dismissals (Ques.) 2122 (i).

White, Isaac, Postmaster at Fort Erie, Dismissal, &amp;c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

**McClure, Mr. F., Colchester.**

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com., of Sup., 2328 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 2470 (i).

Order (Ques. of) 2623 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital* (dismissals) 3953 (ii).*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3211 (ii).

**McCormack, Mr. G., Muskoka and Parry Sound.**

Byng Inlet Customs Officer, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 265 (i).

Lighthouse-keepers, Limitation of Age (Ques.) 266 (i).

Point au Baril Lighthouse-keeper, Appnmt., &amp;c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

**McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton, N.S.**

Baie des Chaleurs Ry., par. in Halifax Chronicle (remarks) 3420 (ii).

Coal Imports from Great Britain, Rate of Duty under new Tariff (Ques.) 1634 (i).

Grand Narrows Preventive Officer, J. R. McNeil's Dismissal (Ques.) 3504 (ii).

G. T. R. Co. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjn., 599 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2286 (i).*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3895 (ii).*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2242 (i).*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3820 (ii).

Tariff Bill, Date of Introduction and N.S. Elections (Ques.) 268 (i).

**McGregor, Mr. W., North Essex.**

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 647 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1857 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer Diana (remarks) 1820 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Quarantine* (hog cholera, compensation) 2273 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°, 914 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (Indian corn) 3415, 3435, 4463 ; (wire nails) 3646 ; (barbed wire) 3665, 4150 ; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &amp;c.) 3681 ; (salt, &amp;c.) 3716 (ii).

**McHugh, Mr. G., South Victoria.**

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1890 (i).

Minden and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°, 1172 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3193 ; (wheat flour) 3454 (ii).

**McInerney, Mr. G. V., Kent, N.B.**

Address, on The, 250, 270 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Government*: Post Office, 1726 ; Public Works, 1735 (i).*Collection of Revenues*: Weights and Measures (salaries) 2519 (ii).*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2596, 2634 (ii).**McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Vancouver, B.C.**

B. C. Southern Ry., Expiration of Time for Disallowance (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

—— Disallowance of Provincial Act (prop. Res.) 493 (i).

**McInnes, Mr. W. W. B.—Con.**

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4576 (ii).

Gold Dredging, Stewart River, Yukon, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1740 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield, B.C., Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1386 (i).

Maple Bay Post Office, Claim of Wm. Beaumont (Ques.) 4364 (ii).

Nanaimo and Comox Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3720 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re Globe's* attack on Speech on Disallowance, 709 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income*: Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2788 (ii).

*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2230, 2237.

Treaty between Great Britain and Japan (Ques.) 1985 (i).

**McIsaac, Mr. C. F., Antigonish, N.B.**

Dismissal from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2397 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2094 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (iron or steel scrap) 3627 (ii).

**McLennan, Mr. R. R., Glengarry.**

Binder Twine, Cost, &c., made at Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 1634 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Dismissal of Employees (Ques.) 2563 (i).

Cornwall and Soulanges Canals. Dimensions and Contractors (Ques.) 2411 (i).

Ry. Return Fare Tickets (B. 11) 1°, 257; 2° m., 695 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2200 (i).

*Quarantine* (salaries, &c.) 2202 (i).

*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3901 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2646 (ii).

**McLennan, Mr. A., Inverness, N.S.**

Dismissals, Inverness Co., Dom. Officials, Year 1879 (Ques.) 4477 (ii).

Inverness Election Pet. (remarks) 2299 (i).

Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2195 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Port Mulgrave and Margaree) 2793 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2720 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3824 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (marble, &c.) 3497; (salt, &c.) 3717 (ii).

**McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.**

Atlantic, Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4238 (ii).

Beet-Root Sugar Manufactured in Can. and Bounty Paid (Ques.) 264 (i).

Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. withdr. of B., 4342 (ii).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3577 (ii).

Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T., and B.C., on M. for Ret., 808 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2198; (experimental farms) 2109 (i).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2601 (i).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 2270 (i).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1589 (i).

Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3405; (cornmeal) 3421; (wire nails) 3649; (salt, &c.) 3713; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4178; (Indian corn) 4424, 4451 (ii).

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.**

Address, on The, 443 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1844 (i).

Budget Speeches, Date of Delivery (Stmnt.) 554 (i).

Business of the Hse, on M. to adjn. for Queen's Birthday, 2741 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 2339 (i).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°, 838 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 29) 1°, 774, 779; 2° m., 2022 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 847 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, &c. (remarks) 1899 (i).

G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjn., 598 (i).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. (B. 47) 1°, 1075 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).

I. C. R., Bicycles, Free Carriage (remarks) 2743.

— Extension to Montreal, B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 4663 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for 1°, 550 (i).

— B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4255 (ii).

Jury, Alf., Immigration Agent, and Toronto Street Ry. (Ques.) 2216 (i).

Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt., Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

*Lily*, Tug, Payments by Govt. for Hire, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2225 (i).

Pinplate Barges, Registration (Ques.) 921 (i).

Post Office Mail Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5094 (i).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Con.**

- Public Accounts and Auditor Gen.'s Repts. (M.) 838 (i).  
 Public Bills, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3500 (i).  
 Quarantine Regulations, U. S., N. W. T., Man. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 810 (i).  
 Queen's Birthday, on M. to adjn., 2741 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1794 (i).  
 Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3519 (ii).  
 Spence, John (Inland Revenue) Superannuation (Ques.) 1079 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5504, 5511 (ii).  
 Superannuation Act (C. S.) B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 173 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3881; St Pierre River) 5156 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Auditor General (contingencies) 2071; Customs (contingencies) 2080; Indian Dept., 1711, 1720; Inland Revenue, 1920; Interior, 1700; Post Office (contingencies) 2063 (i); (technical services) 5105 (ii); Railways and Canals, 1930, 1946 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Calling Timber, 2511. Excise (preventive service) 2505. Post Office (outside service) conc., 5418; (mail service) 5070 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2529 (i).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2821 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. B.) 4946; (N. S.) 4921, conc., 5432, 5433; (Rideau Hall) 2597, 2638, 2649 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (Dartmouth branch) 5115; (extension to Montreal) 3782 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1396 (i).  
 Volunteers of 1866, Recognition of Services, &c., by Govt. (Ques.) 3056 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3161; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3356; (Indian corn) 3415 3426; (wire nails) 3647; (strip fencing) 3688; (shovels) 3703 (ii).

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**

- Address, on The, 435 (i).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4003, 4248 (ii).  
 Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1840 (i).  
 Business of the Hse. on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 2968 (ii).  
 Dismissals, Land Office, Winnipeg, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4031 (ii).  
 Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1829 (i).  
 Indian Agent Crowe (Ques.) 340, 573, 788, 847  
 ——— *McIver* (Ques.) 573, 788 (i).  
 McCallum, A., Lock Master, du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1911 (i).  
 "Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.

**McNeill, Mr. A.—Con.**

- Procedure (Ques. of) Member adjourning deb. 167, 178 (i).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 946  
 Reciprocal Rights, Belgium and Germany (remarks) 1462 (i).  
 ——— Tariff (remarks) 1456 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2235 (i).  
*Civil Government*: Customs (contingencies) 2076; Interior 1681, 1689; Railways and Canals, 1937, 1972 (ii).  
 Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4209 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, Preferential Clause (remarks) 1306 (i).  
 Trade with the Empire, adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 4101 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2944, 3195, 3207 (ii).

**Madore, Mr. J. A. C., Hochelaga.**

- Can. Securities Co. of Montreal incorp. (B. 34) 1<sup>st</sup>, 914 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Miscellaneous* (commissions of investigation) 5248.

**Marcotte, Mr. F. A., Champlain.**

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2737 (ii).

**Martin, Mr. A., East Queen's, P. E. I.**

- Belle River Breakwater, Extension (Ques.) 918 (i).  
 ——— (M. for Ret.) 2445 (i).  
 Belfast Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 926 (i).  
 Cascumpec Buoy Service, Tenders and Contract (Ques.) 1742 (i).  
 Cheese and Butter Factories, withdr. of Govt. Aid (M. for Cor. \*) 3538 (ii).  
 Coal Boring in P. E. I., Vote in Estimates (Ques.) 796 (i).  
 Crawford, Duncan, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 787 (i).  
 Dillon, Thos. J., Dairy Inspector, Dismissal (Ques.) 2424 (i).  
 Dismissals of Postmasters in P. E. I. (M. for Cor.) 1056 (i).  
 Eldon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 786 (i).  
 Fish Island Light-keeper, Dismissal (Ques.) 2424.  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1023 (i).  
 Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4774 (ii).  
 McDonald, Danl., sub-Collector of Customs, Charges against (Ques.) 786 (i).  
 McPhee, Angus, Postmaster at Hopefield, Dismissal (M. for Cor. \*) 546 (i); (Ques.) 4365 (ii).  
 Murray Harbour Buoy Service, Contract (Ques.) 1029 (i).  
 ——— Harbour Master, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2216 (i).  
 Newfoundland and Confederation (M. for Ret.) 2433 (i).

**Martin, Mr. A. —Con.**

- Orwell Customs sub-collector (Ques.) 1742 (i).  
 — Brush Wharf, Preventive Officer, Appmnt. (Ques.) 1301 (i).  
*Prince Edward*, Dredge, Charges against Capt. (Ques.) 792 (i).  
 P. E. I. Mail Service (remarks) 1560 (i).  
 Postmasters' Salaries, Increase (Ques.) 787 (i).  
 Ry. Expenditures, Dom. (remarks) 1452 (i).  
 Returns (inquiries) 948 (i), 3243, 3678, 4032 (ii).  
 Ross, James, sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ques.) 786 (i).  
 — David, Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Cor., &c. \*) 1057 (i).  
 Southport, Belfast, &c., prop. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 1657; (remarks) 2043 (i).  
 Stanley Bridge Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Ret. \*) 1663 (i).  
 Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 177, 269.  
 — (inquiry for Ret.) 948 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2287; (dairy-ing interests, butter and cheese) 2187 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2783; (Mar. Provs.) 4889; (P. E. I.) 2732, 4976 (ii).  
*Railways and Canals—Capital*: P. E. I. Ry., 3843.  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3350; (mutton, &c.) 3407; (books) 3474; (Indian corn) 4464 (ii).  
 Wood Island Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 792 (i).

**Maxwell, Mr. G. R., Burrard, B.C.**

- Address, on The, 343 (i).  
 B. C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 542 (i).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2360 (i).  
 Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America incorp. (B. 82) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup> M., 1632, 1775, 1936 (i).  
 Salmon (B.C.) Sold in British Market, Quality, &c. (M. for Cor.) 1991 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (B.C.) 4936; (Rideau Hall) 2632 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3394 (ii).  
 Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1899 (i).

**Mills, Mr. J. R., Annapolis, N.S.**

- Annapolis Co. Post Offices (Ques.) 485 (i).  
 — Mail Contract (Ques.) 1989 (i).  
 — Mail Route, Petition respecting (Ques.) 3237 (ii).  
 — Royal Postmaster, Mr. West's Appmnt., &c. (M. for Ret.) 2001 (i).  
 — and Liverpool, N.S., Mail Routes, Contracts (M. for Ret. \*) 2446 (i).  
 Bear River, Obstructions to Navigation, &c., (Ques.) 486 (i).

**Mills, Mr. J. R. —Con.**

- Bear River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).  
 Brown, Geo., Payment for Mail Service (Ques.) 572 (i).  
 Covert, D. and D. J. Riordan, Dismissal and Appmnt. (Ques.) 917 (i).  
 Ft. Anne, Annapolis, Caretaker (Ques.) 5009 (ii).  
 Mail Contracts in N. S. (Ques.) 1025 (i).  
 Margaretsville Pier, Tenders for Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3868 (ii).  
 North Perott Postmaster, Mr. Spurr's Appmnt. (M. for Ret.) 1998 (i).  
 N. S. Central Ry., Balance of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 3868 (ii).  
 Piers, &c., Annapolis Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 486, 487 (ii).  
 Postmaster at Annapolis, Appmnt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 567 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4730, 5379, 5389, 5402 (ii).  
 Returns (inquiry) 4651 (ii).  
 Riordan, D. G., Postmaster at Annapolis, Amount of Bonds (Ques.) 3235 (ii).  
 St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 71) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive service) 5022. Post Office (mail service) 5072; (outside service) conc., 5419 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4940. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4956 (ii).  
 Thorne, James H., Complaint against (Ques.) 916.  
 Virginia Post Office, Mr. Bank's Appmnt. (M. for Ret.) 1999 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D., Jacques Cartier.**

- Address, on The, 131 (i).  
 American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3284 (ii).  
 Belgian Consulate, Montreal, Claims of Importers (Ques.) 1542 (i).  
 Dame, David, Dismissal from Lachine Canal (Ques.) 3338 (ii).  
 Dismissals in Montreal (Lachine Canal) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2575 (i).  
 Govt. Commissioners and Politics (Ques.) 1543 (i).  
 Lachine Canal, Dismissals (Ques.) 2410 (i).  
 Ottawa Deptl. Building, Temporary Repairs to Roof, Tenders (Ques.) 1301 (i).  
 Richelieu River, Works at Belœil, Tenders (Ques.) 1302 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (agents' salaries) 4036 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2735 (ii).  
*Scientific Institutions* (hydrographic service) 2296.  
 Tariff Inquiry, Translation of Evidence (Ques.) 793 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (axes, scythes, &c.) 4173; (barbed wire) 3661; (brass wire) 3894; (hats, caps, &c.) 4192; (rice) 4131; (wire-nails) 3641 (ii).

**Montague, Hon. W. H., Haldimand.**

- Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 721 (i).
- G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjn., 589 (i).
- Kootenay Mail Service, on M. to'adjn. (remarks) 5540 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5534 (ii).
- Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 804, 810 (i).
- Subsidies to Rys. (B. C.) in Com. on Res., 5527 (ii).
- Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5515 (ii).
- Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com. on Res., 5518 (ii).
- Superannuation Act (C.S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 172 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Civil Government* : Railways and Canals, 1934 (i).

**Moore, Mr. A. H., Stanstead.**

- Fitch Bay Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ques.) 3868.
- Petroleum, Refined, Reduction of Duty (prop. Res.) 828 (i).

SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2843 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (Indian corn) 4410 (ii).

**Morin, Mr. J. B., Dorchester.**

- Cap Saumon Lighthouse, Construction, Amt. Paid, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
- Contract for Firewood (Ques.) 264 (i).
- Chambly Canal, Expenditure on Culvert (Ques.) 1028 (i).
- Tenders for Stone (Ques.) 1028 (i).
- Fournier, Jakes, Dismissal as Postmaster (Ques.) 921 (i).
- Les Eboulements Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 263 (i).
- Murray Bay Wharf and P. O. Mail Contract (Ques.) 340 (i).
- St. Johns Military School, Contracts for Drugs, &c. (Ques.) 1028 (i).
- Tenders for Coal and Wood (Ques.) 1029.
- Coal Oil Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1078 (i).
- St. Paul and Murray Bay Mail Contract (Ques.) 263 (i).

**Morrison, Mr. A., New Westminster.**

- Alaska Boundary, Line of Demarcation (M. for Cor. \*) 3538 (ii).
- Quotation from Treaty *re* Mt. St. Elias 3505 (ii).
- B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 523 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 908 (i).
- Gold Discoveries, Harrison Lake Region (Ques.) 1744 (i).

**Morrison, Mr. A.—Con.**

- Harrison River Rapids, Improvements (Ques.) 1744 (i).
- Mining Development, &c., of British America incorp. B. 82 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2°, 1632, 1936 (i).
- Co.'s Pet., ref. back to Com. (M.) 2563 (i).
- Pacific Postal Service, Allowances to Mail Clerks (Ques.) 2417 (i).
- Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).
- SUPPLY :
- Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2205, 2209.
- Westminster and Burrard Telephone Co. (Ques.) 2420 (i).
- Wiggins, John, Dismissal from B.C. Penitentiary (Ques.) 2418 (i).
- Yukon Mining Co.'s (B. 118) Sen. Amts., 5226 (ii).

**Mulock, Hon. W., North York.**

- Address, on The (Personal Explanation) 367 (i).
- Agriculture Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1172 (i).
- Allandale (N.B.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1079 (i).
- American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3004, 3462 (ii).
- Annapolis Co. (N.S.) Post Offices (Ans.) 485 (i).
- D. G. Riordan's Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
- Mail Contract (Ans.) 1989 (i).
- Mail Route, Petition respecting (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
- Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 567 (i).
- Royal Post Office, Mr. West's Appnmt. on M. for Ret., 2010 (i).
- Ashcroft and Barkerville Mail Service (Ans.) 2417 (i).
- Athabasca and Mackenzie River Mail Service (Ans.) 2421 (i).
- Aylmer West Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 794, 795 (i).
- Beamsville (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 484 (i).
- Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1847, 1886 (i).
- Bear Island (N.S.) Postmaster (Ans.) 672 (i).
- Beauharnois Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 572 (i).
- and County Election (Ans.) 268 (i).
- Dismissal of Alexis Doutre, on M. for Cor., &c., 836 (i).
- Bartonville Postmaster, Gauld, R. T., Dismissal (Ans.) 1983 (i).
- Belfast (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 927.
- Brown, Geo., Payment for Mail Service (Ans.) 572 (i).
- Caplin River Postmaster, reported Dismissal (Ans.) 1027, 1308 (i).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2030 (i).
- (B. 130) 1°, 3677 (ii).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Conservative Newspapers, Delivery (Ans.) 918.  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 5353 (ii).  
 Dablon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1027 (i).  
 Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5473 (ii).  
 East Bay (C.B.) Post Office, Removal (Ans.) 4366 (ii).  
 Eldon (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 786.  
 Elgin, East and West, Mail Contracts, &c., on M. for Ret., 837 (i).  
 Esquimalt Postmaster, Appnmt. of Telegraph Operator (Ans.) 1985 (i).  
 Fitch Bay Postmaster, Change, &c., (Ans.) 3868.  
 Fort Erie Postmaster, Dismissal of Isaac White (Ans.) 3238 (ii).  
 Gazette and Star, Free Postage from Montreal (Ans.) 3841 (ii).  
 Hardy, Hon. Mr., Speeches, Distribution from House of Commons (Ans.) 3741 (ii).  
 Hartney, (Man.) Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2885 (ii).  
 Jubilee Postage Stamps (Ans.) 2655 (ii).  
 Karsdale Postmaster, Complaint against J. H. Thorne (Ans.) 917 (i).  
 Kelley, Miss, Windsor P. O. Employee (Ans.) 920 (i).  
 Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt. of Mr. Gunn (Ans.) 3740, 3865 (ii).  
 ——— Mr. Shannon's Dismissal (Ans.) 2653 (ii).  
 ——— Appnmt., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3739.  
 Kootenay Mail Service, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5540 (ii).  
 Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Richardson) in Com. (Amt.) 2609 (i).  
 Les Eboulements (P.Q.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 263 (i).  
 McIntyre's Lake and Sydney Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3741 (ii).  
 McKnight, W., Postmaster at Ninga, Man., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3740 (ii).  
 McManus, Robt., late Postmaster at Northfield (B.C.) Character (Ans.) 2879 (ii).  
 ——— Mrs., Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1379 (i).  
 ——— Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).  
 Magdalen Islands Savings Bank (Ans.) 789 (i).  
 ——— Winter Mail Service (Ans.) 799, 1027 (i).  
 Magenta (P.Q.) Postmaster, Dismissal of Jakes Fournier (Ans.) 921 (i).  
 Mail Contracts in N. S. (Ans.) 1025 (i).  
 Maple Bay (B.C.) Post Office, Claim of Wm. Beaumont (Ans.) 4365 (ii).  
 Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. of G. G. King (Ans.) 261, 269, 484 (i).  
 Melocheville Postmaster, Sale of Stamps (Ans.) 2418 (i).  
 Mercier, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Commissioner (Ans.) 918 (i).  
 Merrick, P. O. Inspector, Neglect of Duties (Ans.) 2409 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Mount Albert and Holt Mail Contract (Ans.) 795 (i).  
 Murray Bay Wharf and P. O. Mail Contract (Ans.) 340 (i).  
 Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal of J. S. Stewart (Ans.) 1542 (i).  
 Nanaimo and Comox Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3720 (ii).  
 Newburg and Kingston Mail Contract, on M. for Cor., 1749 (i).  
 New York Sun's Article on Queen Victoria (Ans.) 1990 (i).  
 Northfield (B.C.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).  
 ——— Character (Ans.) 2879 (ii).  
 North Perott (N.S.) Postmaster, Mr. Spurr's Appnmt., on M. for Ret., 1999 (i).  
 Odessa Postmaster, Name, Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 266 (i).  
 Return, on inquiry for, 2571 (i).  
 Orangedale, Margaree, &c., Mail Contracts (Ans.) 4365 (ii).  
 Pacific Postal Service, Allowances to Mail Clerks (Ans.) 2417 (i).  
 Pirate Harbour (N.S.) Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 1028 (i).  
 Postmaster General's Rep., presented (Mr. Mulock) 2970 (ii).  
 Postmasters' Salaries, Increase (Ans.) 787 (i).  
 Postmasters in P. E. I., Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1057 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. (B. 129) 1°, 3676; (M. for Com.) 5529; in Com., 5532, 5537, 4500, 4725, 5373, 5397 (ii).  
 ——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5684 (ii).  
 Qu'Appelle Mail Service, Tenders and Contract (Ans.) 1079 (i).  
 Ste. Philonène Postmaster, Dismissal and Complaints against (Ans.) 3236 (ii).  
 St. Andrew's (N.S.) Post Office Rep. respecting late fire (Ans.) 3235 (ii).  
 St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Contract, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).  
 St. Charles and St. Gervais Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3721 (ii).  
 St. Paul and Murray Bay Mail Contract (Ans.) 263 (i).  
 St. Valerien de Rimouski, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 2566 (i).  
 Sadowa Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2123.  
 Salem Postmaster, Mr. Kinney's Dismissal (Ans.) 2411 (i).  
 Stratford Street Letter-box Service (Ans.) 2126.  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 5367 (ii).  
 ——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).  
 Sunny Brae and Melrose Mail Contract (Ans.) 1028 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.***

Superannuation Act (C.S.) Repeal (B. 9) 1<sup>o</sup>, 169;  
2<sup>o</sup>, 552 (i).

—— (prop. Res.) 551 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (travelling allowances, Man.) conc., 3735 (i).

*Canals—Capital*: St. Pierre River, 5151. *Income*: Rideau (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).

*Charges of Management* (printing bank notes) 5202, conc., 5455 (ii).

*Civil Government*: Post Office, 1721, (contingencies) 2083, (statutory increases) 5078, 5111, 5265, (technical services) 5100 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: Post Office (mail service) 2790, 5060; (outside service) 5417, conc., 5432 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (expenses Algoma election) 4987 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and Nfld.) 4994 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (commissions of investigation) 5240; (St. Johns, P.Q., postmaster's defalcations) 5213.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rat Portage, P.O.) 5275 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5473 (ii).

Tatamagouche Postmaster, Wm. Dobson's Resignation (Ans.) 1541 (i).

Thornville (N.S.) Postmaster, Dismissal of D. Covert (Ans.) 917 (i).

Valleyfield Mail Service, Delay in Transit (Ans.) 1743 (i).

—— Postmaster, Appnt. of E. Dion (Ans.) 2418 (i).

Virginia Post Office, Mr. Bank's Appnt., on M. for Ret., 2000 (i).

Wood Island (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Crawford's Dismissal (Ans.) 787 (i).

**Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.***

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 21) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707 (i).

Athabasca and Mackenzie River Mail Service (Ques.) 2421 (i).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 538 (i).

British Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538.

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 945; in Com., 2337; M. to ref. back to Com., 2310; in Com., 2612, 2920 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4556; in Com. on B., 5359 (ii).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2162 (i).

Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Powers, on M. for Ret., 1041 (i).

Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538 (i).

Indians, Peace River and Athabasca Regions (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2602 (i).

Mounted Police, Strength of Force (Ques.) 1990.

**Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.***

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4722 (ii).

Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 817 (i).

Ry. Lands and Taxation (prop. Res.) 3510, 3522.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 122 (Mr. *Davin*) in Com., 4051 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5508 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2193 (i).

*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 4062 (ii).

*Indians*: Man. and N.W.T. (industrial schools) 4076 (ii).

*Government of N.W.T.* (schools) 4082 (ii).

*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 4079 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2627 (i). Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 2787 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 2268 (i).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1356 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:

In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3390: (photographs, &c.) 3477; (coal oil) 3492; (wire nails) 3647; (barbed wire) 3663; (agricultural implements) 4166 (ii).

U. S. Whalers in Mackenzie River (Ques.) 4735.

Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1052 (i).

**Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.***

Address, on The, 400 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 945; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2610 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1388 (i).

Ont. Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 78) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538 (i).

**Parmalee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.***

Thibault, Chas., Superannuation, Contributions and Amts. drawn from Fund (Ques.) 1306 (i).

**Paterson, Hon. W. (Controller of Customs) *North Grey.***

Beauharnois Canal, Appnt. of Collector of Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2419 (i).

Beet-Root Sugar Manufactured in Can., and Bounty Paid (Ans.) 265 (i).

Belgian Consulate, Montreal, Claims of Importers (Ans.) 1543 (i).

British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1462.

Byng Inlet Customs Officer, Appnt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 265 (i).

Coal Oil (American) Imports (Ans.) 258 (i).

Customs Deptl. Appnts. (Ans.) 2422 (i).

—— Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ans.) 2422 (i).

—— Collectors, Hudson Bay Officials (Ans.) 1452 (i).

Dismissals, Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

**Paterson, Hon. W.—Con.**

Export Duty on Logs, par. in *Midland Free Press* (remarks) 4106 (ii).

Fenelon Falls Customs Officer (Ans.) 259 (i).

Fishing Licenses, Payment in Advance (Ans.) 267 (i).

Grand Narrows (C.B.) Preventive Officer, J. R. McNeill's Dismissal (Ans.) 3504 (ii).

Gretna Sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal of J. F. Tennant (Ans.) 3504 (ii).

Hamilton and Niagara Customs Collector (Ans.) 1540 (i).

Hudson Bay Ports, Customs Collectors (Ans.) 794.

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2220 (i).

Morrisburg Customs Collector, Appnmt. (Ans.) 341, 489 (i).

Mt. Stewart (P.E.I.) sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ans.) 786 (i).

Napanee Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).

Orwell (P.E.I.) Customs sub-Collector (Ans.) 1743 (i).

—— (Brush Wharf) Preventive Officer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1301 (i).

Penetanguishene Customs Collector, Vacancy (Ans.) 261 (i).

Prince Edward Co., Preventive Officers (Ans.) 491 (i).

P. E. I. Customs Collector G. McDonald's Appnmt. (Ans.) 2125 (i).

Returns, on inquiry for (remarks) 4108, 4122 (ii).

St. Thomas (Ont.) Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ans.) 267 (i).

*Silver Spray* and *Mary Grover*, Seizure for infraction of Revenue Laws (Ans.) 928, 1300 (i).

Smuggling by American Whalers, Mackenzie River Basin (Ans.) 794 (i), 4735 (ii).

Strathroy Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Civil Government: Customs, 1730, 1980, (contingencies) 2072 (i).*

*Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 2552; (Que.) 2553; (Ont.) 2554; (N.W.T.) 2560; (B.C.) 2561 (i); (preventive service) 5002, 5014, 5040; conc., 5448 (ii). Miscellaneous, 2562 (i)*

*Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4947. Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2764 (ii).*

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1117, 1310 (i).

—— Preferential Clause (remarks) 1309 (i).

Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 257 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4015 (ii).

U. S. Whalers in Mackenzie River (Ans.) 749 (i); 4735 (ii).

Valleyfield Collector of Customs, Appnmt. (Ans.) 926 (i).

Veneers, Imports by Dom. Organ Co. (Ans.) 1545 (i).

**Paterson, Hon. W.—Con.**

Vernon River Bridge (P.E.I.) sub-Collector of Customs McDonald, Charges against (Ans.) 786 (i).

**Ways and Means—The Tariff :**

In Com.: Res. 1 (Customs Acts, Amts., definitions, &c.) 2842; (Res. 12) 2843; (Res. 14) 2844; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2945, 2953, 3141; (vermouth, &c.) 3357; (mutton, &c.) 3367; (Indian corn) 3409, 3422; (labels) 3474; (marble, &c.) 3497; (iron or steel angles) 3638; (iron forgings) 3639; (wire nails) 3640; (shoe tacks) 3652; (screws, &c.) 3655; (barbed wire) 3659; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3679, 4152; (brass wire) 3694; (iron or steel nuts) 3696; (skates, &c.) 3697; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4146; (agricultural implements) 4157; (clothes wringers) 4166; (watch cases) 4167; (cotton fabrics) 4180; (coal) 4468 (ii).

**Penny, Mr. E. G., Montreal (St. Lawrence).**

Dismissals in Montreal (Lachine Canal) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2575 (i).

Harbours and Breakwaters, Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2463 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Arrears of Interest (Ques.) 4471 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1786 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3781 (ii).*

**Ways and Means—The Tariff :**

In Com.: (wire nails) 3644 (ii).

**Perry, Mr. S., West Prince.**

Tignish Wharf, Dues Collected (Ques.) 3057 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2730 (ii).*

*Railways—Capital: P.E.I. Ry., 3851 (ii).*

**Ways and Means—The Tariff :**

In Com.: (Indian corn) 4465 (ii).

**Pettet, Mr. W. V., Prince Edward, Ont.**

Merrick, P. O. Inspector, Neglect of Duties (Ques.) 2409 (i).

Preventive Officers, Prince Edward Co. (Ques.) 491 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

*Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1922 (i).*

**Ways and Means—The Tariff :**

In Com.: (coal oil) 3496 (ii).

**Pope, Mr. R. H., Compton.**

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4307 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2645 (ii).*

**Pouliot, Mr. C. E., Temiscouata.**

McDonald, A. R., General Inspector, I.C.R.,  
Appnmt. (Ques.) 1078 (i).

**Poupore, Mr. W. J., Pontiac.**

Abittibi and Grand Lac Indians (Ques.) 2568 (i).  
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com.  
on Res., 4595 (ii).

Game Laws, Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup.,  
4022 (ii).

Hull Electric Co.'s (B. 20) 1<sup>st</sup>, 707; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 784.

Pontiac County, Drowned Lands, Claims un-  
settled (Ques.) 3869 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys., Pembroke Southern Ry., in  
Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).

—— Portage du Fort Ry., in Com. on Res., 5520.

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works—Capital*: Harbours and Rivers  
(St. Lawrence ship channel) 4873. *Income*:  
Buildings (N.S.) 4908; (Ottawa west deptl. block  
fire) 4884. Harbours and Rivers (Que., Gatineau  
River) 4960 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5312 (ii).

**Powell, Mr. H. A., Westmoreland.**

American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Belcourt)  
on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>. 3284 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) on M.  
for Com. on Res., 4601 (i).

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fair-  
lie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2380 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and  
Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) in  
Com. on Res., 4358; on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4677 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in  
Com., 4257 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton)  
in Com., 2463 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in  
Com., 5385, 5405 (ii).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr.  
Wood, Hamilton) on M. for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2455 (i).

Stanley Bridge and P.E.I. Ry., Pets. re Con-  
struction (Ques.) 2881 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3943 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional clerks)  
4848 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 4906;  
(Ottawa west. deptl. block, fire) 4881. Harbours  
and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 2733; (P.E.I.) 2731 (ii).

*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (rolling stock) 5322 (ii).

*Collection of Revenues*: I. C. R. (expenses of com-  
missions) 5254 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1603 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (books) 3472 (ii).

**Prefontaine, Mr. R., Maisonneuve.**

Address, on The, 385 (i).

La Banque du Peuple (B. 86) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1539 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in  
Com., 2467 (i).

**Prefontaine, Mr. R.—Con.**

Personal Explanation, par. in Montreal Gazette,  
re Preferential Clause, 2657 (ii).

Southern Counties Ry. incorp. (B. 110) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2653  
(ii.)

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: St. Pierre River, 5151 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Harbours and Rivers  
(Que.) 2737 (ii).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling  
(Amt.) 2548 (ii).

**Prior, Mr. E. G., Victoria, B.C.**

Ashcroft and Barkerville Mail Service (Ques.)  
2416 (i).

Behring Sea Seal Regulations, on Orders of the  
Day (remarks) 2570 (i).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provin-  
cial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. McInnes) 516 (i).

Esquimalt Post Office, Appnmt. of Telegraph  
Operator (Ques.) 1985 (i).

Fishing by Foreigners in B. C., Illegal (M. for  
Ret.\*) 2446 (i).

Fish Traps used by Americans in B. C. (Ques.)  
1376 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.)  
Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1389 (i).

Marine Lights, Fiddle Reef (Ques.) 1376 (i).

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff  
(remarks) 2219 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2219 (i).

Pacific-Yukon Route, Surveys (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Poaching by Americans, Deep-Sea Fisheries  
(Ques.) 1375 (i).

Quarantine Regulations, Victoria (remarks) 1554.

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contin-  
gent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 840 (i).

San Pedro, Removal of Wreck (Ques.) 1376 (i).

Silver and Lead Smelting in B. C., Payments re  
(Ques.) 3146 (ii).

Smuggling into the Yukon Country (Ques.) 1375.

## SUPPLY :

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, &c.)  
2294 (i).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (B.C.) 2591 (i).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 2269; (salaries and contingen-  
cies) 2205, 2226 (i).

William's Head Station, Quarantine Supt., Dis-  
missal (M. for Ret.\*) 1663 (i).

**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., Montreal (Ste. Anne's).**

Address, on The, 223; (explanation) 434 (i).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) in  
Com., 3553 (ii).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res.,  
5192 (ii).

Dismissals in Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup.,  
2572 (i).

—— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M.  
for Com. of Sup., 2368 (i).

Enright, Michael, Employee on Lachine Canal,  
Dismissal (Ques.) 2564 (i).

—— (M. for Cor.) 3537 (ii).

**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F.—*Con.***

- Inland Rev. Deptl. Changes, on M. to adjn., 4370 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°, 550 (i); 2° m., 3562.  
 — B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4256 (ii).  
 Lachine Canal Employees, Dismissals (Ques.) 923.  
 — Michael Enright (Ques.) 2564 (i).  
 — (M. for Cor.\*) 3537 (ii).  
 — Storeman Behan (M. for Cor.\*) 3537 (ii).  
 McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B. C.)  
 Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1385 (i).  
 Man. Schools Ques., Mr. *Fitzpatrick*'s Letter to  
 Hon. Ed. Blake (M. for copy) 836 (i).  
 "Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1549.  
 Personal Explanation *re* Can. Sugar Refinery  
 (remarks) 270 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in  
 Com., 4511, 4729 (ii).  
 Royal Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 27)  
 1°, 707 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat chal-  
 lenged, on M. to adjn., 967 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals—Capital*: Lachine, 3874; St. Pierre River,  
 5154. *Income*: Beauharnois (damages) 5132;  
 Lachine, conc., 5451 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue (contingencies)  
 4839; Justice (salaries) 4834 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (preventive ser-  
 vice) 5004, 5032, 5040, 5056; conc., 5450. Inspec-  
 tion of Staples, 5059. Railways (I. C. R., ex-  
 penses of commissions) 5257; (Baie de Cha-  
 leurs) 5149 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election  
 expenses) 4990 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (commissions of investigation) 5240.  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.)  
 4747, 4774; (payments to commissioners) 4802 (ii).  
*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (electric light-  
 ing, Ottawa) 4898. Harbours and Rivers (St.  
 Lawrence ship channel) 4874. *Income*: Build-  
 ings (Ottawa, west deptl. block fire) 4882. Har-  
 bours and Rivers (Man.) 4973; (Ont.) 4970 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 2267; (salaries and contingen-  
 cies) 2239 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R. (extension to Mon-  
 treal) 3778, 3827 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4151; (shirts  
 and shirt waists) 4185; (woollen fabrics) 4191;  
 (fur caps) 4192; (metal glove fasteners, &c.)  
 4466 (ii).

**Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.***

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop.  
 Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4243 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (rasps and files) 4141 (ii).

**Reid, Mr. J. D., *North Grenville.***

- Butter Trade with England (prop. Res.) 601,  
 1808 (i).  
 Carmichael, Andrew, Postmaster, Dismissal (M.  
 for Ret., &c.\*) 1057 (i).

**Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.***

- Cornwall and Beauharnois Canals, Cost of Breaks  
 in 1894-95 (Ques.) 2425 (i).  
 Freight Rates on Rys., Regulation (B. 63) 1°,  
 1299 (i).  
**SUPPLY :**  
*Civil Government*: Public Works, 1737 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Ont.) 2556 (i).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall)  
 2601. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2738 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3406 (ii).

**Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.***

- Address, on The, 371 (i).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie)  
 on M. for Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).  
 Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on  
 prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup.,  
 2137 (i).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M.  
 for 2°, 1017 (i).  
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°,  
 1373; 2° m., 1574 (i); in Com., 2926 (ii).  
 Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplmt. of Sealer  
*Diana* (remarks) 1810, 1824 (i).  
 Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s (B. 72) 1°, 1373.  
 Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°,  
 1172; in Com., 2163 (i).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1427 (i).  
 Vote on Preferential Clause (remarks) 2945 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: (wheat flour) 3446; (coal oil) 3478; (wire  
 nails) 3648; (agricultural implements) 4152 (ii).

**Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, *East Toronto.***

- Address, on The, 320 (i).  
 Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in  
 Com., 3550 (ii).  
 Copyright Act (1889) Govt. Action (Ques.) 1542.  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com.  
 on Res., 4543 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M.  
 for 2°, 906 (i).  
 Queen's Own Rifles, Rep. of Commission (Ques.)  
 1739 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr.  
*Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1787 (i).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1370 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2909; (books)  
 3465, 3707 (ii).

**Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.***

- Carstens, Mr., Immigration Agent, Winnipeg,  
 Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3720 (ii).  
 Coal, Bituminous, Steam and Slack, Imports  
 from U.S., 1896 (M. for Ret.\*) 3538 (ii).  
 Cottingham, W. S., Dismissal from Land Office  
 (Ques.) 4342 (ii).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie)  
 on M. for Com. of Sup., 2384 (i).

**Roche, Mr. W. J.—Con.**

- Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com of Sup., 2157 (i).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1012 (i).  
 Gretna Customs sub-Collector, J. F. Tennant's Dismissal (Ques.) 3503 (ii).  
 Portage la Prairie Post Office, Change of Site (Ques.) 2883 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1518 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : (wheat flour) 3456 (ii).

**Roddick, Mr. T. G., Montreal (St. Antoine).**

## SUPPLY :

- Marine and Fisheries* (tidal service) 2291 (i).

**Rogers, Mr. D. D., Frontenac.**

- Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4242 (ii).  
 Butter Exports, Bonus, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 1806 (i).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4585 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4129 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* (Trent Valley) 3563 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2619 (i).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2092 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com., Res. 16 (preferential clause), 2944, 3023, 3231; (mutton, &c.) 3369; (surgical instruments) 3477; (coal oil) 3479; (china ware, &c.) 3496; (shovels) 3703; (paintings, &c.) 3709; (agricultural implements) 4155.

**Rosamond, Mr. B., North Lanark.**

- Continental Heat and Light Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°, 1538; 2° m., 1632 (i).  
 Mycenian Marble Co. of Can. Relief (B. 83) 1°, 1538; 2° m., 1632 (i).  
 Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (B. 91) 1°, 1666.

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Ont.) 2589 (i).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com.: (woollen yarns) 4187; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (coal, bituminous) 4202 (ii).

**Russell, Mr. B., Halifax.**

- Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).  
 Farm Implements, Vote on Mr. *Davin*'s Amt., (Personal Explanation) 2298 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* : Grenville (dismissals) 3960 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues* : Post Office (mail service) 5060.  
*Quarantine* (salaries and contingencies) 2246 (ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3108; (skates, &c.) 3697; (files and rasps) 3702 (ii).

**Rutherford, Mr., Macdonald, Man.**

- Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4569 (ii).  
 Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. *Fairlie*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2376 (i).  
 Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3518 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income* : Buildings (Portage La-prairie P. O.) 4953. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4972 (ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : (wheat flour) 3442; (shoe tacks) 3653; (strip fencing) 3692; (hides and skins) 3712 (ii).

**Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.**

- Criminal Code Amt. (Seduction and Abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) conc. in Amts. (M.) 3542.  
 Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Guay*) in Com., 3539 (ii).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 15 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5494 (ii).  
 — Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5514 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* : Customs (preventive service) 5046 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5438 (ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4152 (ii).

**Seagram, Mr. J. E., North Waterloo.**

## SUPPLY :

- Collection of Revenues* : Customs (Ont.) 2559 (i).

**Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.**

- Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1070 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.S.) 4933 (ii).  
*Ways and Means*—The Tariff :  
 In Com. : (strip fencing) 3692 (ii).

**Sifton, Hon. C. (Minister of Interior) Brandon.**

- Abittibi and Grand Lac Indians (Ans.) 2568 (i).  
 Alaska Boundary, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2743 (ii).  
 — Papers respecting (remarks) 2887 (ii).  
 — and B.C. (remarks) 3419 (ii).  
 — Memo. re (remarks) 4107 (ii).  
 C.P.R. Land Grants, Patents and Exemptions (Ans.) 2883, 3235 (ii).  
 Cape Croker Indian Agent McIver (Ans.) 574, 788 (i).  
 Carstens, Mr., Immigration Agent, Winnipeg, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3720 (ii).  
 Champain, Emmanuel, Claim against Govt. by Rebellion, 1885 (Ans.) 490 (i).  
 Cottingham, W. S., Dismissal from Land Office (Ans.) 4342 (ii).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Daly, Hon. T. M., Rep. on Immigration (Ans.) 922 (i).
- Dismissals, Land Office, Man., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4018, 4024, 4031 (ii).
- Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2310 (i).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 61 (Mr. Davin) on M. for 2°, 2037 (i).
- (B. 116) 1°, 2798; 2°, 4118 (ii).
- Game Laws, Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
- Gold Discoveries, Harrison Lake Region (Ans.) 1744 (i).
- Gold Dredging, Stewart River, Yukon, Tenders, &c., 1740 (i).
- Grundy, Ernest, late Postmaster at Duck Lake (Ans.) 3870 (ii).
- Immigration Agent to Ireland, E. O'Kelly's Appmnt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
- Agents, &c., Superannuation (Ans.) 573 (i).
- Indian Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 492 (i).
- Cor. unanswered (Ans.) 1984 (i).
- Office, Regina, Removal to Winnipeg (Ans.) 1985 (i).
- Indians, Man. and N. W. T., Supplies under Treaty, Tenders (Ans.) 487 (i).
- Peace River and Athabasca Regions (Ans.) 1986 (i).
- Jury, Alf., Immigration Agent, and Toronto Street Ry. (Ans.) 2217 (i).
- Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 115) 1°, 2798 (ii).
- McGirr, Wm., Notification of Superannuation (Ans.) 1987 (i).
- Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
- Mitchell, Dr. Geo., Dismissal (Ans.) 927 (i).
- N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 2797; in Com., 4110 (ii).
- Saugeen Reserve, Indian Agent Crowe (Ans.) 340, 573, 788 (i).
- Seed Grain, Amounts owing by Farmers, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1989 (i).
- Stockholm Exhibition, Walton Jones's Appmnt. (Ans.) 1984 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* : Indian Dept., 1709; Interior, 1669, (contingencies) 2068; Justice, 1667; Mounted Police, 1709 (i).
- Dominion Lands—Capital* (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).
- Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2801, 3743, 4033, 4053; (general expenses) 4066 (ii).
- Indians* : B. C. (surveys, &c.) 4077; Man. and N.W.T. (supplies) 4075; Oka (removal to Gibson) 4073 (ii).
- Geological Survey*, 4072 (ii).
- Government of N. W. T.* (schools) 4082 (ii).
- Miscellaneous* (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4083 (ii).
- Mounted Police* (pay of force) 4078 (ii).
- Walpole Island Indians, Appmnt. of Physician (Ans.) 787 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
In Com. : (wheat flour) 3460 (ii).
- Winnipeg Industrial School, Name of Principal, Date of Appmnt. (Ans.) 490 (i).

**Snetsinger, Mr., Cornwall and Stormont.**

- Ont. Pacific Ry. Co., Change of Title (B. 28) 1°\*, 707 (i).
- SUPPLY :**
- Canals—Capital* : Cornwall, 5117; Grenville (dismissals) 3908 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
In Com. : Res. 17 (combine clause) 3348 (ii).

**Somerville, Mr. J., North Wentworth and Brant.**

- Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 1665 (i).
- Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4735 (ii).
- Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3719 (ii).
- Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. Rosamond) in Com., 2347 (i).
- SUPPLY :**
- Canals—Capital* : Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5122 (ii).
- Civil Government* : Interior, 1678 (i).
- Collection of Revenues* : Customs (preventive service) 5043 (ii).
- Public Works—Income* : Buildings (N.B.) 4942, 5279, conc., 5437; (Kentville, &c., P.O.) 4901; (Que., Montmagny P. O.) 5283 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff* :  
In Com. : (files and rasps) 4130 (ii).

**Speaker, Mr. (HON. JAS. D. EDGAR) North Ontario.**

- Address, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1900 (i).
- American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Belcourt) on M. for 3° (ruling) 3006 (ii).
- Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Procedure (ruling) 3990 (ii).
- Bibaud, Azaire, Emplmt. in House of Commons (Ans.) 3509 (ii).
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Oster) on M. for 2°, 946 (i).
- Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps. (read) 1, 420, 481, 1631 (i).
- Debate, Irrelevancy of, 827, 852 (i), 3031, 5419 (ii).
- Elections, Certificates received during recess (read) 3 (i).
- Election Petitions, Judges' Certificates, &c. (read) 2 (i).
- Franchise Act Amt. B., on M. for 2°, 724; (ruling) 730, 750 (i).
- on M. to adjn. (remarks) 549 (i).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c., 1900 (i).
- Govt. of N.W.T., Order (Ques. of) 1044 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 2926 (ii).
- House of Commons Restaurant, Sale of Liquor (remarks) 672 (i).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Hull Electric Co.'s B. (ruling) 784 (i).  
 Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction, on Ques. (remarks) 1544 (i).  
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 492 (i).  
 Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to pass (remarks) 2448 (i).  
 Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).  
 Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. (remarks) 268 (i).  
 Members Absence before Prorogation, par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 5159 (ii).  
 Member called to Order, 3736; (ruling) 3737 (ii).  
 Members, New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 86, 950, 1664, 1983 (i).  
 Members' remarks checked, 163, 555, 562, 699, 711, 714, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462, 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299 (i); 3398, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5070, 5229, 5462 (ii).  
 Members requested to keep Order, 1381 (i).  
 ——— to withdraw statement, 2239 (i).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 492, 667, 1900 (i); 2659, 3742, 4008, 4013, 5009 (ii).  
 Ministers answering Ques. (remarks) 789 (i).  
 Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (remarks) 1229 (i).  
 Order, Ques. of, Member quoting previous Debate (ruling) 827 (i).  
 ——— Member transgressing Rules, 367 (i).  
 Parliament, Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fielding*) Member called to Order, 177 (i).  
 ——— (Mr. *McInnes*) 711, 714 (i).  
 Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce, (remarks) 3506 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5378 (ii).  
 Private Bills, on ref. to Com. (remarks) 1227 (i).  
 Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 5542 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) on Chairman's Ruling, 2130 (i).  
 Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *McNeil*) Member adjourning Deb. (ruling) 167, 180 (i).  
 Public Bills, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place Bills Nos. 2 and 3 on Order Paper, 3500 (ii).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee, on M. to adjn. Hse., 947 (i).  
 Question put by Member containing Statement of Facts (remarks) 569 (i).  
 Question ruled out of Order, 926 (i), 3972 (ii).  
 Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i), 4046 (ii).  
 Routine Proceedings, Error in Printing (remarks) 1231 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Election, Member to conclude remarks with a Motion, 953; (ruling) 959 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B., Proceedings of Hse. null and void (remarks) 5540 (ii).  
 Saturday Sittings (remarks) 4472 (i).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Seed Grain, Distribution in Man. and N. W. T., Amounts outstanding (Ans.) 2215 (i).  
 Speech from the Throne (rep.) 4 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Collection of Revenues: Public Works, conc.* (remarks) 5417 (ii).  
*Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies)* 2103; (extra clerks) 2103 (i); (translators) 4846 (ii); (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional indemnity) 4856 (ii).  
 Unparliamentary language, 235, 882, 1909, 2139.  
 Vacancies (notification) 3 (i).  
 Votes and Proceedings, Changes (remarks) 1452.  
 Warrants for Writs of Election, 1, 420, 481 (i).  
 Tariff, The, Ques. of Order (ruling) 2953 (ii).  
 ——— Members Voting, 2945 (ii).  
 Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. that B. pass (remarks) 2449 (i).
- Speaker, Deputy (MR. L. P. BRODEUR) Rouville.**  
 Member, New, Certificate of Return (notification) 86 (i).  
 Members' remarks checked, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 5401, 5403, 5316 (ii).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5009 (ii).  
 Order, Ques. of, Member requested to withdraw statement, 2624 (ii).  
 ——— (ruling) 3326 (ii).  
 ——— (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of conspiracy (remarks) 5303; (ruling) 5305 (ii).  
 Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B., on M. for 2°, 2166 (i).  
 Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 2741 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.)* 4943 (ii).  
 Vote in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 2546 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*  
 In Com.: (coal oil) 3479; (scrap iron) ruling, 3630 (ii).
- Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.**  
 Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 638 (i).  
 B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 533 (i).  
 Business of the House, on M. to adjn., 4203; (remarks) 5087 (ii).  
 Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Ostler*) in Com., 2338 (i).  
 Cataract Power Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) in Com., 4052 (ii).  
 Cattle Shipping Regulations (Ques.) 2217 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2025 (i).  
 ——— Examinations, Appnmts. to P. O. Dept. (Ques.) 2564 (i).  
 Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4547; in Com. on B., 5168 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

- Customs Deptl. Appnmts. (Ques.) 2422 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4123 (ii).  
 Dismissal, Mr. Dobbin, Land Office, Winnipeg, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).  
 ——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2316 (i).  
 Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5465 (ii).  
 Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4702 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 897 (i).  
 Immigration Agents, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 572 (i).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. Co. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4347, 4373; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 4654, 4667 (ii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4252 (ii).  
 Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2605 (i).  
 Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2345 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 2140 (i).  
 Patents for Wire Fences, Number Granted, &c. (Ques.) 2882 (ii).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Henry's and Rothwell's promotions, 1901 (i).  
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com., 4720 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4501, 4727, 5381, 5537 (ii).  
 Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 1665 (i).  
 Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 813 (i).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 844 (i).  
 Questions by Members not in Order (remarks) 3975.  
 Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1789 (i).  
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5367, 5490 (ii).  
 ——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).  
 ——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5514 (ii).  
 Superannuations, July, 1896, to April, 1897, Names, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (travelling expenses. Man.) 4842 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (agricultural societies) 2109; (cold storage) 2274; (dairy interests, butter and cheese) 2119, 2196; (experimental farms) 2115; (*Patent Record*) 2107 (i); (*Stockholm Exhibition*) 4859 (ii); (*Year-book*) 2108 (i).  
*Canals—Capital*: Beauharnois, 5273; Grenville (dismissals) 3680, 3969; Lachine, 4824; St. Pierre River, 5154; Sault Ste. Marie, 5117 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Civil Government*: Agriculture (contingencies) 2079; Customs (contingencies) 2079 (i); Indian Dept. (sec.'s salary) 4828 (ii); Interior, 1669, 1676, 1691 (i), (salaries) 4837 (ii); Justice, 1666, (i), 4834; Militia (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 2083 (i), (statutory increases) 5079, (technical services) 5108; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4830 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (B.C.) 2561 (i), (preventive service) 5014 (ii); (N.W.T.) 2560; (P.E.I.) 2552. Miscellaneous, 2562 (i). Public Works, conc., 5416. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5148, 5453 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2548 (i).  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).  
*Geological Survey*, 4072 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 4033, 4052; (general expenses) 4068, 4993 (ii).  
*Indians*: Oka (removal to Gibson) 4073; (inspectors) 4078 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988, 5059, conc., 5451 (ii); (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2101; (official debates) 2105; (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional clerks) 4849 (ii); (voters' lists), 2106 (i).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries) 2293 (i).  
*Militia* (Military College) 4808 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 4082, conc., 5423; (commissions of investigation) conc., 5429; (tariff inquiry) 5211 (ii).  
*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 4078 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4745 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 4920, conc., 5434; (Ont.) 2586, (Ottawa, grounds, &c.) 4948; (Que.) 5281, (Montmagny P.O.) 5284; (Man., Portage Laprairie P.O.) 2589. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2739, 4967; (Collingwood Harbour) 2766 (Fort Francis Locks) 4970. Dredging, 2780.  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 2264; (hog cholera, slaughter) 2270; (Man. Hospitals) 2263; (salaries, &c.) 2203, 2232; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2262 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5291, 5296, 5309, 5339, conc., 5477; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5465 (ii).  
*Scientific Institutions* (hydrographic service) 2295.  
 Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4215 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1409 (i).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3104, 3116, 3147, 3167, 3174; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3296; (mutton, &c.) 3361; (cornmeal) 3441; (wheat flour) 3443, 3450; (strip fencing, &c.) 3683; (files and rasps) 3701, 4140; (agricultural implements) 4166; (watch cases) 4168; (sugar) 4398; (Indian corn) 4402 (ii).  
 Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1054 (i).  
 Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5228 (ii).

**Stenson, Mr. M. T., Richmond and Wolfe.**

- Farm, Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2155 (i).

**Stenson, Mr. M. T.—Con.**

Militia Camps, Eastern Townships, Battalions  
(Ques.) 3668 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 4060 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall)  
2637 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (Indian corn) 4417 (ii).

**Stubbs, Mr. W., Cardwell.**

Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop.  
Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4244 (ii).

**Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.**

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr.  
*Oslcr*) in Com., 2339 (i).

Dom. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr.  
*Gibson*) 2° m., 2777 (ii).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Mc-*  
*Mullen*) on M. for 2°, 3573 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr.  
*Richardson*) in Com., 2165; on M. to pass B.  
(remarks) 2448 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.)  
on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1391 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in  
Com., 5412 (ii).

Private Bills, ref. to Coms. (M.) 1227 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) Senate and I.C.R. Extension  
to Montreal, 5038 (ii).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr.  
*Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2776 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B., pro-  
ceedings of Hse. null and void (M.) 5537, 5539.

Stationary Engineers, Examination, &c. (B. 108)  
1°, 2408 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., Ont. and Rainy River, in Com.  
on Res., 5517 (ii).

— Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com.  
on Res., 5518 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3894;  
(construction) 5130 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (sessional indem-  
nity) 4854 (i).

*Militia* (Jubilee contingent) 2660 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.B.) 4946;  
(N.S.) 4938 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (salt, &c.) 3714 (ii).

Welland Power Supply Canal Co.'s (B. 44) 1°\*,  
1072 (i).

**Talbot, Mr. O. E., Bellechasse.**

Address, on The, 322 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Collection of Revenues*: Railways (Baie de  
Chaleurs) 5141 (ii).

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.)  
4795 (ii).

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Que., Mont-  
magny P.O.) 5281 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff* :

In Com. : (coal oil) 3480; (cornmeal) 3435; (strip  
fencing) 3688 (ii).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I., (Minister of Public Works)**

*St. John and Iberville.*

Address, on The, 236 (i).

Belle River (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Extension  
(Ans.) 918 (i).

Campobello Breakwater (N.B.) Repairs (Ans.)  
2565 (i).

*Challenger*, Dredge, Work done at Midland  
(Ans.) 260 (i).

Civil Service Examinations, Appnmts. to P.O.  
Dept. (Ans.) 2564 (i).

Clerks of Works, Govt., and Private Practice  
(Ans.) 1306 (i).

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie)  
on M. for Com. of Sup., 2324 (i).

Fire in West Deptl. Block, Documents destroyed  
(Ans.) 919 (i).

— Repairs to Roof (Ans.) 1301 (i).

Grand River Wharf, Construction, non-Payment  
of Labourers (Ans.) 790 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures, &c. (Ans.)  
3971 (ii).

Harrison River Rapids, Improvements (Ans.)  
1744 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup.,  
3775, 5229; conc., 5461 (ii).

Iona (N.S.) Repairs to Wharf, &c. (Ans.) 1740 (i).

*La Libre Parole*, Libellous Statements against  
Min. of Crown (Ans.) 3972.

Langevin Block, Contractor's Claims (Ans.) 791.

L'Ardoise (N.S.) Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.)  
670 (i).

Laprairie P.O., Change of Site (Ans.) 2883 (ii).

*Lily*, Tug, Payments by Govt. for Hire (Ans.)  
1810 (i).

McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works,  
Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Margaretsville (N.S.) Pier, Tenders for Contract,  
&c. (Ans.) 3869 (ii).

Nicolet River (P.Q.) Breakwater, Repairs, &c.  
(Ans.) 671 (i).

North River, St. Ann's (N.S.) Pets. *re* Building  
Wharf (Ans.) 1740 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused  
of Conspiracy, 5302 (ii).

Ottawa Deptl. Building, Fire, Repairs to Roof,  
Tenders (Ans.) 1301 (i).

Owen Sound and Collingwood Harbours, Expen-  
diture (Ans.) 796 (i).

Parliament Grounds, Repairing Walks (Ans.)  
5037 (ii).

Piers, &c., Annapolis Co. (N.S.) Repairs, &c.  
(Ans.) 486, 487 (i).

Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., Deceased (remarks) 5185

*Prince Edward*, Dredge, Charges against Capt.  
(Ans.) 792 (i).

McKenzie, Capt. Wm., of Dredge *Canada*, Dis-  
missal (Ans.) 1743 (i).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Monument commemorative  
(Ans.) 3508 (ii).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I.—Con.**

Richelieu River, Works at Belœil, Tenders (Ans.) 1302 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening, &c., Amts. Paid (Ans.) 3867 (ii).

Strathroy Post Office, Tenders and Contract (Ans.) 797 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., Richelieu Valley, in Com. on Res., 5520 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Canals—Capital:* Lachine, 4892 (ii).

*Civil Government:* Public Works, 1735 (i); (History of Public Works, 4893 (ii).

*Public Works—Capital:* Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897, conc., 5431; (west deptl. block, fire) 4893 (ii). Dredging (Kaministiquia River) 2577; (St. Lawrence River channel) 2576 (i). Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4865 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2591 (i), 4956; (N.B.) 4941, 5278; (N.S.) 4901 (ii); (Ont.) 2578 (i), 4948; (Alexandria reformatory) 4949; (Kingston drill hall) 4948; Ottawa grounds, &c.) 4948; (Smith's Falls P. O.) 4949; (Ottawa) 4948; (Rideau Hall) 2592, 2618 (i), 4888, (ii); (telephone service) 2653; (Major's Hill Park) 2654; (Rents, Dom. Buildings), 2654; (west deptl. block, fire) 4880; (Man. immigration shed) 4950 (ii); (Portage Laprairie P. O.) 2589 (i), 4951; Rat Portage P. O.: 5285 (ii); (N. W. T.) 2590 (i), 2787; (Que., Montmagny P. O.) 5263; (Montreal P. O.) 4947; (Montreal drill shed) 4947, conc. 5456 (ii). (Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 4975 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4974; (dredging) 2780, 2889; (Man.) 4971; (Mar. Provs.) 2734, 4889; (N.B.) 2732, 4956, 4958; (N.S.) 2719, 2728, 4956; (Ont.) 2738, 2773, 2778; (Collingwood Harbour) 2759; (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Manitoulin Island) 4964; (P.E.I.) 2730, 4958; (Que.) 2735, 4958; (Gatineau River) 4959; (Rimouski Pier) 4964; (Little Rapids Lock) conc., 5445. Miscellaneous (architects, &c., salaries) 4890; (clerical assistance) 4892. Telegraph Lines (N. W. T.) 2790; (P. E. I.) 2788 (ii).

*Railways—Capital:* I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3775; (rolling stock) 5229; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5461 (ii).

Sussex (N.B.) Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Caretaker (Ans.) 262 (i).

Telegraph Lines in B. C., Govt. and C. P. R. (Ans.) 2567 (i).

Valleyfield Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2567 (i).

Westminster and Burrard Telephone Co. (Ans.) 2420 (i).

Wood Island (P.E.I.) Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 792 (i).

**Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.**

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan) on M. for 2°, 627 (i); in Com., 3545 (ii).

— Prohibition (B. 6) 1°, 89; 2° m., 660 (i).

American Bank Note Co. and Mr. Reid's relation thereto (Ques.) 2881 (ii).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1846 (i).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°, 1072 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4592 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2403 (i).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2148 (i).

Gananoque Drill Shed, Removal (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Hardy, Hon. Mr., Speeches Distributed from House of Commons (Ques.) 3741 (ii).

Immigration Agent to Ireland, E. O'Kelley's Appnmt. (Ques.) 669 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Dismissal of Guards (Ques.) 3338 (ii).

*La Libre Parole*, Libellous Statements against Min. of Crown (Ques.) 3971 (ii).

Mail Service, Ottawa and Brockville West (remarks) 4106 (ii).

Melocheville Postmaster, Stamp Sales (Ques.) 2418 (i).

Members' Absence before Prorogation, par. in Montreal Gazette (remarks) 5159 (ii).

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2221 (i).

Niagara and Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 37) 1°, 914 (i).

Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce (Ques.) 3506 (ii).

Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 555 (i).

River St. Claire Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 41) 1°, 1072 (i).

Shannon, Jas., Postmaster, Kingston, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3058 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 5502 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairy interests, butter and cheese) 2186 (i).

*Canals—Capital:* Grenville (dismissals) 3905 (ii). *Collection of Revenues:* Customs (preventive service) 5040 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2820 (i).

*Indians:* Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities, retired officers) 5000 (ii).

*Legislation:* House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091; (salaries) 2103 (i); (sessional indemnity, &c.) 4845, 4853 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4945 (ii).

*Miscellaneous* (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4862 (ii).

*Public Works—Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 4913 (ii); (Ont.) 2585 (i); (Rat Portage) 5286 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 2592, 2615 (i), 4885; (west deptl. block, fire) 4884; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5283. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4968 (ii).

Thousand Islands, Purchase from Indian Dept. (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Tariff, The, Members Votes, 2944 (ii).

— on Ques. of Order, 2953 (ii).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.***Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. ; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3115, 3180 ; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3311, 3329 ; (mutton, &c.) 3365 ; (Indian corn) 3417, 3426 ; (wheat flour) 3443 ; (coal oil) 3482 ; (iron forgings) 3639 ; (springs, axles, &c.) 3640 ; (wire nails) 3643 ; (barbed wire) 3663 ; (strip fencing) 3688 ; (iron or steel nuts) 3696 ; (files and rasps) 3702 ; (shovels) 3703 ; (free list, remarks) 3706 ; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711 ; (oleo-stearine, &c.) 3712 ; (salt, &c.) 3714 ; (Norway iron, &c.) 3718 ; (cotton fabrics) 4180 ; (Indian corn) 4450 ; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466 ; (carriage hardware) 4470 (ii).

Weights and Measures Inspector, Port Arthur, Appnmt. (Ques.) 793 (i).

**Tisdale, Hon. D., South Norfolk.**

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Osler) in Com., 2611 (i), 2920 (ii).

Dismissals, Land Office, Man., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4017 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4252 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Richardson) in Com., 2602 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4733 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Militia* (Military College) 4806, 4821 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff :*

In Com. : (Indian corn) 4419 (ii).

Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 4208 ; in Com., 4215 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. Casey) on ref. to Com., 614 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir C., Bart., Cape Breton.**

Address, on The, 22 ; (remarks) 191 (i).

— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty, 3245 (ii).

Alaska Boundary, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2742 (ii).

— and B.C. (remarks) 3418 (ii).

— Memo. *re* (remarks) 4107 (ii).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).

— (M. for papers) 1835 (i).

Appnmts. by late Govt., Recommendations of Treasury Board (M. for Ret.) 1639 (i).

— present Government (M. for Ret.) 1055 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Colonial Sec.'s Stmt. *re* Contract (Ques.) 783 (i).

— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 928 (i).

— Tenders, on M. for copies, 2426 (i).

— par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 2742 (ii).

— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2775 (ii).

— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3987, 4231 (ii).

Beansville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1765 (i).

Behring Sea Convention, Re-opening, London Press Cor. (remarks) 4472 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 783 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—Con.**

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Osler) in Com., 2338, 2344 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. McMullen) on M. for 1°, 776 (i).

— Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4119 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 4529 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. Davies) in Com., 4126 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Service, B. C. Quarantine Station, 2406 (i).

East Bay (C.B.) Post Office, Removal (Ques.) 4366 (ii).

Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks), 2021 (i), 3873 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 90 ; on M. for 2°, 973 (i).

— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 546 (i).

G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of \$300,000, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 578 (i).

Inland Rev., Deptl. Changes, on M. to adjn. 4367 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (Ques.) 1304 (i).

— (remarks) 1545 (i), 3540 (ii).

— par. in Speech from the Throne (remarks) 2657 (ii).

— (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. Blair) on M. for Com. on Res., 4259 ; in

Com., 4344-4394 ; on M. for 1° of B., 4478 (ii).

— Employees Dismissed at Antigonish (Ques.) 2565 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 3745, 3785 (ii).

Lobster Fishery of Cape Breton (remarks) 2051 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. Charlton) in Com., 2461 (i).

Military College, Kingston, Change in Administration (remarks) 3540, 4180 (ii).

— Professional Staff (Ques.) 4120 (ii).

— Sergeants, Services Dispensed with (Ques.) 4121 (ii).

Ministers answering Ques. (remarks) 789 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. Sifton) in Com., 4110 (ii).

Pacific Cable, Govt. Action (remarks) 4109 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Duty on Coal (remarks) 673 (i).

— (Mr. Choquette) 4205 (ii).

Pirate Harbour Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 1028.

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 4504 (ii).

Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 556 (i).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty (remarks) 2021 (i), 3873 (ii).

Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 811 (i).

Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 4373 (ii).

— Diamond Jubilee, on M. to adjn., 948 (i).

Questions Ruled out of Order (remarks) 3972 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—Con.**

- Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 617 (i).  
 Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3517 (ii).  
 Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 3°, 2457 (i); on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).  
 Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).  
 Returns (inquiry) 4108 (ii).  
 St. Lawrence River Canals, Improvements (Ques.) 2423 (i).  
 Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn., 956, 964 (i).  
 Saturday Sittings (Ques.) 4394 (ii).  
 Sunny Brae and Melrose Mail Contract (Ques.) 1027 (i).  
 Superannuation Act (C. S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 169; on M. for 2°, 552 (i).  
 Public Officials, &c., under Present Administration (M. for Ret.) 2447 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage) 2280 (ii).  
*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3875, 3937.  
*Charges of Management*, 1566 (i).  
*Civil Government*: Auditor General (contingencies) 2071, 2078; (High Commissioner) 1982; Interior, 1679; Railways and Canals, 1950, 1962 (i).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 2816, 3743, 4034 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2096; (official debates) 2105 (i).  
*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Halifax and Nfld.) 2790 (ii).  
*Marine* (tidal service) 2293 (i).  
*Militia* (Jubilee contingent) 2661; (Military College) 4480 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries*, 2795 (ii).  
*Public Works*: *Income*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2640. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2785; (N. S.) 2719; (Ont.) 2774. Miscellaneous (Monument to late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 2789 (ii).  
*Quarantine* (salaries, &c.) 2231; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2362 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: L.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3745, 3785 (ii).  
 Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4207; in Com., 4212 (ii).  
 Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1258 (i).  
 Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4016 (ii).  
 Trade with the Empire, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 4104 (ii).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1258 (i).  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2845, 2960, 3095, 3101, 3133; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3247; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (mutton, &c.) 3359, 3384; (cornmeal) 3424; (books) 3466; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (surgical instruments) 3478; (coal oil) 3490 (iron or steel scrap) 3628; (iron or steel angles) 3687; (sugar) 4395 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., Pictou.**

- Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3550 (ii).  
 American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3003, 3274 (ii).  
 Annapolis Royal Post Office, Mr. West's Appnmt., on M. for Ret., 2014 (i).  
 Bunker Island Marine Hospital, Mrs. Le Caine's Dismissal (Ques.) 3504, 3866. (ii).  
 Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3583 (ii).  
 Cameron, John, Savings Bank Agent, New Glasgow, Appnmt., &c. (M. for Ret.)\* 3448 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act, Min. of Justice's Opinion (Ques.) 2124 (i).  
 — Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 4119 (ii).  
 Customs and Inland Rev. Dept. Repeal B. 125 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3580 (ii).  
 County Court Judges, Commissions without Legislation (Ques.) 2124 (i).  
 Criminal Code Amt. (Seduction and Abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3543 (ii).  
 Dismissals (Hughes, Noonan and Davis) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).  
 — Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2393 (i).  
 Dobson, Wm., Postmaster, Tatamagouche, Resignation (Ques.) 1541 (i).  
 Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3724 (ii).  
 Fisheries Protection Service, Officers on Govt. Steamers (remarks) 3671 (ii).  
 — Supplies and Repairs to Vessels, &c. (M. for Ret.)\* 2447 (i).  
 Forged and Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723.  
 Cahan, Convict, Release from Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) 3339 (i).  
 Goodwin vs. The Queen, par. in *Toronto Globe* (Ques.) 3840 (ii).  
 Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1574 (i).  
 "Indian Gardens" Reserve (N.S.) Sale of Hay (Ques.) 3509 (ii).  
 Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3571 (ii).  
 I. C. R. Car Inspector at Stellarton, Dismissal (M. for Ret.)\* 1663 (ii).  
 — Fuel Inspector, W. B. Moore, Dismissal (Ques.) 1541 (i).  
 Isaac's Harbour Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4106 (ii).  
 Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt. of Mr. Gunn (Ques.) 3740, 3865 (ii).  
 — Mr. Shannon's Superannuation (Ques.) 2653 (i).  
 Kinney, L. W., Postmaster at Salem, Dismissal (Ques.) 2411 (i).  
 Lobster Fishing in Cape Breton (remarks) 1550.

**Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—Con.**

- McDonald, G., Appnmt., sub-Collector of Customs (Ques.) 2125 (i).  
 McLean, James, Foreman Carpenter, I.C.R. (Ques.) 2121 (ii).  
 McLeod and McKay, Messrs., Bridge Tenders on I.C.R., Dismissal (M. for Rep. \*) 2447 (i).  
 ——— Ret. (inquiry) 3743 (ii).  
 McKenzie, Capt. Wm., Dredge *Canada*, Dismissal (Ques.) 1743 (i).  
 McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1387.  
 Mabou Harbour Buoy Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4206, 4226 (ii).  
 Mackerel Fishery in N.S., Protection to Fishermen, on M. to adjn., (remarks) 3674 (ii).  
 Militia Camp, Aldershot, Queen's Co., N.S., Supplies (M. for Ret. \*) 2448 (i).  
*Newfield*, Str., Appnmts. (Ques.) 2125 (i).  
 N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4116 (ii).  
 Orangedale, Margaree, &c., Mail Contracts (Ques.) 4365 (ii).  
 Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Guay*) in Com., 3539 (i).  
 Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 3583 (ii).  
 Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3560 (ii).  
 Returns, (inquiries) 2054, 2298 (i), 2969, 3419, 3743 (ii).  
 St. Andrew's P.O. (N.S.) Rep. respecting late Fire (Ques.) 3235 (ii).  
 Shannon, Mr. James, Postmaster at Kingston, Superannuation (Ques.) 2653 (ii).  
 Shubenacadie and Dean Mail Contract (M. for Ret. \*) 1663 (i).  
 Sullivan, Danl. Brian, Release from Prison (M. for papers \*) 1663 (i); (Ques.) 3583 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (travelling allowances, Judges of Man.) conc., 3731 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue, 1919 (i); Marine and Fisheries, conc., 3730 (ii); Railways and Canals, 1935, 1943 (i).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (Que.) 2553. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2514 (i).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 3745, 4034 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2094 (i).  
*Fisheries* (oyster culture) 2552 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (litigated matters) 3863 (ii).  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 2578 (i).  
*Railways—Capital*: I. C. R., 3834. P. E. I. Ry., 3353 (ii).  
 Tariff Res., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2480 (i).  
 Walsh, C. J., Claim on Leeward Islands Govt. (remarks) 3676 (ii).  
*Ways and Means—The Tariff*:  
 In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2989; (iron or steel, scrap) 3583 (ii).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.**

- Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2389 (i).  
 Kingston and London Barracks, Wood Contracts (Ans.) 2425 (i).  
 Military College, Kingston, Reorganization (M. for Ret. \*) 2447 (i).  
 Returns (inquiry) 2969 (ii).  
 Tottenham and Athlone Mail Contracts, Cancellation (M. for Cor. \*) 3537 (ii).

**Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C., West York.**

- Address, on The, 300 (i).  
 Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 654 (i).  
 Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2757 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5011, 5039 (ii).  
 Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5176 (ii).  
 Dismissals from Public Service, B.C. Quarantine Station, 2105 (i).  
 Don. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).  
 I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4051, 4330, 4383 (ii).  
 ——— conc., 5459 (ii).  
 Morrisburg Customs Collector, Dismissal (Ques.) 489 (i).  
 Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2346 (i).  
 Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5099 (ii).  
 Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Bank Holiday (Ques.) 4372 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (dairy interests, cheese and butter) 2202 (i); (N.W.T. Exhibition) 4859.  
*Canals—Capital*: Grenville (dismissals) 3884; Trent Valley (construction) 5127 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Interior, 1702 (i); Justice (salaries) 4835; Post Office (statutory increases) 5110, (technical services) 5109 (ii).  
*Collection of Revenues*: Customs (B.C.) 2561; (N.S.) 2552; (Ont.) 2555; (Que.) 2554 (i); (preventive service) 5002, 5020, conc., 5446. Post Office (mail service) 5067; (outside service) conc., 5418 (ii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988; (translators) 4847; (sessional indemnity) 4852 (ii).  
*Immigration* (agents' salaries) 3745, 4056 (ii).  
*Indians*: Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities retired officers) 5000 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 3863 (ii).  
*Militia* (Military College) 4822 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (tariff inquiry) 5212 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (gratuities, retired officers) 4987. Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4762, 4797 (ii).

**Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C.—Con.**SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Public Works—Capital: Buildings* (electric lighting) 4897. *Harbours and Rivers* (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4873. *Income: Buildings* (N.B.) 4947; (N.S.) 4910, conc., 5439; (Ottawa) 4948: (Rideau Hall) 2600, 2647, 4887; (west deptl. block, fire) 4882; (Que.) 5456. *Harbours and Rivers* (Ont., Collingwood Harbour) 2767; (Manitoulin Island) 4964; (Que., Gatineau River) 4960 (ii).

*Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.)* conc., 5459 (ii).

*Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding)* 1471 (i).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

*In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause)* 3060; *Res. 17 (combine clause)* 3271, 3290, 3332; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3353; (Indian corn) 3410, 3435; (wheat flour) 3452; (advertising matter, &c.) 3474; (wire nails) 3640; (screws, &c.) 3658; (barbed wire) 3664; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &c.) 3682; (files and rasps) 3702 (ii).

**Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.**

*Anderson, Thos. E., Appnmt. as Collector of Customs* (M. for Cor., &c.) 1057 (i).

*Napanee Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.)* 482 (i).

*Newburg and Kingston Mail Contract* (M. for Cor.) 1748 (i).

*Odessa Postmaster, Name, Recommendation, &c. (Ques.)* 266 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese)* 2197 (i).

*Immigration (agents' salaries)* 4033 (ii).

*Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding)* 1528 (i).

— arrangement as to Discussion, 3031 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

*In Com.: (Indian corn)* 4446 (ii).

**Wood, Hon. J. F., Brockville.**

*Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. Cowan)* on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

*Customs Appnmts. and Dismissals, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for Ret. \*)* 1058 (i).

*Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Fitzpatrick)* on M. for 2°, 856 (i).

*Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T., Changes (Ques.)* 1077 (i).

*Inland Revenue Dept., Dismissals and Appnmts. since July, 1896 (M. for Ret. \*)* 1663 (i).

**Wood, Hon. J. F.—Con.**

*Returns (inquiries)* 2571 (i), 3242 (ii).

*St. Lawrence River (Upper) Sale of Islands (Ques.)* 1026 (i).

*Silver Spray and Mary Grover, Seizure by Inland Rev. (Ques.)* 927, 1300 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Civil Government: Interior, 1674; Marine and Fisheries, 1732 (i).*

*Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 2509. Excise (preventive service) 2496; (salaries) 2492; (travelling, &c.) 2507. Weights and Measures, &c. (gas inspection) 2551; (salaries) 2514 (ii).*

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

*In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause)* 3105; (corn-meal) 3427 (ii).

*Weights and Measures, Metrical System (Ques.)* 1027 (i).

*Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. Macdonell)* on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

**Wood, Mr. A. T., Hamilton.**

*Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright)* 4004, 4216 (ii).

*Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1772 (i).*

*Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 12) 1°\*, 258; 2°\*, 703 (i); Sen. Amts., 3559.*

*Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. McMullen)* on M. for 1°, 776 (i).

*Ry. Commission, Creation of (Ques.)* 3976 (ii).

*Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°\*, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); (M. for Com.)* 4046.

*Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Domville)* on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

*Ways and Means—The Tariff:*

*In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause)* 3330; (wire nails) 3643; (screws, &c.) 3658; (barbed wire) 3661; (strip fencing) 3686; (wire cable) 3693; (rasps and files) 3699; (paintings, &c.) 3709; (duck belting, &c.) 3710, 4137; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4171 (ii).

**Yeo, Mr. J., East Prince, P. E. I.**

*Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup.,* 4771 (ii).

## SUPPLY:

*Railways—Capital: P. E. I. Ry., 3859 (ii).*

# INDEX—PART II

## SUBJECTS

- ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 2568 (i).
- ALGOMA ELECTION, EXPENSES *re* COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 4987, 5059 ; conc., 5451 (ii).
- ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : considn., M. (Mr. Laurier) 6.
- moved (Mr. Russell) 7 ; seconded (Mr. Ethier) 18.
- Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 22 ; (Mr. Laurier) 59 ; (Mr. Foster) 67 ; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 85, 99 ; (Mr. Davin) 111 ; (Mr. Monk) 131 ; (Mr. Casgrain) 149 ; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 167, 181 ; (Mr. Dupont) 194 ; (Mr. La Rivière) 209 ; (Mr. Quinn) 223, 434 ; (Mr. Tarte) 236 ; (Mr. Craig) 248 ; (Mr. McInerney) 250, 270 ; (Mr. Lemieux) 282, 397 ; (Mr. Maclean) 287 ; (Mr. MacPherson) 291 ; (Mr. Wallace) 300 ; (Mr. Casey) 311 ; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 320 ; (Mr. Talbot) 322 ; (Mr. Chancy) 331 ; (Mr. Maxwell) 343 ; (Mr. Hughes) 352 ; (Mr. Mulock) 367 ; (Mr. Richardson) 371 ; (Mr. Chauvin) 374 ; (Mr. Clarke) 377 ; (Mr. Préfontaine) 385 ; (Mr. Broder) 393 ; (Mr. Osler) 400 ; (Mr. McCleary) 402 ; (Mr. Bennett) 409 ; (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 420 ; (Mr. McNeill) 435 ; (Mr. McMullen) 443 ; (Mr. Costigan) 452 ; (Mr. Britton) 469 (i).
- REPLY : Presented (Mr. Laurier) 1900 (i).
- (JUBILEE) TO HER MAJESTY : M. (Mr. Laurier) 3243 (ii).
- ADJOURNMENTS, Ms. :
- EASTER (Mr. Laurier) 838 (i).
- ASCENSION DAY (Mr. Laurier) 2878 (ii).
- ATLANTIC EAST SS. SERVICE (Sir Charles Tupper) 928 (i).
- BILLS NOT PRINTED IN FRENCH (Mr. Laurier) 555 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. CHANGES (Sir Henri Joly de Lothinière) 4366 (ii).
- MACKEREL FISHERY (Mr. Kaulbach) 3673 (ii).
- NORTHFIELD (B.C.) POSTMASTER (Mr. Davin) 1377.
- "OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS" (Mr. Davin) 1546 (i).
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2740.
- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE (Mr. McNeill) 946 (i).
- CELEBRATION OF DAY (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4736 (ii).
- MILITIA CONTINGENT (Mr. Donville) 838 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, MEMBER'S SEAT CHALLENGED (Mr. Davin) 970 (i).
- TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE (Mr. McNeill) 4101 (ii).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, G.T.R., \$300,000 GRANT (Mr. Foster) 574 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 3731, 4141, 4841, 4986 (ii).
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Mr. Laurier). 1<sup>st</sup>, 4 ; *pro formâ*.
- ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 262 (i).
- ADVERTISING MATTER : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3474 (ii).
- AGENTS (IMMIGRATION) AND EMPLOYEES IN CAN., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3743, 4033, 4066 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :
- AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 2100 (i).
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM., 2ND REP. (COLD STORAGE) : conc., 1899 (i).
- AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT : in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 4832 (ii).
- ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 2106, 2179, 2226, 2274 (i), 4859, 4986 (ii).
- BUTTER EXPORTS, BONUS, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 601, 1799 (i).
- CATTLE, CONFERENCE BETWEEN MR. GOURDEAU AND SS. CO.'S, REP. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Maclean) 2446.
- QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i), 4880, 4991 (ii).
- SHIPPING REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2217 (i).
- CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WITHDR. OF GOVT. AID : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 3538 (ii).
- COLD STORAGE : in Com. of Sup., 2274 (i).
- COM. ON RES. : M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3842 (ii).
- CONTRACT : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 4364 (ii).
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).
- DAIRYING SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2119, 2180 (i).
- DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1633 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS : in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
- GAME LAWS, QUEBEC, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP. : Remarks (Mr. Poupore) 4022 (ii).
- GOVT. HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Davis) 3537 (ii).
- HOGS, SLAUGHTER, SPECIAL COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).
- "PATENT RECORD" : in Com. of Sup., 2107 (i).
- PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, CAN. REPRESENTATION : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3508 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

- PUBLIC HEALTH**: in Com. of Sup., 2202, 2226 (i).  
**QUARANTINE**: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).  
 — **MAN. AND N. W. TERS.**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3238 (ii).  
 — **REGULATIONS, U.S., MAN., N.W.T. AND B.C.**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 797, 822 (i).  
 — **VICTORIA, B.C.**: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1554 (i).  
**STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK**: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (i).  
**STATISTICS, GENERAL**: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).  
**SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989 (i).  
 — **DISTRIBUTION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2215 (i).  
**STOCKHOLM EXHIBITION, WALTON JONES' APPNMT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).  
**TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).  
**TIMOTHY SEED AND CLOVER, IMPOSITION OF DUTY**: Ques. (Mr. *Bazinet*) 793 (i).  
**TUBERCULOSIS, PREVENTION OF SPREADING**: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM.**: List of Members, 665 (i).  
 — 2nd Rep. (Cold Storage) conc., 1899 (i).  
 — **DEPT.**: in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 4832 (ii).
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4152, 4155 (ii).  
 — See "FARM IMPLEMENTS."  
 — **SOCIETIES, AID TO**: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
- ALASKAN BOUNDARY**: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2472 (ii).  
 — **PAPERS RESPECTING**: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 2887 (ii).  
 — **AND B.C.**: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3418.  
 — **QUOTATION FROM TREATY, MT. ST. ELIAS**: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3505 (ii).  
 — **LINE OF DEMARCATION**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Morrison*) 3538 (ii).  
 — **MEMO. re**: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4107.
- Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21** (Mr. *Oliver*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 707; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 785 (i).
- ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY**: in Com. of Sup., 4949.
- Alien Labour Prohibition B. No. 6** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 89; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 660 (i). See B. 5.
- Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 5** (Mr. *Cowan*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 88; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 621 (i); in Com. and consolid. with B. 6, 3545; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- Alien Act Amt. B. No. 133** (Mr. *McMullen*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 3865 (ii).
- ALLANDALE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1079 (i).
- American Bank Note Co.'s B. No. 68** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573; in Com., 2449 (i); 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 3003; Order for 3<sup>rd</sup> read, 3089; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 3274; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3461 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. AND MR. REID'S RELATION THERETO**: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2881 (ii).  
 — **CONTRACT**: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1462; (Mr. *Foster*) 1560 (i).  
 — **M. for Papers** (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1835 (i).  
 — **Notice of Motion** (Mr. *Foster*) 2572; M., 2652.
- AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.: COST OF ENGRAVING PLATES, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3056 (ii).  
 — **PLATES REQUIRED AND COST**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3505 (ii).
- AMERICAN HISTORY, BOOKS ON**: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
- AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING**: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1541 (i).
- ANDERSON, GEO., APPNMT. AS AGENT TO JAPAN**: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3339 (ii).
- ANDERSON, THOS. E., APPNMT. AS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Wilson*) 1057 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS CO. MAIL ROUTE, PET. RESPECTING**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3237 (ii).  
 — **MAIL SERVICE, PAYMENT TO GEO. BROWN**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).  
 — **CONTRACT**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1989 (i).  
 — **POST OFFICE**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).  
 — **POSTMASTER, D. G. RIORDAN, AMOUNT OF BONDS**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).  
 — **POSTMASTER, MR. WEST'S APPNMT.**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 2001 (i).  
 — **AND LIVERPOOL (N.S.) MAIL ROUTES, CONTRACTS**: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mills*) 2446 (i).
- APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT., RECOMMENDATIONS OF TREASURY BOARD**: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).  
 — **BY PRESENT GOVT.**: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1055 (i).
- ARCHITECTS, DRAUGHTSMEN, &c., SALARIES**: in Com. of Sup., 4890 (ii).
- ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO. 3, DISBANDMENT**: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 340 (i).
- ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS**: in Com. of Sup., 4082; conc., 5423 (ii).
- ARCHIVES**: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS**: in Com. of Sup., 2106, 2179, 2226, 2274 (i), 4859, 4986 (ii).
- ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).
- ASCENSION DAY, ADJNMT.**: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2878.
- ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
- ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).
- Atikokan Iron Range Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50** (Mr. *Dymont*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1171; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, 2ND PROPOSAL**: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 782 (ii).  
 — **COLONIAL SEC.'S STNMT. re CONTRACT**: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 783 (i).  
 — **WINTER TERMINUS**: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 1374 (i).  
 — **TENDERS**: M. for copies (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2426.  
 — **Remarks** (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2757 (ii).  
 — **Remarks** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3742 (ii).

- ATLANTIC EAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3976 (i).  
 Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3987, 4231; Ruling as to Procedure (Mr. *Speaker*) 3990; (Mr. *Davies*) 3994; (Mr. *Dobell*) 3999; (Mr. *Foster*) 4002, 4244; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4003; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 4004, 4216; (Mr. *Ellis*) 4218; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4219; (Mr. *Gillies*) 4221, 4227; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4228; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4216; Mr. *Fielding*) 4232; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4235; (Mr. *McMillan*) 4238; (Mr. *Casey*) 4240; (Mr. *Rogers*) 4242; (Mr. *Ratz*) 4243; (Mr. *Stubbs*) 4244; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4248; agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4251 (ii).  
 AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2070 (i).  
 AULT, MR. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2879 (ii).  
 AXES, SCYTHES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4169 (ii).  
 AYLMER WEST POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1663 (i).  
 BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1541 (i).  
 — CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*), 261 (i).  
 — OPERATING: in Com. of Sup., 5133; conc., 5452 (ii).  
 — PAR. IN HALIFAX "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3420 (i).  
 BADDECK AND IONA, GRAND NARROWS AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2791; conc., 5419 (ii).  
 BALDERSON, MR., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).  
 BANFF ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).  
 BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664 (i).  
 BARBED WIRE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3659 (ii).  
 BATEMAN, INDIAN AGENT, SCUGOG ISLAND, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081 (i), 3424 (ii).  
 BAZINET, MR., OF JOLIETTE, AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).  
 BEAMSVILLE POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 484 (i).  
 — DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 1453 (i).  
 — MR. FAIRBROTHER'S DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1749 (i).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1744; (Mr. *Craig*) 1760; (Mr. *Lister*) 1763; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1765; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 1772; (Mr. *Logan*) 1773, 1836; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1840; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1844; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1846; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1847, 1886; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1854; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1857; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1859; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1865; (Mr. *Dyment*) 1871; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1873; (Mr. *Frost*) 1875; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1878; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1887; (Mr. *Davin*) 1889; (Mr. *McHugh*) 1890; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1891; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1895. (i).  
 BEAR RIVER (N. S.) OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAV., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).  
 BEAR ISLAND, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672 (i).  
 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).  
 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LOCKMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).  
 — DRAINAGE CULVERTS: in Com. of Sup., 5131, 5270 (ii).  
 — CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 925 (i).  
 — M. for U. C.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).  
 — POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).  
 — AND COUNTY ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).  
 — DISMISSAL OF ALEXIS DOUTRE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 836 (i).  
 BEET-ROOT SUGAR MANUFACTURED IN CAN., BOUNTY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 264 (i).  
 BEHAN, MICHAEL, STOREMAN ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).  
 BEHRING SEA SEAL REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).  
 — CONVENTION, RE-OPENING, LONDON PRESS COR.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4472 (ii).  
 BELFAST (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926 (i).  
 BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, AND TARIFF RES.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 1460 (i).  
 — CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542 (i).  
 BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 918 (i).  
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2445 (i).  
 BENNETT, W. H., Esq., Member for East Simcoe: introduced, 3.  
 BERTHIER PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5280 (ii).  
 — WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 262 (i).  
 BIBAUD, AZARIE, EMPLOYMT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3509 (ii).  
 BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. *Laurier*).  
 1°\*, 4; *pro formá*.  
 BILL (No. 2) Further to secure the safety of Railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. *Casey*).  
 1°, 87; 2° m., 608; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 614 (i); in Com., 3560 (ii).  
 BILL (No. 3) To promote the safety of Railway employees.—(Mr. *Maclean*).  
 1°, 87; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 621 (i).  
 BILL (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).  
 1°, 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1058 (i).  
 BILL (No. 5) To restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Cowan*).  
 1°, 88; 2°, 621 (i); in Com. and consolid. with B. No. 6, 3545; 3°\*, 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 11.)  
 BILL (No. 6) To prohibit the importation and immigration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor*).  
 1°, 89; 2°, 660 (i). See B. No. 5.

- BILL (No. 7)** To consolidate and amend the law relating to the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)  
1° , 89 ; 2° m., 718 ; deb. adjd., 774 ; rsmd., 847, 973.
- BILL (No. 8)** In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)  
1° , 95 ; 2° , 673 (i).
- BILL (No. 9)** To provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the Retirement of members of the Civil Service.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)  
1° , 169 ; 2° m., 552 (i).
- BILL (No. 10)** To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)  
1°\* , 258 ; 2° , 674 ; in Com., 2460 (i).
- BILL (No. 11)** Respecting the sale of Railway Return Fare Tickets.—(Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry.*)  
1° , 257 ; 2° , 695 (i).
- BILL (No. 12)** Further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton.*)  
1°\* , 258 ; 2° , 703 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1775 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 13)** To amend the Criminal Code of 1892.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)  
1°\* , 339 ; 2° , 1060 ; in Com., 2474 (i) ; M. to conc. in Amts., 3542 (ii).
- BILL (No. 14)** Respecting drainage on and across the lands of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey.*)  
1° , 481 ; 2° , 1064 (i).
- BILL (No. 15)** Further to amend the Act respecting Interest.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)  
1° , 550 (i) ; 2° m., 3562 (ii).
- BILL (No. 16)** To again amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Casey.*)  
1° , 565 ; 2° m., 1775 ; 2° , 1798 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 3545 (ii).
- BILL (No. 17)** To incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3° m., 2448 (i) ; 3°\* , 2775 (ii).
- BILL (No. 18)** To confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 19)** Respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com., 2450 (i) ; 3°\* , 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 20)** Respecting the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2° , 784 (i).
- BILL (No. 21)** Respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 (i).
- BILL (No. 22)** Respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 23)** To incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Britton.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 24)** Respecting the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 25)** To confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 26)** Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1573 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 27)** To incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 785 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 28)** Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Snetsinger.*)  
1°\* , 707 ; 2°\* , 945 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1775 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 29)** In further amendment of the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)  
1° , 774 ; 2° m., 2022 ; wthdn., 2031 (i).
- BILL (No. 30)** Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)  
1°\* , 838 ; 2°\* , 945 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 31)** Respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)  
1°\* , 838 ; 2°\* , 945 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 32)** Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)  
1°\* , 838 ; 2°\* , 945 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\* , 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 33)** Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oster.*)  
1°\* , 838 ; 2° , 945 ; Order for Com., 2163 ; in Com., 2337 ; 3° m., 2610 (i) ; recom. and 3° , 2920 (ii).
- BILL (No. 34)** To incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.—(Mr. *Madore.*)  
1°\* , 914 ; 2°\* , 1058 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 35)** Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)  
1°\* , 914 ; 2°\* , 1058 ; in Com. and 3°\* , 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

- BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 914; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1058 (i); withdn., 3144 (ii).
- BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 914; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 950; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1058 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3540 (ii).
- BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Canadian General Electric Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 950; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the Maritime Milling Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1071; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 41) Respecting the River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1072; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1072; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1202 (i).
- BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1072; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1072; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1202; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 45) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1072 (i).
- BILL (No. 46) Respecting Trade and other Labels.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1075 (i).
- BILL (No. 47) In further amendment of the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McMullen*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1075 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 3562 (ii).
- BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1171; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 49)—Respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1171; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2775 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 50)—Respecting the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1171; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com., 2163; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 2408; recom., 2602; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 52) Respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 53) To revive and further amend the Acts respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3465; proceedings of House null and void, 5539 (ii).
- BILL (No. 54) Respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232 (1); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Minden and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Lount*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2610 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 57) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1172 (i).
- BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *Domville*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1226; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1409; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 59) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Davis*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1228; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 2036 (i).
- BILL (No. 60) In further amendment of the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Douglas*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1229; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2041 (i).
- BILL (No. 61) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1229; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2037 (i).
- BILL (No. 62) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1231; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 2037 (i).
- BILL (No. 63) To regulate Freight Rates on Railways.—(Mr. *Reid*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1299 (i).
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the British Yukon Chartered Company.—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 65) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 66) Relating to the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573 (i); withdn., 2740 (ii).
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Pilots serving between Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. *Guay*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573 (i); in Com., 3539, 3704; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3705 (ii).

- BILL (No. 68) Respecting the American Bank Note Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573; in Com., 2449 (i); 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3003; Order for 3<sup>o</sup> read, 3089; 3 m., 3274; 3<sup>o</sup>, 3461 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1574 (i); in Com., 2925, 3002; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3002 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 71) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1574 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1574; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Lount.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1574; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 75) Respecting the attachment of the salaries of Dominion employees.—(Mr. Richardson.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373 (i).
- BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the British Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i); withdn., 4119 (ii).
- BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3705 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 78) To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.—(Mr. Britton.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345. (60-61 Vic., c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1631; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2021 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America, Limited.—(Mr. Maxwell.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1632, 1775; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 83) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Rosmond.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1632; in Com., 2345, 2449; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2449 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 84) To incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.—(Mr. Rosmond.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1632; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Railway Company.—(Mr. Edwards.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i); withdn., 3668 (ii).
- BILL (No. 86) Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3003 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Columbia Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 88) To incorporate "Les Cisterciens Réformés."—(Mr. LaRivière.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1632; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 89) Further to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.—(Mr. Davin.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>, 1539 (i).
- BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 91) Respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Rosmond.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (1); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (ii).
- BILL (No. 94) To commemorate the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by making her birthday a perpetual holiday—from the Senate—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1738 (i).
- BILL (No. 95) To amend the law of Libel.—(Mr. Davin.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1738 (i).
- BILL (No. 96) To amend the law respecting Controverted Elections.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou.)**  
1<sup>o</sup>, 1738 (i).

- BILL (No. 97) For the relief of Adeline Myrtle Tuckett Lawry—*from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)  
1° —; 2°, 2022; in Com. and 3° on div., 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes*.)  
1°, 1899; 2°, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*.)  
1°, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); 2°, 2776; M. for Com., 3909, 4046; in Com. and 3°, 4050 (ii).
- BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)  
1°, 1899; 2°, 2347 (i).
- BILL (No. 101) Respecting the Montreal and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)  
1°, 1899; 2°, 2022 (i).
- BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—(Mr. *Belecourt*.)  
1°, 1983; 2°, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 74)
- BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)  
1°, 2051; 2°, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Domville*.)  
1°, 2051; Order for 2°, 2166; M. withdn., 2348 (i); 2°, 2777; B. withdn., 4119 (ii).
- BILL (No. 105) To amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.—(Mr. *Davies*.)  
1°, 2215 (i); 2° and in Com., 2742; 3°, 2800; Sen. Amts., 4109 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 106) Respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the Company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1°, 2297 (i); 2°, 2777; in Com. and 3°, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 107) Further to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1°, 2408 (i).
- BILL (No. 108) Respecting the examination of stationary engineers and the inspection of steam boilers.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)  
1°, 2408 (i).
- BILL (No. 109) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne*.)  
1°, 2475 (i); 2°, 2778; in Com. and 3°, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 110) To incorporate the Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)  
1°, 2654; 2°, 2778; in Com. and 3°, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 111) For granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$26,000 required for defraying certain expenses of the Militia Contingent to be sent to England for the Jubilee of Her Majesty in June, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1° and 2°, 2662; 3°, 2742 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 112) To prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter or cheese.—(Mr. *Parmalee*.)  
1°, 2795 (ii).
- BILL (No. 113) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Davies*.)  
1°, 2796; 2° and in Com., 3721; 3°, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)  
1°, 2797; 2° and in Com., 4110; 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)  
1°, 2798; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton*.)  
1°, 2798; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 117) To provide for the Registration of Cheese Factories and Creameries, and for the Branding of Dairy Products, and to prohibit Misrepresentation as to the dates of Manufacture of such products.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1°, 2878; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)  
1°, 2967; 2°, 3465; in Com. and 3°, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 119) Respecting La Mutuelle Générale Canadienne.—(Mr. *Mudore*.)  
1°, 2967; 2°, 3090; in Com. and 3°, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 120) Further to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1°, 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 121) To amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *Beattie*.)  
1°, 3234 (ii).
- BILL (No. 122) To amend the Act relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company—*from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1°, 3418; 2°, 3705; in Com. and 3°, 4051 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 123) Respecting Forged or unauthorized Endorsements of Bills—*from the Senate*.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright*.)  
1°, 3580; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Cataract Power Company of Hamilton, Limited.—(Mr. *MacPherson*.)  
1° and 2°, 3579; in Com. and 3°, 4051 (ii).

- BILL (No. 125) Respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
Res. prop., 4086; 1°, 3580; 2°, 4110; in Com., 4122; 3°, 4129 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Voters' Lists.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°, 3581; 2°\* and in Com., 3724; 3°\*, 3729 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 127) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Davies.)**  
1°, 3581; 2° and in Com., 3724; 3°\*, 3728 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 128) Relating to the Canada Investment and Agency Company, Limited.—from the Senate.—(Mr. Davin.)**  
1°\*, 3842; 2°\*, 3909; in Com. and 3°\*, 4119 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 129) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°, 3676; 2° and in Com., 4500; in Com., 4725, 5372, 5531, 5537; 3°\*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°, 3677; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 131) Respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Judges thereof—from the Senate.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°\*, 3719; 2°, 4207; in Com., 4212; 3°\*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 132) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Davies.)**  
1°, 3730; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 133) To amend the law relating to Aliens.—(Mr. McMullen.)**  
1°\*, 3865 (ii).
- BILL (No. 134) Respecting Interest—from the Senate.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°\*, 3971; 2°\* and in Com., 4252; 3°\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 135) To amend the Companies Act—from the Senate.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°\*, 3971; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 136) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Res. prop. and in Com., 4118; 1°\*, 4119; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 5415 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 137) Respecting Trial by Jury in certain cases in the North-west Territories—from the Senate.—(Mr. Davies.)**  
1°\*, 4203; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 138) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892—from the Senate.—(Mr. Davies.)**  
1°\*, 4203 (ii).
- BILL (No. 139) Further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**  
1°\*, 4204; 2°\* and in Com., 4719; 3°\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 140) Further to amend the Act respecting Judges of the Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Davies.)**  
1°\*, 4204; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 141) Respecting Cold Storage on Steamships from Canada to the United Kingdom and in certain Cities in Canada.—(Mr. Fisher.)**  
Res. prop. and in Com., 4130; 1°\*, 4252; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 142) To confirm certain agreements entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the City of Montreal.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
Res. prop., 4086; M. for Com., 4258; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340; in Com., 4341, 4342, 4373; 1° of B., 4477; 2° and in Com., 4612; 3° m., 4654; 3°, 4697 (ii).
- BILL (143) To consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Res. (Tariff) prop., 1136 (i); in Com., 2842, 2887, 2970, 3060, 3146, 3290, 3465, 3583, 3679, 4130, 4395, 4613; Res. as adopted, 4614; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4698 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)**  
Res. prop. and in Com., 4698; 1°\* of B., 2°\* and in Com., 4699; 3°\*, 4701 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 145) Respecting Export Duties.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Res. prop., 4701; in Com., 4718; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 146) To authorize a Subsidy for a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
Res. prop., 3870; in Com., 4512; 1° of B., 4725; 2°\* and in Com., 5164, 5338, 5342; 3°\*, 5536 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 5.)
- Bill (No. 147) To amend An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—from the Senate.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°\*, 5009; 2°\* and in Com., 5157; 3°\*, 5372 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 148) to authorize the raising by way of Loan of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Res. prop., 4736; in Com., 5161; 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 5163 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 149) To provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
Res. prop., 4653; in Com., 5186; 1°\*, 5201; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°, 5288 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 6.)

- BILL (No. 150)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>st</sup>, 5478; 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5535 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 151)** To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Blair*.)  
Res. prop., 4736, 5158; in Com., 5361, 5478; 1<sup>st</sup>, 5529; 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 5535; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5541 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILLS** : Royal Assent, 2765, 5543 (ii).
- BINDER TWINE MADE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY** : Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 1634 (i).
- BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN** : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).
- BLANCHET, EUGÈNE, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R.** : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1082 (i).  
— M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
- BOMPAS, BISCHOFF & Co., SOLICITORS FOR THE DOM., RETIREMENT** : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
- BOOKS, &c.** : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3465, 3706.
- BOUNDARY**. See "ALASKAN."
- BOULARDERIE WHARF, N. S.** : in Com. of Sup., 2719.
- BOUNTIES**. See "IRON AND STEEL."
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASED** : Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).
- BRANTFORD POST OFFICE, FREE DELIVERY** : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Cluney*) 3537 (ii).
- BRASS WIRE** : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3694 (ii).
- BRAZIL, REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS** : in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).
- BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION** : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 1744 (i).  
— MR. DOBELL AS DIRECTOR : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3056 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA** :
- ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).
- BEHRING SEA CONVENTION, LONDON PRESS COR.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4472 (ii).  
— SEAL REGULATIONS, ON ORDERS OF THE DAY : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).
- BOUNDARY. See "ALASKAN."
- CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 2561 (i).
- CAPE BEALE AND CARMENAH TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
- COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4973 (ii).
- COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s B., RETURN OF FEES : Remarks (Mr. *Bostock*) 4651 (ii).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY., PLANS DEPOSITED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 267 (i).  
— CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 568 (i).
- ESQUIMALT DEFENCE, &c. : conc., 5426 (ii).  
— POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1985 (i).
- FIDDLE REEF MARINE LIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
- FISHING BY FOREIGNERS, ILLEGAL : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2446 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA—Con.**
- FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
- FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4973.
- GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
- GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1740 (i).
- HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
- KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5540 (ii).
- MC MANUS, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTH-FIELD, CHARACTER : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2879 (ii).
- M McNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3056 (ii).
- MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WM. BEAUMONT : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4364 (ii).
- NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3720 (ii).
- NORTHFIELD POSTMASTER, INSPECTOR FLETCHER'S REP. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2021 (ii).
- PACIFIC POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 241 (i).
- PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
- POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP-SEA FISHERIES : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
- QUARANTINE REGULATIONS U.S., MAN., N.W.T. AND B.C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 797, 822 (i).  
— VICTORIA : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1554 (i).  
"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
- SALMON SOLD IN BRITISH MARKETS, QUALITY, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1991 (i).
- SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING, PAYMENTS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3146 (ii).
- SMUGGLING BY AMERICAN WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER BASIN : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
- SMUGGLING INTO THE YUKON COUNTRY : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES, GOVT. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 2567 (i).
- U. S. WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4735 (ii).
- VICTORIA, DRILL HALL : in Com., of Sup., 4956 (ii).  
— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 2591 (i), 4954 (ii).
- VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
- WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD INLET TELEPHONE Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2420 (i).
- B. C. SOUTHERN RY. Co.'s CHARTER, DISALLOWANCE** : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 340 (i).  
— prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 493 (ii).  
— "GLOBE'S" COMMENTS ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE : Personal explanation (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (i).  
— EXPIRATION OF TIME : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3234 (ii).
- B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65** (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BRITISH GOODS AND CUSTOMS TARIFF** : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1461, 1462 (i).
- British Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76** (Mr. *Oliver*). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1538; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1631 (i); wthdn., 4119.

- British Yukon Chartered Co.'s incorp.**  
**B. No. 64** (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 89.*)
- BRODEUR, S. A., COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2419 (i).
- BRITANNIA METAL, &c.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703 (ii).
- BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5526
- BROWN, GEO., PAYMENT FOR MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).
- BUCKTHORN, &c., FENCING:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3679, 4147, 4161 (ii).
- BUDGET SPEECHES, DATES OF DELIVERY:** Stmt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 554 (i).
- BUDGET, THE:** Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 763 (i).  
 — FINANCIAL STMT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1033, 1120, 1136 (i).  
 — Reply (Mr. *Foster*) 1172 (i).  
 —. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- BUILDINGS, PUBLIC:** in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2758, 4880, 5278; conc., 5432 (ii).
- Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 12** (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 258; 2<sup>o</sup>, 703; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1775 (i); Sen. Amts., 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 31.*)
- BULLETINS AND REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION:** in Com. of Sup., 2118 (i).
- BUNKER ISLAND MARINE HOSPITAL, MRS. LECAIN'S DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3504, 3866 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, NOTICES OF MOTION:** Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 86 (i).  
 — PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 783 (i).  
 — WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1899 (i).  
 — MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2967 (ii).  
 — MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3582 (ii).  
 — SATURDAY SITTINGS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4394 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5038, 5010, 5286 (ii).
- Butter and Cheese (Improper Speculation in Sale) Prohibition B. No. 112** (Mr. *Parnalee*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2795 (ii).
- BUTTER TRADE WITH ENGLAND:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 601, 1799 (i).
- BYNG INLET CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 265 (i).
- CACOUNA, EXTENSION OF WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33** (Mr. *Oster*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838; 2<sup>o</sup>, 945; Order for Com., 2163; in Com., 2337; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2610; (i) recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2920 (ii).
- CAMERON, JOHN, SAVINGS BANK AGENT, NEW GLASGOW, APPNMT., &c.:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3448 (i).
- CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS (N.B.) SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).
- CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS:** Ques. (Mr. *Ganony*) 2565 (i).
- CANALS:**  
**BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT., &c.:** M. for O. C. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).  
 — COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).  
**CANALS:** in Com. of Sup., 3861, 3919, 4823, 5115, 5270; conc., 5451.  
**CANAL CONTRACTS, DEPOSITS ON TENDERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1026 (i).  
**CHAMBLY CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT:** Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1023 (i).  
 — TENDERS FOR STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1023.  
**CORNWALL AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95:** Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).  
**CORNWALL AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS:** Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (ii).  
**DISMISSALS.** See general heading.  
**GALOPS CANAL, IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS:** M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).  
**GALOPS RAPIDS, TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION:** M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).  
**GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT:** M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).  
**ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS:** M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (i).  
**SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. OF ARBITRATORS:** (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1540 (i).  
 — SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 488 (i).  
 — SECTION 12: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 489 (i).  
 — TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 341, 488 (i).  
 — SECTION 12, TENDERS, CONTRACT: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).  
 — SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
- CAN. AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).
- Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35** (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 914; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c. 37.*)
- Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43** (Mr. *Ingram*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1072; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 38.*)
- Can. Fire Ins. Co.'s B. No. 103** (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2051; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 78.*)
- Can. General Electric Co.'s B. No. 39** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 950; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c. 71.*)
- Can. Investment and Agency Co.'s B. No. 128** (Mr. *Davin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3842; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3909; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4119 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 83.*)  
 — Power Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573 (i); withdn, 2740 (ii).
- CAN. REGISTRY OF SHIPPING:** in Com. of Sup., 2290.
- Can. Securities Co. of Montreal incorp. B. No. 34** (Mr. *Madore*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 914; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61, *Vic., c. 84.*)
- CANNED LOBSTERS, SCIENTIFIC EXAMINATION:** in Com. of Sup., 4999 (ii).

- CAPE BEALE AND CARMENAH (B.C.) TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
- CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT McIVOR : Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 573, 788 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE (N.B.) BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- CAPLIN RIVER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027, 1308 (i).
- CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION : Amt. Paid : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 264 (i).
- CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 264 (i).
- CARMICHAEL, ANDREW, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Pets., &c.\* (Mr. Reid) 1057.
- CARRIAGE HARDWARE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4470 (ii).
- CARSTENS, IMMIGRATION AGENT, WINNIPEG, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3720.
- CARTWRIGHT, MR. F. L., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR MOUNTED POLICE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 489 (i).
- CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1742 (i).
- Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton B. No. 124** (Mr. MacPherson). 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>, 3579; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4051 (ii).
- CATTLE, CONFERENCE BETWEEN MR. GOURDEAU AND SS. CO.'S REP. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Maclean) 2446 (i).
- QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).
- SHIPPING REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2217 (i).
- CEDAR SPRINGS, FISHERY INSPECTOR HENRY LINLEY, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4206 (ii).
- Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30** (Mr. McMullen). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 40.)
- CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY. (N.S.) AND LIVERPOOL, &C., RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4738; in Com., 5524.
- "CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 260 (i).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1028 (i).
- TENDERS FOR STONE : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1028.
- CHAMPAGNE, L. N., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WRIGHT : introduced, 86 (i).
- CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* REBELLION, 1885 : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 490 (i).
- CHAPLEAU'S NEW POLL-BOOK, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4843; conc., 5427 (ii).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIÈRE DE PRAIRIES BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 567 (i).
- Cheese Factories and Creameries, &c., Registration B. No. 117** (Mr. Fisher). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2878; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 21.)
- See "BUTTER."
- CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WITHDR. OF GOVT. AID : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 3538 (ii).
- CHINAWARE, &C. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3496.
- CHISHOLM, W. C., INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1375 (i).
- CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES : in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii).
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1666, 1912, 2066 (i), 3730, 4828, 4873, 5110, 5265 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 29** (Mr. McMullen). 1<sup>o</sup>, 774; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2022; withdn., 2031 (i).
- further **Amt. B. No. 130** (Mr. Mulock). 1<sup>o</sup>, 3677; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 14.)
- See "SUPERANNUATION."
- CIVIL SERVICE ACT, MIN. OF JUSTICE'S OPINION : Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2124 (i).
- EXAMINATIONS, APPNMTS. TO P.O. DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2564 (i).
- EXAMINERS : in Com. of Sup., 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).
- SERVANTS, COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 546 (i).
- COUNTY OF GASPÉ, COMMISSION *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chaurin) 1451 (i).
- CLERKS OF WORKS, GOVT., PRIVATE PRACTICE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1306 (i).
- CLOTHES WRINGERS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4166, 4167 (ii).
- COAL, BITUMINOUS, STEAM AND SLACK, IMPORTS FROM U.S., 1896 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Roche) 3538 (ii).
- in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192, 4466 (ii).
- BORING IN P.E.I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 796 (i).
- DUTIES : Personal Explanation (Sir Charles Tupper) 673 (i).
- IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN, RATE OF DUTY UNDER TARIFF : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1634 (i).
- TRADE OF N.S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES OF FINANCE MINISTER : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 669 (i).
- COAL OIL DUTIES : on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).
- IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 258, 796 (i).
- in Com. of Ways and Means, 3478 (ii).
- SUPPLY, ST. JOHNS BARRACKS, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1078 (i).
- COASTING LAWS OF CAN. AND U.S. : M. for Cor. (Mr. Britton) 3525 (ii).
- COAST LINE RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4738 (ii).
- COBOURG POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 1306 (i).
- COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST : M. for copy\* (Mr. Cameron) 2020 (i).
- COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4736 (ii).
- Cold Storage on SS. from Can. to United Kingdom, &c., B. No. 141** (Mr. Fisher). Com. on Res. (M.) 3842; in Com., 4130; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 4252; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 7.)

- COLD STORAGE ON SS., CONTRACT:** Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 4364 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2274 (i).  
 — 2ND REP. AGRICULTURE, &C., COM.: conc., 1899 (ii).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES:** in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i), 2790, 4864, 5002, 5083, 5133, 5254, 5416; conc. 5452.
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR:** in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
- Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 32** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- Columbia River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87** (Mr. *Bostock*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93** (Mr. *Bostock*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (i).  
 — RETURN OF FEES: M. (Mr. *Bostock*) 4651 (ii).
- COLUMBIA RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS:** in Com. of Sup., 4973 (ii).
- COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE PARTISAN OFFENCES:**  
 M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1462 (i).
- COMMISSION re CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS:** in Com. of Sup. 2215 (i); conc., 5429 (ii).  
 — COUNTY OF GASPÉ: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451.
- COMMITTEES:**  
 AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM., 2ND REP. (Cold Storage) conc., 1899 (i).  
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).  
 — 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. *Choquette*) 707, 1665 (i).  
 — 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Choquette*) 5183 (ii).  
 LIBRARY COM., JOINT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 666 (i).  
 PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 666 (i).  
 — ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2476 (i).  
 — 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 4364 (ii).  
 SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).  
 — Lists presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 661 (i).  
 — NAMES ADDED: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2051, 2408, 2476 (i).  
 SPECIAL COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Casey*) 122 (i).
- Companies' Act Amt. B. No. 135** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3971; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- CONNOLLY, D., POSTMASTER AT ALLANDALE, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1079 (i).
- CONSERVATIVE NEWSPAPERS, DELIVERY:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 918 (i).
- Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. No. 107** (Mr. *Davin*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2408 (i).
- Continental Heat and Light Co.'s incorp. B. No. 84** (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1632; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- CONTINGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup., 2066, 2103, 4066, 4832 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.:** Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 420, 489, 1631 (i).
- Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 96** (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1738 (i).
- CONVICTS LIBERATED, SENTENCES COMMUTED, &C.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 546 (i).
- COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) GOVT. ACTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 1542 (i).
- CORNMEAL:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3421 (i).
- CORNWALL AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS:** Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (i).  
 — BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).  
 — DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2563 (i).  
 — ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5115 (ii).
- COTTINGHAM, W. S., DISMISSAL FROM LAND OFFICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4342 (ii).
- COTTON DUCK:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 4186 (ii).  
 — FABRICS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4179, 4180 (ii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMMISSIONS WITHOUT LEGISLATION:** Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2124 (i).  
 — N. S., ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).
- COVERT, D., AND D. J. RIORDAN, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).
- C.P.R., ABROGATION OF ARTICLE IN CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 96 (i).  
 — LAND GRANTS, PATENTS AND EXEMPTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2883, 3235 (ii).  
 — RATES AND TOLLS, WEST OF TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4204 (ii).  
 — TRANSPORT OF GRAIN FROM N.W.T. AND MAN., 1891 to 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3509, 3669.
- C.P.R. and Hull Electric Co.'s Agreement B. No. 25** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- CRAWFORD, DUNCAN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 787 (i).
- CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.:** in Com. of Sup., 2179 (i).
- CREPEAU, J. H., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL:** M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Ives*) 1057 (i).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 339; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1060; in Com., 2474 (i); M. to conc. in Amts., 3542 (ii).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 138** (Mr. *Davies*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4203 (ii).
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS:** in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).
- CROWE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT, SAUGEEN RESERVE' DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788 (i).

**Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Subsidy B. No. 146**

(Mr. Blair). Res. prop., 3870; in Com., 4512; 1° of B., 4725; 2°\* and in Com., 5164, 5338, 5342; 3°\*, 5536 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 5.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. Earle) 4575; (Mr. McInnes) 4576; (Mr. Bennett) 4583; (Mr. Rogers) 4585; (Mr. Taylor) 4592; (Mr. Poupore) 4595; (Mr. Henderson) 4599; (Mr. Powell) 4601; (Mr. Ives) 4604; (Mr. Blair) 4512; (Mr. Foster) 4523, 4588; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4529; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4539, 4601; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 4543; (Mr. Sproule) 4547; (Mr. Bostock) 4563; (Mr. Oliver) 4556; (Mr. Rutherford) 4569; (Mr. Haggart) 4606 (ii).

— PLANS DEPOSITED BY C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 267 (i).

— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 568 (i).

CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 2509 (i), 4864, 5058 (ii).

**CUSTOMS:**

ANDERSON, THOS. E., APPNMT. AS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Wilson) 1057 (i).

BERTHIER WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 262 (i).

BRITISH GOODS AND CUSTOMS TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1461, 1462 (i).

BRODEUR, S. A., COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2419 (i).

COAL, BITUMINOUS, STEAM AND SLACK, IMPORTS FROM U. S., 1896: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Roche) 3538 (ii).

COAL IMPORTS FROM G. B., RATE OF DUTY UNDER NEW TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 1634 (i).

COAL OIL DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

— IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 258.

— FROM U. S. IN TANK CARS: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 796 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1730, 1980, 2072, 2552 (i), 4864, 5002, 5013, 5040; conc., 5446 (ii).

— DEPTL. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2422 (i).

DISMISSALS. See general heading.

FENELON FALLS CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 258 (i).

HAMILTON AND NIAGARA CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 1540 (i).

HUDSON BAY PORTS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 794, 1452 (i).

KINGSTON COTTON MILLS AND TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 98 (i).

MCDONALD, DANL., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).

MCDONALD, G., APPNMT., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, P.E.I.: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2125 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY UNDER TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2219 (i).

MORRISBURG CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 341, 489 (i).

— DAVID HALLIDAY'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Broder) 1775 (i).

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 482 (i).

ORWELL (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1742 (i).

— BRUSH WHARF PREVENTIVE OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1301 (i).

PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 261 (i).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i), 5002, 5013, 5040 (ii).

**CUSTOMS—Con.**

PRINCE EDWARD CO., PREVENTIVE OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 491 (i).

SMUGGLING BY AMERICAN WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER BASIN: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 794 (i).

SMUGGLING INTO THE YUKON COUNTRY: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1375 (i).

STRATHROY CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Calvert) 483 (i).

TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 257 (i).

— Remarks (Mr. McMillan) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 926 (i).

VERNON RIVER BRIDGE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).

WELLER BAY AS AN OUTPORT, VALUE OF GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1663.

**Customs Act Amt. and Consolidation B.**

**No. 143** (Mr. Fielding). Res. (Tariff) prop., 1136 (i); in Com., 2842, 2887, 2970, 3060, 3146, 3290, 3465, 3583, 3679, 4130, 4395, 4613; Res. as adopted, 4614; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4698 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 16.)

CUSTOMS APPNMTS. AND DISMISSALS, NAMES AND SALARIES: M. for Pets., &c.\* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1058 (i).

**Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B.**

**No. 125** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Res. prop., 4086; 1° of B., 3580; 2°, 4110; in Com., 4122; 3°\*, 4129 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 18.)

DARLON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027 (i).

Dairy Products. See "CHEESE FACTORIES," "BUTTER," &c.

DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2119, 2180 (i).

DANIS, A. D., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 929 (i).

— CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUND: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2421 (i).

DALY, HON. T. M., REP. ON IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 922 (i).

DAME, DAVID, DISMISSAL FROM LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3338 (ii).

DANVILLE AND ST. CAMILLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Ives) 3538 (ii).

DAUNAIS, C. M., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1450 (i).

DAVIS, T. O., ESQ., Member for Saskatchewan: introduced, 3 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 1ST REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. Somerville) 707, 1665 (i).

— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. Choquette) 5183 (ii).

— PUBLISHING: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (i).

DELISLE, L. T., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1307 (i).

DILLON, THOS. J., DAIRY INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2424 (i).

“DIANA.” See “HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION.”

## DISMISSALS :

- AULT, MR. E. : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2879 (i).  
 BEAUBARNOIS CANAL, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 925 (i).  
 — LOCKMEN: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1743 (i).  
 — EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. MacLennan, *Glen-garry*) 2563.  
 CARSTENS, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT, WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3720 (ii).  
 COTTINGHAM, W. S., LAND OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4342 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS: BYNG INLET CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 265 (i).  
 — COVERT D., and D. J. RIORDAN: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 917 (i).  
 — DANIS, A. D., COLLECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 925 (i).  
 — GRAND NARROWS (C. B.) PREVENTIVE OFFICER J. R. MCNEILL: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3504 (ii).  
 — HALLIDAY, DAVID, COLLECTOR AT MORRISBURG: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 341, 489.  
 — LAROUCHE, G.: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027.  
 — MCARTHUR, WM., FENELON FALLS: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 258 (i).  
 — M. for Cor. (Mr. Hughes) 1639, 1744 (i).  
 — MCNEILL, J. R., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, GRAND NARROWS: Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3504 (ii).  
 — MORRISBURG COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 489 (i).  
 — MT. STEWART (P. E. I.) COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).  
 — NUNN, JAMES GORDON, COLLECTOR, ST. THOMAS Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 267 (i).  
 — OFFICIALS, NAMES AND SALARIES: M. for Pets. &c.\* (Mr. Wood, *Brockville*) 1058 (i).  
 — ROSS, JAMES, SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).  
 — ST. THOMAS, COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 267 (i).  
 — TENNANT, J. F., SUB-COLLECTOR AT GREYNA; Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3503 (ii).  
 DILLON THOS. J., DAIRY INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2424 (i).  
 DOBBIN, MR., LAND OFFICE, WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4029 (ii).  
 FISHERIES: CEDAR SPRINGS INSPECTOR, HENRY LINLEY: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4206 (ii).  
 — HUGHES, J. W., AND MESSRS. NOONAN AND DAVIS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4009 (ii).  
 — RESTIGOUCHE RIVER FISHERY OFFICER, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McAlister) 1662 (i).  
 LAND OFFICE, MAN.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Tisdale) 4017 (ii).  
 INVERNESS CO., DOM. OFFICIALS (1879): Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4477 (i).  
 INLAND REVENUE DEPT., SINCE JULY, 1896; M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Wood, *Brockville*) 1663 (i).  
 I. C. R., BLANCHET, EUGENE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1082, 1639 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2446 (i).  
 — CAR INSPECTOR, STELLARTON: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1663 (i).  
 — CASTONGUAY STATION MASTER: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2446 (i).  
 — BRIDGE TENDERS: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3743 (ii).  
 — EMPLOYEES AT RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 2586 (i).

## DISMISSALS—Con.

- I. C. R., EMPLOYEES AT ANTIGONISH: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 2565 (i).  
 — MOORE, W. B., FUEL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Bell, *Pictou*) 2121 (ii).  
 — MCLEOD AND MCKAY, MESSRS., BRIDGE TENDERS: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2447.  
 — Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1541 (i).  
 — PIERRE BEGIN, SECTIONMAN: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1638 (i).  
 — ST. CHARLES STATION MASTER: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1540 (i).  
 INDIAN AGENT WM. BATEMAN, SCUGOG ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1081 (i) 3524 (ii).  
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. Hughes) 3524 (ii).  
 — CHISHOLM, W. C.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1375 (i).  
 — CROWE, JOHN, AGENT, SAUGEEN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. McNeill) 340, 573, 788 (i).  
 — FAIRLIE, REV. MR.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2201 (i).  
 — HAGARVILLE AGENT, DR. JONES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clancy) 3530 (ii).  
 — SIX NATIONS INDIAN OFFICE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (ii).  
 — TUSCARORA INDIANS, PHYSICIANS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Clancy) 3529 (ii).  
 — WALPOLE ISLAND, DR. GEO. MITCHELL: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 927 (i).  
 KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3338 (ii).  
 LACHINE CANAL, MONTREAL: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2572 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2410 (i).  
 — BEHAN, MICHAEL, STOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2565 (i).  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Quinn) 3537 (ii).  
 — DAME, DAVID: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3338 (ii).  
 — ENRIGHT, MICHAEL: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 2564.  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Quinn) 3537 (ii).  
 — GAHAN, MR.: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 924 (i).  
 — GALLAGHER, JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).  
 — HATCH, PATRICK: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).  
 — HICKEY, JAMES: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).  
 — SHIELDS, JAMES: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).  
 — TYNAN, JOHN. Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).  
 MCCALLUM, PETER, LOCK SUPT., DU LIEVRES: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1835 (i).  
 MCKENZIE, CAPT. WM., DREDGE "CANADA": Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1743 (i).  
 MAN. AND N.W.T.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 4022 (ii).  
 MARINE, BUNKER ISLAND MARINE HOSPITAL, MRS. LE CAINE: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3504, 3866 (ii).  
 — DELISLE, L. T., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1307 (i).  
 — FISH ISLAND (P. E. I.) LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2424 (i).  
 — OAK POINT (N. B.) LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER G. R. PICKETTS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3669 (ii).  
 — O'BRIEN, WM., STR. "LANDOWNE": Ques. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 4008 (ii),  
 — SMITH, F. X., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, GASPE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1905 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2446 (i).  
 MUMA, HENRY, OFFICIAL REFEREE: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4735 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

- "OTONOBEE" DREDGE, ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Hughes) 1774 (i).  
 POIRIER, T.: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027 (i).  
 POST OFFICE: ALLANDALE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1079 (i).  
 — ANNAPOLIS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 567 (i).  
 — AYLMER WEST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 794, 795 (i).  
 — BELFAST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 926 (i).  
 — BEAMSVILLE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 484 (i).  
 — M. for Cor. (Mr. McCleary) 1453, 1749 (i).  
 [See "BEAMSVILLE."]  
 — BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER, ALEXIS DOUTRE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Bergeron) 836 (i).  
 — CAPLIN RIVER POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027, 1308 (i).  
 — CARMICHAEL, ANDREW: M. for Pets., &c.\* (Mr. Reid) 1057 (i).  
 — COVERT, D., THORNVILLE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. Mills) 917 (i).  
 — CRAWFORD, DUNCAN: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 787.  
 — CREPEAU, J. H.: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Ives) 1057 (i).  
 — DABLON POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1027 (i).  
 — ELDON POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786.  
 — FOURNIER, JAKES: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 921 (i).  
 — GAULD, R. T., BURTONVILLE: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 1983 (i).  
 — HARTNEY, J. H.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2885 (ii).  
 — ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4106 (ii).  
 — KING'S AND YORK POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 546 (i).  
 — KINNEY, L. W., SALEM: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2411 (i).  
 — LAVERGE, M.P., LATE DEP. POSTMASTER, QUEBEC: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Casgrain) 2446 (i).  
 — MCKNIGHT, W., NINGA, MAN.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3740 (ii).  
 — MCMANUS, MRS., POSTMISTRESS AT NORTHFIELD, B.C., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1305.  
 — MCPHEE, ANGUS, HOPEFIELD, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4365 (ii).  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 546 (i).  
 — MAGENTA, P.Q.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 921 (i).  
 — MARTIN, MR., P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 926.  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 1663 (i).  
 — P.E.I. POSTMASTERS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 1056 (i).  
 — MUSQUODOBOIT, UPPER: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1542 (i).  
 — ROSS, DAVID: M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. Martin) 1057 (i).  
 — STE. PHILOMENE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Brown) 3256 (i).  
 — ST. VALERIE DE RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 2566 (i).  
 — STANLEY BRIDGE, (P.E.I.): M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 1663 (i).  
 — TREMBLAY, C. E., LES EBOULEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 263 (i).  
 — WEST, H. A., ANNAPOLIS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 567 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

- POST OFFICE: WHITE, ISAAC, FORT ERIE: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 3238 (ii).  
 — WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.): Ques. (Mr. Martin) 787 (i).  
 POTVIN, PETER, BYNG INLET: Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 263 (i).  
 QUARANTINE SUPT., WILLIAM'S HEAD STATION: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Prior) 1663 (i).  
 RETURNS: Inquiry (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2054 (i), 3743 (ii).  
 ROBERTSON, MR. A. B.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2879 (ii).  
 ST. PETER'S CANAL, DANIEL B. STONE: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 2414 (i).  
 TRENT CANAL, ROSEDALE WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).  
 — KENNEDY, MR.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).  
 — LAIDLAW, GEO., BALSAM LAKE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).  
 WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2122 (i).  
 WIGGINS, JOHN, B. C. PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2418 (i).  
 WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, W. J. CASSELMAN: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2415 (i).  
 DISTILLERIES, EXTRA DUTY OF OFFICERS, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i).  
 DIVISIONS:  
 AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: on M. for Com. of Supply, Amt. (Mr. Davin) to place on Free List, neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178 (i).  
 ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to confirm contract with Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4250 (ii).  
 I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL: on M. (Mr. Blair) to confirm agreement with Grand Trunk Ry. Co. and Drummond County Ry. Co., agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4339 (ii).  
 LIVERPOOL (N.S.) PUBLIC BUILDING: on M. (Mr. McMullen) to strike out vote on concurrence in Rep. of Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20, N. 40) 5441 (ii).  
 Divorce (Adeline Myrtle T. Lawry) B. No. 97 (Mr. Landerkin). 1°, —; 2°, 2022; in Com. and 3° on div., 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 97.)  
 DOBBIN, MR., DISMISSAL FROM LAND OFFICE WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4029 (i).  
 DOBSON, WM., POSTMASTER, TATAMAGOUCHE, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1541 (i).  
 Dom. Building and Loan Association B. No. 48 (Mr. Cowan). 1°, 1171; 2°, 1232; in Com. and 3°, 1936 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 85.)  
 Dom. Employees Attachment of Salaries B. No. 75 (Mr. Richardson). 1°, 1373 (i).  
 DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1633 (i).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 60 (Mr. Douglas). 1°, 1229; 2°, 2041 (i).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. Davin). 1°, 1229; 2°, 2037 (i).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. Sifton). 1°, 2798; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 29.)  
 DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4082, 5423 (ii).  
 DOM. NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).

- DOM. POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).
- Dom. Portland Cement Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79** (Mr. Britton). 1<sup>st</sup>, 1538; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1631; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 93.)
- Dom. Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 106** (Mr. Gibson). 1<sup>st</sup>, 2297 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2777; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3465 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 86.)
- DOUTRE, ALEXIS, POSTMASTER AT BEAUHARNOIS, APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 572 (i).
- DISMISSAL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Bergeron) 836 (i).
- Drainage across Railway Co.'s Lands B. No. 14** (Mr. Casey). 1<sup>st</sup>, 481; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1064 (i).
- DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2780, 4889 (ii).
- DRYDEN, SHEPPARD, APPNMT. AS CARETAKER OF GOVT. BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261 (i).
- DUCK BELTING, &C. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3710 (ii).
- DUNN, JOHN W., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 573 (i).
- DRUMMOND CO. RY., RENTAL : conc., 5457 (ii).
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 5158 (ii).
- See "L.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL."
- DYKE, JNO., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 572 (i).
- EAST BAY (C.B.) POST OFFICE, REMOVAL : Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4366 (ii).
- EASTER ADJOURNMENT : Remarks (Mr. Ellis) 708 (i).
- M. (Mr. Laurier) 838 (i).
- EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5530 (ii).
- EGGS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3408 (ii).
- ELDON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).
- ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, MAIL CONTRACTS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 837 (i).
- Election Act Amt. and Consolid. B. No. 7** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1<sup>st</sup>, 89; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 718; deb. adjd., 774; rsmd., 847, 973 (i).
- Deb. on M. for 2<sup>nd</sup> (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 856; (Mr. McMullen) 847; (Mr. Speaker) 852; (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 856; (Mr. Charlton) 860, 881; (Mr. Bennett) 870; (Mr. Calvert) 885; (Mr. Craig) 887; (Mr. Frost) 893; (Mr. Sproule) 897; (Mr. Ross Robertson) 906; (Mr. Morrison) 908; (Sir Charles Tupper) 973; (Mr. Davies) 993; (Mr. Roche) 1012; (Mr. Richardson) 1017; (Mr. Hughes) 1019; (Mr. Martin) 1023 (i).
- ELECTIONS : Certificates received during Recess (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- See "CONTROVERTED."
- ENRIGHT, MICHAEL, EMPLOYEE ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 2564 (i).
- Engineers' (Stationery) Examination and Steam Boilers Inspection B. No. 108** (Mr. Sutherland). 1<sup>st</sup>, 2408 (i).
- ESQUIMAULT DEFENCE, &C. : conc., 5426 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1985 (i).
- ESTEVEAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1638 (i).
- ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98 : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 667 (i).
- SUPPL., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).
- SUPPL., 1897-98, 4612 (ii).
- FURTHER SUPPL., 1897-98, 5009.
- TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR : Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 708 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270, 972 (i).
- EXCHEQUER COURT, LOCAL JUDGE IN ADMIRALTY, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1986 (i).
- EXCISE DUTIES COLLECTED BY A. DANIS, VALLEY-FIELD : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2422 (i).
- OFFICERS, INSPECTORS, &C., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS : in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
- EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM. : List of Members, 661 (i).
- EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND "FREE PRESS" : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4613 (ii).
- Export Duties B. No. 145** (Mr. Fielding). Res. prop., 4653, 4701; in Com., 4718; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4719 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 17.)
- EXPORT DUTIES ON PULP WOOD : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3872 (ii).
- EXPORT OF BACON, HAMS, &C. : prop. B., withdr. (Mr. Henderson) 4341 (ii).
- FAIRBROTHER, W. D., POSTMASTER AT BEAMSVILLE, APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 484 (i).
- See "BEAMSVILLE."
- FAIRLIE, REV. MR., WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 490 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Cameron) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1664, 2201 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. Jameson) 2307; (Mr. Richardson) 2308; (Mr. Sifton) 2310; (Mr. Craig) 2311; (Mr. Flint) 2314; (Mr. Sproule) 2316; (Mr. Bergeron) 2317; (Mr. Tarte) 2324; (Mr. McClure) 2328; (Mr. Davin) 2330, 2348 (i); (Mr. Maxwell) 2360; (Mr. Quinn) 2368; (Mr. Rutherford) 2376; (Mr. Powell) 2380; (Mr. Roche) 2384; (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2389; (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2393; (Mr. McIsaac) 2397; (Mr. Taylor) 2403 (i).
- FARM IMPLEMENTS, DUTY ON : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) to M. for Com. of Sup. 2054 (i).
- VOTE ON MR. DAVIN'S AMT. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Russell) 2298 (i).
- DUTY, COAL OIL IN TANK VESSELS : Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 2216 (i).
- in Com. of Ways and Means, 4152, 4155 (ii).
- FENELON FALLS CUSTOMS OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 258 (i).
- FIDDLE REEF (B. C.) MARINE LIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1376 (i).
- FILES AND RASPS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3698, 4133, 4137 (ii).
- FINANCE :
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 169 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL : in Com. of Sup., 2070 (i).
- CAMERON, JOHN, SAVINGS BANK AGENT, NEW GLASGOW, APPNMT., &C. : M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3448 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5201; conc. 5455 (ii).
- DANIS, A. D., CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUND: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2421 (i).
- DOM. NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).
- FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1721 (i).
- HALIFAX LOAN CO'S. B. SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. Fraser, Guysboro') 1665 (i).
- INSURANCE CO.'S ABSTRACT STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 492 (i).
- LOANS, TEMPORARY: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 949.
- LOAN (PUBLIC SERVICE) \$15,000,000: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4735 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS, SAVINGS BANK: (Mr. Lemieux) 789 (i).
- PRINTING GOVT. NOTES, STAMPS, &c., TENDERS AND CONTRACT: M. for copies (Mr. Foster) 516 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, ANNUAL REP.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 169 (i).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDITOR GEN.'S REPS.: M. (Mr. McMullen) 838 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS AND CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 492 (i).
- SUPPLY: Res. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 481 (i).
- See general heading.
- TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 1985 (i).
- [See "CUSTOMS," "TRADE AND COMMERCE," &c.]
- FIRE IN WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, DOCUMENTS DESTROYED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 919 (i).
- FIRE PROTECTION, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.: on conc., 5429 (ii).
- Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 127** (Mr. Davies). 1°, 3581; 2° and in Com., 3724; 3°, 3728 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 24.)

## FISHERIES:

- BEHRING SEA CONVENTION, RE-OPENING, LONDON PRESS, COR.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4472.
- SEAL REGULATIONS, ON ORDERS OF THE DAY: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2570 (i).
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 4471 (ii).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 2087, 2407, 2551 (i), 4839, 4999, 5427 (ii).
- FISHERY BULLETINS, DISTRIBUTION ON GASPE COAST, DELAY: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 4008 (ii).
- FISHERIES CASE, APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1303 (i).
- FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).
- FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE, SUPPLIES AND REPAIRS TO VESSELS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2447 (i).
- OFFICERS ON GOVT. STEAMERS; Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 3670 (ii).
- FISH ISLAND LIGHT-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2424 (i).
- FISHING BY FOREIGNERS IN B. C., ILLEGAL: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Prior) 2446 (i).
- LICENSES, PAYMENT IN ADVANCE: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 267 (i).
- IN BONAVENTURE: Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 671.
- GRANTED, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 837 (i).
- TO U. S. VESSELS, ISSUING: on conc., 5427 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

- FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1376 (i).
- GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4372 (ii).
- GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N. S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 4371 (ii).
- LOBSTERS, CANNED, SCIENTIFIC EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4999 (ii).
- EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. MacLennan, Inverness) 4759 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1550, 2051 (i).
- McNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Bostock) 3056 (ii).
- MACKEREL FISHERY IN N. S., PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 3673 (ii).
- OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).
- POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP-SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1375 (i).
- RIVER MATANE, FISHING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 4207 (ii).
- SALMON (B. C.) SOLD IN BRITISH MARKET, QUALITY, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Maxwell) 1991 (i).
- U. S. WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 4735 (ii).
- [See "MARINE."]
- FITCH BAY POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Moore) 3868 (ii).
- Forged or Unauthorized Endorsation of Bills B. No. 123** (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1°\* 3580; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- FORT ERIE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF ISAAC WHITE: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 3238 (ii).
- FORT FRANCIS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4970 (ii).
- FORTIFICATION WALLS, QUEBEC, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1303 (i).
- FOURNIER, JAKES, DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 921 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT: prop. withdr. of Amt. (Mr. Foster) 784 (i).
- on M. to adjn. Hse: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 546 (i).
- See "ELECTION ACT AMT."
- FRASER RIVER (B. C.) IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 4973 (ii).
- FRECHETTE, ACHILLE, TECHNICAL TRANSLATION: in Com. of Sup. 5057 (ii).
- FREE LIST: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3706 (ii).
- Freight Rates.** See "RAILWAYS."
- FUR CAPS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192 (ii).
- GAHAN, MR., LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 924 (i).
- CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3339.
- GALLAGHER, JOHN, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 923 (i).
- GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3862.
- IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS: M. for copy\* (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (ii).
- GALOPS RAPIDS, TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION M. for copy\* (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (ii).

- GAME LAWS, QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Poupore*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
- GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1078 (i).
- GASPE LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126.
- GATINEAU RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4959.
- GAULD, R. T., POSTMASTER, BURTONVILLE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1983 (i).
- "GAZETTE" AND "STAR," MONTREAL, FREE POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3841 (ii).
- General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 47** (Mr. *McMullen*). 1° 1075 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i), 4072.
- GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4372.
- GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N.S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4371 (ii).
- GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2740 (ii).
- GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
- GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1740 (i).
- GOODWIN vs. THE QUEEN, PAR. IN TORONTO "GLOBE": Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3840 (ii).
- GOVERNOR GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1666.
- GOVT. BUSINESS. See "BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE."
- COMMISSIONERS AND POLITICS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1543 (i).
- HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davis*) 3537 (ii).
- OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 4081, 5002 (ii).
- SUBSIDY AND POWERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1030, 1043 (i).
- OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1662 (i).
- STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
- GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1077 (i).
- GRAHAME, THOS., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
- GRAHAM, D., ESQ., Member for North Ontario: introduced, 3.
- GRAND NARROWS, (C.B.) PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).
- GRAND RIVER WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, NON-PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 790 (i).
- GRATUITIES TO RETIRED OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 4987, 4993, 5001 (ii).
- GRAY, LT. COL., LATE INSPECTOR OF STORES, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2881 (ii).
- Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92** (Mr. *Prefontaine*). 1°\*, 1666; 2°\*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81** (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°\*, 1538; 2°\*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. Mr. *Blair* 4737 (ii).
- ST. JEROME, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5157.
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S BRIDGE AT HAWKESBURY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
- Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70** (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°\*, 1373; 2°, 1574 (i); in Com., 2925, 3002; 3°\*, 3002 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 3875, 3919 (ii).
- GRETNA CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, J. F. TENNANT'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3503 (ii).
- GROSSE ISLE WHARF, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
- GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3870 (ii).
- G. T. R. AND DOM. GOVT., REPORTED GRANT OF \$300,000: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 574 (i).
- G. T. R. Co. of Can. B. No. 26** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°\*, 707; 2°\*, 785; in Com. and 3°\*, 1573 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- SUBSIDY (VICTORIA BRIDGE): prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5536 (ii).
- See "I. C. R." &c.
- GUITÉ, J. F., ESQ., Member for Bonaventure: introduced, 87 (i).
- GULF SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- HAGARSVILLE INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL OF DR. JONES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3530 (ii).
- HALIFAX LOAN CO.'S B., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1665 (i).
- HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).
- HALLIDAY, DAVID, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT MORRISBURG, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).
- HAMILTON AND NIAGARA CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1540 (i).
- HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, EXPENDITURES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 3971 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2577, 2719 (i), 4885, 4958 (ii).
- HARDY, HON. MR., SPEECHES DISTRIBUTED FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3741 (ii).
- HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
- LAKE REGION, GOLD DISCOVERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
- HARTNEY, J. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2885 (ii).
- HATCH, PATRICK, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
- HATS, CAPS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192.
- HENRY AND ROTHWELL, MESSRS., PROMOTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
- Personal Explanation (Messrs *Sproule* and *Haggart*) 1901 (i).
- HEYD, C. B., ESQ., Member for South Brant: introduced, 3 (i).
- HICKEY, JAMES, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).

HIDES AND SKINS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3711 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).

HILLSBOROUGH (P.E.I.) RIVER BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 1664.  
— in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).

HILTON AND MARKDALE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

HOG SLAUGHTER, SPECIAL COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

HOLT AND MOUNT ALBERT MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 795 (i).

HONORA WHARF, MANITOULIN ISLAND : in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).

HOPEFIELD POSTMASTER, ANGUS MCPHREE'S DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4365 (ii).  
— M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 546 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

ADDRESS TO HIS EX., CONSDN. : M. (Mr. Laurier) 6 (i).  
— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 1900 (i).  
— (JUBILER) TO HER MAJESTY : M. (Mr. Laurier) 3243 (ii).

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER : M. (Mr. Laurier) 838 (i).  
— ASCENSION DAY : M. (Mr. Laurier) 2878 (ii).

BIBAUD, AZABIE, EMPLOYT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3509 (ii).

BILLS : Royal Assent, 2765, 5543 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., MORNING SITTINGS : M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3582 (i).  
— NOTICES OF M. : M. (Mr. Laurier) 86 (i).  
— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS : M. (Mr. Laurier) 2867 (ii).  
— THURSDAYS : M. (Mr. Laurier) 783 (i).  
— WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS : M. (Mr. Laurier) 1899 (i).  
— SATURDAY SITTINGS : Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4394 (ii).  
— Ms. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4472, 5157 (ii).

CHAPLEAU'S NEW POLL-BOOK, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4843 ; conc., 5427 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 1, 420, 489, 1631 (i).

EASTER ADJNMT. : Remarks (Mr. Ellis) 708 (i).  
— M. (Mr. Laurier) 838 (i).

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATES, &c. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).  
— CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS : Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

HARDY, HON. MR., SPEECHES DISTRIBUTED FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3741 (ii).

INVERNESS ELECTION PET. : Remarks (Mr. McLennan) 2299 (i).

LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 4843, 4987, 5059, 5427 ; conc., 5451 (ii).

LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).  
— in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).

MEMBERS' ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5159 (i).

MEMBERS REMARKS CHECKED, 163, 555, 562, 699, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462, 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5229, 5316, 5401, 5403 (ii).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS—Con.

MEMBERS, NEW : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 86, 950, 1664, 1983 (i).

MINISTERS ANSWERING QUESTIONS : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 789 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 492, 667, 789, 1900 (i), 2658, 3742, 4008, 4612, 5009 (ii).

ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER QUOTING PREVIOUS DEB. : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 827 (i).  
— (Mr. Speaker) 177, 1381 (i).

PARLIAMENT, OPENING : Mess. by Black Rod 1 (i).  
— PROROGATION : Intimation (Sir Richard Cartwright) 5542 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION, re "GLOBE'S" ATTACK ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE (Mr. McInnes) 709 (i).  
— MEMBERS CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 177, 1381 (i).  
— SPEECH AT TONAWANDA (Mr. Charlton) 914 (i).  
— PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" (Mr. Prefontaine) 2657 (ii).  
— PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS" re MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER (Mr. Davin) 2886 (ii).

POULIOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 5184 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS PETS. : Ms. (Mr. Landerkin) 838, 1665.

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS : on Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Davin) 2126 (i).  
— PAR. IN MONTREAL "WITNESS" re MR. FAIRLIE'S LETTER (Mr. Davin) 2656 (ii).  
— SENATE AND I.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL (Mr. Sutherland) 5038 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT. : M. (Mr. Laurier) 4499 (ii).  
— DIAMOND JUBILEE, ADJNMT. : M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4736 (ii).

QUESTION PUT BY MEMBER CONTAINING STATEMENTS OF FACTS : Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).  
— RULED OUT OF ORDER : (Mr. Speaker) 3972 (ii).

RESTAURANT, SALE OF LIQUOR ; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 672 (i).

RETURNS, INQUIRIES FOR (Mr. Foster) 1999, 2298, 2572, (i), 2969, 4032, 4109 (ii).  
— (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2298 (i) 2969, 3419 4100.  
— (Mr. Davin) 2298, 2571 (i) 2887, 2970, 3146 (ii).  
— (Mr. McAlister) 2571 (i).  
— (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 2571 (i).  
— (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2969 (ii).  
— (Mr. Martin) 3243, 3678, 4032 (ii).  
— (Mr. Haggart) 4109 (ii).  
— (Mr. Bennett) 4122 (i).  
— (Mr. Mills) 4651 (i).

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS, ERROR IN PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1231 (i).

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2741 (ii).

SELECT STANDING COMS. See "COMMITTEES."

SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 2103.  
— INDEMNITY, SEN. AND HOUSE OF COMMONS : prop Res. (Mr. Davies) 3671 (ii).

SPEAKER, DEP., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).  
— AND ELECTIONS : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 2218 (i).

SPECIAL COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM : M. (Mr. Casey) 1227 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE : Rep. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE : withdr. requested (Mr. Speaker) 1909, 2137, 2139, 2140 (i).

VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS (PRINTING) ; in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1452 (i).
- WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 420, 481 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, EMPLOYMENT OF SEALER "DIANA": Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 1810, 1824.
- Remarks (Mr. *Davies*) 1811, 1829, 1987; (Mr. *Davin*) 1817, 1833, 1987; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1820; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1820; (Mr. *Foster*) 1821; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1825; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1827; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1927; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1829; (Mr. *Casey*) 1832; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1834 (i).
- CHARTER OF "DIANA": Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1987.
- Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 796 (i), 2884 (ii)
- RESIDENCE, &C., OF CREW: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2884 (ii).
- MILBURN & CO.'S OFFER OF SHIP "PORT PERIE": Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1988 (i).
- HUDSON BAY PORTS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
- Hudson's Bay and Yukon Rys. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3705 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 46.*)
- Hull Electric Co. See "C.P.R."
- Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Poupore*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>, 784 (i).
- Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1539; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1631 (i); withdn., 3668 (ii).
- HUNGERFORD, WM., ENGINEER DREDGE "OTONABEE," DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1774 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
- HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

## IMMIGRATION:

- AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES IN GREAT BRITAIN, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (ii).
- IN CAN., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3743, 4033; contingencies, 4066 (ii).
- IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4062 (ii).
- SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572 (i).
- IN IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669.
- IN U. S., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3507.
- DALY, HON. T. M., REP. ON IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 922 (i).
- DUNN, JOHN W., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
- DYKE, JNO., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572 (i).
- GRAHAME, THOS., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
- IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 3743, 4033, 4062, 4992.
- BUILDING, LOUISE EMBANKMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).
- WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
- JURY, ALF., IMMIGRATION AGENT, AND TORONTO STREET RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2216 (i).
- O'KELLEY, E., IMMIGRATION AGENT TO IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669 (i).
- SMALL-POX AMONG IMMIGRANTS, WINNIPEG (1893): in Com. of Sup., 4083 (ii).

[See "AGRICULTURE, SUPPLY," &C.]

Indemnity. See "SENATE."

## INDIANS:

- ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2568 (i).
- BRANTFORD INDIAN OFFICE, APPNMT. OF DAVID HILL: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3539 (ii).
- CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT McIVER, : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
- DAUNAIS, C. M., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1450 (i).
- DISTURBANCES IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3059.
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- INDIAN DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 4828 (ii).
- INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4073, 5000 (ii).
- INDIAN DEPTL. COR., UNANSWERED: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).
- "INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE (N.S.) SALE OF HAY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).
- INDIANS, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA REGIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1986 (i).
- INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHEDULE OF TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 130, 487, 1078, 1301.
- MR. McCOLL'S LETTER re PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).
- MICMAC INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMillan*) 4019 (ii).
- REGINA, REMOVAL OF OFFICE TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1985 (i).
- ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).
- SAUGEEN RESERVE, INDIAN AGENT CROWE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788, 847 (i).
- SCHOOLS, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4081 (ii).
- THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).
- TUSCARORA INDIAN RESERVE, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 787, 927 (i).
- WILLIAMS, P. J., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1450 (i).
- WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DATE OF APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).
- SUPT.'S APPNMT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).
- See "FAIRLIE, Rev. Mr."
- [See "MAN.," "N. W. T.," &C.]
- INDIAN CORN: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3409, 3417, 3426, 4399 (ii).
- "INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE (N.S.) Sale of Hay: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).
- INDIAN GARDEN (N.S.) &C., AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- INDIA-RUBBER BOOTS, BELTING, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4145 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE:
- CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 2509 (i), 4864, 5058.
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- DISTILLERIES, CLERKS, EXTRA PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i).
- EXCISE DUTIES COLLECTED BY A. DANIS, VALLEY-FIELD: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2422 (i).
- OFFICERS, INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).
- FRECHETTE, ACHILLE, TECHNICAL TRANSLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5057 (ii).
- GAS, SALARIES OF INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

- GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., CHANGES :  
Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1077 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 1721, 1912,  
(i), 4339 (ii).
- REP. : Presented (Sir Henri Joli de Lot-  
biniere) 86 (i).
- DEPTL. CHANGES : Personal Explanation (Sir  
Henri Joli de Lotbiniere) 4366 (ii),
- LAWS, INFRACTION : Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1544,  
1637 (i).
- COST OF COLLECTIONS, MONTREAL, & C. : Ques.  
(Mr. Bergeron) 3057 (ii).
- ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURE FROM GEO. VEZINA : Ques.  
(Mr. Davin) 1374 (i).
- SEIZURE AT PONT ROUGE : Ques. (Mr. Dugas)  
1373 (i).
- PETROLEUM, REFINED, REDUCTION OF DUTY : prop.  
Res. (Mr. Moore) 823 (i).
- STAPLES, INSPECTION OF : in Com. of Sup., 5058 (ii).
- SPENCE, JOHN, INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION :  
Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1079 (i).
- “ SILVER SPRAY ” AND “ MARY GROVER, ” SEIZURE :  
Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 927, 1300 (i).
- TRAVELLING, RENT, FUEL, & C., EXCISE OFFICERS :  
in Com. of Sup., 2507 (i).
- VEZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REV. DEPT. : Ques. (Mr.  
Casgrain) 2569 (i).
- WEIGHTS, MEASURES, GAS, & C. : in Com. of Sup.,  
2511, 2557 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR,  
APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 793 (i).
- METRICAL SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brock-  
ville) 1027 (i).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 144** (Sir  
Henri Joly de Lotbiniere). Res. prop. and in Com.,  
4698 ; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 2<sup>nd</sup> and in Com., 4699 ; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4701  
(ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- INLAND REVENUE DEPT., DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS.  
SINCE JULY, 1896 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Wood,  
Brockville) 1663 (i).

**Inspection Act.** See “ GENERAL. ”

## INTERIOR :

- ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP : Ques. (Mr.  
Davin) 1374 (i).
- BOUNDARY. See “ ALASKA. ”
- BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION : M. for  
Ret. (Mr. Davis) 1744 (i).
- CARTWRIGHT, MR. F. L., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR  
MOUNTED POLICE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 489 (i).
- CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. BY REBEL-  
LION, 1885 : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 490 (i).
- COAL BORING IN P. E. I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES : Ques.  
(Mr. Martin) 796 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 4083, 5223, 5423 (ii).
- ESTEVAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA : Ques.  
(Mr. Davin) 1638 (i).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr.  
Fisher) 5542 (ii).
- GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION : Ques.  
(Mr. Morrison) 1744 (i).
- GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS :  
Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 1740 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. See “ HUDSON BAY. ”
- INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPTL. REP. ; Presented (Mr. Sif-  
ton) 492 (i).
- INTERIOR : in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1701, 2068 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- INTERIOR DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, GRATUITIES : in Com. of  
Sup. 5001 (ii).
- MCGIBB, WM., NOTIFICATION OF SUPERANNUATION :  
Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1987 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE : Ques. (Mr.  
Oliver) 1990 (i).
- COMMISSIONER'S REP. : Presented (Mr. Law-  
rier) 1072 (i).
- PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS : Ques. (Mr. Prior)  
1375 (i).
- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE AND MOUNTED POLICE :  
Ques. (Mr. Davin) 97 (i).
- SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS : M. for Ret. (Mr.  
Davis) 3530 (ii).
- SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING IN B. C., PAYMENTS *re* :  
Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3146 (ii).
- WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP : prop.  
res. (Mr. Davin) 1051 (i).
- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :**
- ALLOWANCES TO INJURED PASSENGERS : in Com. of  
Sup., 5276 (ii),
- BICYCLES CARRIED FREE : Remarks (Mr. McMullen)  
2473 (ii).
- COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION, SALARIES : in Com.  
of Sup. 5254 (ii).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- RET. : Presented (Mr. Blair) 4203 (ii).
- IONA STATION RESTAURANT : Ques. (Mr. Bethune)  
1739 (i).
- LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 3834 ; conc.,  
5421 (ii).
- MCLEAN, JAMES, FOREMAN CARPENTER : Ques. (Sir  
Charles H. Tupper) 2121 (i).
- NEW TIME TABLE : Remarks (Mr. Choquette) 3241 (ii).
- MCDONALD, A. R., GENERAL INSPECTOR, APPNMT. :  
Ques. (Mr. Pouliot) 1078 (i).
- POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPNMT. : Ques.  
(Mr. Gillies) 788 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, & C. : in Com. of Sup., 3745, 5113,  
5269, 5288, 5457 ; conc., 5421, 5477 (ii).
- I. C. R., EXTENSION TO MONTREAL :** Ques. (Sir Charles  
Tupper) 1304 (i).
- COR. WITH G. T. R., & C. : M. for copy\* (Mr.  
Boisvert) 2446 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1545 (i), 2657, 3540.
- DRUMMOND CO. RY. AND G. T. R. : Rep. pre-  
sented (Mr. Blair) 4202 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 5079 (ii).
- I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, G. T. R. and  
Drummond Co. Ry. Co.'s Agreement  
B. No. 142** (Mr. Blair). Res. prop., 4086 ; M.  
for Com., 4258 ; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340 ; in  
Com., 4341, 4342, 4373 ; 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 4477 ; 2<sup>o</sup> and in  
Com., 4612 ; 3<sup>o</sup> m. \*, 4654 ; 3<sup>o</sup>, 4697 (ii).
- Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. Blair) 4258, 4344-4394 ; (Mr.  
Foster) 4259, 4287 ; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4259 ;  
(Sir Charles Tupper) 4259 ; (Mr. Pope) 4307 ; (Mr.  
Charlton) 4314 ; (Mr. Haggart) 4319 ; (Mr. Craig)  
4324 ; (Mr. Dupont) 4326 ; (Mr. Wallace) 4330 (ii).
- Deb. in Com. (Mr. Foster) 4342, 4374 ; (Sir Charles Tup-  
per) 4344-4394 ; (Mr. Blair) 4342, 4375 ; (Mr. Haggart)  
4345, 4378 ; (Mr. Sproule) 4347, 4373 ; (Mr. Ingram)  
4347, 4385 ; (Mr. Lount) 4349 ; (Mr. Wallace) 4351,  
4383 ; (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 4355, 4386 ; (Mr. Powell)  
4358 ; (Mr. Davies) 4384 ; (Mr. Britton) 4386 ; (Mr.  
Clancy) 4386 ; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4387 (ii).

**I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—Con.**

Deb. on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (Mr. Blair) 4654; (Mr. Sproule) 4654, 4667; (Mr. Haggart) 4655; (Mr. McMullen) 4663; (Mr. Lavergne) 4665; (Mr. Gibson) 4671; (Mr. Powell) 4677; (Mr. Foster) 4694, 4697 (ii).

**Interest Act Amt. B. No. 15** (Mr. Quinn). 1<sup>o</sup>, 550 (i); 2<sup>d</sup> m., 3562 (ii).

**Interest B. No. 134** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3971; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 4252; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 8.)

**INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESS.**: Presented (Mr. Laurier) 492 (i).

**INVERNESS ELECTION PET.**: Remarks (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) 2299 (i).

**IONA WHARF (N.S.) REPAIRS TO WHARF**: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 489, 921, 1740 (i).

—— **STATION RESTAURANT**: Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1739 (i).

**IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 5158 (ii).

**IRON FORGINGS**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3639.

**IRON, PIG, CAN. MANUFACTURE AND BOUNTY**: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 97 (i).

**IRON OR STEEL ANGLES, &c.**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3637 (ii).

—— **NUTS, &c.**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3696.

**Iron and Steel Bounties Provision B. No. 149** (Mr. Fielding). Res. prop., 4653; in Com., 5186; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 5201; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 5288 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 6.)

**IRON OR STEEL SCRAP**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3583 (ii).

**IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1633 (i).

**ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL**: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4106 (ii).

**ISLE PERROT WHARF**: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

**James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52** (Mr. Lount). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3<sup>o</sup>, 2609 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 47.)

**JAMESON, R. W., ESQ., Member for Winnipeg**: introduced, 1665 (i).

**JAPAN, APPNMT. OF AGENT**: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3339.

—— **TREATY**: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 1985 (i).

**JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

**JONES, JUDGE, RESIGNATION AND GRATUITY**: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2882 (ii).

—— **M. for Cor.\*** (Mr. Bennett) 3537 (ii).

**ONES, DR., DISMISSAL AS INDIAN AGENT**: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clancy) 3530 (ii).

**Judges**. See "SUPREME COURT."

**JUBILEE POSTAGE STAMPS**: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 2654.

**JUDIQUÉ WHARF, N.S.**: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

**JURY, ALF., IMMIGRATION AGENT, AND TORONTO STREET RY.**: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2216 (i).

**JUSTICE:**

**ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE**: in Com. of Sup., 3731, 4141, 4841, 4986 (ii).

**JUSTICE—Con.**

**ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES**: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 262 (i).

**ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT. AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS**: in Com. of Sup., 4082; conc., 5423 (ii).

**BOMPAS, BISCHOFF & CO., SOLICITORS FOR THE DOM., RETIREMENT**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 546 (i).

**CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES**: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii).

**CIVIL SERVICE ACT, MIN. OF JUSTICE'S OPINION**: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2124 (i).

**CONVICTS LIBERATED, SENTENCES COMMUTED, &c.**: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 546 (i).

**COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMMISSIONS WITHOUT LEGISLATION**: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2124 (i).

**DOM. POLICE**: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).

**EXCHEQUER COURT, LOCAL JUDGE IN ADMIRALTY, APPNMT.**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1986 (i).

**FISHERIES CASE, APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT**: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 136, 1303 (i).

**GAHAN, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY**: Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3339.

**GOVT. OF N.W.T., SUBSIDY AND POWERS**: M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 1030, 1043 (i).

**GOVT. OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 1662 (i).

**JONES, JUDGE, RESIGNATION AND GRATUITY**: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2882 (ii).

—— **M. for Cor.\*** (Mr. Bennett) 3537 (ii).

**JUSTICE DEPT.**: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 4833 (ii).

**LITIGATED MATTERS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE**: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).

**MAN. SCHOOLS QUES., PAPERS NOT BROUGHT DOWN**: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 168, 826 (i).

—— **REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE**: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 342 (i).

—— **AND REMEDIAL ORDER**: Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 792 (i).

—— **MR. FITZPATRICK'S LETTER TO HON. ED. BLAKE**: M. for copy (Mr. Quinn) 836 (i).

—— **SETTLEMENT**: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 918, 1307, 1451.

**MAN. SCHOOL FUND, COM. ON RES.**: M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3842 (ii).

**PENITENTIARIES DEPT.**: in Com. of Sup. 1668, (i),

—— **REP.**: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3679 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2794, 4740, 4798, 4774, 4987 (ii).

**PRINCE ALBERT, SHERIFF, APPNMT.**: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 667.

**SULLIVAN, DANL. BRIAN, RELEASE FROM IMPEISONMENT**: M. for Papers\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1663 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3383 (ii).

**SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT**: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 4476 (ii).

**SUPREME COURT, R. G. DAVIS'S SALARY**: in Com. of Sup., 4986 (ii).

**KARSDALE POST OFFICE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER**: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 916 (i).

**Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. Bostock). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1574 (i); in Com., 2450; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 48.)

**KELLY, MISS, WINDSOR P.O. EMPLOYEE**: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 920 (i).

**KENNEDY, MR., DISMISSAL FROM TRENT CANAL**: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).

- KENTVILLE AND LIVERPOOL P. O. : in Com. of Sup. ; 4901 ; conc., 5432 (ii).
- KING, G. G., APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER AT MARSH HILL : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261, 268, 483 (i).  
 — M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).
- KING'S AND YORK, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Britton*). 1°\*, 950 ; 2°\* 1058 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\*, 3540 (ii).
- KINGSTON COTTON MILLS AND TARIFF CHANGES : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 98 (i).  
 — DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).  
 — AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2425 (i).  
 — PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1983 (i).  
 — DISMISSAL OF GUARDS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3338 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2795, 4740, 4774 (ii).  
 — POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SUPERANNUATION, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3740, 3865.
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 ; in Com., 5512 (ii).
- KINNEY, L. W., POSTMASTER AT SALEM, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2411 (i).
- KNIGHT'S POINT (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
- KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. to adjn., 5540 (ii).
- La Banque du Peuple B. No. 86** (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°\*, 1539 ; 2°\*, 2347 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\*, 3003 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- LABELS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 2474.
- LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSALS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2410 (i).  
 — QUES. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).  
 — DAVID DAME : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3338 (ii).  
 — STOREMAN BEHAN : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).  
 — MICHAEL ENRIGHT : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).  
 — ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150 ; conc., 5451 (ii).
- LAFLEUR, JOHN, PAYMENT TO : in Com. of Sup., 4986.
- LAIDLAW, GEO., DISMISSAL TRENT CANAL : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
- Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 72 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°\*, 1373 ; 2°\*, 1574 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- "LA LIBRE PAROLE," LIBELLOUS STATEMENTS AGAINST MIN. OF CROWN : Ques (Mr. *Taylor*) 3971 (ii).
- La Mutuelle Canadienne B. No. 119 (Mr. *Madore*). 1°\*, 2967 ; 2°\*, 3090 ; in Com. and 3°\*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 3834 ; conc., 5421 (ii).
- LA PRAIRIE ICE PIERS, & C. : in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).
- Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 115** (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 2798 ; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°\*, 1172 ; 2°\*, 1232 ; in Com., 2163 ; 3° m., 2408 ; recom., 2602 ; 3°, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 791 (i).
- L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 670 (i).
- LAROCHE, G., DISMISSAL : Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).
- Laurin, OCTAVE, BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER AND COUNTY ELECTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).  
 — APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).
- LAVERGE, M. P., LATE DEP. POSTMASTER, QUEBEC, DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
- LAVOIE, DR. NAP., STR. "LA CANADIENNE" : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304, 1544 (i).
- LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 4843, 4987, 5059, 5427 ; conc., 5451 (ii).
- "Les Cisterciens Réformés" incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°\*, 1539 ; 2°, 1632 ; in Com. and 3°\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- LES EBOULEMENTS POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).
- Libel Law Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°\*, 1738 (i).
- LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS, LIMITATION OF AGE : Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
- "LILY," TUG, PAYMENTS BY GOVT. FOR HIRE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1809 (i).
- Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Hughes*). 1°\*, 1899 ; 2°\*, 2022 (i) ; in Com. and 3°\*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- LINLEY, HENRY, FISHERY INSPECTOR, CEDAR SPRINGS, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 4206 (ii).
- LITIGATED MATTERS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
- LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE : Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) on conc. in Vote rep. from Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20, N. 40) 5441 (ii).  
 — PAR. MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542 (ii).
- Loan Association.** See "DOM. BUILDING."
- LOANS, GOVT., TEMPORARY : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 949.
- Loan (\$15,000,000) for Public Service B. No. 148** (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 4736 ; in Com., 5161 ; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 5163 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- Loan Companies.** See "BUILDING SOCIETY."
- LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 4769 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON : Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1550, 2051 (i).

- Lord's Day Observance B. No. 10** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 258; 2<sup>o</sup>, 674; in Com., 2460 (i).
- MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 2789 (ii).
- MACPHERSON, DR., GRATUITY TO WIDOW**: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).
- McARTHUR, WM., CUSTOMS OFFICER, FENELON FALLS, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).  
— M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1639, 1774 (i).
- MCCALLUM, PETER, LOCK SUPT. DU LIEVRE, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1835; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
- MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER**: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2421 (i).
- MCDONALD, DANL., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST**: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
- MCDONALD, CAPT. JOHN N., CHARGES AGAINST**: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 791 (i).
- MCDONALD, A. R., GENERAL INSPECTOR I.C.R., APPNMT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 1078 (i).
- MCDONALD, G., APPNMT., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, P.E.I.**: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).
- MCGIRR, WM., NOTIFICATION OF SUPERANNUATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1987 (i).  
— SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).
- McINTYRE'S LAKE AND SYDNEY LAKE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.**: Ques. (Mr. *Haley*) 3741 (ii).
- McIVER, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT CAPE CROKER**: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
- MCKENZIE, CAPT. WM., OF DREDGE "CANADA," DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1743 (i).
- MCKNIGHT, W., POSTMASTER AT NINGA, MAN., DISMISSAL, &C.**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3740 (ii).
- MCLEOD AND MCKAY, MESSRS., BRIDGE TENDERS ON I.C.R., DISMISSAL**: M. for Reps.\* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2447 (i).
- McMANUS, MRS., POSTMISTRESS, NORTHFIELD (B.C.) DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1305 (i).  
— on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 1379 (i).  
Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1379; (Mr. *Foster*) 1380; (Mr. *Davis, Saskatchewan*) 1385; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1385; (Mr. *McInnes*) 1386; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1387; (Mr. *Oster*) 1388; (Mr. *Prior*) 1389; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1390; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1391; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1392; (Mr. *Lount*) 1393 (i).  
— ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTHFIELD, CHARACTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2879 (ii).
- McNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3056 (ii).
- McNEILL, J. R., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT GRAND NARROWS, DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).
- McPHEE, ANGUS, POSTMASTER AT HOPEFIELD, DISMISSAL**: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 546 (i).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4365 (ii).
- MABOU HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.**: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4206, 4226 (ii).
- MACKEREL FISHERY IN N.S., PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN**: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS SAVINGS BANK**: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS, WINTER MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789, 1027 (i).
- MAGENTA (P.Q.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.**: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 921 (i).
- MAIL CONTRACTS IN N. S.**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1025.  
— CANCELLED SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664.  
— OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4106 (ii).  
— in Com. of Sup., 2790, 5083 (ii).  
— SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994; conc., 5419 (ii).  
— See "POST OFFICE."
- MANITOBA**:
- FAIRLIE, REV. MR., PRINCIPAL WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, APPNMT, &C.**: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).
- GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., CHANGES**: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1077 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION**. See "HUDSON BAY."
- JAMESON, R. W., ESQ., Member for Winnipeg**: introduced, 1665 (i).
- MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER**: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2421 (i).
- MILITIA CORPS, MORRIS (MAN.) ORGANIZATION**: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1307 (i).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 262 (i).  
— POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2883 (ii).  
— in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, MAN., UNSETTLED CLAIM OF PROV.**: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 546 (i).
- RUTHERFORD, J. G., ESQ., Member for Macdonald**: introduced, 1990 (i).
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS**: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1987 (i).
- SIFTON, HON. C., Member for Brandon**: introduced, 3.
- TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, MAN.**: in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).
- WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION BUILDING**: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
- WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, NAME OF PRINCIPAL, &C.**: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).  
— APPNMT. OF SUPT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).
- WINNIPEG AND ST. LONIFACE HOSPITAL**: in Com. of Sup., 2263.  
[See "NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES."]
- Man. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24** (Mr. *Douglas*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>, 785 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c. 52.*)
- MAN. SCHOOLS QUES., PAPERS NOT BROUGHT DOWN**: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 168 (i).  
— REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 342 (i).  
— AND REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 792 (i).  
— MR. FITZPATRICK'S LETTER TO HON. ED. BLAKE: M. for copy (Mr. *Quinn*) 836 (i).  
— FURTHER PAPERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 826 (i).  
— SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 918, 1307, 1451 (i).

- MAN. SCHOOL FUND: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) for Com. on Res., 3842 (ii).
- Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 19** (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (i).
- MARBLE, & C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3497 (ii).
- MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WILLIAM BEAUMONT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4364 (ii).
- MARCOTTE, F. A., Esq., Member for Champlain: in introduced, 950 (i).
- MARGARETTSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).  
— TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).
- MARINE:**
- BEAR RIVER (N.S.) OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAV., & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).  
— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).
- BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).
- CAN. REGISTRY OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 2290.
- CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).
- COASTING LAWS OF CANADA AND U. S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Britton*) 3525 (ii).
- CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).  
— CONSTRUCTION, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- FIDDLE REEF (B.C.) MARINE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. See "HUDSON BAY."
- HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).
- GASPE LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126.
- GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
- IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633 (i).
- "LA CANADIENNE," DR. NAP. LAVOIE: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304, 1544 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS, LIMITATION OF AGE: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).
- MARINE HOSPITALS AND SHIPWRECKED SEAMEN: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1730, 2007 (i); com., 3730, 4839 (ii).
- NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS IN: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).
- "NEWFIELD," STR., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2290.
- PINPLATS BARGES, REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 921 (i).
- POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT., & C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
- REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
- TIDAL SERVICE, & C.: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
- WRECKS, INVESTIGATION INTO: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
- [See "FISHERIES," & C.]
- Maritime Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40** (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1071; 2<sup>o</sup>\* 1202 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- MARSH HILL (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. of G. G. KING: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261, 268, 483 (i).  
— M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).
- MARTIN, MR., POSTMASTER, (P. E. I.) DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926 (i).
- MAUGERVILLE, UPPER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, & C.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).
- MEDICINAL PREPARATIONS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3477 (ii).
- Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 56** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3<sup>o</sup>, 2610 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- MELOCHEVILLE POSTMASTER, STAMP SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2418 (i).
- MEMBERS, NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 86, 950, 1664 (i).
- MEMBERS' ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5159 (ii).  
— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542.
- MEMBER CALLED TO ORDER: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Speaker*) 177 (i).
- MEMBERS REMARKS CHECKED: 163, 555, 562, 699, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462, 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5229, 5316, 5401, 5403 (ii).
- MERCIER JOS., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633, 1835 (i).
- MERCIER, WILFRID, APPNMT. AS COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 917 (i).  
— INVESTIGATION AT POST OFFICE, VALLEY-FIELD: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2448 (i).
- MERRICK, POST OFFICE INSPECTOR, NEGLECT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 2409 (i).
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:  
ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 667 (i).  
— Suppl., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).  
— Suppl., 1897-98, 4612 (ii).  
— further Suppl., 1897-98, 5009 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 492 (i).
- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2658 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, REPLY: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1900 (i).
- METAL GLOVE FASTENERS, & C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4466 (ii).
- METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).
- Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23** (Mr. *Britton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- MICMAC INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMillan*) 4019 (ii).
- MILITIA:**
- ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO. 3, DISBANDMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 340.
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1078 (i).

**MILITIA—Con.**

- GRAY, LT. COL., LATE INSPECTOR OF STORES; Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2881 (ii).
- KINGSTON AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2425 (i).
- MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1926 (i), 4802, 4831, 4861, 4993 (ii).
- MILITIA, ACTIVE, NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND MEN: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Adolphe Caron) 2445 (i).
- ALDERSHOT CAMP (N.S.) SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2448 (i).
- CAMPS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS BATTALIONS: Ques. (Mr. Stenson) 3668 (ii).
- CORPS, MORRIS (MAN.) ORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. La Rivière) 1307 (i).
- MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, REORGANIZATION: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2447 (i).
- ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 791 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3540 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 4802 (ii).
- Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4108 (ii).
- SERGEANTS SERVICES DISPENSED WITH: Ques. 4121 (ii).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1926 (i), 4831 (ii).
- DEPT. REP.: Presented (Sir Richard Cartwright) 667 (i).
- MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4861 (ii).
- OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2415 (i).
- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4861, 4994 (ii).
- PAR. IN QUEBEC "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. Davin) 3239 (ii).
- NAMES OF MILITIA OFFICERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3236 (ii).
- CELEBRATION, VOTE FOR MILITIA: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2558 (ii).
- LIST OF OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1901.
- APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 973, 1083.
- Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 973 (i).
- COLONIAL TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 922 (i).
- M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. Domville) 838 (i).
- QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 1739 (i).
- ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1029 (i).
- COAL OIL SUPPLY, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1078 (i).
- CONTRACT FOR DRUGS: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1028 (i).
- VETERANS OF 1837-38, PENSION CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cameron) 3537 (ii).
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES, &c., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3056 (ii).
- Minden and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55** (Mr. McHugh). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 55.)
- Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. Maxwell). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1632, 1775; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 90.)

- MINING DEVELOPMENT, &c., CO.'S PET., REF. BACK TO COM.:** M. (Mr. Morrison) 2563 (i).
- MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY UNDER TARIFF:** Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2219 (i).
- MINISTERS ANSWERING QUESTIONS:** Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 789 (i).
- MISCELLANEOUS:** in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i), 3863, 4082, 5000, 5205; conc., 5456 (ii).
- MITCHELL, DR. GEO., INDIAN PHYSICIAN AT WALPOLE ISLAND:** Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 927 (i).
- MONTFORD COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4738 (ii).
- MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 5281 (ii).
- Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 90** (Mr. Préfontaine). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 67.)
- MONTREAL INLAND REVENUE, COST OF COLLECTIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3057 (ii).
- Montreal and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 101** (Mr. Préfontaine). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1899; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2022 (i).
- MONTREAL POST OFFICE, NEW SKYLIGHTS, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
- MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS OF CAN.:** in Com. of Sup., 4861 (ii).
- MORGAN, MICHAEL, POSTMASTER AT BEAR ISLAND:** Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 672 (i).
- MORRISBURG CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT.:** Ques. (Mr. Broder) 341, 489 (i).
- DAVID HALLIDAY'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Broder) 1775 (i).
- DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 489 (i).
- MOUNT ALBERT AND HOLT MAIL CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 795 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE:** in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 4078 (ii).
- Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 62** (Mr. Davin). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1231; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2037 (i).
- **Pension Act Amt. B. No. 57** (Mr. Davin). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172 (i).
- (1889) **Amt. B. No. 59** (Mr. Davis). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1228; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2036 (i).
- (1889) **Amt. B. No. 89** (Mr. Davin). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1539 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE:** Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 1990 (i).
- MT. STEWART (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).
- MUMA, HENRY, OFFICIAL REFEREE, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 3719 (ii).
- DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Somerville) 4735 (ii).
- MURRAY BAY AND ST. PAUL MAIL CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. Morin) 263 (i).
- WHARF AND MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 340 (i).
- MURRAY HARBOUR (P. E. I.) HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.:** Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2216 (i).
- BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1029 (i).
- MUSQUODOBOIT, UPPER, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER:** Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1542 (i).
- MUTTON, &c.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3358 (ii).

**Mycenian Marble Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 83** (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1632; in Com., 2345, 2449; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2449 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

**Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 105** (Mr. *Davies*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2215 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 2742; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2800; Sen. Amts., 4109 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3720 (ii).

NANTEL, BRUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 482 (i).

**National Life Assurance Co's. of Can. incorp. B. No. 74** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1574; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2426 (i).

#### NEW BRUNSWICK:

BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5528 (ii).

CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).

CAPE TORMENTINE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N. B. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

DISMISSALS. See general heading.

OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McAlister*) 1663 (i).

ST. JOHN HARBOUR, in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

SCOVIL, WALTER B., PET. re: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2415 (i).

SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

SUSSEX, GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARE-TAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).

WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).

[See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

NEPEAN POINT INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE, OTTAWA, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).

NEWBURG AND KINGSTON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).

"NEWFIELD," STR., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2433 (i).

NEWSPAPERS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3707 (ii).

#### NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., PAR. IN HALIFAX *Chronicle*: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3420 (ii).

COAL TRADE OF N. S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES, FINANCE MINISTER, Mr. (*Gillies*) 669 (i).

#### NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS—*Con.*

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND *Free Press*: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4105 (ii).

GOODWIN vs. THE QUEEN, PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3840 (ii).

*La Libre Parole*, LIBELLOUS STATEMENTS AGAINST MIN. OF CROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3971 (ii).

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542 (ii).

MEMBERS ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5159 (ii).

MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER, PAR. IN MANITOBA *Free Press*: (Mr. *Davin*) 2886 (ii).

NEW YORK *Sun's* ARTICLE ON QUEEN VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1990 (i).

PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2657 (ii).

REP. OF SPEECH IN *Globe* (Mr. *Craig*) 3672 (ii).

**Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 37** (Mr. *Ingram*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 914; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1058; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

NICOLET RIVER BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).

**North American Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 54** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

NORTHFIELD (B.C.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1305 (i).

— INSPECTOR FLETCHER'S REP.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2021 (i).

NORTH HARBOUR, ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Bethune*) 2445 (i).

NORTH PERROTT POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485.

— POSTMASTER, MR. SPURR'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 1998 (i).

NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S BUILDING OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1740 (i).

#### NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).

ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).

BANFF ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 5000.

BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 1744 (i).

CARTWRIGHT, MR. F. L., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 489 (i).

CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOV'T, REBEL-LION, 1885; Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 490 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (i).

CUSTOMS COLLECTORS, HUDSON BAY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794, 1452 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 2560 (i).

DAUNAIS, C. M., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1450 (i).

DAVIS, T. O., Esq., Member for Saskatchewan: introduced 3 (i).

DISMISSALS. See general heading.

ESTEVAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1633 (i).

GOVT. HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davis*) 3537 (ii).

GOVT. OF N. W. T., SUBSIDY AND POWERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1030, 1043 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 4081, 5002 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

- GRAIN TRANSPORT FROM N. W. T. AND MAN., 1891 TO 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3509, 3669 (ii).
- GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3870 (ii).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. See "HUDSON BAY."
- HUDSON BAY PORTS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794, 1452 (i).
- INDIAN DISTURBANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3059.
- INDIAN OFFICE, REGINA, REMOVAL TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1985 (i).
- INDIANS, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA REGIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1936 (i).
- INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N. W. T., SCHEDULE OF TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 487, 1078, 1301 (i).
- Mr. McCOLL'S LETTER *re* PURCHASE; Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1990 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH, C. P. R., PAR IN PRINCE ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 2657.
- SHERIFF, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 667 (i).
- QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1079 (i).
- QUARANTINE, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3238 (ii).
- REGINA, LONG LAKE, &c., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1637 (i).
- ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN BRIDGE, EDMONTON: in Com. of Sup., 2787 (ii).
- SASKATCHEWAN MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1634 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING Co.'s B., PROCEEDINGS NULL AND VOID: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5537, 5539 (ii).
- SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND UNION LAKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1633 (i).
- SCHOOLS, INDIAN, DAY, BOARDING AND INDUSTRIAL: in Com. of Sup., 4076, 5000 (ii).
- SCHOOLS, UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES, SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5002 (ii).
- SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3530 (ii).
- SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989, 2215 (i).
- TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
- WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP; PROP. RES. (Mr. *Davin*) 1051 (i).

[See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

## North-west Territories Act Amt. B. No.

114 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 2797; 2° and in Com., 4110; 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

NORWAY IRON, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3718 (ii).

## NOVA SCOTIA:

- ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS POSTAL SERVICE. See "POST OFFICE."
- BADDECK AND IONA, GRAND NARROWS AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 2791; conc., 5419 (ii).
- BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- BOULARDERIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i).
- CENTRAL RY. AND LIVERPOOL, &c., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5524 (ii).
- COAL TRADE OF N.S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES OF FINANCE MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 669 (i).
- COAST LINE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2552 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N.S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).
- HALIFAX LOAN Co.'s B., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1665 (i).
- HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).
- "INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE, SALE OF HAY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).
- INDIAN GARDEN, &c., AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- INVERNESS ELECTION PET.: Remarks (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 2299 (i).
- IONA STATION RESTAURANT: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1739 (i).
- REPAIRS TO WHARF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489, 921, 1740 (i).
- JUDIQUE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).
- KENTVILLE AND LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4901; conc., 5432 (ii).
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 670 (i).
- LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1550, 2051 (i).
- MABOU HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4206, 4226 (ii).
- MACKEREL FISHERY, PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).
- MARGARETSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).
- TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).
- MILITIA CAMP, ALDERSHOT, QUEEN'S CO., SUPPLIES; M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2448 (i).
- NORTH HARBOUR ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE; M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Bethune*) 2445 (i).
- NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S, BUILDING OF WHARF; Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1740 (i).
- N. S. CENTRAL RY., BALANCE OF SUBSIDIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).
- N. S. SOUTHERN RY., SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).
- PIERS, &c., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. Mr. *Mills*) 486, 487 (i).
- POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 788 (i).
- PORT HAWKESBURY AND BROAD COVE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE, &c., GUYSBOROUGH, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2793, 4998 (ii).
- PUGWASH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).
- ST. ANDREW'S P. O., REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3235 (ii).
- ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5009 (ii).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).
- SUNNY BRAE RY., SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).
- SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com. 5521, (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- THORNE, JAMES H., COMPLAINT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).
- WALLACE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2720 (ii).
- WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
- WINDSOR JUNCTION (I.C. R.) AND UPPER MUGQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5520 (ii).
- [See "POST OFFICE," &c.]
- OAK BAY MILLS POST OFFICE, CLOSING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1663 (i).
- OAK POINT, (N.B.) LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, G. R. PICKETT'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (ii).
- OATHS OF OFFICE. See "ADMINISTRATION."
- O'BRIEN, WM., DISMISSAL FROM STR. "LANSDOWNE": Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4008 (ii).
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
- ODESSA POSTMASTER, NAME, RECOMMENDATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 266 (i).
- OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL: in Com. of Sup., 4073 (ii).
- O'KELLEY, E., IMMIGRATION AGENT TO IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669 (i).
- OLDFIELD, SAMUEL E., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT POINT AU BARIL, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
- OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2415 (i).
- O'LEARY, HUGH, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1302 (i).
- OLEO-STEARINE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3712 (ii).
- ONTARIO:

- ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4949.
- ALGOMA ELECTION, COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4987, 5059; conc., 5451 (ii).
- ANDERSON, THOS. E., APPNMT. AS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Wilson*) 1057 (i).
- BENNETT, W. H., Esq., Member for East Simcoe: introduced, 3.
- BINDER TWINE MADE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 1634 (i).
- CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT McIVER: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
- "CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 260 (i).
- COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
- CORNWALL, CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5115 (ii).
- AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (i).
- AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).
- CROWE, INDIAN AGENT, SAUGEEN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788, 847 (i).
- CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1633 (i).
- ERNEST FALLS CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).
- FISHING LICENSES GRANTED, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).
- FORT FRANCIS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4970 (ii).
- GAHAN, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3339 (ii).
- GALOPS CANAL, IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 108 (i).
- GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2740 (ii).
- GRAHAM, D., Esq., Member for North Ontario: introduced, 3.
- HAMILTON AND NIAGARA CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1540 (i).
- HEYD, C. B., Esq., Member for South Brant: introduced, 3.
- HILTON AND MARKDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
- HONORA WHARF, MANITOULIN ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
- INDIAN OFFICE, BRANTFORD, APPNMT. OF DAVID HILL: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3539 (ii).
- IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
- KAMINISTIGUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).
- KELLEY, MISS, WINDSOR P. O. EMPLOYEE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 920 (i).
- KINGSTON COTTON MILLS AND TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 98 (i).
- DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
- AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2425 (i).
- PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1983 (i).
- DISMISSAL OF GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3338 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 795, 4740, 4774 (ii).
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736; in Com., 5512 (ii).
- LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 791 (i).
- McIVER, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT CAPE CROKER: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
- MAJOR'S HILL PARK, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 2653.
- MILITARY COLLEGE. See "MILITIA."
- MITCHELL, DR. GEO., INDIAN PHYSICIAN AT WALPOLE ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).
- MORRISBURG CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).
- DAVID HALLIDAY'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Broder*) 1775 (i).
- NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 482 (i).
- NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2426 (i).
- NEPEAN POINT, OTTAWA, INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
- OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2415 (i).
- O'LEARY, HUGH, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1302 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4736; in Com., 5512 (ii).
- OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5517 (ii).
- OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 796 (i).
- POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCormack) 266 (i).
- PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Ingram) 837 (i).
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
- PRINCE EDWARD CO., PREVENTIVE OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 491 (i).
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
- RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5285 (ii).
- RIDEAU HALL, GROUNDS AND RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 2592 (i), 2613, 4885, 5132, 5274 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, CANALS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 2423 (i).
- SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1025 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1080 (i).
- NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS: M. for copy\* (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (i).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 5117 (ii).
- SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).
- SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
- SNETSINGER, J. D., ESQ., Member for Cornwall and Stormont: introduced, 3 (i).
- SOULANGES CANAL, SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 341, 488 (i).
- SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 488 (i).
- SECTION 12, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 489 (i).
- SECTION 12, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copies\* (Mr. Clancy) 2447 (i).
- SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. Clancy) 2447 (i).
- STRATHROY CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Calvert) 483 (i).
- STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5818 (ii).
- THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1080 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1025 (i).
- TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).
- OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3863, 4825, 5126 (ii).
- TUSCARORA INDIAN RESERVE, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Clancy) 3538 (ii).
- WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 787 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 793 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- WELLAND CANAL, SUPERANNUATION: conc., 5454 (ii).
- WELLER BAY AS AN OUTPORT, VALUE OF GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Corby) 1663 (i).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, MR. HICKRY: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).
- [See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS, &c."]
- Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Mr. Os'er). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 80.)
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 28 (Mr. Snetsinger). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 945; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1775 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 57.)
- ORANGEDALE, MARGAREE, &c., MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4365 (ii).
- ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER QUOTING PREVIOUS DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 827 (i).
- (Mr. Speaker) 1381 (i).
- ORWELL (BRUSH WHARF) PREVENTIVE OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1301 (i).
- CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1742 (i).
- "OTONABEE," DREDGE, DISMISSAL, ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 259 (i).
- M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Hughes) 1774 (i).
- OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- Ottawa Gas Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. Belcourt). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1983; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 74.)
- OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SIDEWALKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. Hendcrson) 5037 (ii).
- Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. Champagne). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2475 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2778; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 58.)
- OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4736, 4738 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737; in Com., 5517 (ii).
- Ottawa and New York Ry. Co. See "ONTARIO PACIFIC."
- "OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS": M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. Davin) 1546 (i).
- RUDYARD KIPLING'S POEM: Quotation (Mr. Richardson) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 1428 (i).
- OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 796 (i).
- OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).
- PACIFIC CABLE, GOVT. ACTION: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4109 (ii).
- POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2417 (i).
- PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1375 (i).
- PAINTINGS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3708.
- PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3508 (i).

- PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, REPAIRING WALKS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5037 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod, 1.  
 — PROROGATION: Intimation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5542 (ii).
- Patents. See "MYCENIAN MARBLE CO."
- Patent Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Fisher*).  
 1°, 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 3722 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 25.)  
 'PATENT RECORD': in Com. of Sup., 2107 (i).
- PATENTS FOR WIRE FENCES, NUMBER GRANTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2882 (ii).
- PEARS AND PEACHES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4132, 4133 (ii).
- PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 261 (i).
- PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i), 2794, 4740, 4774, 4798, 4987 (ii).
- PENSION ACT. See "MOUNTED POLICE."
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* PROP. TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 175 (i).  
 — *re* CAN. SUGAR REFINERY: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 270 (i).  
 — "GLOBE'S" ATTACK ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (i).  
 — SPEECH AT TONAWANDA (Mr. *Charlton*) 914 (i).  
 — HENRY'S AND ROTHWELL'S PROMOTIONS (Mr. *Sproule*) 1901 (i).  
 — PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE," PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2657 (ii).  
 — PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS" *re* MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER (Mr. *Davin*) 2886 (ii).  
 — QUEBEC BRIDGE (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).  
 — See "PRIVILEGE," &c.
- Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 139 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*). 1°, 4204; 2° and in Com., 4719; 3°, 4724 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 20.)
- PETROLEUM, REFINED, REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 828 (i).
- PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- PHOTOGRAPHS &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3475.
- PICKETT, G. R., OAK POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (ii).
- PIERS, &c., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486, 487 (i).
- Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Guay*). 1°, 1373; 2°, 1573 (i); in Com., 3539, 3704; 3°, 3705 (ii).  
 — REFUND OF FEES: M. (Mr. *Guay*) 4734 (ii).
- PINPLATS BARGES, REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 921 (i).
- PIRATE HARBOUR POST OFFICE, CLOSING: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1028 (i).
- PLEBISCITE BILL, PREMIER'S PROMISE TO INTRODUCE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3505 (ii).
- POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
- POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
- POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 788 (i).
- POIRIER, T., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).
- PONTIAC COUNTY, DROWNED LANDS, CLAIMS UNSETTLED: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3869 (ii).
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737, 4738 (ii).
- PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5520 (ii).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2883 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).  
 — GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 262 (i).
- PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
- PORT HAWKESBURY TO BROAD COVE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND CANSO, GUYSBORO', PORT HOOD MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2793, 4998 (ii).
- PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).  
 — HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
- POST OFFICE:  
 ANNAPOLIS CO. MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1989 (i).  
 — MAIL ROUTE, PETITION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3237 (ii).  
 — MAIL SERVICE, PAYMENT TO GEO. BROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).  
 — POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 567 (i).  
 — D. G. RIGDAN, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).  
 — POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS ROYAL AND LIVERPOOL MAIL ROUTES, CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Mills*) 2446 (i).  
 — POSTMASTER, MR. WEST'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 2001 (i).
- ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).
- ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).
- AYLMER WEST, POSTMASTER PRICE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1663 (i).
- BEAR ISLAND POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672.  
 — MORGAN, MICHAEL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672 (i).
- BRAUHERNOIS POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).  
 — AND COUNTY ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).
- BRANTFORD FREE POSTAL DELIVERY: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3537 (ii).
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS, APPNMTS. TO P.O. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Spoule*) 2564 (i).
- COBOURG POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1306 (i).  
 — AND COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2020 (i).
- CONSERVATIVE NEWSPAPERS, DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 918 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CONTRACTS CANCELLED SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Cameron) 1664 (i).  
 DANVILLE AND ST. CAMILLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Ives) 3538 (ii).  
 DISMISSALS. See general heading.  
 DOBSON, WM., TATANAGOUCHE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1541 (i).  
 EAST BAY (C.B.) POST OFFICE, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 4366 (ii).  
 ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 837 (i).  
 ESQUIMALT POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR: Ques. (Mr. Frier) 1985 (i).  
 FITCH BAY POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Moore) 3868 (ii).  
 FLETCHER, INSPECTOR, REP.: M for copy\* (Mr. Davin) 2021 (i).  
 "GAZETTE" AND "STAR," FREE POSTAGE FROM MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 3841 (ii).  
 GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 3870 (ii).  
 HOLT AND MOUNT ALBERT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 795 (i).  
 INSPECTORS, CREATION OF NEW OFFICERS: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Cameron) 1664 (i)  
 JUBILEE POSTAGE STAMPS: Ques. (Mr. Gibson) 2654.  
 KARDSDALE POST OFFICE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 916 (i).  
 KELLEY, MISS, WINDSOR P.O. EMPLOYER: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 920 (i).  
 KINGSTON POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3738 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3740, 3865 (ii).  
 ——— MR. SHANNON'S, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 2653 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3058 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 3738 (ii).  
 KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE, ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 5540 (ii).  
 LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE, PAR. MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Personal Explanation (Mr. Henderson) 5542 (ii).  
 MCINTYRE'S LAKE AND SYDNEY LAKE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Huley) 3741 (ii).  
 MCMANUS, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTHFIELD, B.C., CHARACTER: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 2879.  
 MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 789 (i).  
 MAIL CONTRACTS IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1025 (i).  
 MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 5063 (ii).  
 ——— CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 5083 (ii).  
 MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994; conc., 5419 (ii).  
 MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WM. BEAUMONT: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 4364 (ii).  
 MELOCHEVILLE POSTMASTER, STAMP SALE: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2418 (i).  
 MERCIER, WILFRID, INVESTIGATION AT POST OFFICE, VALLEYFIELD: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Bergeron) 2448.  
 MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1027 (i).  
 MARSH HILL (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. OF G. G. KING: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261, 268, 483 (i).  
 ——— M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 1663 (i).  
 MERRICK, P.O. INSPECTOR, NEGLECT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 2409 (i).  
 MOUNT ALBERT AND HOLT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 795 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

MURRAY BAY AND ST. PAUL MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 263 (i).  
 MURRAY BAY WHARF AND MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 340 (i).  
 NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3720 (ii).  
 NEWBURG AND KINGSTON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. Wilson) 1748 (i).  
 NORTH PERROTT POST OFFICE, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 485 (i).  
 ——— POSTMASTER, MR. SPURR'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mills) 1998 (i).  
 OAK BAY MILLS, P.O., CLOSING: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. McAlister) 1663 (i).  
 ODESSA POSTMASTER, NAME, RECOMMENDATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 266 (i).  
 ORANGEDALE, MARGAREE, &c., MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4365 (ii).  
 OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4106 (ii).  
 PACIFIC POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2417 (i).  
 P.E.I. MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 1560 (i).  
 PIRATE HARBOUR POST OFFICE, CLOSING: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1028 (i).  
 POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. Mulock) 2970 (ii).  
 POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 787 (i).  
 POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1721, 2066 (i), 2790, 4417, 5059, 5083, 5110, 5264; conc., 5431 (ii).  
 ——— ADMINISTRATION, APPNMT. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Cameron) 492 (i).  
 QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1079 (i).  
 RIORDAN, D. G., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 3235 (ii).  
 ST. ANDREW'S P. O. (N.S.) REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE: Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3235 (ii).  
 ST. AUBERT AND ST. PAMPHILE MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3235 (ii).  
 ST. CHARLES AND ST. GERVAIS MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3721 (ii).  
 ST. PAUL AND MURRAY BAY MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 263 (i).  
 SADOWA POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2123 (i).  
 SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND UNION LAKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1633 (i).  
 SASKATCHEWAN MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1634 (i).  
 SHUBENACADIE AND DEAN MAIL CONTRACT: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 1663 (i).  
 STRATFORD STREET LETTER-BOX SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 2126 (i).  
 STRATHROY POST OFFICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Calvert) 797 (i).  
 SUNNY BRAE AND MELROSE MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1027 (i).  
 TOTTENHAM AND ATHLONE MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 3537 (ii).  
 U. S. AND CAN. MAIL REGULATIONS, WITHDEWLS. BEFORE DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. Britton) 1635 (i).  
 VALLEYFIELD MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSIT: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1743 (i).  
 ——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT. OF E. DION: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2418 (i).  
 ——— APPNMT., &c.: (Mr. Bergeron) 2566 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

VIRGINIA POST OFFICE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).  
 — Mr. BANK'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*)  
 1999 (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

YOUNG'S COVE POST OFFICE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).

[See "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Post Office Act further Amt. B. No. 29  
 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 3676; 2° and in Com., 4500;  
 in Com., 4725, 5372, 5531, 5537; 3°, 5539 (ii).  
 (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 26.)

POST OFFICE DEPT., ADMINISTRATION, APPNMT. OF  
 INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 492.

— INSPECTORS, CREATION OF NEW OFFICERS: M.  
 for Cor.\* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).

— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup.,  
 5083 (ii).

POTVIN, PETER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL AT BYNG  
 INLET: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 263 (i).

POULIOT, MR., LATE M. P., DECEASED: Remarks  
 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5184 (ii).

Presbyterian Church of Can. Temporalities  
 Fund B. No. 18 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°,  
 707; 2°, 785; in Com. and 3°, 1936 (i). (60-61  
*Vic.*, c. 94.)

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i), 5002,  
 5013, 5040 (ii).

PRICE, DAVID N., APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER AT AYL-  
 MER WEST: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: Ques.  
 (Mr. *Martin*) 918 (i).

— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2445 (i).

CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT:  
 Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).

COAL BORING IN P.E.I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES: Ques.  
 (Mr. *Martin*) 796 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).

DISMISSALS. See general heading.

GOVT. OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.:  
 M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1662 (i).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.\*  
 (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1664 (i).

— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).

KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2730.  
 LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: on M. for  
 Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 4769.

MCDONALD, DANL., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS,  
 CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

MCDONALD, CAPT. JOHN N., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques.  
 (Mr. *Martin*) 791 (i).

MCDONALD, G. APPNMT., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR,  
 P.E.I.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

MUREAY HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques.  
 (Mr. *Martin*) 1029 (i).

— HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr.  
*Martin*) 2216 (i).

ORWELL (BRUSH WHARF) PREVENTIVE OFFICER,  
 APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*, 1301 (i).

— CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*)  
 1742 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CHARGES AGAINST  
 CAPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3843,  
 3854 (ii).

— MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 1560.

RYS. IN P.E.I.: M. for Ret., (Mr. *Martin*) 2051 (i).

SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &c., PROP. RY.: M. for Cor.  
 (Mr. *Martin*) 1657, 2043 (i).

STANLEY BRIDGE AND P.E.I. RY., PETS. re CONSTRU-  
 CTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2881 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).

TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr.  
*Perry*) 3057 (ii).

VERNON RIVER BRIDGE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques.  
 Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

WEST POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr.  
*Martin*) 792 (i).

[See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH C.P.R., PAR. IN PRINCE  
 ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. *Davis*)  
 2657 (ii).

— SHERIFF, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 667 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD CO., PREVENTIVE OFFICERS: Ques.  
 (Mr. *Pettet*) 491 (i).

PRINTING DAY BOOKS, PORTS OF ENTRY: in Com. of  
 Sup., 2562 (i).

PRINTING GOVT. NOTES, STAMPS, &c., TENDERS AND  
 CONTRACTS: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).

— See "AMERICAN BANK NOTE."

PRINTING, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664 (i).

— ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Laurier*)  
 2476 (i).

— 2ND REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*)  
 4364 (ii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup.,  
 1669 (i), 4830 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr.  
*Landerkin*) 838, 1665 (i).

— MISCELLANEOUS, SEL. COM.: List of Members,  
 663 (i).

— REF. TO COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1227.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM.: List of  
 Members, 661 (i).

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS: on  
 Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. *Davin*) 2126 (i).

— PAR. IN "WITNESS" re MR. FAIRLIE'S LETTER  
 (Mr. *Davin*) 2656 (ii).

— REP. OF SPEECH IN "GLOBE" (Mr. *Craig*) 3672.

— SENATE AND I.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL  
 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5038 (ii).

— See "NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS," &c.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1978, 2066  
 (i), 4830 (ii).

PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, MEMBERS ADJOURNING DEB.:  
 Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 167, 178 (i).

PROROGATION: Intimation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*)  
 5542 (ii).

Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B.  
 No. 40 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°, 4204; 2°, in Com.  
 and 3°, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664.

— AND AUDITOR GEN.'S REPS.: M. (Mr. *Mc-*  
*Mullen*) 838 (i).

PUBLIC BILLS, &c., ON M. TO ADJN. HSE. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 555 (ii).  
 — NOS. 2 AND 3, REP. FROM SELECT COM. : M. (Mr. Casey) to place on Order Paper, 3500 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Casey) 4500 (ii).  
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERECTED IN DOM., &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 492 (i).  
 — MAN., UNSETTLED CLAIM OF PROV. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. LaRiviere) 546 (i).  
 PUBLIC HEALTH : in Com. of Sup., 2202, 2226 (i).  
 PUBLIC WORKS :  
 ARCHITECTS, DRAUGHTSMEN, &c., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 4660 (ii).  
 BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P. E. I.) EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 918 (i).  
 — M. for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 2445 (i).  
 BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 2577, 2758, 4880, 5278 (i); conc., 5456 (ii).  
 CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2565 (i).  
 "CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 26 (i).  
 CLERKS OF WORKS, GOVT., PRIVATE PRACTICE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1396 (i).  
 DISMISSALS. See general heading.  
 DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2780, 4889 (ii).  
 DRYDEN, SHEPPARD, APPNMT. AS CARETAKER GOVT. BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261 (i).  
 FIRE IN WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, DOCUMENTS DESTROYED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 919 (i).  
 — TEMPORARY REPAIRS TO ROOF, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1301 (i).  
 FORTIFICATION WALLS. QUEBEC, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1303 (i).  
 GRAND RIVER WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, NON-PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 790 (i).  
 GROSSE ISLE WHARF EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 919 (i).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2719, 4885, 4958 (ii).  
 HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, EXPENDITURES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Penny) 3971 (ii).  
 HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 1744 (i).  
 IONA WHARF (N.S.) PAYMENT FOR REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 489, 921, 1740 (i).  
 LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 791 (i).  
 L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 670 (i).  
 "LILY," TUG, PAYMENTS BY GOVT. FOR HIRE : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1809 (i).  
 MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT : in Com. of Sup., 2789 (ii).  
 MABOU HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 4206, 4226 (ii).  
 MARGARETSVILLE PIER, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 3868 (ii).  
 MURRAY HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1029 (i).  
 — HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 2216 (i).  
 NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA : M. for Ret. (Mr. Belcourt) 2426 (i).  
 NICOLET RIVER BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boisvert) 671 (i).  
 NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S, BUILDING OF WHARF : Ques. (Mr. Bethune) 1740 (i).

## PUBLIC WORKS—Con.

NORTH HARBOUR, ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Bethune) 2445 (i).  
 OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 793 (i).  
 PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, REPAIRING WALKS : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 5037 (ii).  
 PIERS, &c., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 486, 487 (i).  
 PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 262 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2883 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).  
 PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c. : M. for Stmt \* (Mr. Ingram) 837 (i).  
 "PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CHARGES AGAINST CAPT. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 792 (i).  
 PUBLIC WORKS DEPT : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i), 4893 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2719, 2758, 4865, 5280, 5416; conc., 5456 (ii).  
 QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ARREARS OF INTEREST : Ques. (Mr. Penny) 4471 (ii).  
 RENTS, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2551, 2592, 2652 (i), 4885 (ii).  
 RICHELIEU RIVER, WORKS AT BELOEIL, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1302 (i).  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 2787, 4974 (ii).  
 ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1987 (i).  
 ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 5009 (ii).  
 SUSSEX (N.B.) GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261 (i).  
 TELEGRAPH LINES IN B.C., GOVT. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. Bostock) 2576 (i).  
 TEMPORARY CLERKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).  
 TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 3957 (ii).  
 WESTMINSTER AND BURBARD INLET TELEPHONE CO. : Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2420 (ii).  
 WHARFS, REPAIRS TO : in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).  
 WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 792 (i).  
 PUGWASH WHARF (N.S.) : in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).  
 PULP WOOD, EXPORT DUTY : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 2021, 2297 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3872 (ii).  
 PUTTY : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3478 (ii).  
 QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1079 (i).  
 QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).  
 — MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3238 (ii).  
 — REGULATIONS, U. S., MAN., N. W. T. AND B. C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Davin) 797, 822 (i).  
 — IN VICTORIA : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 1554 (i).  
 — STATION, B. C. : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 2405 (i).  
 QUEBEC :  
 ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 2568 (i).  
 AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1541 (i).  
 ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO 3, DISBANDMENT : Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 340 (i).  
 BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. CONTROL : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261 (i).  
 — GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1541 (i).  
 — OPERATING : in Com. of Sup., 5133; conc., 5452.

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- BAZINET, MR., OF JOLIETTE, AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS : Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT. &c. : M. for O. C.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).
- APPNMT. OF COLLECTOR OF TOLLS : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).
- DRAINAGE CULVERTS : in Com. of Sup., 5131, 5270.
- BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542 (i).
- BERTHIER PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 5280.
- WHARF, DURS COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 262 (i).
- BIBAUD, AZARIE, EMPLYMT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3509 (ii).
- BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).
- BRODEUR, S. A., COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2419 (i).
- CACOUNA, EXTENSION OF WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION, AMT. PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).
- CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, TENDERS FOR STONE : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- CHAMPAGNE, L. N., ESQ., Member for Wright : introduced, 86 (i).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIERE DE PRAIRIES BRIDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).
- CIVIL SERVANTS, COUNTY OF GASPÉ, COMMISSION re : Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451 (i).
- CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 2553 (i).
- DANIS, A. D., CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUND : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2421 (i).
- EXCISE COLLECTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2422 (i).
- DISMISSALS. *See general heading.*
- EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 ; in Com., 5520 (ii).
- FISHERY BULLETINS, DISTRIBUTION ON GASPÉ COAST, DELAY : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4008 (ii).
- FORTIFICATION WALLS, QUEBEC, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1303 (i).
- GAME LAWS, QUEBEC : Remarks (Mr. *Poupore*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (i).
- GASPÉ LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126 (i).
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY (VICTORIA BRIDGE) : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 ; in Com., 5536 (ii).
- GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 3875, 3919 (ii).
- GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &c. (MONTREAL DISTRICT) : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4372 (ii).
- GROSSE ISLE WHARF, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
- GUITE, J. F., ESQ., Member for Bonaventure : introduced, 87 (i).
- GULF SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- ILLCIT STILLS, SEIZURE AT PONT ROUGE : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1373 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- ILLCIT SEIZURE FROM GEO. VÉZINA : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE LAWS, INFRACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1544, 1637 (i).
- IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633 (i).
- ISLE PERROT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 ; in Com., 5513 (ii).
- LACHINE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150 ; conc., 5451 (ii).
- LAPRAIRIE, ICE PIERS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).
- LAVOIE, DR. NAP., STR. "LA CANADIENNE" : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304 (i).
- EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1544 (i).
- NANTEL, BRUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 491 (i).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS SAVINGS BANK : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).
- WINTER MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1027 (i).
- MARCOTTE, F. A., ESQ., Member for Champlain : introduced, 950 (i).
- MERCIER, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633, 1835 (i).
- MILITIA CAMPS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS BATTALIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 3668 (ii).
- MONTFORD COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5281 (ii).
- MONTREAL INLAND REVENUE, COST OF COLLECTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3057 (ii).
- POST OFFICE, NEW SKYLIGHTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
- OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL : in Com. of Sup., 4073 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736, 4738 (ii).
- PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, VACANCY : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 261 (i).
- PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- PONTIAC COUNTY, DROWNED LANDS, CLAIMS UNSETTLED : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3869 (ii).
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737, 4738 (ii).
- PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 ; in Com., 5520 (ii).
- POULIOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5184 (ii).
- RIMOUSKI PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
- RIVER MATANE FISHING LEASES : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 4207 (ii).
- RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).
- RIVIERE DU LIEVRE WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 4958.
- RIVIERE STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
- ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, CONTRACTS FOR DRUGS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1029 (i).
- COAL OIL SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- POSTMASTER'S DEFALCATION : in Com. of Sup., 5213 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C., AMTS. PAID: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 3867 (ii).
- NORTH CHANNEL, STRAIGHTENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
- RIVER REACHES: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
- REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).
- SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2576 (i), 4865.
- ST. MARTIN'S POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4941, 5273.
- ST. NICHOLAS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4959 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5150 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. OF ARBITRATORS; Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1540 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5123 (ii).
- SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Boisvert) 671 (i).
- SUBSIDIES TO RY. CO.'S, DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 670 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 4476 (i).
- TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICER, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 491 (i).
- UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4737 (ii).
- VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 926 (i).
- VEZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REVENUE LAWS: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1637, 2569 (i).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF \$300,000: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 342, 489 (i).
- [See "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &C.]
- Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Langelier). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1538; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1631; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2021 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- QUEBEC BRIDGE, SPEECH OF MAYOR OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1637 (i).
- AND HON. MR. DOBELL: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1989 (i), 3056 (ii).
- Personal Explanation (Mr. Choquette) 4205 (ii).
- QUEBEC AND GASPÉ BASIN, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 790 (i).
- MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 4995 (ii).
- QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ARREARS OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. Penny) 4471 (ii).
- QUEBEC LAND SLIDE, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3719 (ii).
- Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. Langelier). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- QUEBEC ORIENTAL RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 918 (i).
- Queen's Birthday (Perpetual Holiday) Commemoration B. No. 94 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1738 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 3583; (Sir Charles Tupper) 4373; (Mr. Clarke) 4499 (ii).
- QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Ross Robertson) 1739 (i).
- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE AND N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 97 (i).
- MILITIA CONTINGENT: M. (Mr. Domville) to adjn. Hse., 838.

- QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 973, 1083 (i).
- LIST OF OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1901 (i).
- PAR. IN QUEBEC "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. Davin) 3239 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 4861, 4994 (ii).
- COLONIAL TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 922 (i).
- M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. McNeill) 946 (i).
- MILITIA APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1083 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3236 (ii).
- CELEBRATION, VOTE FOR MILITIA: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2658 (ii).
- MONUMENT, COMMEMORATIVE: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 3508 (ii).
- BANK HOLIDAY: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 4372 (ii).
- CELEBRATION OF DAY: M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 4736 (ii).
- MR. LAURIER'S EXPENSES: conc., 5456 (ii).
- QUESTIONS RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i), 3972 (ii).

## RAILWAYS:

- AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1541 (i).
- BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1541 (i).
- GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 261 (i).
- PAR IN HALIFAX "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3420 (ii).
- B. C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S CHARTER, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 340 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACT: prop. Res. (Mr. McInnes) 493 (i).
- EXPIRATION OF TIME FOR DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3234 (ii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. McInnes) 709 (ii).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 567 (i).
- COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S B., RETURN OF FEES: Remarks (Mr. Bostock) 4651 (ii).
- CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AND C. P. R., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 568 (i).
- PLANS DEPOSITED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 267 (i).
- DISMISSALS. See general heading.
- HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 1664 (i).
- SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
- N. S. CENTRAL RY., BALANCE OF SUBSIDIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 3868 (ii).
- N. S. SOUTHERN RY., SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 4471 (ii).
- PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH, C. P. R., PAR. IN PRINCE ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. Davis) 2657 (ii).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. Blair) 492 (i).
- RYs. IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Martin) 2051 (ii).
- REGINA, LONG LAKE, &C., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1637 (i).
- RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY.: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 567 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Boisvert) 671 (i).
- SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &C., PROP. RY.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Martin) 1657, 2043 (i).
- STANLEY BRIDGE AND P.E.I. RY., PETS. *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 2881 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES TO RY. CO.'S, DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 670 (i).
- SUBSIDIES (DOM.) TO RYS., &C.: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 177, 269, 948 (i).
- SUNNY BRAE RY., SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1542 (i).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF \$300,000: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 342, 574 (i).
- O. C. *re* GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 489 (i).
- SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4738; in Com., 5536 (ii).
- [See "I. C. R.," "SUBSIDIES," &C.]
- Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Maclean). 1°, 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1058 (i).
- Ry. Act further Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. Gibson). 1°, 95; 2°, 673 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. Casey). 1°, 565; 2° m., 1775; 2°, 1798 (i); in Com. and 3°, 3545 (ii).
- Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. No. 2 (Mr. Casey). 1°, 87; 2° m., 608; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 614, 1299 (i); in Com., 3560 (ii).
- B. No. 3 (Mr. Maclean). 1°, 87; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 621 (i).
- RY. COMMISSION, CREATION OF: Ques. (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) 3976 (ii).
- Ry. Freight Rates Regulation B. No. 63 (Mr. Reid). 1°, 1299 (i).
- RY. LANDS AND TAXATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3513 (ii).
- Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. Beattie). 1°, 3234 (ii).
- Ry. Return Fare Tickets (Sale) B. No. 11 (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry). 1°, 257; 2°, 695 (i).
- RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 661 (i).
- RYS. AND CANALS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1928, 1937, (i), 4830 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 3745, 3843, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150, 5269, 5288; conc., 5451 (ii).
- RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
- RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5285 (ii).
- RECIPROCAL RIGHTS, BELGIUM AND GERMANY: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 1462 (i).
- TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 1456 (i).
- Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. Davin). 1°, 3418; 2°, 3705; in Com. and 3°, 4051 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- REGINA, LONG LAKE, &C., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1637 (i).
- RENTS, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2592, 2652 (i), 4885 (ii).

## REPORTS PRESENTED:

- AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fielding) 169 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. Fisher) 1072 (i).
- LIST (Mr. Fisher) 178 (i).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. Fisher) 5542 (ii).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. Sifton) 492 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere) 86.
- INSURANCE CO.'S ABSTRACT STATEMENT, 492 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
- MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) 667 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP. (Mr. Laurier) 1072 (i).
- PENITENTIARIES (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 3679 (ii).
- POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) 2970 (ii).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. Fisher) 5542 (ii).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. Fielding) 169 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) 492 (i).
- SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. Fisher) 178 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS AND CHARTERED BANKS (Mr. Fielding) 492 (i).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS. (Mr. Paterson) 257 (i).
- Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. Domville). 1°, 2051; Order for 2°, 2166; M. withdn., 2348 (i); 2°, 2777; withdn., 4119 (ii).
- Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. Wood, Hamilton). 1°, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); 2°, 2776; M. for Com., 3909, 4046; in Com. and 3°, 4050 (ii).
- REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
- RICE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4130 (ii).
- RICE FACTORIES IN CAN., NUMBERS, &C.: (Mr. Macdonald, Huron) 258 (i).
- Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. Belcourt). 1°, 1171; 2°, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- RICHELIEU RIVER, WORKS AT BELGIL, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1302 (i).
- GUIDE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).
- RIDEAU HALL GROUNDS AND RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 2592, 2613 (i), 4885, 5132, 5274 (ii).
- RIVER KAMINISTIGUIA: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).
- RIVER MATANE FISHING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 4207 (ii).
- River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. Ingram). 1°, 1072; 2°, 1202; in Com. and 3°, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- RIMOUSKI PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
- RIORDAN, D. G., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 3235 (ii).
- RIVIÈRE DU LIEVRE WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4958.
- RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY.: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 567 (i).
- RIVIÈRE STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2787, 4974.
- ROBERTSON, MR., A. B., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2879 (ii).
- ROSS, JAMES, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 786 (i).

- ROSS, DAVID, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : M. for Cor., &c.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 1057 (i).
- ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS, ERROR IN PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1231 (i).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 2471 (ii).
- Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 27** (Mr. *Quinn*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- RUTHERFORD, J. G., Esq., Member for Macdonald : introduced, 1990 (i).
- STE. PHILOMÈNE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL AND COMPLAINTS AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Brown*) 3256 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
- ST. ANDREW'S POST OFFICE (N.S.), REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3235.
- ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1987 (i).
- ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5009 (ii).
- ST. AUBERT AND ST. PAMPHILE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, TENDERERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3235 (ii).
- ST. CHARLES AND ST. GERVAIS MAIL CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3721 (ii).
- ST. JOHN HARBOUR (N.B.) : in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).
- ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, CONTRACTS FOR DRUGS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1029 (i).
- COAL OIL SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
- POSTMASTER'S DEFALCATION : in Com. of Sup., 5213 (ii).
- St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71** (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1373; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1573; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE, NORTH CHANNEL, STRAIGHTENING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
- CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &c., AMTS. PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3867 (ii).
- CANALS, IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2423 (i).
- NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- REMOVAL OF ROCKS : in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).
- RIVER REACHES : in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
- (UPPER) SALE OF ISLANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1026 (i).
- PURCHASE : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).
- SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 2576 (i), 4865 (ii).
- ST. MARTIN'S Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 4941, 5278 (ii).
- St Mary's River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 42** (Mr. *Dyment*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1072; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1202 (i).
- ST. NICHOLAS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4959 (ii).
- ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).
- ST. PAUL AND MURRAY BAY MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL, DANIEL B. STONE'S DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2414 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 5150 (ii).
- ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- ST. THOMAS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 267 (i).
- ST. VALERIEN DE RIMOUSKI POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2566 (i).
- SADOWA POSTMASTER, APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2123 (i).
- SALMON (B. C.) SOLD IN BRITISH MARKET, QUALITY, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1991 (i).
- FRESH : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3418 (ii).
- SALT, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3713 (ii).
- "SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
- SASKATCHEWAN BRIDGE, EDMONTON : in Com. of Sup., 2787 (ii).
- ELECTION, MEMBER'S SEAT CHALLENGED : M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 950, 970 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 953. (Ruling) 959; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 956, 964; (Mr. *Laurier*) 956, 965; (Mr. *Foster*) 957; (Mr. *Davies*) 959; (Mr. *Casey*) 960, 964; (Mr. *Davis*) 963; (Mr. *Quinn*) 967; (Mr. *Flint*) 969, 970 (i).
- Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s Revival, &c., Change of Name B. No. 53** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1172; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465; Proceedings null and void : M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5537, 5539 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1634 (i).
- SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND ONION LAKE MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1633 (i).
- SATURDAY SITTINGS : M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4472, 5157 (ii).
- SAUGEEN RESERVE, INDIAN AGENT CROWE : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788 (i).
- SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL CONSTRUCTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3874, 5117 (ii).
- Savings Banks in Prov. of Quebec Act Amt. B. No. 147** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5009; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 5157; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5372 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- SCHOOLS (INDIAN) DAY, BOARDING AND INDUSTRIAL : in Com. of Sup., 4076, 5000 (ii).
- N. W. T., CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4081 (ii).
- UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES, SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5002 (ii).
- See "MANITOBA SCHOOL QUES."
- SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4727; in Com., 5513 (ii).
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).
- SCOVIL, WALTER B., PET. re : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2415 (i).

- SCRAP IRON : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3583, 3630.
- SCREWS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3655 (ii).
- SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3530 (ii).
- SCUGOG ISLAND INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3524 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE :
- APPOINTMENTS BY PRESENT GOVT. : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1055 (i).
- BY LATE GOVT., RECOMMENDATION OF TREASURY BOARD : M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).
- BAZINET, MR., AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS : Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).
- CIVIL SERVANTS, COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
- COUNTY OF GASPE, COMMISSION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451 (i).
- CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS : in Com. of Sup., 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).
- EXAMINERS REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 1072 (i).
- LIST : Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).
- COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE PARTISAN OFFENCES : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1462 (i).
- COMMISSION *re* CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS : in Com. of Sup., 2215 (i) ; conc., 5429 (ii).
- COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) GOVT. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1542 (i).
- GOVT. COMMISSIONERS AND POLITICS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1543 (i).
- MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 2421 (i).
- NANTEL, BBUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 491 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2433 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 4830 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5542 (ii).
- QUEBEC LAND SLIDE, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3719 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 1926, 2068 (i).
- REP. : Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).
- SUPERANNUATION, UNDER PRESENT ADMINISTRATION : M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2447 (i).
- JULY 1896, TO APRIL, 1897, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 667 (i).
- TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICER, AMT. PAID : Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 491 (i).
- WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS GOVT. : Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
- SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2215 (i).
- SELECT STANDING COMS. : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 (i).
- COM. TO PREPARE LISTS : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).
- Lists Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 661 (i).
- NAMES ADDED : M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2051, 2408 (i).
- SENATE : in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).
- Senate and House of Commons Act further Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Davies*). Res. prop. 3671 ; 1° of B. 3730 ; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 2103 (i).
- SHANNON, MR. JAMES, POSTMASTER AT KINGSTON, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2653, 3740, 3865 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3058 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).
- SHIELDS, JAMES, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
- SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR (N.B.) : in Com. of Sup., 4958.
- SHIRTS AND SHIRT WAISTS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4180 (ii).
- SHOE TACKS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3652 (ii).
- SHOVELS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703 (ii).
- SHUBENACADIE AND DEAN MAIL CONTRACT : M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
- SIFTON, HON. C., Member for Brandon : introduced, 3 (i).
- SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING IN B.C., PAYMENTS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3146 (ii).
- "SILVER SPRAY" AND "MARY GROVER," SEIZURE : Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 927, 1300 (i).
- SIX NATIONS INDIAN OFFICE, DISMISSALS : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- SKATES, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3696, 4152 (ii).
- SMALL-POX AMONG IMMIGRANTS, WINNIPEG (1893) : in Com. of Sup., 4083 (ii).
- SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
- SMITH, F. X., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT GASPÉ, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1305 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
- SMITH, JOHN L., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
- SMUGGLING BY AMERICAN WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER BASIN : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
- INTO YUKON COUNTRY : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
- SNETSINGER, J. D., ESQ., Member for Cornwall and Stormont : introduced, 3 (i).
- SOCKS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4187 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. OF ARBITRATORS : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1540 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5123.
- SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 311, 488 (i).
- SECTION 12 : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 489 (i).
- SECTION 12, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
- SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
- Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°, 2654 ; 2°, 2778 ; in Com. and 3°, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

- SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &C., PROP. RY.:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1657, 2043 (i).
- SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID:** Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).
- SPEAKER, DEP., SALARY:** in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
- **AND ELECTIONS:** Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2218 (i).
- SPECIAL COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM;** M. (Mr. *Casey*) 1227 (i).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE:** Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
- SPENCE, JOHN, INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1079 (i).
- SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS, &C.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3352 (ii).
- SPRINGS, AXLES, &C.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3640 (ii).
- STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM.:** List of Members, 663 (i).
- STANLEY BRIDGE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 1663 (i).
- **AND P. E. I. RY., PETS. re CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2881 (ii).
- STAPLES, INSPECTION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 5058 (ii).
- STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK:** in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).
- STATISTICS, GENERAL:** in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 113** (Mr. *Davies*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2796; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 3721; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- Steam Boilers.** See "ENGINEERS."
- STEREOTYPES, &C.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703.
- STEWART, J., POSTMASTER, UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).
- STOCKHOLM EXHIBITION, WALTON JONES' APPNMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
- STOKER, WILLIAM, STATISTICAL SERVICES:** in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
- STRATFORD STREET LETTER-BOX SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 2126 (i).
- STRATHROY CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 483 (i).
- **POST OFFICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 797 (i).
- **AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5818 (ii).
- STRIP FENCING, &C.:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3633 (ii).
- Subsidies to Rys. Authorization B. No. 151** (Mr. *Blair*). Res. prop., 4736, 5158; in Com., 5361, 5478; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, of B., 5529; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 5535; 3<sup>o</sup>, 5541 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5362, 5479; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 5363; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5367, 5490; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5367; (Mr. *Davies*) 5368; (Mr. *Foster*) 5478; (Mr. *Casey*) 5486; (Mr. *Scriver*) 5495; (Mr. *Dupont*) 5497; (Mr. *Taylor*) 5502; (Mr. *Bostock*) 5504; (Mr. *McMullen*) 5504; (Mr. *Semple*) 5506; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5506; (Mr. *Britton*) 5508; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5508 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES.** See
- BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY. CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS, N.B. CENTRAL RAILWAY CO. OF N.B.**
- SUBSIDIES—Con.**
- CENTRAL RAILWAY (N.S.) AND LIVERPOOL, &C., RY. COAST LINE RY.**
- COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.**
- DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.**
- EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.**
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.**
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO. (ST. JEROME, &C.)**
- **RY. CO. (BRIDGE OVER OTTAWA RIVER).**
- GULF SHORE RY. CO.**
- INDIAN GARDEN (N.S.) &C., AND SHELBURNE RY.**
- IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.**
- JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY.**
- KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.**
- MONTFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.**
- NEPEAN POINT (OTTAWA) INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE.**
- ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.**
- OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.**
- **AND GATINEAU RY. CO.**
- **AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.**
- PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.**
- PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.**
- PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.**
- PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.**
- PORT HAWKESBURY AND BROAD COVE RY.**
- ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.**
- ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.**
- SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO.**
- STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.**
- SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY.**
- TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.**
- UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.**
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL.**
- WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN (N.B.) RY.**
- WINDSOR JUNCTION (I.C.R.) AND UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT RY.**
- SUBSIDIES (DOM.) TO RYS., &C.:** Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 177, 269, 948 (i).
- **DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT:** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 670 (i).
- SUGAR:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 4395 (ii).
- **CANDY:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 4398 (ii).
- **CONFECTIONERY:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 4398 (ii).
- SULLIVAN, D. B., RELEASE FROM PRISON:** Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3583 (ii).
- **M. for Papers\*** (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE (P.E.I.) HARBOUR:** in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
- Sunday Observance.** See "LORD'S DAY."
- Sun Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 91** (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1666; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).
- **AND MELROSE MAIL CONTRACT:** Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1027 (i).
- **SUBSIDY BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).
- SUPERANNUATIONS, CIVIL SERVICE:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 551 (i).
- **JULY, 1896, TO APRIL, 1897, NAMES, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 667 (i).
- **UNDER PRESENT ADMINISTRATION:** M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2447 (i).

**Superannuation (C. S.) Act Abolition B. No. 9** (Mr. *Mulock*). Res., prop., 551; 1° of B., 169; 2° m., 552 (i).

— **Act, &c., Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. *Fielding*). M. for Comon Res., 3721; in Com., 4118; 1°\* of B., 4119; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 5415 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

**SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT**: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4476 (ii).

**Supreme Court (Ont.) Judges' B. No. 131** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°\*, 3719; 2°, 4207; in Com., 4212; 3°\*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

**SUPREME COURT, R. G. DAVIS'S SALARY**: in Com. of Sup., 4986 (ii).

**SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS**: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3477 (ii).

**SUSSEX (N.B.) GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARE-TAKER**: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).

#### SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

**AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.**: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Dismissal of A. McCallum, 1903; Duty on Farm Implements, 2054, 2131. Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 2134; neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178. Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Mining Machinery and the Tariff, 2219; (Mr. *Cameron*) Winnipeg Industrial School, Rev. Fairlie's Dismissal, &c., 3301; (Mr. *Foster*) The Tariff Resolutions, 2407; (Mr. *Quinn*) Dismissals in Montreal, &c., 2572 (i); (Mr. *Foster*) Bank Note Contract, 2662; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2742; (Mr. *McMullen*) Bicycles as Baggage, 2743; (Mr. *Davin*) Duty on Coal Oil, 2744; (Mr. *Wallace*) Fast Atlantic SS. Service, 2767; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Dismissals, 4009; (Mr. *Tisdale*) Dismissals, Land Office, Man., 4017; (Mr. *Gillies*) Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, 4019; (Mr. *Poupore*) Game Laws, Quebec, 4022; (Mr. *Davin*) Dismissals, 4022; (Mr. *Sproule*) Mr. Dobbin's Dismissal, 4029; (Mr. *Davis*) Man. and North Western Ry. Co., 4766; (Mr. *McLennan*, *Inverness*) Close Season for Lobsters, 4769; (Mr. *Mills*) Bear River Obstructions, 4772 (ii).

**MESS. FROM HIS EX.**: Transmitting Estimates for 1897-98, 667 (i); Suppl., 4612; further Suppl., 5009; Suppl., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).

**RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM.**, 481; **MS.**, 1903, 2054, 2131, 2219, 2301, 2476, 2572 (i); 2662, 2742, 4009, 4766 (ii).

**IN COM.**: 1666, 1912, 2066, 2179, 2226, 2407, 2492, 2576 (i); 2719, 2758, 2778, 3743, 3843, 3874, 3919, 4033, 4052, 4740, 4774, 4865, 5013, 5083, 5201, 5234, 5288, 5338 (ii).

#### COMMITTEE:

*Administration of Justice.* See "Justice."

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*:

Agricultural Societies, Aid to, 2109 (i).

Archives, 2106 (i).

#### SUPPLY—Con.

##### COMMITTEE—Con.

##### *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*—Con.

Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 2118 (i).

Cold Storage, 2274 (i).

Creameries in N.W.T., 2179 (i).

Criminal Statistics, 2108 (i).

Dairying Service, 2119, 2180 (i).

Experimental Farms, 2109 (i).

General Statistics, 2109 (i).

Lafleur, John, Payment to, 4986 (ii).

North-west Exhibition (1894), Outstanding Accounts, 4859 (ii).

*Patent Record*, 2107 (i).

Public Health, 2202, 2226 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, 2108 (i).

Stockholm Exhibition, 4859 (ii).

Stoker, Wm., Statistical Services, 4859 (ii).

*Charges of Management*, 1666 (i).

Dominion Notes, Printing and Engraving, 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).

##### *Civil Government*:

Agriculture, 2088 (i).

Contingencies:

Agriculture, 2083 (i), 4832 (ii)

Auditor General, 2070 (i).

Customs, 2072 (i).

Inland Revenue, 4839 (ii).

Interior, 2068 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, 2087 (i), 4839 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 4831 (ii).

Post Office Dept., 2083 (i).

Privy Council Office, 2066 (i).

Secretary of State, 2068 (i).

Railways and Canals, 4830 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, 2087 (i).

Civil Service Examiners, 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).

Customs, 1730, 1989 (i).

Finance, 1721 (i).

Geological Survey, 1981 (i).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 1666 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, 1982 (i).

Indian Dept., 1709 (i), 4828 (ii).

Inland Revenue, 1721, 1902 (i), 4839 (ii).

Interior, 1669, 1701 (i), 4837 (ii).

Justice, 1666 (i), 4833 (ii).

Penitentiaries Branch, 1668 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, 1730 (i), 4839; conc., 3730 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 1639, 1926 (i), 4831.

Mounted Police, 1709 (i).

Postmaster General's, 1721, 2066 (i), 5059, 5077, 5110, 5265 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 1978 (i), 4830 (ii).

Public Printing and Stationery, 1669 (i) 4830, (ii).

Public Works, 1735 (i), 4893 (ii).

Railways and Canals, 1928, 1937 (i).

Secretary of State, 1926 (i).

Trade and Commerce, 1981 (i).

##### *Collection of Revenues*:

Dominion Lands, 4082 (ii).

SUPPLY--*Con.*COMMITTEE--*Con.**Collection of Revenues--Con.*

## Canals :

Williamsburg, retiring allowance, Mr. Hickey,  
5277 (ii).

Culling Timber, 2509 (i), 4864, 5058 (ii).

## Customs :

British Columbia, 2561 (i).

North-west Territories, 2560 (i).

Nova Scotia, 2552 (i).

Ontario, 2554 (i).

Prince Edward Island, 2552 (i).

Preventive Service, 5002, 5013, 5040 (ii).

Quebec, 2553 (i).

## Excise :

Extra Duty Pay, large distilleries, &c., 2493.

Frechette, Achille, technical translation, 5057.

Preventive Service, 2493 (i).

Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 2492 (i).

Travelling, rent, fuel, &c., 2507 (i).

## Post Office (Outside Service) :

General Vote, 5264 ; conc., 5431 (ii).

Mail Service, 2790, 5083 (ii).

## Public Works, 5416 (ii).

## Railways :

Baie des Chaleurs, operating, 5133 ; conc.,  
5452 (ii).

I. C. R., Commission of Investigation, sal-  
aries, 5254 (ii).

— Injured Passengers, 5276 (ii).

## Staples, Inspection of, 5058 (ii).

## Weights, Measures, Gas, &amp;c. :

Rent, Fuel, &c., 2551 (i).

Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &c., 2511 (i).

— Inspectors of Gas, 2551 (i).

*Culling Timber.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Dominion Lands,* 4080, 5423 (ii).

*Dominion Police,* 2090 (i).

*Customs.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Excise.* See "Collection of Revenues."

*Fisheries :*

Canned Lobsters, Scientific Examination,  
4999 (ii).

Fisheries Reference to Privy Council, 4999 (ii).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Issuing,  
conc., 5427 (ii).

Oyster Culture, 2551 (i).

Salaries, Inspectors, &c., 2407.

*Geological Survey,* 4072 (ii).*Govt. of North-west Territories :*

Schools, Clerical Assistance, &c., 4081 (ii).

— Unorganized Territories, 5002 (ii).

*Immigration :*

Agents and Employees in Can., salaries, 3743,  
4033 (ii).

— Great Britain, salaries, 4044 (ii).

— Foreign Countries, salaries, 4062 (ii).

Contingencies, 4066 (ii).

General Expenses, further Amount, 4992 (ii).

SUPPLY--*Con.*COMMITTEE--*Con.**Indians :*

## General :

Inspectors, salaries, &c., 4078 (ii).

## Manitoba and N. W. T. :

Schools, Day, Boarding and Industrial, 4076,  
5000 (ii).

Supplies, 4073 (ii).

Retiring Officers, Gratuities, 5006 (ii).

## Sundries :

Oka Indians, removal, 4073 (ii)

Survey and Reserve Commission, 4076 (ii).

*Justice, Administration of :*

Circuit Allowances, Travelling Expenses,  
Judges, 4141 (ii).

Supreme Court, R. G. Davis's Salary, 4986 (ii).

Travelling Allowances, Judges, Man., 3731 (ii).

*Legislation :*

## House of Commons :

Chapleau's New Poll-book, &c., 4843 ; conc.,  
5427 (ii).

Commission *re* Algoma Election, 4987, 5059 ;  
conc., 5451 (ii).

Contingencies, 2103 (i).

Deputy Speaker's Salary, 2091 (i).

Publishing Debates, 2105 (i).

Returning Officers, &c., Payments, 4990 (ii).

Salaries, 2102 (i).

Sessional and Extra Clerks, 2103 (i).

Voters' Lists, Printing, 2106 (i).

## Library :

American History, Books on, 2106 (i).

Salaries, 2106 (i).

## Senate :

Salaries and Contingencies, 2090 (i).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 2294 (i).

Construction, &c., of Lights, 2294 (i).

Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 2293 (i).

Repairs to Wharfs, 2295 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :*

Baddeck and Iona, Grand Narrows and Irish  
Cove, 2791 ; conc., 5419 (ii).

Canada and Newfoundland, 4994 (ii).

Halifax and Newfoundland, 2790 (ii).

Quebec and Gaspé, 4995 (ii).

Port Mulgrave and Canso, Guysborough, Fort  
Hood, 2793, 4998 (ii).

Victoria and San Francisco, 2791 (ii).

*Marine Hospitals :*

Marine Hospitals and Shipwrecked Seamen,  
2296.

*Militia :*

Defence of Esquimalt, &c., conc., 5426 (ii).

Gratuities to Officers retired, 4993 (ii).

Military College, Kingston, 4802 (ii).

Monuments, Battlefields of Can., 4861 (ii.)

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Militia Contingent,  
4861, 4994 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Miscellaneous :*

- Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 4082 ; conc., 5423 (ii).
- Banff, Rocky Mountain Park, 5000 (ii).
- Commission *re* Charges against Officials, 2215 (i) ; conc., 5429 (ii).
- Litigated Matters, Dept. of Justice, 3863 (ii).
- Interior, Deptl. Employees, Gratuities, 5001 (ii).
- Macpherson, Dr., Gratuity to Widow, 4860 (ii).
- Printing Day Books, Ports of Entry, 2562 (i).
- Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Mr. Laurier's Expenses, conc., 5456 (ii).
- Repatriation of French Canadians from Brazil, 4861 (ii).
- Small-pox among Immigrants, Winnipeg (1893) 4083 (ii).
- St. Johns, Que., Postmaster's Defalcation, 5213 (ii).
- Tariff Inquiry, additional Vote, 5205 (ii).

*Mounted Police, 4078 (ii).**Ocean and River Service :*

- Can. Registry of Shipping, 2290 (i).
- Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 2290 (i).
- Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 2293 (i).
- Rewards for Saving Life, 2290 (i).
- Tidal Service, &c., 2291 (i).
- Winter Mail Service, 2293 (i).
- Wrecks, Investigation into, 2290 (i).

*Penitentiaries, 2794 (ii).*

- Commission of Investigation, Expenses, 4798.
- Gratuities to Retiring Officers, 4987 (ii).
- Kingston, 2795, 4740, 4774 (ii).

*Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."**Public Works—Capital :*

- Buildings :
  - Fire Protection, Electric Lighting, &c., conc., 5429 (ii).
  - Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 4893 (ii).
- Harbours and Rivers :
  - River Kaministiquia, 2577 (i).
  - St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2576 (i), 4865 (ii).

*Public Works—Income :*

- Buildings :
  - British Columbia :
    - Victoria P.O., 2591 (i), 4956 (ii).
    - Drill Hall, 4956 (ii).
  - Manitoba :
    - Portage la Prairie P.O., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).
    - Winnipeg Immigration Building, 4949 (ii).
  - Maritime Provinces generally, 2592 (i).
  - New Brunswick :
    - St. Martin's P.O., 4941, 5278 (i).
  - North-west Territories, 2589 (i).
  - Nova Scotia :
    - Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 4901 ; conc., 5432 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income —*Buildings—*Con.*

- Ontario, 2578 (i).
  - Alexandria Reformatory, 4949 (ii).
  - Kingston Drill Hall, 4948 (ii).
  - Ottawa Public Buildings, Sidewalks, &c., 4948 (ii).
  - Western Deptl. Block, 4880 (ii).
  - Port Colborne Public Building, 4948 (ii).
  - Rat Portage Public Building, 5285 (ii).
  - Smith's Falls Public Building, 4949 (ii).
- Quebec :
  - Beauharnois Post Office, 5281 (ii).
  - Berthier Public Building, 5280 (ii).
  - Immigration Building, Louise Embankment, &c., 2577 (i).
  - Montreal P.O., New Skylights, &c., 4947 (ii).
- Rents, Repairs, Furniture, &c.
  - Ottawa, Removal of Depts., &c., 4885 (ii).
  - Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 2653 (ii).
  - Rents, Dom. Public Buildings, 2653 (i).
  - Rideau Hall Grounds and Renewals, 2592, 2613 (i), 4885 (ii).
  - Telephone Service, Ottawa, 2652 (i).
- Dredging : 2780, 4889 (ii).
- Harbours and Rivers :
  - British Columbia :
    - Columbia River Improvements, 4973 (ii).
    - Fraser River Improvements, 4973 (ii).
  - Manitoba, 2780, 4971 (ii).
  - Maritime Provinces generally, 2733 (ii).
  - New Brunswick, 4956 (ii).
    - Cape Tormentine Breakwater, 4958 (ii).
    - River St. John and Tributaries, 2733 (ii).
    - Shippegan Harbour, 4958 (ii).
    - St. John Harbour, 2732 (ii).
  - Nova Scotia, 4956 (ii).
    - Boularderie Wharf, 2719 (ii).
    - Judique Wharf, 2719 (ii).
    - Margaretsville Pier, 2719 (ii).
    - Pugwash Wharf, 2719 (ii).
    - Wallace Wharf, 2720 (ii).
  - Ontario, 2738 (ii).
    - Collingwood Harbour, 2758 (ii).
    - Fort Francis Lock, 4970 (ii).
    - Goderich Harbour, 2740 (ii).
    - Hilton and Markdale Wharf, 4966 (ii).
    - Honora Wharf, Manitoulin Island, 4964 (ii).
    - Port Stanley Harbour, 4966 (ii).
    - Rainy River Channel, 2773 (ii).
    - Toronto Harbour, 2739 (ii).
  - Prince Edward Island :
    - Knight's Point Breakwater, 2730 (ii).
    - Purchase of Wharfs, 4975 (ii).
    - Summerside Harbour, 2731 (ii).
    - West Point Wharf, 2730 (ii).
  - Quebec :
    - Cacouna, Extension of Wharf, 4958 (ii).
    - Gatineau River, East Bank, 4959 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Isle Perrot Wharf, 4958 (ii).

Laprairie, Ice Piers, &amp;c., 2735 (ii).

Rimouski Pier, 4963 (ii).

River Richelieu, Guide Piers, 2735 (ii)

Rivière du Lièvre Works, 4958 (ii).

Rivière Ste Anne de la Parade, 2736 (ii).

Ste Anne de Sorel Ice Piers, 4963 (ii).

St. Lawrence River, Removal of Rocks,  
2736 (ii).

St. Nicholas Wharf, 4959 (ii).

## Roads and Bridges :

Bridge across Saskatchewan, Edmonton,  
2787 (ii).

Maria St. Bridge, Ottawa, 4974 (ii).

## Telegraph Lines :

Cape Beale and Carmenah (B.C.) alternative  
Lines, 2788 (ii).

## Miscellaneous :

Architects, Draughtsmen, &amp;c., salaries, 4890.

Monument, Late Alex. Mackenzie, 2789 (ii).

Temporary Clerks, &amp;c., 4891 (ii).

*Quarantine :*

Cattle Quarantine, 2263 (i), 4860 (ii).

Tracadie Lazaretto, 2262 (i).

Tuberculosis, prevention of spreading, 4991 (ii).

Slaughter of Hogs, compensation, 2270.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital, 2263 (ii).

*Railways and Canals :*

## Canals :

Beauharnois, 5131 (ii).

—— Drainage Culvert, 5270 (ii).

Cornwall, Enlargement, 3861, 5115 (ii).

Galops, Enlargement, 3862 (ii).

Grenville, Enlargement, 3875, 3919 (ii).

Lachine, Enlargement, 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113,  
5150 (ii).—— Jacques Cartier Basin, &c., conc.,  
5451 (ii).

North Channel, Straightening, &amp;c., 3862 (ii).

Rideau, 5132, 5274 (ii).

St. Peter's, 5274 (ii).

St. Pierre River, 5150 (ii).

Sault Ste Marie, Construction, &c., 3874,  
5117 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Construction, 3861, 5123 (ii).

Trent Valley, Construction, 3863, 4825, 5126.

Welland, Superannuations, conc., 5454.

## Railways :

Prince Edward Island Ry. :

Hillsborough Bridge, Survey, 3843 (ii).

Intercolonial Ry., 3745 (ii).

Dartmouth Branch, 5113 (ii).

Rolling Stock, 5269, 5288, 5338 ; conc.,  
5477 (ii).Drummond Co. Ry., Rental for 9 months,  
5457 (ii).

Land Damages, Claims, 3834 ; conc., 4421.

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Scientific Institutions :*

Hydrographic Surveys, 2295 (i).

Meteorological Service, 2295 (i).

Toronto Observatory, 2295 (i).

## CONCURRENCE :

Arbitration, Dom. and Ont. and Que. Accounts,  
5423 (ii).Baddeck and Iona, Grand Narrows and Irish  
Cove Mail Subsidy, 5419 (ii).

Bay des Chaleurs Ry., 5452 (ii).

Chapleau's Patent Poll-book, 5427 (ii).

Commission *re* Algoma Election, 5451 (ii).

—— Charges against Public Officials, 4429 (ii).

Customs, Outside Service, 5446 (ii).

Defence of Esquimalt, &amp;c., 5426 (ii).

Dom. Notes, Printing, &amp;c., 5455 (ii).

Fire Protection, Electric Lighting, &amp;c., 5429 (ii).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, 5427.

I.C.R., Drummond Co. Ry., Rental, 5457 (ii).

—— Land Damages, 5421 (ii).

—— Rolling Stock, additional, 5477 (ii).

Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 5432 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Jacques Cartier Basin, &amp;c., 5451.

Marine and Fisheries Dept., 3730 (ii).

Post Office, Outside Service, 5431 (ii).

Public Works, 5416, 5456 (ii).

Quebec Public Buildings, 5456 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Hon. Mr. Laurier's  
Expenses, 5456 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, County Judges, Man., 3731.

Welland Canal, Superannuations, 5454 (ii).

**Supply B. (Grant for Jubilee Militia Con-  
tingent) No. 111 (Mr. Fielding).** 1<sup>st</sup>\* and  
2<sup>nd</sup>\*, 2662 ; 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 2742 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 1.)**Supply B. (Public Service) No. 150 (Mr.  
Fielding).** 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 5478 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>\*, 5535  
(ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

TANNING BARK : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3711.

TARIFF, THE : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 717 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2476 (i), 2800 (ii).

—— AND HER MAJESTY'S GOVT. *re* PREFERENTIAL  
CLAUSE : Ques. (Mr. Maclean) 2880 (ii).—— DATE OF INTRODUCTION AND N.S. ELECTIONS :  
Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 268 (i).—— INQUIRY, ADDITIONAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup.,  
5205 (ii).—— CONFIDENTIAL EVIDENCE : Remarks (Mr.  
Foster) 793 (i).—— TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE : Ques. (Mr. Monk)  
793 (i).

—— See "WAYS AND MEANS."

TEA AND COFFEE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3718.

TELEGRAPH LINES IN B.C., GOVT. AND C.P.R. : Ques.  
(Mr. Bostock) 2567 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).

TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 2652.

- Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58** (Mr. *Donville*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1126; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1409; in Com., 2450 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- TEMPORARY CLERKS, &C., PUBLIC WORKS:** in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).
- TENNANT, J. F., SUB-COLLECTOR AT GRETNA, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3503 (i).
- TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICE, AMT. PAID:** Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).
- TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Darin*) 1374 (i).  
— in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
- THIBAUT, CHAS., SUPERANNUATION, CONTRIBUTIONS, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Parmalce*) 1306 (i).
- THORNE, JAMES H., COMPLAINT AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).
- THORNVILLE (N.S.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF D. COVERT:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).
- THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).
- TIDAL SERVICE, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
- TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3057 (ii).
- TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- TIMOTHY SEED AND CLOVER, IMPOSITION OF DUTY:** Ques. (Mr. *Bazinet*) 793 (i).
- Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36** (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 914; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1058 (i); withdn., 3144 (ii).
- TORONTO HARBOUR:** in Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).  
— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).
- TOTTENHAM AND ATHLONE MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tyrchitt*) 3537 (ii).
- TRACADIE LAZARETTO:** in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE:**
- ANDERSON, GEO., APPNMT. AS AGENT TO JAPAN:** Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3339 (ii).
- ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE.** See "ATLANTIC."
- BEE-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY PAID:** Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 264 (i).
- BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, AND TARIFF RES.:** Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 1460 (i).  
— CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542.
- BOUNTIES ON IRON.** See "IRON AND STEEL."
- CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WITHDR. OF GOVT. AID:** M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 3538 (ii).
- EXPORT DUTY ON PULP WOOD:** Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 3872 (ii).  
— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2021, 2297 (i).
- EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND "FREE PRESS":** Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4105 (ii).
- EXPORT OF BACON, HAMS, &C., PROP. B.:** withdr. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4341 (ii).
- IRON, PIG, CAN. MANUFACTURE AND BOUNTY:** Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 97 (i).
- PACIFIC CABLE, GOVT. ACTION:** Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4109 (ii).
- RECIPROCAL RIGHTS, BELGIAN AND GERMANY:** Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1462 (i).  
— TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1456.
- TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT.:** in Com. of Sup., 1881, 2087 (i).
- TRADE AND COMMERCE—Con.**
- TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT. REP.:** Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS.:** Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).
- TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, ADJNMT. OF HSE:** M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4101 (ii).
- TREATY WITH JAPAN:** Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).
- TRUSTS AND COMBINES, EXISTENCE IN CAN.:** Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1986 (i).
- VENEERS, IMPORTS BY DOM. ORGAN CO.:** Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1545 (i).  
[See "CUSTOMS," "WAYS AND MEANS," &C.]
- Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 45** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1072 (i).
- Trade and other Labels B. No. 46** (Mr. *Lount*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1075 (i).
- Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 838; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 22** (Mr. *Davis*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, MAN.:** in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).
- TRAVELLERS' BAGGAGE:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 3706 (ii).
- TRAVELLING, RENT, FUEL, &C., EXCISE OFFICERS:** in Com. of Sup., 2507 (i).
- TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN:** Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).
- TREMBLAY, C. E., POSTMASTER AT LES EBOULEMENTS, DISMISSAL:** Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION:** in Com. of Sup., 3863, 4825, 5126 (ii).  
— BALSAM LAKE SECTION, DISMISSAL OF TIMBER INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).  
— ROSEDALE WORKS, DISMISSAL OF FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
- Trial by Jury in N.W.T. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Davies*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4203; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- TRUSTS AND COMBINES, EXISTENCE IN CAN.:** Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1986 (i).
- TUBERCULOSIS, PREVENTION OF SPREADING:** in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).
- TUSCARORA INDIANS, DISMISSAL OF PHYSICIAN:** M. for Cor. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3529 (ii).  
— APPNMT.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
- TYNAN, JOHN, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &C.:** Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
- UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE:** 1909, 2137, 2139, 2140 (i).
- UNITED STATES AND CAN. MAIL REGULATIONS, WITHDRS. BEFORE DELIVERY:** Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1635 (ii).  
— COAL, BITUMINOUS, IMPORTS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 3538 (ii).

- UNITED STATES, COAL OIL, IMPORTS IN TANK CARS :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 796 (i).  
 — COASTING LAWS, CAN. AND U. S. : M. for Cor.  
 (Mr. *Britton*) 3525 (ii).  
 — DEEP-SEA FISHERIES, POACHING BY AMERI-  
 CANS : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).  
 — FISHING LICENSES TO U. S. VESSELS : on  
 conc., 5427 (ii).  
 — FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS IN B. C. :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).  
 — ILLEGAL FISHING IN B. C. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr.  
*Prior*) 2446 (i).  
 — QUARANTINE REGULATIONS : M. for Ret. (Mr.  
*Davin*) 792, 822 (i).  
 — SMUGGLING BY WHALERS, MACKENZIE BASIN :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).  
 — SMUGGLING INTO YUKON COUNTRY : Ques. (Mr.  
*Prior*) 1375 (i).  
 — WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER : Ques. (Mr.  
*Oliver*) 4735 (ii).
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT. :  
 Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 926 (i).  
 — MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSIT : Ques.  
 (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).  
 — POSTMASTER, APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr.  
*Bergeron*) 2417, 2566 (i).
- VELVETS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4165 (ii).
- VENEERS, IMPORTS BY DOM. ORGAN CO. : Ques. (Mr.  
*Hughes*) 1545 (i).
- VERMOUTH, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3357.
- VERNON RIVER BRIDGE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
- VETERANS OF 1837-38, PENSION CLAIMS, &c. : M. for  
 Ret.\* (Mr. *Cameron*) 3537 (ii).
- VÉZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REVENUE : Ques. (Mr.  
*Dugas*) 1637 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2569 (i).
- VICTORIA (B.C.) DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 4956.  
 — in Com. of Sup., 2591 (i), 4956 (ii).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF \$300,000 :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 342, 574 (i).  
 — O. C. re GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 489 (i).
- VICTORIA CO. (N.S.) IONA WHARF, PAYMENT FOR  
 REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489 (i).
- VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY : in  
 Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
- Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry.  
 and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr.  
*Maxwell*). 1\*, 1899; 2\*, 2347 (i).
- VIRGINIA POST OFFICE (N.S.) : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485.  
 — MR. BANK'S APPNMT. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*)  
 1999 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES, &c.,  
 BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3056 (ii).
- VOTERS' LISTS (PRINTING) : in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
- Voters' Lists B. No. 126 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1\*,  
 3581; 2\* and in Com., 3724; 3\*, 3729 (ii). (60-  
 61 *Vic., c. 12.*)
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, CHANGES : Remarks (Mr.  
*Speaker*) 1452 (i).  
 — ERROR IN PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*)  
 1231 (i).
- WALLACE WHARF (N.S.) : in Com. of Sup., 2720 (ii).
- WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN :  
 Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 787 (i).  
 — DR. GEO. MITCHELL, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques.  
 (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).
- WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS  
 GOVT. : Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
- WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTION : Issued (Mr.  
*Speaker*) 1,420, 481 (i).
- WATCH CASES : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4168 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF :  
 Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 481 (i).  
 BUDGET, THE, Financial Stmt. (Mr. *Fielding*)  
 1083, 1120 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 1172; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1232;  
 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1258; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1308; (Mr.  
*Davin*) 1322; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1356; (Mr. *Craig*) 1359;  
 (Mr. *Sproule*) 1409; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1427; (Mr.  
*Kloepfer*) 1442; (Mr. *Douglas*) 1463; (Mr. *Wallace*)  
 1471; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1486; (Mr. *Bennett*)  
 1501; (Mr. *Davis*) 1511; (Mr. *Kendry*) 1515; (Mr.  
*Roche*) 1518; (Mr. *Wilson*) 1528; (Mr. *Casey*) 1560;  
 (Mr. *Clancy*) 1574; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1589; (Mr.  
*Powell*) 1603; (Mr. *Macdonnell, Selkirk*) 1615 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE : In Com. (Sir *Charles Tupper*)  
 2845, 2960, 3095, 3101, 3133, 3249; (Mr. *Davies*) 2865;  
 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2888; (Mr. *Foster*) 2902, 2945,  
 2970, 3078, 3091, 3095, 3099, 3127, 3158; (Mr. *Ross Robert-*  
*son*) 2909; (Mr. *Craig*) 2910, 3153, 3170; (Mr. *Bell, Pic-*  
*tou*) 2920; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2944, 3023, 3231; (Mr. *McNeill*)  
 2944, 3195, 3207; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2945, 2953, 3141; (Mr.  
*Davin*) 2956; (Mr. *Ives*) 2965; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2966,  
 3129, 3150, 3167, 3179; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2983, 3079, 3098;  
 (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2989; (Mr. *Frost*) 2997; (Mr.  
*Clancy*) 3015, 3150, 3166, 3184; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3029,  
 3036, 3162; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3044; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3060;  
 (Mr. *Beattie*) 3074, 3169; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3079; (Mr.  
*Sproule*) 3104, 3147, 3167, 3174; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*)  
 3105; (Mr. *Russell*) 3108; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3115; (Mr.  
*Davin*) 3121; (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 3153; (Mr. *Mc-*  
*Mullen*) 3161; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3180; (Mr. *Henderson*)  
 3180; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3185; (Mr. *McHugh*)  
 3193; (Mr. *Kendry*) 3207; (Mr. *McClure*) 3211; (Mr.  
*Ganong*) 3215; (Mr. *Domville*) 3223 (ii).
- COMBINE CLAUSE : In Com. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3247;  
 (Mr. *Fielding*) 3250; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3251; (Mr.  
*Britton*) 3255; (Mr. *Craig*) 3258; (Mr. *Davies*) 3264,  
 3306; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3271, 3290, 3332; (Mr. *Sproule*)  
 3296; (Mr. *Foster*) 3299; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3308; (Mr.  
*Taylor*) 3311, 3329; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3313; (Mr. *Bennett*)  
 3314; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3319; (Mr. *McCleary*) 3323; (Mr.  
*Kaulbach*) 3328; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 3330 (i).
- TARIFF CHANGES : In Com. (advertising matter, &c.)  
 3474; (agricultural implements) 4152, 4155; (axes,  
 scythes, &c.) 4169; (barbed wire) 3659; (books, &c.)  
 3465, 3706; (brass wire) 3694; (Britannia metal) 3703;  
 (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3679, 4147, 4161; (carriage  
 hardware) 4470; (chinaware, &c.) 3496; (clothes  
 wringers) 4166, 4167; (coal) 4466; (coal, bituminous)  
 4194; (coal, bituminous slack) 4192; (coal oil) 3478;  
 (condensed milk) 3409; (corn meal) 3421; (cotton

WAYS AND MEANS—*Con.*

- duck) 4186; (cotton fabrics) 4179, 4180; duck belting, &c.) 3710; (eggs) 3408; (files and rasps) 3698, 4133, 4137; (fur caps) 4192; (hats, caps, &c.) 4192; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (Indian corn) 3409, 3417, 3426, 4399; (India rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4145; (iron forgings) 3639; (iron or steel angles) 3637; (iron or steel ingots) 3637; (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 3696; (iron or steel, scrap) 3583, 3630; (labels) 3474; (marble, &c.) 3497; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466; (mutton, &c.) 3358; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (Norway iron, &c.) 3718; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (paintings, &c.) 3708; (pears and peaches) 4132, 4133; (photographs, &c.) 3475; (putty) 3478; (rice) 4150; (salmon, fresh) 3418; (salt, &c.) 3713; (screws, &c.) 3655; (shirts and shirt waists) 4189; (shoe tacks) 3652; (shovels, &c.) 3703; (skates, &c.) 3696, 4152; (socks, &c.) 4187; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (springs, axles, &c.) 3640; (stereotypes, &c.) 3703; (strip fencing, &c.) 3633; (sugar) 4395; (sugar candy) 4398; (sugar confectionery) 4398; (surgical instruments) 3477; (tanning bark) 3711; (tea and coffee) 3718; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (velvets, &c.) 4465; (vermouth, &c.) 3357; (watch cases) 4168; (wheat flour) 3442; (wire cable) 3693; (wire nails) 3640, 3645; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (woollen yarns) 4187. (ii).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, GAS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2511, 2551 (i).
- INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 793 (i).
- METRICAL SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 1027 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2122 (i).
- Welland Power and Supply Canal Co.'s B. No. 44** (Mr. Sutherland). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1072; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1202; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1936 (i). (60-61 Vic., c. 73.)
- WELLAND CANAL, SUPERANNUATIONS : conc., 5454 (ii).
- WELLER'S BAY AS AN OUTPORT, VALUE OF GOODS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Corby) 1663 (i).
- WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN (N.B.) RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4736 (ii).
- WEST, H. A., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 567 (i).
- WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD INLET TELEPHONE CO. : Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2420 (i).
- WEST POINT WHARF, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 2730.
- WHARFS, REPAIRS TO : in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).
- WHEAT FLOUR : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3442.
- WHITE, ISAAC, POSTMASTER AT FORT ERIE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 3238 (ii).
- WIGGINS, JOHN, DISMISSAL FROM B.C. PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. Morrison) 2418 (i).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, MR. HICKEY : in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).
- W. J. CASSELMAN'S DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2415 (i).
- WILLIAMS HEAD STATION, QUARANTINE SUPT., DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Prior) 1663 (i).
- WILLIAMS, P. J., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1450 (i).
- WINDSOR JUNCTION, I.C.R., AND UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. Blair) 4738; in Com., 5520 (ii).
- Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17** (Mr. Macdonell). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 707; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 785; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2448 (i); 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2775 (ii).
- WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, NAME OF PRINCIPAL, DATE OF APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cameron) 490.
- See "FAIRLIE, REV. MR."
- AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL : in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i).
- WINTER MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).
- WIRE CABLE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3693 (ii).
- WIRE NAILS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3640, 3645 (ii).
- WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : (Mr. Martin) 787 (i).
- HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 792.
- WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1051, 2031, 2033 (i).
- WOOLLEN FABRICS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4191 (ii).
- YARNS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4187.
- WRECKS, INVESTIGATION INTO : in Com. of Sup., 2290.
- YOUNG'S COVE, POST OFFICE (N.S.) : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 485 (i).
- Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 118** (Mr. Maxwell). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2967; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3465; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 Vic., c. 91.)